

Class  
rank.

*Attached to the Infantry Arm.*

29. Cadet William R. Sample to the Fourteenth Infantry.
38. Cadet William R. Dashiell to the Eighth Infantry.
39. Cadet Eli A. Helmick to the Eleventh Infantry.
40. Cadet Alexander W. Perry to the First Infantry.
41. Cadet William T. Littebrant to the Nineteenth Infantry.
42. Cadet Charles G. French to the Twentieth Infantry.
43. Cadet Capers D. Vance to the Twenty-first Infantry.
44. Cadet Matthew C. Butler, jr., to the Fourteenth Infantry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, July 9, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:  
To Mr. CRISP, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.  
To Mr. ROWLAND, for one day, on account of sickness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 1387) for the relief of certain volunteer soldiers;  
A bill (H. R. 5096) authorizing the construction of a bridge across Flint River, in the State of Georgia;

A bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812;

A bill (H. R. 9816) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Fort Smith, Ark.;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 191) relating to the pages of the House of Representatives; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 193) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to amend the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 9397) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CONGER. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This being Monday, the regular order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions.

CONTRACT LABOR.

Mr. FORD. I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that the present immigration to the United States is excessive, artificial, and injurious, and is encouraged to satisfy private greed;

Whereas it is charged by prominent journals that the law prohibiting the importation of contract labor is being extensively evaded, owing to a lack of machinery to enforce the provisions of said law;

Whereas it is claimed that the present indiscriminate immigration is not voluntary or natural, but is promoted and stimulated by transportation companies, and by so-called bankers and *padroni* in America, and that such immigration is having the effect of decreasing the wages of the workmen in the United States: Therefore,

*Be it resolved*, That the Speaker shall appoint a select committee of five, which committee is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the subject-matter herein referred to, and report their conclusions thereon to the House at the earliest practicable moment, by bill or otherwise. Such investigation shall be conducted at such times and places as the said committee may deem proper, and may be continued after the adjournment of the present session of Congress if necessary. Said committee is hereby authorized to send for and examine persons, books, and papers, and administer oaths to witnesses, and to employ a messenger and stenographer, and the expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. FORD. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to inquire how it becomes pertinent to that committee.

The SPEAKER put the question, and was in doubt as to the result. A division was called for.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 56, noes 47.

So the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs was agreed to.

SUGAR AND OIL TRUSTS.

Mr. ADAMS. I offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and desire to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on January 25, 1888, a resolution was adopted by the House reciting that certain individuals and corporations had combined to increase the price of some of the necessities of life, thereby injuriously affecting commerce between the States and impairing the revenues of the United States derived from its duties on imports, and requiring the Committee on Manufactures to investigate

the matter and report the result of such investigation to the House with such recommendations as the said committee might agree upon; and

Whereas the purpose of said resolution was, among other things, to obtain information in regard to the so-called sugar trust and enable the House intelligently to consider a revision of the tariff duties on sugar, and also to obtain information in regard to the so-called Standard Oil trust and enable the House to consider whether legislation in regard thereto ought to be had during the present session of Congress; and

Whereas the broad scope of the resolution as adopted by the House renders it impracticable for the Committee on Manufactures to make during the present session a final report with recommendations covering all the subject-matters embraced within the terms of said resolution: Therefore,

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Manufactures be directed to report immediately to the House, with or without recommendation, all the evidence heretofore taken by said committee relating to the so-called sugar trust; and that said committee be also directed immediately to make a separate report to the House, with or without recommendation, of all the evidence heretofore taken by said committee relating to the so-called Standard Oil trust.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not care whether the resolution goes to the Committee on Rules or to the Committee on Manufactures, to which it relates.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

PUBLIC BUILDING, CAMDEN, N. J.

Mr. HIRES introduced a bill (H. R. 10754) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Camden, N. J.;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ROAD, VICKSBURG.

Mr. CATCHINGS introduced a bill (H. R. 10755) to provide for the repair of the road built by the Government from Vicksburg, Miss., to the national cemetery adjacent thereto; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

LIFE-SAVING STATION, LAKE ONTARIO.

Mr. NUTTING introduced a bill (H. R. 10756) to establish a life-saving station on the coast of Lake Ontario, in the county of Oswego; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

BLAIR EDUCATIONAL BILL.

Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Whereas the people of the United States have largely petitioned Congress for the passage of a bill to aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools; and

Whereas many of the States, through their legislative assemblies, have urged the necessity of such aid, notably that of the State of Virginia, in a joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved (the House of Delegates concurring)*, That the Senators from Virginia be instructed, and the members of the House of Representatives from Virginia be requested, to vote for Federal aid to public free schools, and to support the measure commonly known as the Blair bill, or some other better measure; and

Whereas the Senate, during the early part of the present session of Congress, passed Senate bill 371, being a bill to aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools; and

Whereas said bill has been before the Committee on Education for several months; and

Whereas the majority of said committee have failed to report said bill and have the same placed on the Calendar of the House for its action; and

Whereas the majority of the committee have refused to meet to consider said bill and have on various occasions left the committee-room for the purpose of breaking a quorum, so as to prevent the consideration of said bill; and

Whereas the Republicans in caucus have asked unanimously that said bill be reported and placed on the Calendar of the House; and

Whereas it is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution and subversive of free government to suppress the will of the people:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education are hereby relieved from the further consideration of said bill, and that Tuesday, the 17th day of July, be set apart for the consideration of said bill, that it shall have precedence of all other business until disposed of, and that no dilatory motions shall be entertained during the consideration of said bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a personal explanation. I notice in the RECORD of July 7, that my colleague [Mr. GROSVENOR], speaking of his pair upon the land-forfeiture bill, used the following language:

I am announced as being paired with my colleague [Mr. OUTHWAITE]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "no;" I therefore uphold the pair and would have voted in the affirmative.

I do not know whence the gentleman received his understanding. If he were present this morning I should have inquired of him, but he is not present. I should have voted "yea" upon all occasions on that bill. I have supported the bill as earnestly as I possibly could, and, as it was distinctively a Democratic measure, I can not conceive how the gentleman should have supposed that I would have voted "no."

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to introduce a bill.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. LAWLER. At the end of the roll-call I wish to ask unanimous consent to have a petition printed.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded by several gentlemen, and the Chair is executing the regular order. The gentle-

man from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] is recognized to introduce a bill under the call.

STANDARD OF LENGTH, ETC.

Mr. BLAND introduced a bill (H. R. 10757) to establish public standards of length and standard directions for ascertaining the variations of the compass; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and ordered to be printed.

CAPITOL, NORTH O AND SOUTH WASHINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BREWER (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 10758) to amend the charter of the Capitol, North O Street and South Washington Railway Company; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PENSIONS OF SURVIVORS OF WAR OF 1812.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, introduced a bill (H. R. 10759) to increase the pensions of the survivors of the war of 1812; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF POSTAL APPROPRIATION ACT.

Mr. PETERS introduced a bill (H. R. 10760) to amend section 245, chapter 456, of "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875, and for other purposes;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS. I call for the regular order.

COL. JOHN GEORGE RYAN.

Mr. LAWLER. I hold in my hand a petition making a claim against the Government for damages for the false imprisonment of Col. John George Ryan, who was claimed to be John Surratt, concerned in the conspiracy against the life of Abraham Lincoln. This is a very important matter, damages being claimed to the amount of \$100,000. I do not ask that the petition with the accompanying affidavits be read, but I desire that it be published in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded, and unless that demand be withdrawn the Chair can not entertain the gentleman's request. Does the gentleman from Texas withdraw his demand?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER] asks to have this petition printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLMAN. Without the names?

Mr. LAWLER. There is only one name.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEELE. What is the petition?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois states that it is a petition of a certain gentleman who claims that he was falsely arrested and imprisoned by the Government upon the allegation that he was John Surratt, and who asks damages to the amount of \$100,000.

Mr. STEELE. I think the petition had better go to the proper committee. I object.

Mr. LAWLER. What objection can the gentleman have to printing the petition in the RECORD?

Mr. STEELE. It is not necessary to lumber up the RECORD with matters which are not pertinent.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This day, being the second Monday of the month, is set apart for the consideration of business of the Committee on the District of Columbia, if claimed by that committee. If not, the ordinary business of the House will proceed.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of taking up House bill No. 8272.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8272) to provide for the payment of F. H. Bates as military instructor at the Washington High School, District of Columbia.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HEMPHILL, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 15, noes 63.

Mr. MILLS. I now rise for the purpose of moving that the House go into Committee of the Whole, but I will yield a moment to the gentleman from California [Mr. BIGGS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] desires to call up another bill.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I think it fair to the House to state that we are prepared to go on with District business, if the House will sustain us, and are anxious to do so. But it is not necessary to consume time in making repeated motions. I will therefore submit only one other motion, with the view of testing the sense of the House as to whether we shall be permitted to go on with District business to-day. I therefore move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of taking up the bill (H. R. 9581) to incorporate the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator and Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS. I hope that motion will be voted down.

The question being taken, the motion of Mr. HEMPHILL was not agreed to; there being—ayes 7, noes 76.

Mr. HEMPHILL. In consideration of the action just taken by the House, indicating its desire to consider the bill which the gentleman

from Texas has designated, I will not further urge at this time the business of the District of Columbia Committee, as there is an evident majority against its consideration to-day. But I would like to say that when we get through with the tariff bill I will, throwing myself upon the mercy and kindness of the House, appeal to it to give us additional time for the consideration of our District measures.

Mr. MILLS. I yield a moment to the gentleman from California [Mr. BIGGS].

Mr. BIGGS. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill which I send to the desk, and that it be put on its passage.

Mr. BUCHANAN. After our experience of the last two days, I call for the regular order.

Mr. BIGGS. I hope the gentleman will not object; it is a bill that he has agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will object until these things are made less one-sided.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to resume the consideration of the tariff bill. Before that question is put, I ask consent that we close debate on the pending paragraph of the bill at 1 o'clock to-day.

Mr. RYAN. And all amendments?

Mr. MILLS. And all amendments. After that you can vote as much as you please.

Mr. CANNON. So far as concerns the amendment I have offered, and so far as concerns myself in connection with it, I will say, speaking for myself, that I am ready to consent that the debate be closed at any time. But so far as concerns closing debate on amendments which are to follow, several of which, of great importance I understand, are to be offered in good faith, I can not, for one, assent to closing debate in any time short of two days. Perhaps the subject may not take us so long as that, but a number of gentlemen want to offer amendments in good faith and want an opportunity to discuss them.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me we ought to come to some agreement to limit debate and finish this whole paragraph to-day.

Mr. REED. I do not believe there will be any discussion beyond what is necessary, and I think the gentleman had better let it run on for a while.

Mr. MILLS. Very well. Then I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, and let the debate drift.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

THE TARIFF.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the tariff bill. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out and insert what has been read.

[Mr. WILKINSON withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I owe the House no apology for occupying a few moments this morning, this being the first time I have intruded myself into the discussion of this question. I learned very early in the course of this debate that discussion on this question was of very little use to us here. I comprehended long since the star chamber proceedings of the Committee on Ways and Means. I learned that no discussion, no appeals, no protests from this side of the House would avail to change one paragraph, sentence, line, or word of this bill. The unalterable fiat had gone forth that their dark-lantern bill must pass just as it came from the committee, with possibly a few exceptions agreed to in caucus, where a pot of glue or a wooden screw might serve to mend the broken fences of some Democratic Congressman in a very close district. [Laughter.]

I do not intend now to enter into a discussion of its merits. Over three hundred hours of continuous debate here have failed to convert one single member of this House. What, then, is the use of talking? I am not especially charmed with the sound of my own voice. Nor is it necessary to inform my constituents how I stand on this question; I have frequently declared to them my position. They understand that I am an American; that I am a protectionist from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet, and that consequently I am a Republican, and that I stand upon the platform of the Republican party.

Gentlemen on the other side of this House who were so terribly elated by our friendly dialogue here last Saturday need not worry themselves about our family affairs. I desire to say to them that we are not afraid to discuss this question among ourselves. We may differ as to the ways and means which should be used in correcting the irregularities and inequalities of the tariff while preserving the protective principle, yet, Mr. Chairman, as to the principle and its results we are one. The venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] may not travel in the exact line with his more conservative brother, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and my friend from California [Mr. MCKENNA] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] may differ slightly with my colleagues from Iowa and myself. And some of us may even be in favor of free lumber, free salt, free rice, and free sugar, and be op-



posed to bounties, yet we may all stand solidly together upon the national Republican platform, and we all do stand uncompromisingly in favor of the prosperity and growth of all our country, and of the elevation, the advancement, the peace, and happiness of all our people. Oh, gentlemen on the other side, you need not trouble yourselves about the Republican platform. We will take care of that. And right here I desire to have the Clerk read, for your information, an epitome of that platform, so that you may be more fully conversant with it than you seem to be now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Condensed into the form of a short creed, the Republican platform is something like this:

We believe in a free ballot and in having every vote counted;  
 We believe in protection for protection's sake, and we are not ashamed of it;  
 We believe in abolishing internal taxes created for war purposes;  
 We believe in the direct protection of American labor against cheap foreign labor;  
 We believe in free internal competition;  
 We believe in railroad regulation;  
 We believe in homesteads and good homestead titles for citizens;  
 We believe in home rule for big and intelligent Territories;  
 We believe in a double monetary standard;  
 We believe in the utmost facilities for education, as worth all they can cost;  
 We believe in a big merchant marine and in American ship-yards;  
 We believe in a good navy, good coast defenses, and good water routes for commerce;  
 We believe in making other nations respect our rights and pay for all they get from us;  
 We believe in protecting American citizens against foreign interference, not only at home, but in any part of the world;  
 We believe in civil service reform more than ever; and  
 We believe that nothing is too good for the soldiers who risked their lives to save the country, and saved it.—*New York Press.*

Mr. CONGER. Those are the principles on which the Republican party stands. Those are the principles which the manufacturers of this country indorse; those are the principles which the farmers of this country indorse; those are the principles which the miners of this country indorse; those are the principles which the wage-earners everywhere indorse; and which will receive on the 6th of November next so universal an indorsement that they will thenceforward be recognized not only as the creed of the Republican party but the creed of the nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana, addressed the Chair.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. We can then go on and talk upon some other proposition. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. I would like to speak for five minutes.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman wants only five minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Then I will withdraw my motion.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have read the following amendment, to be presented at the proper time:

Strike out line 329 down to and including the word "gallon," in line 335, and insert the following: "All sugars and molasses shall, on and after January 1, 1893, be admitted free of duty."

Mr. Chairman, in the levying of impost duties I believe they should be so adjusted as to develop our industries. This has become the settled policy of this country and I do not believe any considerable portion of our people desire to change it. But when it has been demonstrated by means of a high protective tariff after years of trial that the industry is not susceptible of development in this country so as to meet the wants of the people, then I believe we should place the article on the free-list. Hence I have offered the amendment which has just been read.

Sugar, one of the great necessities of life, as made from sugar-cane proper, can only be produced in a limited area of the United States. It matters not to what extent we foster this industry by a tariff, we can not extend or materially develop it. The amount of the annual production is less than \$20,000,000. A fraction over one-tenth of the amount consumed is produced in this country. Our people pay a yearly tax of over \$56,000,000 on this one article alone. We do not produce to-day near as much sugar as we did before the war. In 1861-'62 we produced 539,830,500 pounds of sugar; in 1885-'86 the production was 302,754,486 pounds. While our home consumption is increasing at the rate of 10 per cent., our home product is decreasing.

During the past ten years we have paid out over \$455,000,000 in duties on sugar. It is estimated that the ordinary-sized family pays not less than \$5 in duties on the amount of sugar consumed in a year. Eighty-two per cent. ad valorem is the protection given sugar under the present law. This protection has not increased production, but has enhanced the price. Now, after years of a high protective tariff of 2 cents a pound on sugar and the production decreasing and equal to-day to only one-tenth of our consumption, is it the part of wisdom, I ask, or of statesmanship to longer continue the duty? Our Democratic friends need not longer talk about consistency, for it is not found in a bill containing such a hardship on the people. While this bill may have some merit, yet it will not meet with favor by the people of this country when it contains such a manifest injustice.

But Louisiana must be kept in the Democratic column, even if it compels our Democratic friends to support a measure which is neither

"fish or fowl," neither protection or free trade—a bill illogical and built on no connected plan, the chief characteristic of which is its extreme sectionalism.

We hear just now of wonderful experiments in the obtaining of a large percentage of sugar from sorghum cane. If it should prove to be true as stated, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska can produce sugar for the world, for we can raise sorghum cane as certain as Indian corn. I would make liberal appropriations to continue these experiments, not only in Southeastern Kansas but in Iowa, Illinois, and other States, and if it proves to be a success, as claimed and hoped, it will be a very easy matter to renew the tariff on sugar and assist in developing this new industry.

Some of our friends advocate a bounty. The giving of direct bounties or subsidies it seems to me is contrary to the spirit of our form of government. It is in the nature of class legislation, which I can not favor. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, when this question was first brought forward in the House I was not present, and thinking it was a proposition for free sugar, and that the result would be to strike down one of the industrial interests of the South, I felt like opposing it. I believe that the industries of this country, North, South, East, and West, no matter where they are located, deserve to receive the support of every man on this floor. But as the debate progressed, I ascertained that it was proposed to make sugar free, and that it was also proposed to pay a bounty to those who are engaged in the production of sugar in this country. I decided in my own mind, after reflection, that the proposition was a wise one, and that it was a proper one to receive the approval of the House.

Any gentleman on either side who differs in regard to that matter, and who opposes the adoption of such an amendment, would do well to carefully consider just what the result will be. When they go before their constituents in any district, North or South, East or West, and say they have voted against such an amendment, they will find it difficult to convince them that they have acted in behalf of their best interests.

Now, how is this bounty to affect the people of the country? It is a question whether they are to pay six millions of dollars, or sixty millions of dollars.

According to the committee which formulated this bill, this is one of the clauses which they ought to have stricken out, instead of asking for it the support of the House. If they had done that they would have acted in accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States, and in favor of the people taxed upon the necessities of life.

Let me ask any gentleman upon this floor the question whether he does not consider sugar as one of the necessities of life. If there is any one here who does not think so, let him ask his constituents, and he will find that they are of an entirely different opinion, and he will find that they will say universally that it is a necessary of life, and that it is not only a necessary of life but that it is one of the prime necessities of life. Like flour in the house, they can not do without it.

If the amendment making sugar free should pass the House and become a law, what will be the result? The poor man who goes to the store to buy a dollar's worth of sugar—5-cent sugar, for that is the standard quality in this country—gets 20 pounds for a dollar. If the amendment should pass and become a law the result would be that instead of 20 pounds he would get 32 pounds. Now, how are you going to explain to your people that you have looked after their interest when you defraud every workingman out of twelve pounds of sugar in every dollar's worth? If adopted, your constituents will get twelve pounds more for a dollar than they now get, and if it is not adopted they will get only 20 pounds instead of 32 pounds.

Now, our people do not complain that sugar is too high. They are not complaining of any commodity in this country as being too high. All they complain of is that at times they are out of employment, and at other times when they are employed they do not get sufficient wages. From whom, then, does the complaint come? It comes mainly from the rich people. It comes from those who brought about the abolition of the income tax. They are always complaining. Governor St. John explained that in his speech which I read this morning in the Sun. I have a suit of clothes for which I paid \$75. In Canada I could have purchased a similar suit of clothes for \$20. By buying that suit here I had to pay \$50 more. He does not stop to inquire how in the long run the encouragement of each industry reduces prices generally while at the same time all our industrial interests are sustained and encouraged; but those are the men who are always complaining of high prices, the men who are best able to pay them.

It is just that kind of people who are too nice to use the domestic production, but who can afford to pay for the foreign imports, and they ought to have the privilege of paying that duty. But does your workingman buy the imported article? He is glad to be able to buy the home product, and does not seek to get the imported article. He is very well satisfied with the domestic goods. He is the one, therefore, that you ought to think of in the consideration of your tariff. With the rich classes everything they get must come from Europe. [Applause.]



Mr. MILLS. I hope now we will have a vote on this question.

Mr. CANNON. So far as I am concerned, I am ready for a vote on my amendment, but I would like first to be permitted to occupy five minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Very well, with that understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. It is understood that at the expiration of the five minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Illinois the vote will be taken.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is the agreement.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say in that five minutes, in reply to the gentleman—first in reply to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILKINSON]. I hold in my hands a statement taken from the official report made to and adopted by an international convention between Great Britain, France, and Germany in 1879 touching sugar, from which it appears that in many thousands of actual practical experiments in France in refining raw sugars there was practically no loss of saccharine matter. In the high grades of sugar the loss was less than 1 per cent., and since that time the business of refining sugar has been improved.

A word in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], who made that wonderful statement.

Mr. WILKINSON. I would like to have the opportunity of stating to the gentleman—

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield.

Mr. WILKINSON. I yielded to the gentleman's interruptions several times in the course of my remarks, and hope he will allow me to make a single statement.

Mr. CANNON. I hope this interruption is not to be taken out of my time. I would cheerfully yield to the gentleman if I had ten or fifteen minutes.

A word; I say in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky, who always, when he talks in his sincerity and magnificence and smoothness, makes me feel like I wanted to say, "now let us pray, brethren" [laughter]—in reply to him and his statement wherein he stated that the labor in the refinery must be protected, and that we can not cut down any lower and have anything left for decrease upon other articles than sugar, and for that reason did not cut but 20 per cent, why, my friend, you can let raw sugar come in just as provided in the Mills bill—and none other is or will be imported—and then if you go to the higher grades above No. 13, all of which pass through the refineries and none of which are imported, and decrease the amount of the duty upon those higher grades one-half, you will just cut off \$14,000,000 from the profits of the refiners and leave them \$14,000,000 still, and I say again, you will not affect the revenues of the Government one cent. The gentleman knows that. I believe he is on the Committee on Manufactures. I think the Committee on Ways and Means know it. I think they knew it when they first drew their bill, and first called the attention of the country and the House to it and boasted of this reform they were going to make. But, Mr. Chairman, when the bill was reported and the refiners protested, the refiners and the trusts were left in the Mills bill, and they struck out the reform they put in when it was first drawn up and reported to the committee. Why did you do it? I asked that question before and I ask it now, and nobody has so far answered it. Again I repeat the inquiry, why did you do it?

Now a word in regard to my own amendment. I think that amendment ought to be adopted. I suppose it will not be. I apprehend that you are not going to sacrifice the St. Louis platform in this particular by adopting my amendment. True you have been making some little inroads upon the platform by adopting some amendments, four or five small changes, perhaps unimportant ones, the wood-screws of Connecticut, for instance, to satisfy some people on the other side; but I suppose you will not do it here, first, because it would not suit Louisiana men, and second, it would not suit the sugar trust.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], which will again be read.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Strike out lines 329 to 361, inclusive, of section 2, and insert as follows:

"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, and all molasses testing not above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for in this act shall be exempt from duty: *Provided*, That if an export duty shall hereafter be laid upon sugar or molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, such sugar or molasses so imported shall be subject to duty at the rates provided by law at the date of the passage of this act.

"All sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

"Molasses testing above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope, 1½ cents per gallon.

"Maple sugar, 2 cents per pound of crystallizable sugar contained therein as ascertained by the polariscope.

"Maple sirup or molasses, 4 cents per gallon.

"Glucose or grape sugar, 1 cent per pound.

"Sugar candy, not colored, 5 cents per pound. All other confectionery not specially enumerated or provided for, made wholly or in part of sugar, and on sugars after being refined when tintured, colored, or in any other way adulterated, and on all chocolate confectionery, 10 cents per pound: *Provided*, That if an export duty shall hereafter be laid upon sugar or molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, such sugar or molasses so imported shall be subject to duty as provided by law at the date of the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That for the encouragement of the production of sugar and

molasses there shall be paid a bounty to the producers thereof in the United States, when made from beets, sorghum, impber, or other sugar-cane raised in the United States, as follows:

"On sugar, 2 cents for each pound of crystallizable sugar contained therein, as ascertained by the polariscope. On molasses testing above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope, 6 cents per gallon; testing not above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope, 4 cents per gallon; and the bounties provided for in this act shall be paid out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe."

Tellers were demanded and ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] as tellers.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry; whether this amendment is not susceptible of division?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a motion to strike out and insert, and is not susceptible of division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I ask unanimous consent that we may have a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee can not make an arrangement of that kind that the House will recognize.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend in lines 336 and 337 by striking out "1.15 cents" and inserting "seventy-one-hundredths of a cent."

In line 339 strike out "thirty-two one-thousandths" and insert instead "two one-hundredths."

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to occupy a little more than five minutes, and in order that I may not be interrupted I ask unanimous consent to speak fifteen minutes if I need the time. I probably shall not require so much time.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered proposes to reduce the duty on sugar from the present enormous rate of 82 per cent. to 41 per cent. or one-half; in other words, to reduce the present specific rate of 1.40 cents per pound for raw sugar polarizing 75 degrees, to seventy one-hundredth cents per pound, and the present rate of four one-hundredth cents per pound for each additional degree to two one-hundredth cents per pound.

The amendment which I propose is in harmony with the protective lists of the present tariff, and treats sugar, from the protective standpoint, as an article which may be produced in this country to the extent of our wants, notwithstanding the fact that we now produce less sugar in the United States than we did before the war raises a serious doubt as to our ability to overcome climatic disadvantages. I am willing, however, for the present to continue a policy based on the belief that we can develop the production of sugar to the extent of our wants.

We are frequently told by gentlemen upon the other side that the average duty imposed on imports on the dutiable lists of the present tariff is 47 per cent., and that the Mills bill proposes to reduce that average only 7 per cent., leaving still an average of 40 per cent.

Every gentleman who stops to consider the subject appreciates the fact that a comparison of two tariffs by their dutiable lists alone without regard to their free-lists, for the purpose of showing the average imposed by each, is misleading and worthless. No comparison that is just or instructive can be made except by taking both the free and dutiable lists and estimating the average duties of the two united, for it is only by doing this that any tariff obtains proper allowance for transfers from the dutiable to the free list.

Estimated on this proper basis the average duty on all imports under the tariff of 1824 was 47 per cent.; under the tariff of 1846, 26 per cent., and under the tariff of 1833, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1834, it was 29½ per cent., and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1837, in consequence of the reduction in the invoiced value of goods on which specific duties were imposed—which reduction increased the ad valorem equivalent—it was 32 per cent.

Under the tariff of 1824 the average duty on dutiable goods was 51 per cent.; under the tariff of 1846 it was 27 per cent.; under the tariff of 1872 it was 43½ per cent.; and under the first year of the tariff of 1883 it was 41½ per cent.

What is it that has increased the average duty on imported articles on the free-list of the tariff of 1883 from 41½ per cent. for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, to 47 per cent. for the year ending June 30, 1887, without any change in the law? It is the decline of value of imported articles on which a specific duty is fixed; and the article which has had the most influence in increasing the average duty is sugar, which, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, paid a duty of only 50 per cent., but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, paid a duty of 82 per cent.

In other words, if sugar in the last fiscal year had borne a duty of 50 per cent. the average duty of the dutiable lists of the present tariff in the last year would have been only 42 per cent. instead of 47; and if sugar had borne a duty of 41 per cent., as proposed by my amendment, the average duty of the dutiable lists of the present tariff would have been only 40½ per cent. instead of 47.



In other words, it is the increase of the ad valorem duty on sugar from the 50 per cent. contemplated by the tariff of 1883 to 82 per cent. that has raised the average duty of the dutiable lists from 41½ per cent. in 1884 to 47 per cent. in 1887. And now gentlemen who are animadverting on the average duty of 47 per cent.—made so large by the enormous duty on sugar—are supporting a bill which imposes a duty equivalent to an ad valorem duty of 68 per cent. on sugar, against an ad valorem of 50 per cent. as contemplated by the tariff of 1883, and are claiming that they have largely reduced the duty on sugar, when, as a matter of fact, the ad valorem equivalent of the specific duty which they propose on sugar—and our friends on the other side always insist on comparing ad valorem equivalents—is 18 per cent. more than the ad valorem equivalent for the first year under the tariff of 1883.

Mr. Chairman, as I have already intimated, if my amendment should be adopted, the average ad valorem duty of the protected lists of the present tariff would be 40½ per cent., and sugar would have 41 per cent., and that, too, specific, which is equivalent to 10 per cent. more than a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem on most manufactured goods where undervaluations are the rule.

Sugar with that reduction would have more than the average duty on the protected manufactured products, notwithstanding it is a cruder article than advanced manufactures. The average duty on iron in the present tariff is 40½ per cent., on cottons 37½ per cent., and on woolen goods (excluding the compensatory duty for wool) 38 per cent., and an ad valorem duty, too, which in fact is not more than 32 per cent. specific. Therefore my amendment deals with sugar on the principle of protection and gives that industry the average protection given manufacturing industries, notwithstanding it is not yet clear that it can be produced in this country to the extent of our wants, as gives sugar more protection than it gives on the average to manufactured products.

In 1853-'54 Louisiana produced 368,129,000 pounds of sugar, and the remaining Southern States, 18,173,000 pounds, total, 386,302,000 pounds. In 1861-'62 the total product of sugar in these States was 539,830,000 pounds. But in no year since the war has the total annual product exceeded 320,000,000 pounds.

In 1886 this country consumed 1,389,125 tons of sugar, or 53.3 pounds per inhabitant. And of this consumption 1,235,213 tons, or nearly 90 per cent., were imported, and 153,912 tons, or 10 per cent., produced in this country. Certainly it would seem from our experience thus far as if our climatic disadvantages are such that we can not successfully produce sugar here to the extent of our wants. If not, then sugar would not properly be an article to come within the policy of protection, which applies only to articles whose production can be developed to the extent of our wants. But in view of the alleged success during the past year of experiments for the manufacture of sugar from beets in California, and from sorghum in Kansas, I am willing to treat the sugar industry as one which within a reasonable period can be developed to produce sufficient to supply the wants of our country, and to give it the same protection as manufacturing industries.

It should be borne in mind that the tariff of 1816 imposed a duty of only 30 per cent. on sugar, and that of 1857 only 24 per cent., both only the average of the protection lists. My amendment proposes to give sugar 41 per cent.

If greater protection than this is required to make the sugar industry a success, greater than has been required to establish other industries of a more advanced character, the States in which such industries are to be carried on will undoubtedly hasten to temporarily aid when satisfied that sugar can be made here to the extent of our wants without climatic disadvantages.

Mr. Chairman, I can not consent by my vote to retain a duty of 68 per cent. on so indispensable an article of food as sugar, as is proposed by the Mills bill. I trust that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], who assured the House that the Mills bill was a bill to reduce the cost of the food of the people, will listen. If the duty is so fixed as a protective policy, I must object to it as entirely unnecessary and indefensible to protect an industry which has existed in this country for half a century.

If it is maintained as a revenue duty, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] intimated a few days ago, I object to it as unjust, in that it is a duty on a necessary article of food, consumed by the poor man to nearly the same extent as the rich man; an article produced to so small an extent in this country that home competition can not fix the price (as it does in the case of manufactured goods which can be made here to the extent of our wants), but the price is inevitably the foreign cost with the duty added.

In the case of sugar, therefore, we have an article where no one denies that the duty is a tax which increases the burden of the consumer to the extent of the rate, where the commodity is a necessary article of food; where after forty years' trial and with the highest encouragement ever given an industry we are unable to supply only one-tenth of our wants, an article where every reduction of the duty will certainly reduce the revenue which the majority profess to seek to reduce; and yet it is this article which the Democratic majority insist on maintaining at the high rate of 68 per cent.

And while seeking to retain this high rate of duty on so necessary an article of food as sugar, the same Democratic majority place on the free-

list the products of the lumber-manufacturing industry, of the grain-bag manufacturing industry, of the brick-making industry, of the rough building-stone industry, and in the original bill as indorsed at St. Louis the lime and wood-pulp industries, and such products of the farm as wool, pease, beans, vegetables, cucumbers, tomatoes, milk, meats, and poultry; and seriously reduce the duty on manufactured articles, articles such as we can produce in this country to the extent of our wants, and on which for that reason the import duty is not a tax which increases the burden of our people, but a benefit to all classes.

Gentlemen on the Democratic side protest that their great object is to reduce our excessive revenue. If so, why do they reduce the duty on sugar so little, when by making the reduction one-half they can surely cut off \$28,000,000 in revenue on one article, and still leave as high a duty as the average of the protected lists, and when every cent of reduction of duty will surely reduce the cost of a necessary article of food? Why, instead of doing this, do they select articles heretofore insufficiently protected, where the reduction of the duty will increase the revenue, and injure rather than benefit the people?

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Do I understand the gentleman to say that his amendment cuts down the present duty on sugar one-half and provides for no bounty?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, it cuts down the duty one-half. The duty now is 82 per cent. ad valorem, and I propose to make the duty a specific equivalent of 41 cents, without any bounty.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. And still the duty will be above the average duty on protected articles?

Mr. DINGLEY. It will. If sugar bore an ad valorem duty of only 41 per cent., the average duty of the dutiable lists under the existing tariff would have been only 40½ per cent. last year.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. That is a dose which even the free-trade Democracy ought to jump at.

Mr. GEAR. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Under the Mills bill, as I understand, sugar is left at a duty of 68 per cent.?

Mr. DINGLEY. Sixty-eight per cent.

Mr. GEAR. And the gentleman proposes to cut the duty in two?

Mr. DINGLEY. I propose to cut the original 82 per cent. duty in two, making the rate 41 per cent., being 27 per cent. lower than the rate proposed in the Mills bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman from Maine indicate how many votes this bill would receive on the other side if his amendment were adopted?

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not know that that makes any difference.

Mr. MACDONALD. It makes a difference to me.

Mr. DINGLEY. We are now considering the question of sugar; and if the object is to reduce the revenue and reduce the burdens of the people, here is an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MACDONALD. I expect to vote for this bill, because I can not get anything better; but I do not propose to vote for any amendment of the opposition unless it will secure votes for the bill, instead of weakening it on our side.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat surprised at the character of the debate which has taken place during the last few days, and which has been continued this morning. The statements expressed by the gentlemen on the other side of the House are so strangely opposed to the declarations set forth in their platform of principles that they would lead one to believe that those pledges have been either forgotten or abandoned; and it adds to our surprise to see them, while in such an embarrassing perplexity, venture to charge others with lack of consistency and fealty to party promises. The leading feature of the Chicago Republican platform, the rule of action by which the party proposes to be guided, is expressed in the demand for—

such a revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of articles such as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor.

Mr. Worcester defines the word "check"—

To stop, to repress, to restrain.

Mr. Webster—

To make a stop, to pause.

Now, if this demand of the Republican platform means anything it must be that a product like sugar, coming as it does clearly within the class of articles which the Republican party pledged itself to protect by revising the tariff so as to check and stop its importation from foreign countries, should be subjected to a high if not prohibitory tariff duty.

Last year we imported sugar to the value of \$68,897,102.27, and the duties collected on this importation were \$56,515,601.67.

Personally and as a friend of the people I am strongly in favor of reducing the tax on sugar, and the bill we are considering makes a reduction of \$11,292,087.94, a larger amount than is remitted upon any article except those on the woolen schedule. The tariff tax on sugar as fixed by a Republican Congress was 82 per cent., while the bill now before us fixes it at 65 per cent. The same Republican gentlemen who voted for the bill of March 3, 1883, and fixed the duty on sugar at 82

per cent., which is the existing law, now vote for amendments to either remove the duty altogether or make it only nominal. I wish those gentlemen would explain how they reconcile such a course with their party pledges. Sugar is an article—such as is produced by our people, and the production of which gives employment to our labor.

The laborers who are given employment in Louisiana and Florida are colored men. The labor employed in Kansas, California, and other States are our good white farmers, and I would like to ask how our Republican friends reconcile their votes for free sugar with the pledges of their party to those citizens who labor in the production of that article. Sugar is a product of our agricultural industries, and to show how little consideration that industry has received from the Republican party I beg to call the attention of the House to the depressed condition of our farmers as compared with other, and especially with our manufacturing industries.

The census of 1880 shows that the value of the farms in the United States was \$10,197,096,776. There were employed on these farms 7,670,493 persons, and the total product of the farms and orchards—including what was consumed by the farmers themselves—amounted to \$2,264,278,718.

We see from this that the gross product in our agricultural industries was about 22 per cent. on the capital invested, and the annual value of the product per capita was about \$300.

This computation does not take into the account the amount of the capital invested in, or the wear and tear of, farming implements, the cost of seeds and fertilizers, the amount of capital invested in work-stock, nor the cost of their subsistence. Were these items included the profits of farming would probably be reduced one-half of the amount I have indicated; but to be liberal, we will say they would reduce my estimate one-third—\$200 per capita, instead of \$300.

From the same census we learn that the amount of capital invested in manufacturing industries was \$2,790,223,506; the number of hands employed was 2,738,930, and the total value of the product was \$5,369,667,706. The value of the product in the manufacturing industries is thus shown to have been about 200 per cent. on the capital invested, nine times greater than the per cent. of gross product realized in agriculture. The value of the product was about \$2,000 for each person engaged in manufacturing, or seven times as much as the product per capita realized in farming.

But I should deduct the value of the materials used in manufacturing. Let us see what will be the result. The value of the materials used by these 253,840 manufacturing establishments was \$3,394,340,029, leaving an excess of product over the materials used of \$1,975,327,677, or about 70 per cent. on the capital invested—more than three times the per cent. gained in farming—and the annual amount produced per capita, less the cost of materials, was about \$720, just three and three-fifths times the per capita of the product by farming.

As these statistics are highly instructive and very important, as well as interesting, I have prepared a table which will show at a glance the marked difference between the condition of an industry which for twenty-five years has borne all the burdens and received none of the benefits of legislation as contrasted with industries which have been developed by partial laws into powerful monopolies.

Table showing the comparative results of our agricultural and manufacturing industries.

FARMING INDUSTRIES.	
Amount of capital invested, exclusive of implements, cost of seeds and fertilizers, work-stock, or cost of their subsistence	\$10,197,096,776
Number of persons employed	7,670,493
Value of gross product, including consumption by farmers	\$2,264,278,718
Value of product for each person engaged in farming, about	\$300
Per cent. of product on capital invested	22
Product of each person after deducting cost of seeds, fertilizers, feed of work-stock, etc.	\$200
Per cent. of product on capital invested	14½
MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.	
Amount of capital invested	\$2,790,223,506
Number of persons employed	2,738,930
Value of gross product	\$5,369,667,706
Value of product for each person	\$2,000
Per cent. of product on capital invested	200
Value of materials used	\$3,394,340,029
Product after deducting materials used	\$1,975,327,677
Product of each person after deducting value of materials used	\$720
Per cent. of product on capital invested	70

We therefore see that after deducting the cost of the materials used in the manufacturing industries, and deducting the cost of seeds, fertilizers, feed of work-stock, etc., used in agricultural industries, the value of the product of one person in manufacturing industries is three and three-fifths times as much as the value of the product of each person engaged in farming. We also see that for every \$100 capital invested in manufacturing a product is realized of \$70, while for every \$100 capital invested in farming there is realized a product of only \$14.

From this comparison of the relative prosperity of our agricultural and manufacturing industries it is undeniably evident that, even so far back as 1880, the Republican tariff tax had so militated against the interests of the farmers that one man engaged in agriculture could produce only about one-fourth of the amount in value which one man

could produce in manufactures, and that a given amount of capital invested in farming industries produced only one-fifth as much value of product as the same amount produced in manufacturing industries.

I think I have a right, Mr. Chairman, I think I may say it is my solemn duty, to appeal to the Republican party to halt in their mercilessly destructive legislation against the interests of the farmers of the United States. Lamentable as was the picture in 1880, it is more deplorable to-day. Palaces and untold wealth concentrated in the hands of the highly-favored few, while a leaky roof and a mortgaged home is all that is left to the once proud, independent, and happy American farmer.

As evidence of the fact that this statement is no exaggerated picture of the pitiable extremity to which Republican legislation has reduced the farmers of the country, I beg to remind the House that it has been repeatedly asserted on this floor that the farms of the great West are almost buried in mortgages, held by the manufacturing capitalists of the East. I have no personal knowledge of the accuracy of these assertions, but I will give as my authority in one instance an article from the Missouri Republican, one of the leading papers of the United States. It says:

WHO OWNS THE WEST?

All the advocates of high protective tariff have one refrain to their songs, speeches, magazine essays, and sermons—the vast wealth of the country. "We are the richest country on the globe," they assert, "and the protective tariff has made us so;" and then they present us with a bewildering array of figures towering up into the billious to show how prosperous the land has been under the protective policy of the last twenty-six years. In 1862 we had only 32,000 miles of railroad; now we have 150,000. In 1860 we had only \$200,000,000 deposits in savings-banks; now we have \$1,100,000,000. In 1860 we had 2,044,000 farms; in 1880 the number had increased to 4,008,000, and at the present time it can not be less than 5,000,000. All this they tell us has been brought about by the protective policy—as if the industry, enterprise, and patient hard work of the people had nothing to do with the matter.

It may be admitted that the country is rich, and growing more rapidly in wealth than any other country on the globe. But the people have made it so, not the tariff. It has thrived in spite of protection. That policy has drawn enormous wealth from the twenty-nine agricultural States and concentrated it in the nine favored industrial States; and it is in the latter the affluence that excites the admiration of the high-tariff advocates is most conspicuously illustrated.

But, they tell us, the agricultural States have grown rich, too. They also have prospered under protection. See how farms have multiplied in the West and Northwest, and see how railroads have been built in Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and the States and Territories west of the Mississippi, even to the Pacific, and how this vast region has been subdued to settlement.

All true. But who owns these farms and railroads in the Western States? In one word, who owns the West? The people of the West, it might be answered. But the answer would not be true, as a few indisputable figures will sufficiently prove.

First, as to farms. In 1880 there were 138,500 farms in Kansas, 256,000 in Illinois, 194,000 in Indiana, 247,000 in Ohio, 185,300 in Iowa, 154,000 in Michigan, and 131,300 in Wisconsin—making a total of 1,309,100 in the seven States named. Recent statistics collected by Granger associations and printed in farm journals make the following exhibit of farm mortgages in these same States:

Kansas	\$235,000,000
Illinois	1,000,000,000
Indiana	635,000,000
Ohio	1,227,000,000
Iowa	567,000,000
Michigan	500,000,000
Wisconsin	357,000,000
Total	4,521,000,000

These figures are so startling in their enormity as to seem incredible. We do not vouch for their accuracy. They present the 1,309,100 farms in seven Western States as encumbered with an aggregate of four and a half billion mortgage indebtedness, or an average of over \$3,400 for each. The assessed valuation of property in these States in 1885 was as follows:

Kansas	\$275,500,000
Illinois	797,000,000
Indiana	793,000,000
Iowa	625,000,000
Michigan	850,000,000
Wisconsin	496,000,000
Ohio	1,671,000,000
Total	5,507,500,000

It will be seen that the reported mortgage debts cover about four-fifths the assessed value of the farms; and the bulk of these mortgages are held in the Eastern industrial States.

Next, as to railroads. In the seven Western States named there were, in 1885, 37,000 miles of railroad, with a stock and bond account and net earnings as follows:

States.	Stocks and bonds.	Net earnings.
Kansas	\$195,700,000	\$9,440,000
Illinois	740,000,000	16,000,000
Indiana	320,000,000	5,700,000
Iowa	105,000,000	2,180,000
Michigan	214,000,000	5,000,000
Wisconsin	236,000,000	6,900,000
Ohio	767,000,000	12,300,000
Total	2,537,700,000	57,520,000

These 37,000 miles of railroads, having a nominal value of \$2,537,700,000 (over two and a half billion dollars) and yielding annual net earnings of \$57,520,000, are put down in the statistics of the day as part of the property of the States in which they lie. But it is a notorious fact that only a very small fraction of their value is owned in these States. The last report of the Iowa railroad commissioners



states that only one out of forty stockholders in Iowa roads lives in the State, and only one-seventieth of the capital stock is held in the State. In Illinois a similar condition of things prevails. The official report of the railroad commissioners does not state what proportion of the aggregate capital stock of the Illinois roads is held in Illinois, but the location of the capital stock of the leading roads will assist us in forming an estimate. The Illinois Central has \$29,000,000 capital stock, only \$685,000, or less than 3 per cent., of which is owned in Illinois. Of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific, about 5 per cent. of the capital stock is owned in Illinois; of the Ohio and Mississippi stock, only one-half of 1 per cent.; of the St. Louis, Alton and Terre Haute, less than one-half of 1 per cent. Taking these figures as a guide we may safely estimate that of the 19,000 miles of railway in Illinois, valued in stock and bonds at \$740,000,000, the people of Illinois own 5 per cent.; the other 95 per cent. is owned in the rich industrial States of the East.

As Illinois is called the most prosperous and one of the richest agricultural States of the West, it may be inferred that the other States are in no better condition than it in the matter of railroad ownership, and therefore it may be broadly asserted that practically all the railroads of the seven States named, valued at \$2,537,700,000 (two and a half billion dollars and over), are owned in the industrial States. The industrial States are therefore drawing a pretty round sum of money for one thing and another from the seven Western States named every year. The items may be stated as follows:

In protective taxes.....	\$150,000,000
In interest on mortgages.....	270,000,000
In railroad net earnings.....	57,000,000
Total.....	477,000,000

The Western States are, in fact, being bled to death. Western farmers are actually becoming poorer and poorer every year. As a body they do not make a living, and the convincing proof of this fact is that their farms are fast passing under mortgage to the money-lending manufacturing States of the East. Twenty-five years ago these mortgages were few in number and small in amount; now they number millions and cover an aggregate value of thousands of millions, and all bear 6 to 8 per cent. interest.

The West does not own itself. It is owned by the industrial States. Twenty-six years of the malign, sectional, and oppressive policy of high tariff has done the work and done it effectually. The industrial States of the East, enriched beyond estimate by the annual tribute of \$600,000,000 exacted for a quarter of a century from the other States under the false pretense of building up home manufactures, own all Western railroads, telegraph lines, and bridges, and hold mortgages on nearly all farms, their cities, and towns.

This condition of the farmers of the West results directly from the legislation of the Republican party, and, it seems to me, gentlemen on the other side of the House would feel it to be their duty to aid in finding a remedy for so glaring an evil. And yet we see them now resisting, by every resource at their command, the accomplishment of this object.

The Republican platform recently promulgated at Chicago declares that the party will—

favor the entire repeal of the internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system.

Two years ago all the gentlemen were clamorous for the protection of the farmers by the oleomargarine bill. This year they go to Chicago and, by their platform, demand a repeal of that law rather than any part of their tariff for protection.

Not satisfied with this attack on the farmer, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and many other Republican gentlemen, insist upon the entire repeal of the tariff on sugar, a tax which has existed since the first tariff tax levied by the Government under the Constitution, and even anterior to that, to the tariff exacted during the period of the Confederation. Now, why are the gentlemen so hostile to the interests of the farmers?

Do they imagine they can elect anybody to any office against the votes of our honest farmers?

Do they imagine that this kind of Republican legislation will draw any votes to their party?

I can not think it is because they are really hostile to our agricultural interests; but I believe the country is rapidly coming to the conclusion that the Republican party is dominated and controlled by the great monopolies of the Northeast, and that the interests of the great mass of the people have, with that party, been subordinated and made a secondary consideration.

It was not always thus. Let us recall some of the utterances of these distinguished Republicans in the last Congress.

I read from volume 79, page 4895, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 25, 1886, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], speaking on the oleomargarine bill, said:

The agriculturists, who constitute the great foundation of industry—nearly one-half of our whole population—have for nearly a century submitted to taxation which tended to give a diversity of industries, and have rarely asked for taxation which would tend to benefit them directly. \* \* \* It is objected that the proposed tax is too high, and that we do not need the revenue.

Mr. Chairman, in reply I call attention that the proposed tax is not so great as that upon the product of corn when it is made into whisky, or upon tobacco, or upon many articles imported to this country. \* \* \* If gentlemen think we are getting too much revenue, it is perfectly competent to reduce internal taxation upon other articles, or to remove taxes, in whole or in part, upon some of the articles we import.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER], who has just struck his blow at the farmers, two years ago was equally earnest in his advocacy of the oleomargarine bill.

On page 4904 of the same volume of the RECORD I read that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] said, replying to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]:

No man respects the gentleman more than I do and have done for years, but I regret that the trembling hand of age is now being laid upon the very founda-

tion industry that gives life and vitality to the Republic. He would defend a few glutted money corporations and capitalists and strike down the purest industry that gives safety and business prosperity to the nation—the great farming industry. \* \* \* I serve notice on Pennsylvania here and now that if there is to be no interest protected in this Chamber but iron, and if the farmers of this land and the great, glorious West are to be sacrificed to protect your iron industry, you will get your "eye-teeth" cut before many Congresses come and go. [Applause.] \* \* \* The farmer does not often come into our presence demanding protection, but he is here now, and in earnest. In whatever way we strengthen him we add prosperity to every business pursuit in the land. Each owner of the soil is a stockholder in the Republic. As you strengthen, enrich, and protect that element you do add blessings to all the people.

On page 4966, same volume, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, I read that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] said:

Now, sir, I believe it to be a high duty to protect the agricultural industries from unfair rivals from within or from without. \* \* \* Besides, are not the dairymen, the farmers, working people? They compose upward of 60 per cent. of our working people, and no people work harder.

On page 4969, May 26, I read that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], in further reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], said:

The gentleman assumes here to speak for the people whom I represent, and who have placed me here as the guardian of their interests. I thank him for his kind co-operation; but the farmers of Iowa reject the proffered aid. \* \* \* So far as I have made the utterance that the Western country demands and will have protection—by argument if need be, but by war if necessary—I retract not a word. On that ground I stand, and will stand. I insist that tariff legislation is not the only medium by which the rights of the people can be protected.

It seems that two years ago this gentleman was determined to have war unless the farmers' rights were protected.

But now he and they go to Chicago and fling their banner to the breeze, with the inspiring rallying cry to the hosts of protection that rather than have one iota of protection taken off of iron or other imports, they would repeal the whole internal-revenue taxation, oleomargarine and all.

How will the dairymen of the country receive this astounding declaration?

In the same spirit of disregard for the interests of the farmers the Republican members of this House, with a few exceptions, have vehemently opposed the effort of the Democratic party to abolish or even reduce the tax on lumber, so as to enable the farmer to build himself a neat cottage and purchase more cheaply the lumber for his fences, wagons, and farming implements.

When the proposition to tax lumber was first brought before Congress twenty years since, a most distinguished member of the Republican party—he is its dictator and idolized leader to-day—denounced the project in unmeasured terms.

I read from the Congressional Globe, Fortieth Congress, second session, page 3049, June 10, 1868:

Mr. BLAINE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. I desire to discuss briefly the amendment which the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means so vigorously opposes. And in the first place, let me say that during the entire war, when we were seeking everything on the earth, and in the skies, and in the waters under the earth, out of which taxation could be wrung, it never entered into the conception of Congress to tax breadstuffs—never. During the most pressing exigencies of the terrible contest in which we were engaged, neither breadstuffs nor lumber ever became the subject of one penny of taxation. What was the reason of this? Let me tell my friend from Ohio that it was not because of the influence of the rich grain-dealers at Chicago or Toledo or Milwaukee. It was because, if anything be universal, breadstuffs are universal; for they constitute literally "the staff of life."

If you impose on them a tax ever so small in amount it will be made a pretext by the very speculators of whom gentlemen talk for adding an appreciable amount to the cost of a barrel of flour. I do beseech this House not to sanction the principle of subjecting such an article to taxation for the sake of the paltry amount that is to be gained from this source.

Mr. WELKER. Does the gentleman expect to secure an exemption for lumber by advocating an exemption for breadstuffs? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAINE. I am referring to breadstuffs because it illustrates a principle. I beseech this House not to sanction a tax on breadstuffs which will simply build up a mountain of prejudice for the sake of a mole-hill of revenue.

It will be observed from this last remark that, while speaking of breadstuffs, Mr. Blaine's real purpose was to oppose the tax which was then sought to be imposed on lumber. And it is very remarkable that his most devoted followers should now strenuously oppose Democrats in their efforts to enact tax laws which, twenty years ago, Mr. Blaine insisted was wise and necessary legislation. To show how earnest he was in his advocacy of free lumber, I will continue to read from Mr. Blaine's remarks on that occasion:

But, sir, I have said enough on that point. Now, as to the article of lumber. I again remind the House that there has never been a tax upon this article. The gentleman from Ohio may talk of this question as he pleases, but I say that wherever the Western frontiersman undertakes to make for himself a home, to till the soil, to carry on the business of life, he needs lumber for his cabin; he needs lumber for his fence; he needs lumber for his wagon or cart; he needs lumber for his plow; he needs lumber for almost every purpose in his daily life.

Mr. PAINE. Does he not need clothing also?

Mr. BLAINE. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to tell me why it is that these articles have never been taxed heretofore?

Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean to say they have never been taxed?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. Were not the manufactures of wood taxed? Is not lumber wood?

Mr. BLAINE. Not at all; and I am surprised that a gentleman who lives so near Maine as the gentleman from Massachusetts should be so ignorant of what lumber is.

Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. Will my friend allow me to ask whether the tax was not upon lumber, manufactured or unmanufactured?

Mr. BLAINE. I am not answerable for the singular verbiage incorporated in the act of March, which excepted the manufacture of lumber and breadstuffs. The difference between manufactured and unmanufactured lumber is known to everybody, or ought to be known to everybody who attempts to draw the act. Boards, joists, work that comes from the saw-mill (for I use the generic phrase), is lumber. Where it goes through the planing-mill for finer purposes it is not classed as lumber, or if classed at all, as in the reciprocity treaty, it is called manufactured lumber, not unmanufactured lumber. The planing-mill is distinct from the saw-mill.

So we see that, at the threshold of the pending campaign, the Republican party is divided, not on sugar alone, but its members are at variance with the views of its most prominent leader upon the important question of the propriety of a tax on lumber.

Mr. Chairman, I have done. My sole object in addressing the House to-day was to make one more appeal for the farmer. The figures I have given can not be disputed. They show that, weighted as he is in the struggle for life and fortune by the calamitous effects of Republican legislation, he can not, under existing laws, hope for more than one-fifth of the prosperity which rewards the efforts of his more fortunate brother who is engaged in avocations which for twenty-seven years have enjoyed the fostering care and special favor of the party by whose laws the country has been ruled during all that period.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GEAR. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. For how long?

Mr. RYAN. Until he concludes his remarks.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not ask more than five minutes additional.

Mr. STRUBLE. I must object to an indefinite extension.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to extending the time of the gentleman from Alabama for five minutes?

Mr. BLAND. I object to all extensions; let us have a vote.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask but two minutes more.

Mr. BLAND. It is too hot to continue these discussions indefinitely.

Mr. MILLS. I ask for a vote on the pending proposition.

Mr. BAYNE. I want to make a remark before the vote is taken.

Mr. GEAR. If I can obtain the floor, I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. BLAND. I object.

Mr. HOOKER addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] rise?

Mr. HOOKER. For the purpose of taking the floor and yielding it to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BLAND. I object to that.

Mr. HOOKER. If the Chair recognizes me, I have a right to yield my time to any gentleman I may designate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may be recognized for five minutes, and may yield his time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. BLAND. I object. Let us wait for cooler weather before indulging further in this speech-making. I call for a vote.

Mr. HOOKER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know what is the question before the House—whether we are not discussing it under the five-minute rule, and whether each member is not entitled to speak for five minutes if he wishes to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. He is not. The Clerk will read the rule.

The Clerk read as follows, from clause 5, Rule XXXIII:

5. When general debate is closed by order of the House, any member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon; but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. I hope we will now have a vote. I move that the committee rise for the purpose of limiting debate.

Mr. BAYNE. I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 66, noes 48.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*; Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill; and pending that motion I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to fifteen minutes; that is, to 2 o'clock.

Mr. DINGLEY. Nothing will be offered but substantial amendments, and I hope gentlemen will not limit the debate upon the paragraph.

Mr. BAYNE. I want five minutes, and that is all I want, and then I am done with sugar.

Mr. MILLS. What do gentlemen suggest on the other side?

Mr. REED. Limit the debate to the pending amendments. There are some matters of classification, and it is difficult to say now to what extent the debate should be limited upon them.

Mr. MILLS. Very well; then I will move that the debate on the pending amendments be limited to ten minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The question recurred on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and it was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendments has been limited by order of the House to ten minutes.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I trust the proposition of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will be acceptable to every Republican on this floor, without exception, and I hope it will be acceptable to every Democrat on this floor. The proposition of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is to reduce the duty on sugar to an equivalent to 41 per cent.—a high rate of duty on a necessary of life. The present law places the duty on sugar at 82 per cent. ad valorem. That is to say, the specific duty is equivalent to that. The Mills bill proposes to retain the specific duty, but to reduce it to 68 per cent. ad valorem, putting on this necessary of life a high rate of duty. The amendment of the gentleman from Maine proposes to place the duty on sugar at the equivalent of 41 per cent. ad valorem, which is a high rate of duty on a necessary of life. The amendment of the gentleman from Maine, on the basis of last year's importation, will reduce the revenue \$29,000,000 on a necessary of life.

With unctious and with earnestness and with zeal free salt was advocated on that side of the House. If the whole duty on salt were paid by the consumer it would amount to 1 cent. upon each man, woman, and child. If the amendment of the gentleman from Maine be adopted, it will amount to 50 cents on each man, woman, and child, which is a tax to that extent.

Gentlemen who have declaimed so much in favor of reducing the duties on the necessaries of life are confronted now with a proposition. They are confronted, to use the language of the President, by a "condition." [Laughter.] They have the opportunity now by voting for this amendment to reduce the duty on that necessary of life to 41 per cent. ad valorem. Will you do it? You might as well do it, because you will be confronted with that condition until you put yourselves on record by a yea-and-nay vote for or against that proposition. And if you go to the country this fall voting against that proposition to reduce the duty to 41 per cent. ad valorem and attempt to keep the duty up to 82 per cent. ad valorem, the country will draw the proper inference and arrive at the conclusion that the gentlemen who have so strongly advocated reduction of taxes—for this is a tax—on the necessaries of life did not mean what they said, but that they meant to protect a Louisianian industry and sugar refineries, and that they had not the courage or the will to strike down the sugar trusts.

I have heard declamation on that side of the House against trusts. I have heard declamation against a high tax on the necessaries of life. You are confronted now with the opportunity of striking down trusts and confronted with the opportunity to-day of reducing the tax on a necessary of life. Will you do it? We shall see when the voters pass between the tellers on this proposition.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KELLEY. I desire to ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on "Our sugar industry—shall it be protected?" from a pamphlet recently issued by Henry A. Brown, ex-Treasury agent. I do not ask to have it read, but that it shall be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and that will be done.

Mr. KELLEY. In the course of the debate on Saturday I said if the duties on sugar were extraordinary or inordinate, graduate them; but I shall now be found passing through the tellers in favor of specific duties equivalent to 41 per cent. and a fraction ad valorem. [Applause.]

The article referred to is as follows:

#### OUR SUGAR INDUSTRY—SHALL IT BE PROTECTED?

With fivefold sources of sugar production in this country—cane, beet, sorghum, maple, and corn—and climate suitable to each, it is absurd to pretend that sugar producing should be left to tropical climes. Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Austria, and Russia are not tropical climes, yet their sugar products flood the markets and rule the prices of sugar in London and New York.

France pays 2 cents per pound bounty on sugar exports, and virtually prohibits imports of sugar. Germany pays bounty on exports of sugar from 32 cents to about 63 cents per 100 pounds, according to grades, and virtually prohibits the importation of sugar. Germany and France alone produce enough beet sugar to supply the annual consumption of imported sugars in the United States.

Duties are levied as follows on sugars imported into European beet-sugar countries, which, having gained control of the sugar trade in England through her short-sighted abolition of sugar duty, now clamor for abolition of sugar duties in the United States for the same purpose:

France:	Cents.
On brown sugar, ninety-eight degrees and under.....	per pound... 4.38
On brown, above ninety-eight degrees, and on refined.....	do..... 5.47
Germany:	
On all raw sugars.....	do..... 2.59
On all refined sugars.....	do..... 3.25
Austria, etc.:	
On all sugar under No. 19 Dutch standard.....	do..... 3.27
On No. 19 Dutch standard and over, and on refined.....	do..... 4.37



	Cents.
Italy:	
On all sugars No. 20 Dutch standard or less.....per pound.....	4.65
On all sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard.....do.....	5.81
Netherlands:	
On raw sugar ninety-nine degrees, and on refined.....do.....	4.91
On melada and on grape sugar.....do.....	3.27
Belgium:	
On class 4, under No. 7 Dutch standard.....do.....	3.00
On class 3, Nos. 7 to 10 Dutch standard, exclusive.....do.....	3.59
On class 2, Nos. 10 to 15 Dutch standard, exclusive.....do.....	3.95
On class 1, Nos. 15 to 18 Dutch standard, inclusive.....do.....	4.22
On refined over No. 18 Dutch standard and loaves.....do.....	4.49
On refined crystallized.....do.....	4.80
Spain: On sugar.....do.....	5.20
Denmark: On all sugar.....do.....	3.80

Duties are levied on sugars in all other sugar-producing countries (see C. R., 73, 1887), ranging from about 2 cents to 7 cents per pound. The average duty on dutiable sugars imported into the United States in 1887 was 2.63 cents per pound, or less than one-half the average duty levied on sugar in the countries above named, which was 4.17 cents per pound. Consul L. G. Reed, at Barbadoes, the largest sugar producer of the West Indies (C. R. 86, November, 1887) says: "Male laborers on sugar estates are paid 20 cents per diem; females, 15 cents; children, 8 to 10 cents, with the addition of a little molasses every Saturday."

The prices paid for labor in Germany average for men 1.75 mark to 2 marks, or 40 to 48 cents per day without board; for women, 1.1 mark, or 27 cents a day. The price paid for labor in France averages 1.75 francs to 2 francs, or 35 to 50 cents a day for men, and 1 franc, or 20 cents per day for women; as compared with prices of labor in this country these facts tell the labor story, without referring to the still worse paid labor in China, India and other countries.

The above are average examples of wages paid laborers on sugar estates in most foreign-producing countries; while countries that pay a trifle more for labor, levy prohibitory duty on sugars, and the sugar industry of this country must compete with those countries or be wiped out. American sugar industries are entitled to, and require, national protection quite as much as the beet-sugar industries of Europe, or our own cotton, iron and wool-manufacturing industries.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] admit that the duty on sugar is a tax. Is this the only tax in the tariff? I am very glad, also, to hear the gentleman admit that 41 per cent. is a sufficiently protective tax upon this necessary of life, even though its raw material is to be taxed. I would like for the gentleman, however, to reconcile that statement with the position held by himself and held by his associates on that side of the House, that while 41 per cent. on refined sugar is sufficient, even with a high tax on raw sugars, yet the proposed 40 per cent. duty on woolens with raw wool free is an insufficient tax. Here is also a necessary of life and a protected industry. How is it, further, that 45 per cent. on steel rails is inadequate as alleged for the maintenance of that industry.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman pardon me—  
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I really have not the time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGLEY. I only wanted to say that that is 40 per cent. ad valorem, while the 41 per cent. on sugar is specific. Now, if you will give us on woolens 38 per cent. specific there will be no difficulty in the way.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I will be very glad to have the gentleman from Maine elaborate the position he occupies at any other time, but in the few minutes allotted to me I must decline to yield to him. I hope he may take an opportunity to reconcile the difference which exists on that side in reference to their attitude upon these two items of this bill. Steel rails, at least, are specific, and the protective part of the tariff on woolens has not been and is not specific nor so high as proposed in this bill.

Now, sir, the gentleman has spoken of the sugar trust. The refining of sugar, Mr. Chairman, and the production of raw or low-grade sugars—that production which is engaged in by the sorghum producers of the West, by the beet-growers of the West, and cane-growers of the South—are two entirely different and distinct pursuits. The refining of sugar is done mainly in the East. The chief seats of this industry are found in Philadelphia, in New York, and in Boston.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we find—I have figured a little hastily for the purpose of getting at the margins which have been considered necessary heretofore in regard to this industry—that the margin allowed for refining previous to the adoption of the present law, taking the average of sugars below No. 13, was 1.66 cents a pound as between raw sugars and refined sugars. That was then considered necessary by gentlemen upon the other side of the House. We know that the margin that you maintain between the raw sugars and the refined sugars is independent of the question of revenue and of the original question of the tax. It is one of those business matters that has to be settled in a business way whatever may be the tax you agree upon to start with. But, sir, when gentlemen of the other political party revised the tariff in 1883 they did not consider that even 1.66 cents a pound was an adequate margin, so they made it 1.68 cents and a fraction over.

Now, gentlemen, at that time when, as now, you were not dealing with an insufficiency of revenue, when in fact you were confronted by a redundancy of revenue, you deliberately established this as a business-like and proper margin between raw and unrefined sugars, your members on the Ways and Means Committee, and many of you here on the floor, have said that we were destroying this industry. You said at Chicago you would not surrender "any part" of these rates. You are in trouble. You are trying to unload. You now say we

favor a trust. Let us see. If, now, we reduce the raw sugars 20 points and the higher grades or refined sugars 20 points, we should leave the margin for the maintenance of the industry at precisely the same figure at which it now stands—that is to say, 1.68½ cents per pound.

But, sir, what have we done? We have made the margin, not 1.68½, but 1.38½ of a cent. We have lowered the margin to the extent of \$11,000,000 of the possible profits to the refineries of this country, and we consider that a very pronounced step towards breaking up the abuses under the trusts. I think gentlemen on the other side of the House should draw a distinction between what is necessary to stop the abuses of the trust, and what may be necessary for the maintenance of the industry itself. To escape a general reform of the many abuses of the tariff you are now willing to actually kill a selected industry. We want reform, not death. Reform will give life, joy, and increased prosperity to the masses everywhere. Where are your reproaches now? Who now is reckless and desperate?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. I ask that we have a vote on the pending amendment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (S. 1669) authorizing the Mississippi and Louisiana Bridge and Railroad Company, of Natchez, Miss., to construct a bridge over the Mississippi River at or near Natchez, Miss.; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 96) authorizing the District commissioners to designate a site for a statue of Benjamin Franklin.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

- An act (H. R. 7883) granting a pension to Susan L. Watson;
- An act (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Emeline C. Young;
- An act (H. R. 9284) granting a pension to Webster C. Webb;
- An act (H. R. 9224) granting a pension to Belle M. Baker;
- An act (H. R. 4831) granting a pension to Delilah Vandevender;
- An act (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Franklin Long;
- An act (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Byers;
- An act (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Mrs. Lovina J. Reeves;
- An act (H. R. 888) granting a pension to John Magher;
- An act (H. R. 469) granting a pension to Maria A. Salisbury and Almira Morgan, only children of Maj. Abner Morgan, of the Revolutionary Army;
- An act (H. R. 885) to amend chapter 253 of the acts of the second session, Forty-fifth Congress, passed June 15, 1878, granting a pension to John Langland;
- An act (H. R. 8510) for the relief of Mary Command;
- An act (H. R. 8299) for the relief of William M. Dayton;
- An act (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Susan Jones;
- An act (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren;
- An act (H. R. 4770) for the relief of Franklin White;
- An act (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Cheeks; and
- An act (H. R. 9347) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Buck.

THE TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.  
Mr. MILLS. I ask a vote on the pending amendment.  
The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine which has been read.

The question being taken, there were on a division—ayes 79, noes 97.  
Mr. DINGLEY. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.  
The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 105.  
So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBER. I now offer the amendment notice of which I gave on Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 329 to 346, inclusive, and insert the following:  
"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic test as follows, namely:  
"All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscopic not above seventy-five degrees, shall pay a duty of 1.15 cents per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree not above ninety degrees shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay thirty-two thousandths of a cent per pound additional.  
"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, testing by the polariscopic above ninety degrees and not above ninety-one degrees, shall pay a duty of 1.90 cents per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree not above ninety-seven degrees shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay five-hundredths of a cent per pound additional."

"All sugars testing by the polariscope above ninety-seven degrees shall be classified with sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color.  
"All sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely."

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, as this is a subject of considerable importance, I desire to ask consent that I may proceed without the limit required by the rules.

Mr. KELLEY. I move the gentleman have time to explain his amendment.

Mr. MILLS. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WEBER. I think about thirty minutes.

Mr. MILLS. I hope we shall get through with this schedule to-day.

Mr. WEBER. If the gentleman will allow me, I believe the abuses that have been spoken of by the gentleman from Illinois can be corrected by a proper classification of the sugar schedule; and I do not believe gentlemen on the other side will care to put obstacles in the way of preventing the undoubted fraudulent importation of sugar.

Mr. MILLS. I am willing to give the gentleman fifteen minutes, if he will accept that.

Mr. CANNON. I hope he will be allowed to proceed thirty minutes.

Mr. MILLS. I will give him fifteen minutes.

Mr. REED. This is an important matter.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILKINSON] was allowed to proceed almost *ad libitum*.

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I renew the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the objection insisted upon.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman from Indiana will withdraw his objection.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. At the earnest request of my friends I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now suggested that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for twenty-five minutes. Is there further objection? There was no further objection.

Mr. WEBER. The amendment proposed by me is in the nature of a reclassification of the sugar schedule, and is not designed to interfere with the rates proposed by the committee. It is assumed, at least I assume, that the majority of this House purpose standing by the Committee on Ways and Means as to rates, and the reclassification proposed is substantially upon the rates prescribed by the bill of the committee. The amendment is in the interest of the sugar producers as well as of the consumers of this country, and is not inimical to the interests of the refiner so far as the refining interests, pure and simple, are concerned; but the amendment does aim to strike, and I believe it will effectively strike, at the viciousness of the system which is the outgrowth of the existing law, and will result in stamping out practices that have been indulged in by some of the sugar refiners and importers whose trade operations were monopolistic long before they were combined in a sugar trust.

The object of the sugar duty, Mr. Chairman, no matter what it may have been in the days gone by, whether for revenue or for protection, or for both combined, is primarily the protection of the sugar-growers of this country. How far this object falls short in the bill of the committee and in what degree it fails, a careful examination of the existing law and the practical working of the system under the law will reveal. The proposition of the committee is but a horizontal reduction of that fraud-inviting and fraud-resulting system. The committee—and when I say the committee I mean the Democratic majority of the committee, for that seems to have been the committee—the committee seems to have started out with good intentions. The original bill brought into this House fixed the color-line requiring the polariscopic test at No. 16 Dutch standard or under, and repealed that provision of existing law requiring the payment of a drawback on exported refined sugar supposed to equal only the amount of the duty originally collected, less 1 per cent. retained by the Government.

The amended bill, as reported by Mr. MILLS, drops the color line to No. 13, and restores the provision paying drawbacks. This amended bill, this sudden change of front on the part of the committee—always dangerous in the face of the enemy, so the military authorities tell us—this overthrow of sensible intention in the direction of true reform, point suspiciously to the fine Italian hand of the sugar trust. The instrument used to carry out their purposes being the Committee on Ways and Means of this House; their reliance for success being the complication of the subject and the general lack of understanding of its practical working.

I do not charge that this committee was consciously influenced by the agents of the sugar trust; but, sir, the history of the sugar frauds upon the revenues of our Government and the sudden conversion of the Ways and Means Committee, as is evidenced by the schedule as it now exists in the bill compared with the schedule as it originally came to the House, seemingly indicates that the controlling sources of information upon which their amended action was based were the agents of the sugar trust.

Before the existing schedule went into effect in 1883 sugar duties were levied according to the Dutch standard of color alone. Up to that time nine-tenths of the sugar coming into this country came in as of No. 10 Dutch standard, or under.

When JOHN SHERMAN was Secretary of the Treasury he became satisfied that millions of pounds of high-grade sugars came into this country colored to resemble lower grades in order to escape the greater duties imposed upon the higher-colored sugars. He ordered the application of the polariscopic test, in order to ascertain their true saccharine quality upon which to rate the duties. The action of Secretary Sherman was resisted. The power of the courts was invoked; and in the case of Collector Merritt vs. Welsh the courts held that the application of the polariscope test required by Secretary Sherman to detect the true quality of these sugars was beyond the letter and spirit of the law. From that time until revived in 1883 the polariscope was relegated to the rear. But during that polariscopic period of two or three years the increase of the sugar revenues are estimated to be nearly \$5,000,000.

This decision of the Supreme Court of the United States referred to was rendered late in 1881, and in the tariff revision of 1883 the defects of the old system were sought to be remedied. The remedy was in the right direction, but it did not go far enough. The polariscope test was properly required, but only as to sugars grading No. 13 Dutch standard in color or under. Up to that time substantially all the sugars imported came in as of No. 13 in color or under. With such light as that Congress fixed the polariscopic test to apply to the sugar such as had up to that time been imported.

Now, I invite the attention of the committee to a study of some official statistics bearing, I think, most effectively upon this feature of the case.

In 1879 there came into this country of imported sugar 1,598,000,000 pounds, of which 1,597,000,000 pounds came in as of No. 13 or under. In 1880 there came in 1,592,000,000 pounds, of which 1,589,000,000 pounds came in as of No. 13 or under. In 1881 there came in 1,869,000,000 pounds, of which 1,867,000,000 pounds came in as of No. 13 or under. In 1882 there came in 1,913,000,000 pounds, of which 1,911,000,000 pounds came in as of No. 13 or under. I skip the year 1883 for the reason that in the middle of that year the polariscope appeared legally on the scene and was applied to all sugars of No. 13 Dutch standard and under commencing with a duty of 1.40 cents per pound for sugars testing not above 75 per cent. saccharine strength and adding four-hundredths of a cent per pound for each additional degree.

In 1884 there was imported 2,437,000,000 pounds, of which there came in claiming to be No. 13, but testing over ninety-one degrees, 288,000,000 pounds.

Now, the normal or natural color, as it used to be when color determined the quality, and upon which our tariff rates are founded, of sugars testing ninety-one degrees saccharine strength is No. 13 Dutch standard in color, and up to the date of the legal polariscope, in 1883, the highest number of pounds imported of sugars above No. 13 was 3,000,000 pounds; but as soon as the polariscope test was applied and the application of it limited to No. 13 the amount over No. 13, as determined by the color test, grew from 3,000,000 pounds to 288,000,000 pounds, testing by the polariscope ninety-one degrees, and therefore properly belonging to a color grade above No. 13, and subject to a duty under the law of 2.75 instead of 2.04 cents per pound. That was in 1884, and in 1885 the amount of increase had grown to 512,000,000 pounds.

In 1886 the increase in the imports of sugar over No. 13 was 826,000,000 pounds, and in 1887 the increase of imported sugar claiming to be No. 13, and appearing in color to be No. 13, but testing ninety-one degrees or over, and by that test shown to properly belong to the color class above No. 13, was 1,389,000,000 pounds, nearly one-half of the entire amount of sugars imported into the United States, paying 2.04 cents per pound for ninety-one degrees test because they were classed with No. 13 in color, when they should have paid, according to the color class above, to which their polariscope test consigns them, and which would have required at least 2.75 cents per pound. Now, either the sugar-planters of this country were deprived of the benefit of the protection involved between 2.04 (which would be the amount on No. 13 sugar testing ninety-one degrees) and 2.75, which would be the duty under existing law if they were above 13 in color—either, I say, the planters of this country were deprived of the benefit of that protection—or this vast sum remained in the pockets of the sugar trust.

But this is not all. There is more iniquity in that provision of the bill relating to drawbacks upon exported refined sugars, which the committee intended originally to repeal, but which for some reason as yet unexplained, but as to which, although explanation has been repeatedly invited, particularly by my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the committee have maintained a most discreet and commendable silence.

We may well look with suspicion upon the business of exporting refined sugars from this country to England upon the basis of drawbacks which shall equal only the amount of duty originally paid upon the importation of raw sugars. When we recall the facts that both countries go to the same sources of supply for the raw material; that the United States certainly has no advantage in respect of cost of capital employed to run the business of sugar refining, and no advantage in respect of cost of plant; that we stop the raw material half way, we may say, at our ports, unload it, cart it to the refineries, refine it with higher-priced labor, re-ent it to the wharves, reship it, retaining 1 per cent. of the duty originally col-



lected, and that we ship it to the country which buys the raw material at the same sources of supply that we do, and undersell the sugar refiners of that country in their own market, certainly such a state of facts forces us irresistibly to the conclusion that there is something wrong somewhere. Even the very gauzy theory which I have heard announced so often upon the floor of this House during the tariff discussion, which has been so copiously dealt out to the wage-workers of this country to lull them into acquiescence to take this strong free-trade draught, and which I presume will be repeated from every Democratic stump in the country from now until election, the theory that our labor is so much more productive because it is so much more skillful than the labor of other countries—even that theory as applied to sugar refining vanishes in the face of the fact that the labor cost of refining sugar is less than one-fifth of a cent per pound.

Now I want to give the committee a few figures with reference to the sugar drawbacks, and I regret that my friend from Louisiana [Mr. WILKINSON] is not in his seat, in order that I might, with the official statistics, correct the statement he made this morning that since the reduction of drawbacks on the first grade of sugar, exports of refined sugar had almost entirely ceased.

In 1883 we paid as drawbacks on refined sugars exported \$884,856.48. In 1884, after the system under the new tariff, which limited the polariscope test to No. 13 sugars, had fairly come into operation, we paid \$1,579,680.61—nearly double the payment of the preceding year. In 1885—and I desire the gentleman from Louisiana to notice that there is no falling off—the amount leaped up to \$6,695,892.52. In 1886 we paid \$5,638,807.53, and in 1887 \$5,466,501.79. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that in the last three years, because of fraudulent importations, \$1,000,000 per annum was paid as drawbacks by the Government more than had been originally collected as duties. It is certainly a little singular that as the fraudulent importations grow the volume of exported refined sugar swells.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, you can not honestly refine sugar in this country and export it to England simply upon the basis of the duty originally collected, for the conditions are clearly against any such thing. The sugar comes in originally at a lower rate than it should pay according to law, and it goes out upon the basis of color at the rate which it is presumed to have paid in the first instance and ought to have paid, but which it did not pay. When you get this business of exporting refined sugar down to an honest basis, assuming that the elements of labor cost and capital remain the same as now, you will have stopped the business of exporting refined sugars.

Mr. Chairman, the people want relief from this burden of sugar taxation. I do not believe that they desire this relief solely because of the amount of tax which they pay, but because many of them believe that the true principle of protection, namely, the protection of our labor against the cheaper labor of foreign countries, is not involved, and that the sugar tariff is a barrier against nature, against climatic influences, against the decrees of the Almighty.

The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], whom I am glad to see before me, apparently interested in my remarks, stated a few days ago with some earnestness and with that eloquence which usually characterizes his utterances, but as I thought in a spirit of boastful pride, that the free labor of the South to-day is cheaper than the slave labor of ante-bellum days. When the gentleman made that declaration I thought that even this principle of protection, so far as it means the protection of our labor against the cheaper labor of foreign countries, might be considered in this case to have failed. Mr. Chairman, the people do not object to this tax solely on account of its amount. They object also because they believe that a certain percentage of the tax which they pay (and which in my judgment is wholly a tax, because the home production being so insignificant in comparison with the total consumption does not at all affect the prices) does not appear in the Treasury of the United States, but remains in the pockets of the sugar refiners.

But, sir, knowing how completely that side of the House is wedded to the free-trade heresies of Democracy; having witnessed during the past few weeks with considerable admiration the grand discipline that has prevailed over there, whether brought about by the crack of the party lash, by coaxing, or by holding up the subtle influences, insinuatingly and opportunely put forward, of a well directed veto message; having noticed at least a strengthening of your lines at every weak point by sweetening our Louisiana friends with sugar, capturing Kentucky, perhaps, with whisky, wheedling South Carolina with paddy rice, screwing the courage of Connecticut up to the sticking point with wood-screws, and attaching one end of Chicago to the procession with good American stick-tight glue [laughter], I am ready to acknowledge that the two "wings of Democracy" flap loving and harmoniously together; and I am forced to admit that you on that side can not properly be charged with being infidels, for you certainly have taken good care of your own household.

But knowing also, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen on the other side will act entirely in accord with the dictates of the Committee on Ways and Means, and recognizing the wisdom of bowing to the inevitable, I make no useless struggle for a reduction of duties; but I do plead for a re-

classification of the schedule in order that there may be lifted from the shoulders of our people that portion of the burden founded in fraud and resulting in fraud, and for the purpose of showing that I am not entirely in error when I say that the people of this country demand relief from the burden of the sugar tax, I will read a brief extract from good Democratic authority, the loyalty and fealty of which I believe has not yet been questioned, and I presume will not be by any gentleman on the other side of the House. The New York World of July 3 says:

It is desirable to take the tax off sugar, since it is an article of universal consumption and the Government does not need the revenue. But there is a wide misapprehension as to the nature of the tax. The duty has much more of a revenue character than protective. Thorough free-traders prefer to have the tax continued, since five times or thereabouts as much sugar is imported as is produced in the country. And this has been so long the case that the protective idea with respect to it is practically demonstrated to be a failure. It is not profitable to raise sugar in the United States, and it is high time that poor people had ceased to be taxed to sustain the vain attempt.

As to the amendment I have offered, it is upon the basis of the rates submitted in the bill proposed by the committee. It begins at No. 13 Dutch standard in color, testing seventy-five degrees, with a duty of 1.15 cents per pound, as provided by the committee's bill, and thirty-two one-thousandths of a cent per pound for every additional degree or fraction of a degree up to and including ninety degrees.

Up to this point I am with the committee bill exactly. The variation from the committee's schedule, it may be said, begins here, for it requires all sugars not above 16 Dutch standard in color, testing by the polariscope above ninety and not above ninety-one degrees, shall pay a duty of 1.90 cents per pound, and for all additional degrees up to and including ninety-seven degrees of polariscope test they shall pay five one-hundredths of a cent additional. In other words, as sugars increase in richness, as demonstrated by the polariscope, the duty increases.

But it will be observed that the last degree of sugar, testing ninety-seven, pays 2.20 cents per pound, precisely the amount provided in the committee's bill for sugars above 13 and not above 16. Sugars testing by polariscope above ninety-seven degrees shall be classified with sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in color. From this point the exact text of the bill is resumed. [Applause.]

Pass that amendment and it will stop the refiners who indulge in these fraudulent practices. It will not injure Louisiana producers of sugar, but it will give them all the protection involved in the schedule, and will protect the consumers by just the amount between honest and fraudulent importations, and which now remains in the pockets of the sugar refiners of the country. [Applause.]

I reserve whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I believe I have been recognized, and I will yield only for a vote.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of submitting some remarks.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. In that case I will continue to occupy the floor for the purpose of answering one or two points made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEBER] in the remarks which he has just submitted.

In regard to the matter of the amount of duty paid on the raw sugar which has entered into the refined sugar, that is certified to the proper officials under Treasury regulations by the refiners. The Secretary of the Treasury has always had and now has the power to fix a limit beyond which these estimates shall not be paid. Under past Secretaries our export trade in refined sugar, based on the idea that refiners did not make false certification, has been very great. I am not prepared in this matter to impeach anybody's integrity, and so far as I know nobody can do it successfully. Secretary Folger was an able, painstaking, honest man. On the 9th of June, 1883, he issued the following order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., June 9, 1883.

To collectors of customs and others:

Until the 1st day of September, 1883, on the exportation of sugar and sirup, refined wholly from imported sugars, tank-bottoms, sirups of cane-juice, melada, concentrated melada, or concrete, and concentrated molasses, upon which duties shall be paid at the rates prescribed by the tariff of March 3, 1883, drawback will be allowed at the following rates:

1. On refined loaf, cut-loaf, crushed, granulated, and powdered sugar, stove-dried or dried by other equally effective processes, 2.82 cents per pound.
2. On refined white coffee sugar, undried, and above No. 20, Dutch standard in color, 2.25 cents per pound.
3. On all grades of refined coffee sugar, No. 20, Dutch standard, and below, in color, 1.84 cents per pound.
4. On sirup resulting entirely from the refining of the above-enumerated imported materials, 4 cents per gallon.

The allowance on sugars will be subject to the deduction of 1 per cent., and the allowance on sirup to the deduction of 10 per cent., as prescribed by law.

CHAS. J. FOLGER, Secretary.

He next issued this circular:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., October 3, 1883.

To collectors of customs and others:

The provisional rates of drawback specified in the Department's circular of June 9, 1883, No. 77, will continue in force until January 1, 1884, unless sooner revoked.

CHAS. J. FOLGER, Secretary.



Then on February 7, 1884, he issued this circular:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., February 7, 1884.

To collectors of customs and others:

The following rates of drawback on sugar and its products, established provisionally by the circular of June 9, 1883, are hereby declared to be permanent:

1. On refined loaf, cut-loaf, crushed, granulated, and powdered sugar, stove-dried, or dried by other equally effective process, 2.82 cents per pound.
2. On refined white coffee sugar, undried, and above No. 20, Dutch standard in color, 2.28 cents per pound.
3. On all grades of refined coffee sugar, No. 20, Dutch standard, and below, in color, 1.84 cents per pound.
4. On sirup resulting entirely from the refining of the above-enumerated imported materials, 4 cents per gallon.

The allowance on sugars will be subject to the deduction of 1 per cent., and the allowance on sirup to the deduction of 10 per cent., as prescribed by law.

CHAS. J. FOLGER, Secretary.

Then on July 23, 1884, Acting Secretary Coon issued this order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, D. C., July 23, 1884.

To collectors of customs and others:

On the exportation of sugar refined from imported molasses, upon which the duty of 4 cents per gallon, prescribed by the tariff of March 3, 1883, has been paid, a drawback will be allowed at the rate of fifty-five hundredths of a cent per pound, less the legal retention of 1 per cent.

CHAS. E. COON, Acting Secretary.

Exports continued large and complaints of fraud were freely made, as now. On September 28 Acting Secretary Fairchild issued this order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1888.

To collectors of customs and others:

On all refined loaf, cut-loaf, crushed, granulated, and powdered sugar, stove-dried or dried by other equally effective process, exported on and after November 1, 1888, drawback will be allowed at the rate of 2.60 cents per pound, less the legal retention of 1 per cent.

The above rate is provisionally established in lieu of the existing rate of 2.82 cents per pound, pending an inquiry as to what further reduction may be necessary.

C. S. FAIRCHILD, Acting Secretary.

The principal exports were of granulated sugar. On the 3d of February, 1888, Secretary Fairchild issued this order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1888.

To collectors of customs and others:

The rate of drawback provisionally established by the circular of September 28, 1888 (Synopsis 7780), on all refined loaf, cut-loaf, crushed, granulated, and powdered sugar, stove-dried or dried by other equally effective process, namely, 2.60 cents per pound, less the legal retention of 1 per cent., is hereby declared to be permanent.

C. S. FAIRCHILD, Secretary.

You see Secretary Fairchild, first acting for Secretary Manning, and since acting for himself, has cut down Secretary Folger's allowance on granulated sugar.

Mr. DINGLEY. From 2.82 to 2.60.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman from Maine is correct.

Mr. WEBER. They were reduced by Mr. Fairchild.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Further on.

Mr. WEBER. That was the first reduction.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. But first under Mr. Manning's administration.

Now as to exports. Honest exports we do not wish to stop. It gives work for our people. During the fiscal year of 1887 the exports of refined sugar were something over \$11,000,000, if I remember correctly.

Mr. WEBER. Are you speaking of sugar?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Yes, of refined sugar. I think it was something over \$11,000,000.

Mr. WEBER. That is incorrect.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. No, I think it is not; but on the contrary that it is accurate. But during the fiscal year just closed this export trade has been very small. It has not been more than one-fourth or one-fifth what it was before. If you say there was fraud, I say this is evidence of better things now. I expect the Secretary has got it about right. I remember the statements of refiners with whom I have talked in relation to this matter. They have complained of what they consider the insufficiency of the present amount of drawbacks paid by the Treasury Department, and they have stated that under the restrictions of the Treasury Department the amount of the export of refined sugar has diminished until it has become merely nominal. I have not the exact data, but they complain bitterly.

Mr. WEBER. Here are all of the official statistics which the gentleman can use if he desires to do so.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do not contradict the official statistics.

Mr. WEBER. Let me read, then. I do not think the gentleman heard me when I stated the facts derived from the official statistics.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Perhaps, if I had heard what the gentleman said, I would not be making any remarks now. I listened to the gentleman, but could not fully hear him.

Mr. WEBER. I have them here and will read them if you will allow me.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It is not necessary now.

Now. Mr. Chairman, that question of fraudulent drawbacks on ex-

ports is a question which rests at present where it has always rested—with the Treasury Department; and while I do not mean to contend against official figures, yet I have stated with some degree of confidence what I have and remember and what has been communicated to me by refiners and others who are perfectly acquainted with the subject.

It is clear to me that this matter is at least in safe condition at this time as respects frauds. It is a matter we always have had to leave with the Department, and I see no better way now. There may be a better way, but it is not proven. We had better reject these experiments, and not forget that we are doing better than we have done.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WEBER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be permitted to occupy further time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. No; while I thank the gentleman, yet I will not occupy the time of the committee now, though possibly I may take occasion later on to discuss certain other points in connection with the pending amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the last word. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, changing the classification of sugars under the tariff laws, involves more technical knowledge of the subject than all of us perhaps have conveniently at hand. But there is one fact in regard to imported sugars and the tariff duty upon them which almost every well-informed person in this country knows. Sugars between No. 13 and No. 16 Dutch standard, as they are now produced abroad under modern processes of manufacture, are fit, or measurably fit, for consumption by the people of this country without being put through the refineries. I ought to say rather that they would be fit for consumption without refining, if they were not artificially colored to take advantage of our tariff laws. They are, or rather would be, pure enough, clean enough, and light-colored enough to suit the taste of a large proportion of the people of the United States.

But it so happens that the classification of our sugar tariff imposes a higher duty upon sugars lighter in color than No. 13 Dutch standard. Hence the foreign producer has a strong motive to darken the color of his sugar in order to take advantage of the lower duty. He changes the color of his sugar by artificial means before it passes through the custom-house. The result is that after it has passed the custom-house it is forced to go through the refineries in order to get rid of the artificial coloring instead of going directly, as it otherwise would, to the breakfast table of the American consumer. Hence the existing sugar tariff, as well as the Mills bill, for the Mills bill perpetuates the abuse, compels the American consumer to pay a tribute of about a cent a pound to the sugar-refining trust on a large portion of the sugar which he uses. This is the evil which the amendment of the gentleman from New York proposes to cure.

The Committee on Ways and Means also proposed to correct this evil when they made the first draught of their bill for the use of the committee. My colleague [Mr. CANNON] has already called attention to the amazing change of front executed by the Committee on Ways and Means between the time when they printed the first draught of their bill and the time when they submitted the bill for the consideration of the House.

The gentleman from New York has just now declared that he thought the "fine Italian hand" of the sugar trust might be discerned in this amazing change in the text of the bill. He is not far out of the way. The members of the Committee on Manufactures as well as the members of the Committee on Ways and Means would probably admit that the change was due to evidence given by New York sugar refiners before the Committee on Manufactures when that committee was investigating the sugar trust under a resolution of my colleague [Mr. MASON] which passed the House January 25. Three members of the Committee on Manufactures are also majority members of the Ways and Means. They must have begun their investigation in February. The pending bill was reported early in April.

I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution of my colleague [Mr. MASON] was not confined to its original scope of an investigation of the sugar trust. If it had been, we should perhaps have had a report from the committee long ago. It would have been of some benefit to us in the consideration of the provisions of the pending bill relating to the sugar duties. That was undoubtedly the intention of my colleague in introducing it. The scope of that resolution was so broadened by the House that it covered not only the sugar trust, but the Standard Oil trust, and all the other trusts of which we have heard so much during the discussion of the pending bill. I am glad to have all these trusts investigated, but I wish the committee had seen fit to make at least a partial report of the evidence taken, so that we could have had some benefit at this session from their investigations.

It seems to me it would have been only fair for the gentlemen on the Committee on Manufactures who are also members of the Committee on Ways and Means to see to it that at least a partial report was made, including all of the testimony taken in relation to the sugar trust. It is not enough, in my estimation, that in a practical matter, a matter of grave importance of this kind, the facts should be familiar to but three or four gentlemen, however eminent and able they may be. If we in this House are called upon to vote for or against a proposed re-



vision of the tariff laws, we ought to be placed in possession of all the information that is accessible to that committee or any other committee of the House. Therefore I say I regret very much the report was not made months ago.

I introduced a resolution this morning on the call of States calling for an immediate report from that committee of the evidence taken in regard to the sugar trust, and also the evidence in regard to the Standard Oil trust. That, also, is an important matter. The resolution of my colleague [Mr. MASON] was introduced with reference to legislation to be had during the present session of Congress; and yet by the slow method in which the work of that committee has dragged itself along we are not likely to get any practical benefit from it this summer or even next winter.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think I reveal no committee secrets when I state that the evidence taken by the committee on these two points has been concluded months since, and that it could have been presented to the House whenever it chose to call for it.

Mr. ADAMS. On what points?

Mr. BUCHANAN. On the Standard Oil trust and the sugar trust.

Mr. ADAMS. Well, perhaps it is my fault that I was not aware of that fact. Theoretically every one of us may be supposed to know what goes on in every committee, but practically we do not.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And I see no objection to the House ordering that testimony to be printed at once.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have a copy of the evidence on the sugar trust in my hand.

Mr. ADAMS. It ought to be in the hands of every member; and the evidence on the Standard Oil trust also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will regard the *pro forma* amendment as withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. Is there anything pending before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment to strike out and insert.

Mr. HOUK. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed not to exceed fifteen minutes. I do not think I will occupy ten.

Mr. MILLS. I am bound to object. We must get on with this bill.

Mr. HOUK. Then I will modify my request and ask for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee that he be allowed ten minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUK. Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist because I believe in protection, and were I on the Ways and Means Committee and charged with preparing a bill looking to the permanency of the protective system I would place everything on the free-list which was not produced in this country, or which we do not have the means of producing in the early future in sufficient quantities to supply in a great degree the demands of the people. Everything which we can not produce should go on the free-list, because to place a duty on such articles comes within the reasoning of the free-traders, that the amount of the duty is added to the price.

The protective theory, as I understand it, is that protection should be extended to all the industries of this country when they can produce the article in sufficient quantities to supply the demand and meet the wants of consumers. This brings about competition, and the merest tyro knows that competition reduces prices. All human experience proves this to be a practical truth. It is true in every branch of trade that a sufficient supply and competition in the trade lessens prices and cheapens the article to the consumer.

If I had been called upon to vote on the question of reducing or destroying the duty on sugar at the commencement of this session, being somewhat illy informed on the subject up to that time, I should, following my natural inclinations to maintain the protective policy of this country as the great American policy to develop and build up, have voted to maintain the tariff duty as it stands to-day. But, as I now understand it, we produce in this country less than one-ninth of the sugar necessary to supply the consumption of the American people. That fact presenting itself, uncontradicted so far as I know, without any great assurance that this production can be increased commensurate with the demand and sufficient to supply the American market, I hold that as a true protectionist it is not the policy of the Republican party to keep anything on the protected list which is not produced in such quantities in this country as to create competition in the American market and thereby reduce the price. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for one Republican in the interest of protection, that we may not extend it to those industries which are of such small importance as to be insufficient to supply our home market and home consumption, I say I am inclined when the proper time comes to vote to put sugar upon the free-list, and shall do so unless the production shall have greatly increased in the mean time.

But I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, it makes but little difference how we vote in this committee. The decree has gone forth from the caucus,

which seems to be as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, that this bill from the Ways and Means Committee is not to be marred, not to be changed in letter or line except for the purpose of accommodating some Democratic member in a district where to leave the article on the free-list would endanger his re-election. We have seen a good deal to confirm the idea that the Democracy regard the tariff as "a local issue."

I did not vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois for the reason that I, as a true protectionist, fear the result of the policy of inaugurating the bounty system by the sanction of the Republican party. I fear the result of the friends of protection inaugurating the policy of a bounty in lieu of a protective tariff. Where would it lead us to? If you strike down the tariff on sugar and substitute a bounty, why not strike down on iron, on iron ore, on woolen goods, on cotton goods, on every conceivable fabric that is now manufactured abroad and imported into this country, and give the manufacturer a bounty? I apprehend, if we shall establish this precedent of giving a bounty for the production of sugar, that we will open the gate, the entering wedge will be started, and it will finally be driven through all of our American industries, and our free-trade friends will from time to time come forward, placing this precedent in our presence, and, appealing to our past action, make war on every industry now built up and in a state of prosperity in this country by proposing to take the duty off and give a bounty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I understand the authors of this bill, the primary object of it is for the purpose of reducing the surplus in the Treasury. Where is there an intelligent man who has studied this question and believes a reduction of duty on foreign goods and foreign importations will reduce the surplus? Does not all experience go to show that whenever the duties on foreign productions imported into this country are reduced the revenues are increased instead of diminished? Was not that so with sugar? Therefore I appeal to gentlemen on this side, and I appeal to gentlemen on the other side to let us meet this issue fairly and squarely. Talk of no bounties. Do one of two things: either place a duty on sugar or put it on the free-list.

Away with your bounties. I want nothing to do with them, nor do I believe the American people will sustain the bounty policy. I do not believe the American mind is in a humor to encourage bounties on this, that, or the other enterprise. Therefore I shall vote to oppose bounties to any enterprise, for the production of sugar or any other manufactured article. Let the protective system stand, and be applied to every industry worthy of encouragement for the benefit of the American laborer, farmer, tradesman, and manufacturer; but let us not reverse the American policy and drift off after new and strange doctrines summed up in the word "bounty."

The American policy has been to foster manufactures, increase the wages of labor, create a home market, and build up the country by a protective tariff. This Government has never committed itself to the policy of bounty-giving and has not granted bounties in more than one or two instances. These were the exception; a protective tariff has been the rule. Let us adhere to it as a trade regulation in all proper cases and whenever the circumstances and conditions surrounding any industry justify governmental aid in the interest of the people.

But now, keeping in mind the primary object you have in view in this bill, if you desire to reduce the surplus there are but two ways to do it. One way is, instead of reducing duties, to put the article on the free-list absolutely and stop any revenue from that source. The other way, the most practical way, is to repeal the tax on tobacco and on spirits used in the arts. If you please, I will go further and vote to wipe out the entire internal-revenue system from the pages of the statute-books of the United States.

Mr. CHEADLE. Except the tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. HOUK. Except the tax on oleomargarine, and we will collect that in another way. The war taxes are the taxes collected through the internal-revenue system, except the little tax on oleomargarine. Let the war taxes be wiped out and the protective system stand.

If we desire to reduce the surplus in the Treasury, let us repeal the internal-revenue system, repeal the tax on tobacco at any rate. Every Democrat who made a speech in Tennessee for ten years up to the election of Cleveland, so far as my knowledge goes, made war on the entire internal-revenue system from A to izzard. And I have heard and answered many of them by apologizing for the law and condemning the methods of its execution.

I would like to hear from our Democratic friends from my State. I would like to know how they stand on this question. I would like to have them tell me and tell this House, and through this House tell their constituents, whether they are for the repeal of the tobacco tax, or the modification or repeal of the internal-revenue system, or whether they are against it; because I tell the gentlemen their constituents will talk to them about it this fall. There will be music on this subject in many parts of Tennessee between this time and the election in November, and I am curious to know how our Tennessee Democrats are going to follow the tune.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Let us have a vote on this amendment.



Mr. HOUK. I want to call attention to just one other thing.  
Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

Mr. HOUK. I do not ask five minutes. Give me two minutes. Another way to aid in reducing the surplus is to do our duty here, bring the Blair bill out of the Committee on Education and have a vote upon it. That will aid in reducing the surplus and will give the bread of life to the ignorant children of the South and all other parts of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Again, I have seen it charged in the newspapers that our candidate for the Presidency voted against the Blair bill.

I have here the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Forty-eighth Congress, first session, and on page 2724 I find that when the question was taken on the passage of that bill it was passed by a vote of 33 yeas to 11 nays, and among those voting in the affirmative is the name of Senator Harrison. Again, by referring to page 2105 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, I find that on the 5th of March, 1886, that bill being under consideration, Senator Harrison rose and said:

I am paired upon this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. If he were present, I should vote yea. I understand he would vote nay.

That is his record upon that question, and now I ask the Democrats to quit lying about it. [Laughter.]

Not only did our Presidential candidate vote for the Blair bill, but the Republican platform adopted at Chicago, on which he stands, explicitly declares in favor of both State and national aid to the cause of free education.

I had the honor to be a member of the committee on resolutions and platform, and I am proud to have had the honor and privilege of aiding in making a national platform, declaring against free trade, in favor of an American policy, and the education of the people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means for information. I desire to ask the gentlemen of the majority of the committee (and I see three of them present), whether or not on the 26th of March last, Mr. Havemeyer, of New York, did not have a hearing by the majority of the committee, or by four members of the majority, with respect to sugar? I know that on the 12th of March there was a hearing and an examination of Mr. Havemeyer before the Committee on Manufactures, but I want to know now whether, on the 23d of March, the day of the adjournment of this House by reason of the decease of the lamented Chief-Justice of the United States, the members of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means did not, individually or collectively, some of them, give a hearing to Mr. Havemeyer on this subject?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anybody ever came to Washington to confer with the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means but what he had ample opportunity to talk over the business he came here about.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Does that include Mr. Havemeyer?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. As regards this particular case, I do not remember dates, but I remember that Mr. Havemeyer talked with me and perhaps a little with some of the other Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee about the sugar-refining business. It was when he was here summoned as a witness before the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That was on the 12th of March.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Very well, then, I would say that it was on the 12th. I am speaking now from memory, and I will say that at my request, having developed before the Committee on Manufactures an interesting line of investigation, precisely what the Committee on Ways and Means were engaged upon, I asked him to wait after he was done with the Committee on Manufactures and go with me to the Ways and Means Committee room, as I wanted him to talk there with one or two gentlemen of the committee. It related to some matters of a technical character that I for one wanted information about. That, I suppose, is what the gentleman from Maryland refers to.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Now, does the gentleman from Arkansas recall the fact that on the day of our adjournment here on account of the decease of the Chief-Justice Mr. Havemeyer did have a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means or some of its members?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Anyhow, you admit that he did have a hearing before the majority on some other day upon your invitation?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do not mean to deny it, the facts, as stated, at all. My only recollection on the subject is what I have given you. But suppose he did. Suppose he had come to me or I had met him on the day you say, I would have listened to him with great pleasure.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Yes; you would deny a hearing to the miner and the manufacturer and the laboring man, while you would give it to Mr. Havemeyer, the leader of the sugar trust.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That is all stuff.

Mr. MILLS. We never denied anybody.

Mr. MCCOMAS. You did not deny him.

Mr. MILLS. We never denied anybody. We would not deny you, and the statement is false.

Mr. MCCOMAS. You gave him a hearing.

Mr. MILLS. We did not deny anybody.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I have the floor.

Mr. MILLS. You have not got the floor. I yielded to you two minutes out of courtesy for a question. You have not got any time.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I was recognized by the Chair for five minutes. This is my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The five minutes have expired.

Mr. MCCOMAS. My five minutes are hardly out yet, Mr. Chairman. I want just a minute more to say this. What I am talking about here is not the motives of men but the conduct of committees.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, never mind the conduct of the committee.

Mr. MCCOMAS. And I have the information that at the time I have indicated the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, or some of them, gave a hearing to the head of the sugar trust, Mr. Havemeyer, and then on the 2d of April following this bill came in, and they had struck out "16" and put in "13" Dutch standard.

When the laborers of the country could not be heard, and the manufacturers of the country could not be heard, the leaders of the trusts were heard, and in obedience to their arguments and their persuasions you came here, gentlemen, and obeyed their dictates by leaving your good position and taking your worse position in behalf of the refiners' trust and of the frauds committed upon the sugar consumers of this country.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I think the statement of the gentleman ought not to go upon the record without a denial of its truth. There was no hearing given by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee to Mr. Havemeyer in the sense in which the word "hearing" has been used upon this floor.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Did you not give Mr. Havemeyer a hearing upon this subject?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not; nor was I present at that time.

Mr. MILLS. Nor was I.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Your colleague on the committee [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas] has said so.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Not in the sense of a hearing before the committee.

Mr. MCCOMAS. He said so.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. He did not; that is exactly the question I am raising on the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CANNON. What did he say?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If the gentleman from Illinois, who is filching time which does not belong to him, will not interfere he will find out. What the gentleman from Arkansas said was that he invited Mr. Havemeyer to the room of the Committee on Ways and Means to give those gentlemen who were then present the information which had been given to him; he did not say that he invited Mr. Havemeyer to a formal meeting of the committee.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Not formal—informal.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I have not said any such thing.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Nor were some of us present. But this is the fact which the gentleman has disingenuously distorted. No human being came to any member of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee and asked to have a conversation with him when it was not courteously accorded.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Did Mr. Havemeyer—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. One moment. When the gentleman says, in antithesis, that we gave a hearing to the "chief of the sugar trust" and refused it to others he is intentionally disingenuous.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. If he wants to be fair and frank, does he deny specifically that Mr. Havemeyer on March 12 or 23, individually conferred, informally if you please, on this subject with a number of gentlemen of that committee?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not deny it.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Ah, that is my point.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not deny it. [Applause on the Republican side.] And the gentlemen who applaud, applaud a disingenuous statement.

Mr. MCCOMAS. My statement is as fair as yours. My assertion was that members of that committee, men who happen to be on that committee, a number of the gentlemen in the majority on the committee, had, informally or formally, I care not which, given time and had conversations on this question with this gentleman at the head of the sugar "trust," and within a few days thereafter reported this bill making the change from 16 to 13, Dutch standard.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Indubitably, if Mr. Havemeyer asked an audience, he got it.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That was my point.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. No, it was not; you have dodged.

Mr. MCCOMAS. You have dodged.



Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Your point was that we had given it to that gentleman and had refused it to others.

Mr. MCCOMAS. My point is that you heard him.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. And we heard every one else who applied in the same way; therefore your point is not a fair one.

Mr. MCCOMAS. But you did hear him.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I did not hear him. I remember nothing of the kind.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Other gentlemen of the committee did hear him.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. There was not a time when any gentleman could not be heard in the same way.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The only point I desired to put on record was a denial of the double charge that certain persons were heard, while there was a refusal to hear others. That was the disingenuous and unfair statement which I desire to contradict.

Mr. REED. Yet it is a notorious fact that hearings were refused in all cases.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It is not a fact that a hearing was ever refused to a gentleman who came to the majority of the committee and asked for a hearing. While formal hearings by the committee sitting as a committee were refused, yet it is not true, and the gentleman is not authorized in saying it is true, that we refused hearings to certain gentlemen and in the same sense accorded hearings to others.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I think I am entitled to a minute on this subject. I want to say that the gentleman from Kentucky, by what he has said, has admitted all that I have charged.

Mr. DOCKERY and others. No, he has not.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The record will show.

Mr. MCCOMAS. With respect to Mr. Havemeyer, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has said that at his request Mr. Havemeyer talked with certain members of that committee. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky now to say that he did talk with certain members of that committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. No, I did not. I said I did not know, and therefore I did not contradict it. I was not present.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Did he talk with you?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have no recollection of ever having talked with Mr. Havemeyer about sugar. I talked to Mr. John Parsons in the presence of Mr. Havemeyer in a humorous way about the testimony—

[Cries of "Ah!" "Ah!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let me get through. The gentleman, judging of me by himself, may think it was improper. I had known Mr. John Parsons; he was in the committee-room; we renewed our acquaintance, and had a humorous conversation about the gentleman being before the Committee on Manufactures, and I was introduced to three or four gentlemen, including one or possibly two of the Messrs. Havemeyer; but there was no conversation between us either about the sugar schedule or the testimony before the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I understand that Mr. Parsons is the counsel of the sugar trust; I am told so, and that Mr. Havemeyer, the head of the trust, is his client. As I now understand, Mr. Havemeyer had various conversations with certain members of that committee—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Who told you that he had "various conversations?"

Mr. MCCOMAS. Well, say one—say two.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Why can you not be accurate in a single statement? Why can you not stick to accuracy?

Mr. MCCOMAS. I now repeat what I have said. The first branch of it is—and I appeal for confirmation to every member on this side—that when hearings were asked for on behalf of the laboring interests by laboring men of various crafts in this country, they were turned from your door. That is one part of my proposition, and have I not proved it by all the members on this side of the House?

Now, the second one is this: That this man, Mr. Havemeyer, came here and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] said that he had conversations with certain gentlemen on the committee; that there were certain gentlemen there. When you turn to the record you will find that the gentleman said with some members of the committee. I do not say anything I can not prove. I can prove by admissions of the gentleman from Arkansas that these men had conversations with these men on this committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As to Mr. Parsons, I had no conversation with him on the subject of the sugar schedule. I had humorous conversation about his being here before the committee.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Humorous conversations!

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman manufactures his facts to fit the occasion.

Mr. MCCOMAS. The gentleman is intentionally disingenuous as to the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman, I repeat, attempts to put on record in juxtaposition the statement that we gave a hearing to some with the other statement that we refused a hearing to others, using the words in both cases in the same sense. I say we

gave to all gentlemen who came before the members of that committee a courteous hearing. I say we denied no one, but treated impartially all of those who came there asking for an informal hearing. That is true, and anything contradictory of it is false.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Let us poll the committee.

Mr. HOLMES. There was no hearing formally or informally on the part of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I ask the gentleman to answer that question—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What is it?

Mr. HOLMES. You gave no notice—that is the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means gave no notice they would hear parties formally or informally.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. So far as I am concerned I gave notice myself to gentlemen who are experts in these matters, who were coming to Washington, that I would be glad to get all the information from them I could. So far as I know no public notice was given by the committee, that is by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. MCCOMAS. You had no hearing, then, before that committee? Were not parties introduced before that committee?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yes; parties were informally before that committee. I deny the right of any gentleman to ask for a private conversation. It is a discourteous and improper thing to do. Having said that much, I answer so far as I am concerned there were gentlemen in various avocations I heard of, and I told them I would be glad to have conversations with them, and as to other gentlemen I went further and said I would be glad if they would meet my colleagues who were seeking information from those who knew it. I was doing the best I could to get all the information before the committee I could.

Mr. HOLMES. That is, the majority of the committee granted a hearing to the capitalists of the country and the leaders of the trusts; that they have been heard, but a hearing was denied to everybody else. [Hissing and cries of dissent from the Democratic side.] The leaders of the sugar trust were invited before that committee and granted a hearing, whilst a hearing was refused to all others. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have not said a word about trusts. I do not know who the gentleman refers to as capitalists.

Mr. HOLMES. That will be all explained to the country. Now, I ask the gentleman whether the laboring men ever had a hearing before that Committee on Ways and Means, formally or informally?

Mr. ROGERS. We will discuss this question before the country. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. HOLMES. I say a hearing was granted to those capitalists and leaders of the sugar trust, but that no hearing of any sort was granted to the laboring men of the country. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Oh, you are demagoging, my friend; all of you are.

The question recurred on Mr. WEBER'S amendment.

Mr. WEBER. I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 78, noes 97.

Mr. WEBER. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. WEBER and Mr. MILLS were appointed.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 65, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLS. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 353 strike out the word "four" and insert "two and three-quarters;" so that it will read, "molasses testing not above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope shall pay a duty of 2½ cents per gallon."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means why he could not reduce it to 2 cents a gallon instead of 2½ cents?

Mr. MILLS. Because it will make an improper proportion between that and the other provisions relating to sugar.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I am informed by those interested in boiling molasses that the duty on molasses should be, under the provisions of what the committee have fixed on sugar in this bill, 2 cents a gallon. They have not been able to make any profit for the last two or three years under the present duty; and when the committee are reducing the duty on sugar they think that the duty on molasses, to make it right, so that they can boil that article with a profit to themselves, should be put at 2 cents a gallon. They have made calculations which bring out that result as the proper amount of the duty, and a proper relation between the duty on molasses and sugar; and I ask the chairman of the committee why he can not get it down to 2 cents a gallon at once?

Mr. RANDALL rose.

Mr. MILLS. I will answer by saying—

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard?

Mr. RANDALL. I only wanted to say that the exact relation which molasses that is boiled and sugar produced from it has to the rate of duty fixed in the bill of the Committee on Ways and Means is 2½ cents; and that 2½ cents is the proper rate of duty.



Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Why will not the chairman of the committee agree to fix it at 2½ cents instead of 2¼ cents, so that those who boil molasses may have some of the advantage which is necessary to enable them to carry on their business under the operations of this law? And I think if that rate was fixed it would be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. MILLS. At the reduction of from 4 to 2¼ cents we have made a larger reduction on molasses than upon sugar. If the relation between sugar and molasses is correct according to the existing law, then we have given the molasses people a very large advantage over the sugar people.

Mr. RANDALL. If you would put them exactly on the basis of a 20 per cent. reduction you would fix the duty at 2½ cents, for that is the exact equivalent, if I am not mistaken in the calculation.

Mr. MILLS. But this is more than that. It is even as much as 30 per cent.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means fixes the amount at 2¼, and we would be satisfied with 2½; and I think this sum, if the committee will not agree to reduce it to 2 cents, ought to be adopted. I hope it will.

Mr. RANDALL. The 2½, as I understand it, is the exact relation which that molasses would bear to the reduction made in this bill on sugars. I have been advised by some of the Louisiana members here that they desired it 2¼, but I do not think that is a proper relation. The fact is, the molasses that comes into this country to be boiled does not come in competition nor in the same period of the year with the Louisiana molasses.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I would state in reply that the molasses-boilers would be satisfied, I believe, with 2½, if they are unable to get it fixed at a lower rate. Still, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will agree to make it 2 cents. I have spoken with one or two of the Louisiana members myself, and I know they will take 2½ cents if they can not get the rate lowered.

Mr. MILLS. When this bill comes back from the Senate there may be some matters in conference to be decided. After a full examination of the matter if it be then necessary these changes can be made.

Mr. MASON. Are you sure it will ever get there?

Mr. RANDALL. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Texas by making it 2½ cents.

The amendment was rejected.

The question recurring on the amendment of Mr. MILLS, it was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending, proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER], which the Clerk will now read. The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out line 329 down to and including the word "gallon," in line 355, and insert the following:

"All sugar and molasses shall, on and after January 1, 1889, be admitted free of duty."

The amendment was rejected.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which concurrence was requested, the joint resolution (H. Res. 196) declaring the true intent and meaning of the act approved May 9, 1888.

It further announced that the Senate requested the return of its resolution agreeing to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 899) for the relief of Mary M. Briggs.

It further announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1983) to ratify an act entitled "An act creating the county of San Juan, in the Territory of New Mexico."

#### THE TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 329 to 351, inclusive, and insert:

"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall pay on their polariscopic test as follows, namely:

"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, all tank-bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscopic not above seventy-five degrees, shall pay a duty of 1.15 cents per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay three hundredths of a cent per pound additional.

"All sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely:

"All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.20 cents per pound.

"All sugar above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.50 cents per pound.

"Molasses testing not above fifty-six degrees by the polariscopic shall pay a duty of 4 cents per gallon; molasses testing above fifty-six degrees shall pay a duty of 6 cents per gallon.

"Provided, That if any export duty shall hereafter be laid upon sugar or molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, such sugar or molasses so imported shall be subject to duties as provided by law at the date of the passage of this act: And provided further, That no drawback of duty shall be allowed or paid on any sugar exported from the United States."

Mr. CANNON. I desire to add to that amendment the following words, which I will give to the Clerk:

Sugar-candy, not colored, 5 cents a pound; all other confectionery 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to state very briefly what this amendment is. It is precisely the provision that was first reported by the majority, the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee to the full Ways and Means Committee on the 1st day of March last. I then read an account in the *Courier-Journal* and in papers throughout the country of interviews with gentlemen on that committee, and the comments and dispatches sent off by the *Associated Press*. I read them with great pleasure, because they stated, and stated truly, that under the provisions which are embodied in the amendment one-half of the sugar that the common people of this country use would go into consumption without passing through the refineries.

It is also true that they would have gone into consumption at over a cent a pound less than they would go into consumption under the provision as the bill stands to-day. Judge of my sorrow, surprise, and indignation when the Ways and Means Committee reported that bill and I found they had changed it so as to drive the poor man's sugar through the refinery by artificial means and subject it to the extortion of the sugar trust. I wondered why it was. It has been partially explained this morning. The gentleman from Maryland asked if Mr. Havemeyer was before that committee. The answer was, "Oh, no; but before members of the committee." Who is Havemeyer? The greatest sugar refiner in this country, at the head of the trust, the organizer; the man whose iron hand crushes out every refiner who does not come into the trust; the man who levies a toll on 60,000,000 people to the extent of \$30,000,000 annually; the man who stands eminent and prominent in the Democratic party fighting its battles.

He is the rich man, the *Cæsus* of New York, if you please, to whom many Democrats look with hope for relief in his earnest and efficient advocacy of the re-election of Grover Cleveland, as he advocated the election of Grover Cleveland. There is the cat in the meal; there is the nigger in the wood-pile. I have called attention to it time and time again and asked for an explanation, and have had to speak right out in meeting. Take the bill as it was originally reported, take the bill as it stands to-day, take Havemeyer's presence, take the monopoly that still grinds upon the people by virtue of the Mills bill as you have changed it back, in connection with your interviews as they were first reported, and it is so plain that a wayfaring man may run as he reads.

Now, I do not expect you to correct it. A correction of your bill would break up the sugar trust and lose you its effective support this fall. You have agreed upon it in caucus. I simply wanted to call attention to it, and from you to appeal to the people who pay the tax on sugar every year of a dollar and fifty cents, man, woman, and child, throughout the country, by virtue of these provisions. We will try the case before the great jury next fall. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. REED. I hope the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will explain to us why he made the change in the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain why in the Committee on Ways and Means in former Congresses when a bill reducing the duties on sugar was presented you stood then by this same man whom you say is at the head of the sugar trust?

Mr. CANNON. Do two wrongs make a right?

Mr. MILLS. It is not your time yet. I want to know, when you were in power on the Ways and Means Committee, why it was that you stood by Mr. Havemeyer and by all the other sugar trusts and all the other trusts in this country, and then refused to accord us consideration of the measure in the House? You now parade yourself before the country as super-honest, super-decent, and super-patriotic—

Mr. REED. Super-heated.

Mr. MILLS. And yet you knelt by the side of the leaders of these monopolies and recited your prayers year after year and day after day, never finding fault with them until we got a Democratic majority in this House that came here honestly to reduce taxation on the people; and when we propose to smite some of your idols, you raise the cry of Havemeyer and the sugar trust. Let me tell you, and don't you forget it, we are going to give you an opportunity to vote on these trusts before you get away from here, and every one of you will vote on the side of the trusts, too.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have the privilege of saying, before the committee votes upon this proposition—

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be recognized before the sound of the voice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has died away.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Maine, and will recognize the gentleman from Louisiana later.

Mr. GAY. Very well.

Mr. REED. It does seem strange to me that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, whenever asked for an explanation of the features of his bill, finds it necessary to fly into a passion, finds it necessary to go off into a defense of his own virtue. I should suppose that such a defense was necessary, and yet after all he might occasionally omit it and once in a while give us an explanation of the reasons



which have governed him and the committee; but from the inception of this tariff bill down to the present time the committee have kept utterly secret the reasons which have influenced them in framing the various provisions of this bill. Time after time in committee, time after time in the House, we have asked them for their reasons, we have asked what induced them to make these changes in the tariff, and what induced them to make changes in their own bill, but they have seen fit always to refuse to answer.

There are persons uncharitable enough to suppose that that may arise from ignorance, but the debate to-day shows that in some cases it arises from other reasons. It would be betraying the secrets of those private interviews which have been had with favored manufacturers by gentlemen on the other side. It would expose the secrets of the political origin and political character of the amendments which they are endeavoring to make to the tariff. Here is a direct charge made against them that after an interview with Mr. Havemeyer they had this sugar schedule changed—changed, it is charged, in the interest of one of those "trusts" which they denounce so much, and the most prominent one before the country to-day. Instead of rising to explain the reasons, the sound reasons, unconnected with personal influence that induced the committee to make this change, the chairman springs to his feet for the purpose of indulging in general declarations as to how good he is and how bad we are.

Why, Mr. Chairman, is this the way—and I appeal to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] upon this point—is this the way to conduct a business transaction? Has business entirely vanished from this proceeding? Are we to be vouchsafed no business reasons for a change made under circumstances so suspicious? Do they desire to go before the country in dead silence upon this bill, or do they desire to go to the country with only some remarks as to the goodness of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Is that the reason why this change was made in the sugar schedule, because the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means thinks he is better than our side? Is that good sound business reasoning? Are intelligent men to be contented with that? It looks as if the kind of intelligent men that adorn the other side of the House were contented with precisely that thing. It looks as if they were not going to vouchsafe to the country any statement of the reasons upon which this bill is founded, and it seems from the whole tenor of the discussion to-day that this bill has been made up in the interest of a few favored people for the purpose of effectuating the success of certain particular Democrats. Now, that is not a business reason, that is not a business way in which to control the affairs of this country, and I believe if it can ever be squarely brought before the people they will stamp it with their most signal disapproval. [Applause on the Republican side and cries of "Vote!" on the Democratic side.]

[Mr. GAY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. MILLS. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the preparation of this schedule, that it was made, so far as I know, without Mr. Havemeyer's knowledge and without his advice. It was made precisely upon the old line of the Republican tariff of 1833, so far as the classification is concerned; and we have gone back to that. I think our first preparation of the bill was on that line, and we afterward changed it; I believe it was at my suggestion it was changed. It was the representatives from Louisiana who came before us and remonstrated against it. I never had a word from Mr. Havemeyer on this subject—had no counsel with him; do not know what his views were on that subject. If he had any he never told them to me. He may have talked to other gentlemen, and doubtless did. But we went back to this schedule because our friends remonstrated against it and claimed it would inflict great injury upon them and their interests. So far as Mr. Havemeyer's Democracy is concerned, I know nothing about it.

Mr. REED. Did I understand the gentleman to say "our friends?"

Mr. MILLS. I speak of you all as "friends;" I often do that; it is entirely parliamentary. But I will withdraw it if you so desire. [Laughter.]

Now, I want to finish what I was about to say. All I know of Mr. Havemeyer's politics is that I have heard he contributed a large sum to the election of General Garfield.

Mr. CANNON. I have heard he contributed a large sum to the election of Cleveland and has promised to contribute a large sum to his re-election.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] kindly tell to whom the second promise he mentions was made?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] stated what he heard. In reply to that I have stated what I have heard. My hearing is as good as his.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that our friends on the other side have just voted to place a duty of 68 per cent. on sugar, and seem to stand by their schedule on that subject, I desire the Clerk to read an extract from the Democratic platform which is pertinent to this question.

The Clerk read as follows:

It is repugnant to the creed of Democracy that by such taxation the cost of the necessities of life should be unjustifiably increased to all our people. Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted to exist which,

while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I ask attention to the paragraph just read, because our friends on the other side during the whole debate on this subject have seemed to be oversensitive upon the matter of "trusts." Hence, I have caused to be read the proposition in their platform on this subject, in order to show how much difference it makes whether this matter of "trusts" touches them or somebody else.

When we protested against placing lumber on the free-list, because a great industry in Maine and other Northern States, obliged to compete with the lumber product of Canada, would thereby be destroyed, gentlemen cried out frantically against the lumber trust. They were asked to tell us where such a trust existed, or to produce some evidence that it existed at all, but failed to do so, and at last their claims of the existence of a lumber trust dwindled down to the statement of a supposed trust by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER].

And no proposition has been more definitely made and persistently repeated and reiterated than that these trusts were created and supported by the tariff upon the articles involved in the different trusts. It was in vain that we pointed them to the Standard Oil trust, where there is no duty to operate, that great monopoly which is said to have demoralized the Democracy of one State at least and to have been efficient in producing political results not in conformity with the free will of the people. It was in vain that we held up the fact that trusts existed in other countries than our own and without the influence of a tariff. Always when we sought to protect any industry marked for destruction in the Mills bill a trust was imagined and paraded as a scare-crow to frighten gentlemen into the free-trade ranks.

But here is an industry where a real, indisputable trust exists. A trust that within a few months has arbitrarily raised the price of sugar 1 cent per pound, levying this tax upon every one of 60,000,000 people, to all of whom that article of food is a necessity, levying it not for revenue purposes, not to encourage increased production and competition and a consequent reduction of prices, but to decrease production and fill the pockets of the members of that trust, then the abhorrence of trusts on the part of our Democratic friends disappears, and they stand here and vote for a duty of 68 per cent. on this necessary article of food, and this a specific duty which no undervaluation can reduce.

What has become of the loudly-protested anxiety of gentlemen on the other side for the dear people whom they pretend so much to love? For the consumer for whom they express so much desire to furnish cheap food?

Why, Mr. Chairman, if there is a duty upon any article that oppresses the people it is the duty upon sugar. All the people use it. As I have before had occasion to say, it is the largest food charge in nearly every family in the land, and yet to protect one-tenth of the quantity of sugar necessary to supply the demands of our own people, and without any reasonable hope of increasing the product, this bill provides that we shall pay a tariff of 68 per cent. upon ten times as much sugar as we produce. This is simply outrageous when compared with the way in which the Mills bill deals with great Northern industries that are sufficient in capacity to meet the wants of our people, and which by competition have caused a reduction of prices of more than 30 per cent. in the last twenty years.

In the course of the debate this morning the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILKINSON] criticised me because in comparing the duty upon sugar with the duty upon some products of my own State I had raised, as he said, a sectional question.

Why, gentlemen, you raise the sectional question yourselves in the bill which you have submitted to this House—make a distinction between the sections of the country in treating one section to free trade and low duties and the other to high duties. I simply stated the fact. That fact came out most clearly in the discussion of the amendment of my colleague from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] this afternoon. When he proposed to reduce the duty on sugar to 41 per cent.—a duty equal to the average duty upon all articles in the dutiable list—how readily our friends on the other side voted that proposition down and insisted on 68 per cent.

If you look at the schedule you will find that while the duties on Northern productions are to-day not more than an average of 27 per cent., the duty on Southern productions, including the high duties upon sugar and rice, is more than 75 per cent. Still, when we ask for something like a fair equalization of duties, you say we are raising a sectional question.

Ah, gentlemen, you like to put the State of Maine on the free-list. It seems good to you to put the industries, great and small, of many of the Northern Republican States there, or reduce them to the lowest limit, but when we propose to give you even a homeopathic dose of your own medicine it seems to freeze the very marrow in your bones. [Laughter and applause.]

The question recurred on Mr. CANNON's amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 84, noes 85.

Mr. BREWER. Mr. Chairman, I am paired with Mr. HEARD. Were he present, I would vote "ay."

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I am paired with Mr. RICHARDSON. Were he present, I would vote "ay."



Mr. GEAR demanded tellers. Tellers were ordered; and Messrs. MILLS and CANNON were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 65, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, a little study of this sugar schedule is instructive. The average rate at which sugars are put in this bill, from raw to refined, is 65.64 per cent. The great bulk of the sugar imported is below No. 13 Dutch standard of color, ninety-five degrees polariscope test. The amount of that grade imported the past year was 1,112,543,601 pounds, and that grade is put in this bill at 67.10 per cent. The anvils made in my city are put at a rate equivalent to 23.69 per cent.; chains, 35 per cent.; oil-cloths, 25 per cent.; crockery an average of 40 per cent. While I would protect every American industry that needs protection, I think that protection should bear at least some semblance of equality. From the time the ore is dug from the mine until the chain is polished and ready for shipment it takes quite as much labor and requires quite as much capital to produce the chain as it does to produce sugar.

Rice is put (cleaned) at 100.47 per cent., while rubber goods are put at 15 per cent. I need not enlarge. You cut down the protection to the American workman, but you leave the sugar and rice he consumes at a rate proportionately far too high.

Much has been said to-day about the sugar trust. A word as to that. It is perhaps the most thoroughly organized and iron-clad affair in this or any country. I have here a copy of the deed signed by the parties to the trust. It is dated August 16, 1887, and is signed by the representatives of sixteen refineries. The shares are not to exceed \$50,000,000 of value in all. It provides that the ownership of each refinery shall, if not already so, become an incorporation. Then the individual holders of these shares are to exchange them for trust certificates at a rate to be ascertained by an appraisal of the value of each refinery.

These certificates of the trust are to be issued by a central board of trustees named in the deed. This has been done. The holders of the stock of each refinery have surrendered their shares, and have received in lieu thereof their pro rata of trust certificates. This is a very neat operation. Their property has gone beyond their control, and they can not withdraw if they would. The trustees holding the stock vote it at the stockholders' elections, and can elect any board of directors they please to, and the stockholder must stand by helpless and see his property managed by a board of directors he may know nothing about. The net profits of each refinery are paid in to this central board of trustees, who from time to time divide them among the individual refineries. It will be seen that it is a perfect machine, and the testimony taken before the committee I have the honor of being a member of shows that it has been worked with all the regularity and remorselessness of a machine. The fact, however, which was abundantly proven, and which is of immediate interest to the whole country, is that since the formation of this trust sugars have been advanced to the consumer at least one cent per pound.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. CANNON. We have not passed from the sugar schedule yet.

The CHAIRMAN *pro tempore*. No amendment has been offered.

Mr. WEBER. I move, after line 359, to insert:

*And provided further*, That no drawback of duty shall be allowed or paid on any sugar exported from the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the last charge upon the sugar trust of this country. The gentlemen of the other side are here afforded the last opportunity of purging themselves of the suspicion, which will grow into a certainty if they refuse this proposition, that their proposed legislation is in the interest of the sugar combine.

In explanation of this amendment I beg to say that I found this provision in its exact language in the original bill, and as it does not appear in the amended bill, I conclude that its omission is an oversight or a clerical error. Therefore I desire to offer it now.

The explanation of the gentleman from Louisiana as to the suspicious change from the original good intent is that it was on the request of the Louisiana delegation that the rates and color line were changed. I hope the gentlemen on the other side will give us a reason for this, the other change. They have not so far given us any reason for the change from the original bill to the amended bill. By skillful cross-examination we have discovered that after the first bill came into the House Mr. Havemeyer appeared on the scene, and that forthwith the changed bill came into this House. I charge that the amended bill is in the interest of the sugar trust of this country.

I hope this amendment will do away with the other end of the line which permits frauds on the revenues of the Government. I maintained a few moments ago, and I hope demonstrated it, that it is impossible for sugar to be exported on a drawback equal in amount only to the duty paid. The facts and figures are against it. As the importation of fraudulent sugars increases the exportation of refined sugars swells accordingly.

Now, I desire to occupy no further time of the committee, but simply ask a question to which I would like to have a response from gentlemen on the other side of the House—why they have changed fronts so materially in this regard?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from New York [Mr. WEBER] has just made a direct charge against this side of the House in regard to the sugar trust and Mr. Havemeyer. Two distinguished leaders on that side, gentlemen recognized as leaders, and whose ability and long experience on this floor entitle them to be classified as such, have undertaken to present their views but have clearly forgotten facts bearing on the question they sought to discuss in connection with Mr. Havemeyer and his direct interest in the sugar refineries of this country.

I wish to say to the members of this House, and through them to the people of the United States, that the Democratic party in the city of New York, of which I am an humble member, through the instrumentality of Tammany Hall, the oldest political organization in this country, have taken strong ground against that sugar trust. They have called public attention to it and to other trusts as well; and have employed counsel to appear before the attorney-general of the State of New York and present the case there as one in violation of the criminal laws of that State; and the attorney-general of the State of New York, a Democrat, has within the last two weeks taken the necessary legal steps to dissolve the sugar trust as well as the sugar companies which have united and joined in this enterprise.

Now, so much for the attitude of the Democrats with reference to trusts. I speak, I repeat, for the oldest Democratic organization in America. We have stood there, Mr. Chairman, like a wall of iron against the encroachments of trusts and will continue to stand there until we abolish and destroy them; and gentlemen on that side of the House can come to their rescue when the time offers for them to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLS. I ask for a vote.

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York. I want to ask my colleague a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment is exhausted, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEBER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. I desire now that the amendment which I sent up some time ago may be read.

The amendment of Mr. CANNON was read, as follows:

Strike out lines 329 to 351 inclusive, and insert the following:

"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscope test as follows, namely:

"All sugars not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above seventy-five degrees, shall pay a duty of 1.15 cents per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscope test they shall pay thirty-two thousandths of a cent per pound additional.

"All sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely:

"All sugars above No. 16 and not above No. 18 Dutch standard, 1.70 cents per pound.

"All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard, 1.90 cents per pound.

"All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.30 cents per pound."

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to debate this question, but if I can have order I merely want to say a few words by way of explanation of the amendment, and what it will accomplish if adopted. It does not change the committee's bill on all sugars that are imported into this country below No. 13 Dutch standard, but it does change the bill with reference to the provision relating to sugars above No. 13 by lowering the rate of that class of sugars one-half a cent a pound; so that if adopted, there being no sugars imported into this country above No. 13, it will give to the people of the country the sugar, which we force through the refineries, cheaper by just one-half a cent a pound, and will give the refiners less protection by this half a cent a pound, and you leave the refiners with a profit of four and three-tenths mills per pound. It will break in on the trust, and largely break it up.

And now I want to call the attention of my venerable friend from Tammany Hall [laughter], who says that they are trying to break up the trusts in New York—I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA]—that they are going to break up these trusts by prosecuting them under the criminal laws. I always understood, Mr. Chairman, that it was better to lock the stable door before the horse was stolen than to try to catch and punish the thief after the horse was gone. My provision will take the foundation from under your Havemeyers and the other Tammany people who are in this trust [laughter] and break it up, and then there will not be any need in your trying to bring the criminal laws of the State to bear upon them and send them to the penitentiary.

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York. I wanted to ask my colleague a question while he was addressing the committee.

Mr. SPINOLA. What is it?

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York. I want to ask my colleague if the honorable President of the United States did not himself sign the Elevated Railroad trust of New York. Will the gentleman from Tammany Hall answer that?



Mr. SPINOLA. The "gentleman from Tammany Hall" will take great pleasure in answering the gentleman's question by simply informing him that no such trust has ever existed in New York as the one he mentions.

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York. Yes, sir; the Elevated trust.

Mr. SPINOLA. There is no such trust known as the Elevated Railroad trust.

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York. The President signed it and allowed this trust to get a foothold there in that city.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEBER. I offer the amendment I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after line 259 the following:

"Provided, All drawbacks on sugar shall be paid in accordance with the polariscopic test, as herein provided."

Mr. WEBER. I desire only to say that this is the last assault on the sugar trust. It affords an opportunity to the gentlemen on the other side to purge themselves of the suspicion, which should they vote this down will become a certainty, that they are acting as is most desired by the sugar trust. This simply provides that sugar going out of the country shall be tested precisely the same as sugar coming into the country, because substantially all the sugar coming into this country comes in under No. 13 and in accordance with the polariscopic test.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, rose.

Mr. WEBER. If the gentleman is going to answer, I will reserve my time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not care about the gentleman's time. I have plenty of time of my own. I have nothing to say about the identification of the Democratic party with trusts. There will be abundant time for the discussion of that matter hereafter on the stump. But the question of a drawback is a very important question as to a great many of the articles on which it is given. There are some forty or fifty articles on which when exported drawbacks are allowed; allowed as to the whole amount of duty in certain cases, as to 90 per cent. in certain cases, and as to 99 per cent. duty in certain other cases. I hold the list in my hand. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEBER] might indicate a much more conspicuous devotion to the interest of the tax-payer and consumer of America if he would draught an article which would abolish all the drawback rates and put the tax-payer of America upon the same footing with the consumer abroad under this advantage.

But it was, in the judgment of those who have gone before us, a wise thing as to certain articles to allow a drawback on those imports which are afterward exported upon which there was an import duty when imported. I do not see any reason why an exception should be made in sugar. I thought at one time that there might be such an exception, but I studied the whole question in its relation to all the industries and it seemed that a step of that sort as to this article, leaving out all others, was one that we were not prepared to take. This is a question that does not relate to the sugar industry alone, but to all others.

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

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Oh, certainly.

Mr. BAYNE. As I understand it, the sugar that goes out gets a larger drawback than the duty paid when it came in under this system; and as I understand it, that principle does not apply to any other drawback.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman has shown in this long and protracted debate, in which he has taken quite a conspicuous part, a very great familiarity with all these matters; and he is no doubt aware that this is fixed by the executive department of the Government; that it is fixed upon the basis of the waste of the sugar in the process of refining, whether accurate or not I do not know, but it has been fixed by the various Secretaries of the Treasury under former administrations and reduced under the present Administration. It was fixed for the purpose of giving to the sugar exporter who has been the sugar importer the duty which he paid. It was larger per pound because a pound of refined sugar was richer in saccharine matter than a pound of raw sugar which had been imported, and it was to provide for waste that the additional amount was given. Whether it was accurate or not is a question with which I am unfamiliar. It is purely an administrative question and has been decided by this Administration to be inaccurate heretofore, because it has reduced the amount of the drawback.

Mr. CANNON. Right here allow me to state that I inquired at the Treasury Department touching this matter and was informed, not only by the Treasury agents, but by the Assistant Secretary, who had this matter in charge, that sugar refiners refused absolutely to state the cost of refining or the amount of waste.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That, however, is a question of administration. It is not a matter of statute. The question I desire to submit is a mere business suggestion in answer to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEBER], and not in response to the political speech made by the gentleman from New York,

that the question of drawback was one of much larger scope than its mere relation to sugar, and that the precedent that would be established by repealing the drawback on sugar was one that ought not to be taken until Congress is ready to go further in that matter.

Mr. CANNON. I had no desire or intention to make a political speech.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not charge you with it. I said the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Illinois never makes political speeches on the tariff. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. I want to say that the amendment of the gentleman from New York would accomplish, as I understand it—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It is suggested that my statement was too broad; that I should have said the gentleman from Illinois only makes political speeches in answer to Judge KELLEY and his Republican colleagues. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if the gentleman has got through with his political speech, will he allow me to ask a business question, whether he does not think that this amendment, which provides for finding the saccharine strength, where the sugar is exported, in each cargo of sugar, should prevail?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Under existing law the officers of the Treasury Department have authority to use the polariscope to test the saccharine strength of sugar. That is the law to-day.

Mr. CANNON. How would it do to make it mandatory?

Mr. MILLS. But it can be of no service to you on this, because the Secretary of the Treasury has to make an estimate and they have been doing it under all the administrations. The estimate is made, not by the Secretary, but by the officers under him, to find out as nearly as they can what amount of sugar pays duty on coming in, and then after it is refined, what the wastage is; and they deduct that and make the rebate accordingly. It is a matter of estimate by the experts of the Treasury Department, and the polariscope has nothing to do with it. The polariscope is used when the sugar comes in to test its saccharine strength.

Mr. BAYNE. I am told there is no loss of saccharine strength by refining.

Mr. MILLS. That is a question for the Treasury experts.

Mr. BAYNE. But they pay a drawback of about two and a half.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I can inform my friend that under former administrations they were paying too much drawback; but they could not help it. It was a question of estimate, and when the Treasury Department found that they were paying back more than was proper they lowered the rebate. I know that this administration has lowered it.

Mr. McMILLIN. The first reduction under this administration was from 2.82 to 2.60; and then, if my memory serves me correctly, it was reduced to 2.40, until now it is below what is actually paid by the refiners. As to this second reduction, however, I may be in error. That is the present status of the question, and the rebate is paid under the act of 1883.

Mr. MILLS. I hope our friends on the other side will now let us dispose of this sugar schedule.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] that the reduction of drawbacks on exported sugar under this Administration has been, I think, from 2.82 to 2.60 per pound, where it now rests.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is 2.60 on the highest grade.

Mr. WEBER. The only reduction made since the law of 1883 went into effect has been on the highest grade.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman does not deny that the present Administration has reduced the amount of rebate paid.

Mr. WEBER. I do not deny it, and when I was accused of interjecting politics into this sugar question it seemed to me that the interjection of politics was on the other side by the gentleman from West Virginia, and others, who called attention to the reductions made under this Administration.

Mr. McMILLIN. I may not be strictly accurate as to the figures, but the fact remains that there has been a reduction made under the present Administration.

Mr. WEBER. The new tariff went into effect in 1883. The readjustment of duties necessitated a reduction of drawback rates. In 1884 the amount of drawbacks paid on sugars exported reached about \$1,579,000, a figure which it had several times before reached. That was under a Republican Administration. In 1885, however, it suspiciously jumped up to six millions five or six hundred thousand dollars, and it took the Democratic Administration sixteen months before they came to the conclusion that there was something wrong about it, and then reduced the rates on the highest grade from 2.82 to 2.60 per pound.

Mr. McADOO. The trouble was that there were too many Republicans still in office. They were not turned out rapidly enough. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. How much does the gentleman say was exported last year?

Mr. WEBER. I am not speaking about the amount of pounds. I am speaking of the drawbacks in dollars. The gentleman from Ar-



Kansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] and I differed as to amounts awhile ago, arising from the fact that he referred to the value of the sugars while I referred to the drawbacks.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. WEBER, and it was rejected—ayes 52, noes 79.

The Clerk read as follows:

All tobacco in leaf, unmanufactured and not stemmed, 35 cents per pound.

Mr. MILLS. Some gentlemen have asked that the paragraph just read be passed over informally; and I accordingly make that request.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is what I was about to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the paragraph just read by the Clerk will be passed over for the present, with leave to recur to it hereafter. The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Potato or corn starch, rice starch, and other starch, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. NUTTING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read. The manufacture of starch in the United States is an important industry. I do not believe there is any good reason for reducing the tariff on starch; and there are several good reasons why it should not be reduced. The present duty upon corn starch is 2 cents a pound; this bill, as now presented to us, proposes to reduce that duty to 1 cent a pound. There can be but two reasons given by the majority of the committee in favor of this reduction: First, that it will help to reduce the surplus revenue; second, that it will give consumers cheaper starch; and, third, possibly assist in giving us the markets of the world. We will examine these grounds and see what foundation there is for them or any of them.

Mr. Chairman, in the last year starch manufactured in the United States amounted in value to about \$15,000,000. The capital invested in the United States in this business is about \$10,000,000, and four or five States are interested in it. The amount of money paid during the last year to laborers in this branch of industry was about \$2,000,000. The number of acres of land which it takes to raise the corn that is made into starch in the United States is 480,000—very nearly half a million acres. If you reduce the duty upon starch 1 cent a pound it will be necessary to reduce the wages of the men in order that the manufacturing establishments in the United States may keep in operation. You are not going to get the markets of the world, because Canada and some thirteen other countries which manufacture starch have a duty upon the article which is more than the duty we place upon it in the United States. So that by this reduction of duty you not only strike a blow at the starch industry of the United States, but you really assist those outside this country who are engaged in the manufacture.

This industry is carried on in at least five States, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa. There is plant enough now in existence and in process of construction in this country to supply the wants of the entire population of the United States.

You must remember, also, that the immense outlay of capital in this business has been ventured upon the faith that the Government would not change the rate of duty.

It can not be said that the price of corn starch has been kept up by the tariff, because we find that in 1865 the export price of starch was 9.8 cents per pound; and in 1875, ten years afterward, the export price was 5.7 cents per pound, a reduction of nearly one-half. In 1885, ten years later, the export price was 4 cents a pound (I am taking the average); and in 1887, the last year, the average export price was less than 3 cents a pound. So that during all this time, while we had a tariff of 2 cents a pound on starch, the price to the consumer steadily decreased. In my home city, Oswego, we have probably the largest establishment for making corn starch in the world. The output from this one establishment last year was nearly or quite 20,000,000 pounds. Think of it, 20,000,000 pounds, or nearly one thousand car-loads.

The average amount of money which the American family pays for starch during the course of a year is less than 25 cents, and there is no burden on the people by the duty on starch. The amount received upon importations of starch into this country is less than \$7,000. So that, by reducing this duty, you are not going to do anything considerable in the way of a reduction of the surplus. Nor would you reduce the price of starch. I believe the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means only claim that by this reduction upon starch the surplus will be reduced to the extent of about \$3,000.

The farmer is interested in this question. It is a fact which every man on this floor, before he votes on this question, should know, that last year we exported but a little more than 40,000,000 bushels of corn; and there should go beside that this other fact, that last year there were used in the manufacture of starch in the United States almost 13,000,000 bushels of corn.

In this one industry almost one-third as much corn is used as we sold in the "markets of the world."

There can be but little profit in corn starch at from 2½ to 4 cents per pound. You should not strike this industry. Let it alone. It gives nearly fifteen thousand farmers steady employment to raise the corn necessary to keep the twenty-four corn-starch factories in this country running. These fifteen thousand farmers, because of these starch facto-

ories, have a steady home market each year for 13,000,000 bushels of corn. Not only this, but these fifteen thousand farmers have families. Not less than forty thousand people are interested in raising the corn used in making starch, if you count four or five to each farmer's family. Then, too, there are four or five thousand laborers who find steady employment in these factories at good wages. There are nearly six hundred people employed in the one factory in my city, where there is more corn starch made probably than in any other one factory in the world.

The present duty of 2 cents is not prohibitory, as the following figures will show:

Pounds of starch imported into this country in—	
1884	1,629,221
1885	614,879
1886	414,421
1887	311,856

Reduce the tariff to 1 cent a pound as this bill proposes and you put the factories that make corn starch in this country in competition with cheap foreign labor; not cheap foreign labor in the manufacture of corn starch, but cheap foreign labor in the manufacture of potato starch. You have potatoes on the free-list now; that strikes at our farmers. Now you propose to reduce the tariff on starch so that foreign nations can make their potatoes into starch and send it here and sell it cheaper than corn starch can be made. This will ruin the manufacture of corn starch in this country. The farmer will lose his market for 13,000,000 bushels of corn. He will lose his home market. This will destroy the opportunity of four thousand laborers who now find remunerative labor in this business; this will cause the ten millions of capital invested in corn-starch manufacture in this country to be destroyed. You do not open the markets of the world by this blow at starch-making, but you open your own markets to the world.

I have shown this tariff on starch is not added to the cost of starch to the consumer, for starch has steadily decreased in cost to the consumer until it is now less than 4 cents per pound on an average, when twenty years ago it was more than twice that in cost to the consumer. Competition between manufacturers in this country has reduced the price. Let the majority of the Ways and Means Committee show one petition asking for a reduction of tariff on corn starch. There has been no request to that end.

This reduction will not reduce the surplus, for you will find that the 1 cent per pound tariff which this bill leaves will bring more revenue than the 2 cents has brought. The importations will increase enough to more than make up the difference.

No, Mr. Chairman, let this industry alone. Let the farmer's interest in it alone. Let the laborer's interest in it alone. Do not destroy the capital, but be wise enough to protect and foster all these in leaving the tariff at 2 cents per pound.

If you should succeed and make law of this provision as to starch, and destroy starch-making in this country, then you would place the people of this country in the hands of foreign starch-makers, and up would go the price.

No, Mr. Chairman, let the American people be supplied by our own starch-makers.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, this item of the pending tariff bill is one which affords our friends on both sides of the House an opportunity to attest the sincerity of the protestations they have made, that they seek to promote the interests of the farmer. This article of potato starch is one in which the farming interests in certain sections of our country are directly concerned to a very important degree. In Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York, where the largest portion of our potato starch is manufactured, the starch factories furnish the principal home market for the farmer's potatoes. In a large portion of the agricultural regions of those States the starch factories form one of the essential sources of reliance for the farmer.

In the northern part of my State—the most fertile region of Maine—the potato-starch industry is a most important factor with regard to the interests of the farmer. During some years past the starch factories of this country have probably consumed annually something like 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bushels of potatoes; and the production of starch has been 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 pounds. The starch factories are located in the immediate vicinity of the potato fields. The farmer digs his potatoes and sells them almost at his very door. During a number of years past the farmers in Aroostook County, Maine, where this industry is very largely carried on, have been enabled to sell their potatoes without assortment, large and small, just as taken from the field, at prices varying from 25 to 30 cents a bushel, to the starch factories. Without these factories those farmers would have no market for that class of their potato product that is not adapted for table use.

By reducing the duty 50 per cent., as proposed in this bill, you will simply permit the potatoes raised in the British provinces to come across the line and compete ruinously with the product of the farmers of my State and of the other States bordering on Canada which are interested in this business.

In that portion of my own district to which I have alluded there are some forty of these starch factories scattered through the potato region, producing thousands of tons of starch annually and providing the farm-



ers with a reliable cash market at home for hundreds of thousands of bushels of potatoes.

In a recent interview on the subject, Mr. Alba Holmes, one of the leading starch manufacturers of Aroostook County, Maine, stated emphatically that the removal of the duty on starch would close every factory in that county. The reduction of the duty to 1 cent per pound would probably be quite as disastrous. Mr. Holmes said:

The average price of starch for some time past has been 4 cents per pound. Owing to the prices we pay for potatoes and labor, there is only a very small margin for profit. In fact we could not continue the business and sell at a less price. We find formidable competitors in Germany and Holland, who, owing to their starvation labor prices and the low prices paid for potatoes, are enabled to export large quantities of starch, pay a duty of 2 cents per pound, and sell for 4 cents and make a profit. Take off the duty and we could not, nor would we try to compete with them. I shall close my factories that moment the duty is taken off.

Take the matter of dextrine or burnt starch. It was formerly manufactured in Providence, R. I., and in New York, the two factories using about 1,400 tons of starch annually. At that time it was protected by a fair duty and the business flourished. The duty was unjustly reduced to 1 cent per pound. We say unjustly, because it takes 1½ pounds of starch to make a pound of dextrine, and at the present rate of duty on starch it should now be 3 cents instead of one. The result was what might have been expected, the American manufacturers of dextrine were driven to the wall, and to-day there is not a pound manufactured in the United States.

Hon. Thomas H. Phair, State senator from the same county, and the owner of seven starch factories, declares that without the protective tariff not a pound of starch could be made in Aroostook until the farmers should be ready to furnish potatoes for 10 cents a bushel. He says:

Last year Canadian factories paid from 10 to 13 cents a bushel for their potatoes, while the factories on the American side paid from 25 to 30 cents. Take off the duty and our farmers must sell their potatoes for 2 or 3 cents a bushel less than the province farmers, on account of difference of freight, or not sell any.

A few days ago, while in Boston, I met a Prince Edward's Island man who had several tons of starch to sell, and he sold it for 4½ cents, less the duty of 2 cents and 2½ per cent. commission—that is, he sold for 2½ cents, less the 2½ per cent. commission, and paid the freight, \$2.50 a ton. At the prices paid for potatoes last year by our factories the cost of starch here was about 4½ cents a pound. While the Prince Edward man paid \$2.50 a ton for transportation we have to pay \$7.50.

Not only must the free-trade policy, if adopted by the people, shut up every starch factory in Aroostook, but it must absolutely stop shipments of potatoes, unless our farmers are ready and willing to produce them for less price than the province farmers now realize.

Hon. C. F. A. Johnson, a pioneer in this industry, and one of the most highly-respected citizens of his section, stated before the Committee on Ways and Means a few years ago, when this interest was similarly threatened, that the interests of more than ten thousand farmers were involved. He said:

Protection to the starch-maker is protection of the utmost importance to the farmer. It really means to him home comforts, the education of his children, and the support in his community of religious and charitable institutions, with all that those advantages imply.

If any gentleman of this committee has ever had the good fortune to be a planter and hoer and digger of potatoes he will readily assent to the proposition that 25 cents per bushel is as low as he or any other man ought to do it. At this price, which is the usual one paid by starch-makers, starch costs from 3½ to 4½ cents per pound, to which must be added from one-half to five-eighths of a cent per pound for transportation, storage, and commission. This brings up the cost when it is sold to 4½ to 4¾ cents per pound. This variation in cost is explained chiefly by variation in quality of potatoes in different years. I have known years when they yielded but 6 pounds per bushel.

There is in the communities in which these mills are located in my own State (Maine) a large amount of capital invested; the business is one involving large risks; my own firm lost in this business in 1881 over \$12,000.

The present tariff of 2 cents per pound is as small as we can possibly work under. A reduction would demolish the industry in the United States. The farmers of the neighboring maritime provinces (contentedly or otherwise) produce potatoes at much less price than ours can, and the Canadian starch-makers have a very material advantage over us in the matter of transportation.

We can not take a pound of starch to their country without paying their government a duty of 2 cents. Why should not American citizens have the advantage of their own markets?

Last year the starch factories in the province of New Brunswick paid from 10 to 13 cents a bushel for their potatoes right across the St. John River at the very time when the farmers of my State were receiving 25 and 30 cents for every bushel they could lay down at the starch factory. If you agree to this proposed reduction of one-half of the present duty, making it but 1 cent per pound, the result is to be the destruction of this industry on the American side of the line. You are going to take away from the farmers of New England, New York, and the other States interested this chief market for the sale of one of their important products; and you are going to do this, very strangely, as it seems to me, directly in the face of the fact that the Canadian tariff to-day puts a duty of 2 cents upon every pound of starch that goes from the United States to the British provinces.

Our present duty on starch is in no sense a burden upon the American people. The additional cost that is imparted to a yard of cloth by reason of the starch used in its manufacture is infinitesimal, and this potato starch is used almost entirely for the purpose of starching yarns and fabrics of cotton cloth and cloth for prints. Yet by this legislation cutting down the duty one-half you propose to say to the farmers of Maine, of New York, New Hampshire, Vermont, and elsewhere, who who have been engaged in raising potatoes upon land better adapted for that than for other purposes, "The American Congress has decreed that you shall sell no more of your potatoes at the prices they now bring, but you must raise and sell them to compete with the low prices of the Canadian farmers."

Everybody knows that in Canada labor is cheaper, land is cheaper, and that the people live in a less comfortable way than we are willing that our American farmers should live; so that the competition involved in the proposed reduction of duty, so far as the potato industry is concerned, would be to our farmers simply destructive.

I can not see why we are called upon to show to Canada a liberality which Canada refuses to show to us. I can not see why we are called upon to allow the products of the starch factories of Canada to come over into the United States at one-half the duty which the Canadian Government exacts from the American manufacturer if he tries to sell starch in the British provinces. There is no logic in this; there is no patriotism in it; there is no common sense in it; there is no justice in it to our farmers. On the contrary, so far as my section of the country is concerned, it is one of the most direct and serious blows that this Mills bill proposes to strike at the agricultural interests.

Mr. Chairman, this reduction of the tariff on potato-starch and the failure to put the rate on dextrine and similar starch products at a rate that will protect the American producer form part of what seems a systematic assault upon all the leading industries of my State, as evidence of which I have compiled from the figures published by the Ways and Means Committee the following comparative statement:

THE DEMOCRATIC ASSAULT UPON MAINE'S INDUSTRIES—HOW THE MILLS BILL STRIKES AT NEW ENGLAND LUMBERING, MANUFACTURING, AND FARMING INTERESTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF EUROPE AND CANADA—FACTS THAT SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS.

The following table shows exactly how the Democratic Mills tariff-reduction bill proposes to strike down the protective duties that under Republican laws have stimulated American industries, increased the wages of American labor, furnished a profitable home market for our farmers, and given to American workmen the most comfortable and happy homes in the world. Although a few items cited below have been dropped out of this bill since it was reported, the following list represents the changes of the existing tariff proposed by the Mills bill as it was indorsed by the Democratic national convention at St. Louis and the Democratic State convention of Maine:

	Protective duties under the Republican tariff.	Proposed rates under the Democratic Mills tariff.
Timber:		
Hewn and sawed and timber used for spars and in building wharves.	20 per cent. ad valorem.	Free-list.
Squared or sided.....	1 cent per cubic foot.....	Do.
Wood, unmanufactured.....	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Sawed boards, planks, and deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber.	\$1 and \$2 per 1,000 feet....	Do.
Hubs, for wheels, posts, last-blocks, wagon-blocks, car-blocks, gun-blocks, heading-blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough, hewn, or sawed only.	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Staves of wood.....	10 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Pickets and palings.....	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Laths.....	15 cents per 1,000.....	Do.
Shingles.....	35 cents per 1,000.....	Do.
Clapboards, pine or spruce..	\$1.50 to \$2 per 1,000.....	Do.
Fish-glue, or isinglass.....	25 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Soap, hard and soft.....	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Hemlock extract, for tanning.	.....do.....	Do.
Barytes.....	10 per cent. ad valorem .	Do.
All earths or clays, unwrought or unmanufactured.	\$1.50 per ton.....	Do.
China, clay, or kaolin.....	\$3 per ton.....	Do.
Brick.....	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Vegetables, fresh or in brine (cucumbers, pickles, cabbages, turnips, carrots, beets, tomatoes, squashes, pumpkins, etc.)	10 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Meats, game, and poultry.....	.....do.....	Do.
Milk, fresh.....	.....do.....	Do.
Egg yolks.....	.....do.....	Do.
Beans, pease, and split pease.	10 and 20 per cent. ad valorem.	Do.
Pulp, for paper-makers' use.	10 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Bristles.....	15 cents per pound.....	Do.
Bulbs and bulbous roots, not medicinal.	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Feathers of all kinds.....	25 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Grease.....	10 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Lime.....	.....do.....	Do.
Garden seeds.....	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Marble of all kinds.....	65 cents per cubic foot....	Do.
Plaster of Paris, ground or calcined.	20 per cent. ad valorem.....	Do.
Granite, freestone, sandstone, and all building or monumental stone unmanufactured.	\$1 per ton.....	Do.
Tallow.....	1 cent per pound.....	Do.
Wools: Clothing wools of various grades.	12 and 10 cents per pound	Do.
Slate, and manufactures of slate.	30 per cent. ad valorem.....	20 per cent. ad valorem

	Protective duties under the Republican tariff.	Proposed rates under the Democratic Mills tariff.
Anvils, anchors, or parts thereof; mill-irons and mill-cranks of wrought-iron, and wrought-iron for ships, and forgings of iron and steel for vessels, steam-engines, and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing each 25 pounds or more.	2 cents per pound .....	1½ cents per pound.
Saws.....	40 per cent. ad valorem..	30 per cent. ad valorem
Cabinet and house furniture, finished.	35 per cent. ad valorem..	Do.
Lumber:		
Boards, planks, deals, and other sawed lumber of hemlock, white-wood, sycamore, and basswood:		
Planed or finished on one side.	\$1.50 per 1,000 feet.....	50 cents per 1,000 feet.
Planed or finished on two sides.	\$2 per 1,000 feet.....	\$1 per 1,000 feet.
Planed on two sides, tongued and grooved.	\$2.50 per 1,000 feet.....	\$1.50 per 1,000 feet.
All other articles of sawed lumber not elsewhere specified:		
Planed or finished on one side.	\$2.50 per 1,000 feet.....	50 cents per 1,000 feet.
Planed or finished on two sides.	\$3 per 1,000 feet.....	\$1 per 1,000 feet.
Planed one side, tongued and grooved.	.....do.....	Do.
Planed on two sides, tongued and grooved.	\$3.50 per 1,000 feet. ....	\$1.50 per 1,000 feet.
All other manufactures of wood.	35 per cent. ad valorem..	30 per cent. ad valorem.
Potato starch .....	2 cents per pound.....	1 cent per pound.
Oil-cloths for floors .....	40 per cent. ad valorem..	25 per cent. ad valorem.
Woolen rags, shoddy, etc.	10 cents per pound .....	Free-list.
Printing paper, unsized, for books and newspapers.	15 per cent. ad valorem..	12 per cent. ad valorem.
Sized or glued for printing ..	20 per cent. ad valorem..	15 per cent. ad valorem.
Paper boxes .....	35 per cent. ad valorem..	25 per cent. ad valorem.
Brushes of all kinds.....	30 per cent. ad valorem..	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Card clothing for factories ..	25 to 45 cents per square foot.	15 to 25 cents per square foot.
Carriages and parts of.....	35 per cent. ad valorem..	30 per cent. ad valorem.
Friction matches .....	.....do.....	25 per cent. ad valorem.
Inks and ink powders.....	30 per cent. ad valorem..	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Marble, sawed, dressed, and tiles.	\$1.10 per cubic foot.....	65 cents per cubic foot.
Marble manufactures.....	50 per cent. ad valorem..	30 per cent. ad valorem.

COTTON AND WOOLEN MANUFACTURES.

*Cotton goods.*—Under the existing tariff all cotton manufactures are protected by a specific duty equivalent to about 40 per cent. on the average—the common grades less, and the fine grades more.

The Mills bill abolishes all specific duties and substitutes a sweeping ad valorem duty of 40 per cent. for all kinds of goods. As the ad valorem duties invite fraudulent undervaluations, which practically reduce duties 8 to 10 per cent., the practical effect of such a change in the tariff would be to reduce the protection on fine goods so as to prevent their manufacture in this country.

*Woolen goods.*—The present tariff imposes a duty of about 35 cents per pound (as an equivalent for the duty on wool, of which the wool-grower receives the benefit), and 35 per cent. ad valorem on coarse and 40 per cent. ad valorem on fine goods. As the pound duty is intended to be made a little more than the average duty on the wool, to guard against errors, that is also a slight protection to those engaged in woolen manufacturing.

The Mills bill abolishes the pound duty (because of free wool) and imposes an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent., and 40 per cent. on imported woolsens. The farmer loses the advantage of the duty on wool, and the manufacturer is left with nothing but the ad valorem duty on imported woolsens, the effect of which must be to increase importations and thus injure the home manufacturers.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COX having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGEE reported that the Committee of the Whole 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.

WILLIAM H. TABBARRAH.

Mr. MOFFITT. I ask, by unanimous consent, to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 948) for the relief of William H. Tabbarrah, and that the same be now put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to correct the record of William H. Tabbarrah, to a private in Company F, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers, so that the same shall show him to have been discharged for gunshot wound of right thigh received in action, instead of the record now made.

The amendment reported by the committee was to strike out "private" and in lieu thereof to insert "sergeant."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let the report of the committee be read.

The report of the committee (by Mr. CAREY) was read, as follows: The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 948) for the relief of William H. Tabbarrah, beg leave to report:

The records of the War Department show that William H. Tabbarrah, late sergeant of Company F, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers, was discharged February 27, 1863, at convalescent camp, Alexandria, Va., on surgeon's certificate of disability, by reason of tuberculosis contracted after enlistment. (See record hereto annexed.)

The evidence before the committee shows that the discharge of the said Tabbarrah for the cause stated was erroneous; that he was not disabled by reason of tuberculosis at the time of his discharge, but was disabled by reason of wounds received in the service, and that the cause assigned for his discharge should have been on account of gunshot wound. (See affidavits hereto annexed.)

The committee recommend that the bill pass with the following amendment: Strike out, in line 4 of the bill, where the same occurs, the word "private" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sergeant."

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington City, April 20, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your request of the 15th ultimo for information upon House bill 948, Fiftieth Congress, first session, to provide for correction of the record of William H. Tabbarrah, late of Company F, Ninety-sixth New York Volunteers, so as to show him discharged for wound, I have the honor to inclose a report of the 18th instant from the Adjutant-General, which, it is believed, furnishes the information requested.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM C. ENDICOTT,  
Secretary of War.

Hon. R. W. TOWNSEND,  
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
Washington, April 18, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to return House bill 948, Fiftieth Congress, first session, authorizing the Secretary of War to correct the record of William H. Tabbarrah, late a private in Company F, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers, to show him to have been discharged by reason of gunshot wound of right thigh, received in action, instead of the record now made, transmitted by the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, and, in compliance with instructions, to report as follows:

The records of this office show that Sergeant William H. Tabbarrah, Company F, Ninety-sixth New York Volunteers, was enrolled October 25, 1861, mustered in November 15, 1861, and present for duty to April 30, 1862. On roll for June, 1862, he is reported absent in hospital at Annapolis, Md., wounded at the battle of Fair Oaks, May 31, 1862. On June 3, 1862, he was admitted to the general hospital at Annapolis, Md., with gunshot wound, location not stated, and was treated until December 18, 1862, when he was returned to duty and sent to his regiment. While en route to his regiment he was examined by the medical board at Convalescent Camp, near Alexandria, Va., February 14, 1863, and discharged February 27, 1863, at said camp on surgeon's certificate of disability by reason of tuberculosis contracted since enlistment.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. C. DRUM,  
Adjutant-General.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

To the Adjutant-General of the United States Army, etc.:  
CLINTON COUNTY, New York, ss:

William H. Tabbarrah, being duly sworn, says that he resides at Plattsburgh, N. Y., and was a sergeant in Company F, Ninety-sixth New York Volunteers, in the late war, and now draws a pension for gunshot wound of right thigh, by pension certificate No. 13583, which wound was received at the battle of Fair Oaks, May 31, 1862.

Deponent further states that he has made application for a bounty by reason of being discharged for wounds; and the same has been denied upon the ground that the record shows that deponent was discharged for difficulty of the lungs, when, in fact, deponent has never had difficulty of the lungs at all, and was discharged solely on account of said wound and for no other cause whatever, to defendant's knowledge; and deponent respectfully asks that upon the evidence on file upon his application for pension, and in other records contained, and that herewith submitted, said records be corrected and made to show that he was discharged for gunshot wound, as he in fact was.

WILLIAM H. TABBARRAH.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of January, 1888.

F. F. HATHAWAY,  
Notary Public.

STATE OF NEW YORK Clinton County, ss:

James M. Fulton, being duly sworn, says that his residence and post-office is Beekmantown, Clinton County, New York, and has resided there and been a practicing physician and surgeon in said county for forty-three years last past; that his age is now sixty-nine years. Deponent further says that he is and has been for about twenty-seven years last past well acquainted with William H. Tabbarrah, and knew him well, both before his enlistment in the Ninety-sixth Regiment of New York Volunteers and after his discharge and return home from said service, and since said Tabbarrah's discharge deponent has been his family physician until said Tabbarrah removed from Beekmantown aforesaid to Plattsburgh, upon his appointment as keeper of the light-house upon Cumberland Head, in said town, upon the west shore of Lake Champlain, which position said Tabbarrah still holds. Deponent further says that shortly after said William H. Tabbarrah's discharge, in the spring of 1863, deponent saw him and knows that said Tabbarrah was badly wounded in his right thigh, and deponent aided in dressing said wound and in searching for the ball, and deponent knows that said wound has made said Tabbarrah a cripple ever since.

Deponent further says that in all his attendance upon said Tabbarrah deponent has not known him to have any difficulty of the lungs nor disease of the lungs of any kind, more than perhaps a cold or some little ailment of that sort, and deponent knows that when said Tabbarrah returned from the war he had no lung trouble whatever. Deponent further says that he has no interest in said Tabbarrah's matters, either pension, bounty, or otherwise; and further saith not.

J. M. FULTON, M. D.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 16th day of January, 1888, and I certify that said witness is a physician in good standing in his profession, and entitled to full credit

JAMES J. BROWN,  
Justice of the Peace.



## STATE OF NEW YORK, Clinton County, ss:

Romeo Hyde, of Beekmantown, in said county, being duly sworn, says that his age is thirty-nine years; that he is well acquainted with William H. Tabbarrah, who was formerly a sergeant in Company F of the Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteers, of which deponent was also a member in the late war, and deponent knew him well while in said regiment. Deponent further says that he saw said Tabbarrah within a very few days after the battle of Fair Oaks, in May, 1862. Deponent saw him one of the first days in June at White-house Landing upon a stretcher badly wounded, and deponent knows that at that time and all through said service, so far as deponent knew at the time and since, said Tabbarrah has had no difficulty of the lungs, but his trouble has always been since the war his said wound.

Deponent further says that he is himself now a regular practicing physician in said town of Beekmantown, and has been for about fourteen years last past, and has often seen said Tabbarrah in those years, as said Tabbarrah married his wife from a family residing in the same village with deponent, and deponent has never known or heard that said Tabbarrah had any lung difficulty, but has no doubt whatever but what his discharge from the service was wholly on account of said gunshot wound, from which he ever since has been and still is badly crippled and disabled; and further deponent has no interest whatever in said matter.

ROMEO HYDE.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 16th day of January, 1883, and I certify that said witness is a physician in good and regular standing in his profession, and entitled to full credit.

JAMES J. BROWN,  
Justice of the Peace.

Mr. MOFFITT's motion was agreed to, and the bill was taken up and the amendment of the committee agreed to; and then 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. MOFFITT 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.

## RIGHT OF WAY BILL.

Mr. PEEL. I ask by unanimous consent that the House take a recess at 5 o'clock to-morrow evening until 8 o'clock; the evening session to be devoted to the consideration of bills granting right of way through Indian reservations, reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which there is no objection.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

## EVANSVILLE MARINE HOSPITAL.

Mr. HOVEY. I ask, by unanimous consent, to take up the bill (H. R. 1321) for the erection of a marine hospital at Evansville, Ind.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BLAND. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 64.

Mr. BLAND demanded tellers.

Tellers were not ordered.

So the motion was disagreed to.

Mr. HOVEY. Not another bill shall pass by consent.

Mr. BLAND. I move the House take a recess until 5 o'clock, and on that motion I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 59.

So the motion was disagreed to.

Mr. BLAND. I move that the House do now adjourn, and on that motion I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 28.

Mr. BLAND demanded tellers.

Tellers were not ordered.

So the motion was disagreed to.

Mr. BLAND. I move the House take a recess until 6 o'clock.

The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker *pro tempore* declared the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

## PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 10761) correcting the rank of Gustav Dachselt, and granting a pension to his widow in accordance with that rank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10762) for the relief of William Q. Lawrence—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DARLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10763) granting a pension to George W. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10764) granting a pension to L. S. Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10765) for the relief of W. H. Cowherd—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEAR: A bill (H. R. 10766) granting right of way to the Cedar Rapids, Iowa Falls and Northwestern Railway Company—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 10767) granting a pension to William J. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10768) granting a pension to James M. Duggan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10769) granting a pension to John M. Krunk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10770) for the relief of Simeon H. King's executrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10771) granting a pension to John Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10772) granting a pension to Eliza A. Carson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10773) for the benefit of the Danville, Lancaster and Nicholasville Turnpike Road Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 10774) for the relief Honora O'Daley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PIDCOCK: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting a pension to Ann Vigo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE (by request): A bill (H. R. 10776) for the relief of Elisha Casey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 10777) for the relief of Caesar Snell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) for the relief of Nelson Cowan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 10779) granting a pension to William M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 10780) for the relief of Benjamin E. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of John Donahue—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10782) granting a pension to William H. Hood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. L. ANDERSON: Petition of John F. Green, of Yazoo County, and of Martha W. Lindley, of Lauderdale County, Mississippi, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BIGGS: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., and of the Board of Trade of Los Angeles, Cal., for the passage of the bill to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of James E. Wilms, of Riley Kinman, and of James S. Smith, of Jackson County, Arkansas, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEAR: Petition of 130 citizens of Jefferson County, Iowa, for amendments to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of citizens of Port Gibson, Miss., for abolishing boxes in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOUK: Petition of Harriet Ballard, of Alfred McConnell, and of Joseph Lane, administrator of Wiley Line, deceased, of Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAWLER: Petition of John George Ryan, of Chicago, Ill., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLAMMY: Petition of J. W. Winslow and 26 others, citizens of the Third district of North Carolina, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of F. M. Halthoff, heir of Francis Halthoff, of Ashley County, Arkansas, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of John N. Berrong, of John L. Moss, of C. A. Humphreys, of Susan Lowry, and of Elisha Kimbrough, of Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: Resolutions of the General Conference of the Congregational Churches of Maine, for repeal of internal-revenue laws, and prohibiting exportation and importation of liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Navana, Tex., in favor of the schedule of duties adopted by the wool-growers and manufacturers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Cassar Snell and of Nelson Cowan, of Murfreesborough, Tenn., for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAWYER: Petition for repeal of law preventing the payment of arrears of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Petition of W. A. Rooth and 42 others, citizens of St. Clair County, Missouri, in favor of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. G. M. THOMAS: Petition of John Darnell for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM WHITING: Petition of Rev. P. F. Barnard and 25 others citizens of the Eleventh district of Massachusetts, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of William H. Hood, for a special-act pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

By Mr. GUENTHER: Of citizens of Waupaca County, Wisconsin.

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. CUTCHEON: Of 127 citizens of Manistee and Osceola Counties, and of 149 citizens of Mason and Wexford Counties, Michigan.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Of 185 citizens of Ashtabula and Trumbull Counties, Ohio.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 10, 1888.

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

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

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of George F. Calvert, of Port Orange, Fla., alleging fraud on the part of United States officials in the contested-homestead case of A. Force vs. E. H. Jones, and praying for investigation thereof; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Orange County, North Carolina, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce act; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Winona, Minn., praying for the passage of the House bill authorizing the Winona and Southwestern Railroad to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Winona, Minn.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SABIN presented a memorial of the St. Paul (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce, remonstrating against the construction of bridges over the Detroit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Redwood, Minn., praying for legislation protecting wool and woolen-manufacturing interests; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PAYNE presented two petitions, signed by 95 ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Ohio, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLUMB presented the memorial of John Cowdon in regard to the improvement of the Mississippi River and tributaries since 1830, and favoring the adoption of the Lake Borgne outlet improvement system; which was referred to the Committee on Improvement of the Mississippi River.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 63 ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Westerville, Ohio, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of H. P. Wheeler and 124 other citizens of Hillsdale County, Michigan, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were indefinitely postponed:

A bill (S. 3165) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Fletcher;

A bill (S. 3164) granting an increase of pension to Henry Potter; and

A bill (S. 3014) granting a pension to Joseph Zerbach.

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

A bill (H. R. 6193) for the relief of Edson Saxberry;

A bill (H. R. 9910) increasing the pension of William J. Headly;

A bill (H. R. 621) granting an increase of pension to William M. Whaley;

A bill (H. R. 7093) granting an increase of pension to John A. Rolf;

A bill (S. 3166) granting a pension to William F. Pike;

A bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham;

A bill (S. 3198) granting a pension to Mary Murphy;

A bill (S. 3150) granting a pension to William Schaffer;

A bill (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole; and

A bill (S. 3189) granting a pension to William T. Hutton.

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3171) granting a pension to Andrew Hopper, sub-

mitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 3138) granting a pension to George Wylie;

A bill (S. 3102) granting a pension to James Smith; and

A bill (S. 2704) granting a pension to James Hope Arthur.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3221) granting a pension to Isaac N. Hawkins, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3137) granting a pension to Ruth Ames;

A bill (H. R. 10334) to grant a pension to Elizabeth O'Laughlin, the helpless and invalid daughter of Dennis O'Laughlin, late a member of Company I, Ninth Minnesota Volunteer Infantry;

A bill (S. 3157) granting a pension to Joseph S. Wilson; and

A bill (S. 3158) granting a pension to Nancy L. Huffman.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following petitions, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the committee were discharged from their further consideration:

The petition of Alfred E. Gathercole, praying to be allowed a pension; and

The petition of Matilda Gillespie, as guardian of the minor children of John Burchill, praying that they be allowed a pension.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 3063) for the relief of Levinia Robinson;

A bill (S. 3161) granting a pension to Henry Ann Stuart;

A bill (S. 6) granting a pension to Mrs. Emeline P. Trask;

A bill (S. 3070) for the relief of John Anthony Orleman and Mary Albina Wilhelmina Orleman;

A bill (S. 3160) granting a pension to Nelson Beebe, of Oregon;

A bill (S. 951) for the relief of Elvira E. Baxter;

A bill (S. 1309) granting a pension to Hiram Bateman;

A bill (S. 3043) granting a pension to Samuel G. Whitley;

A bill (S. 3041) granting a pension to George Slack;

A bill (S. 3024) granting a pension to Lewis H. Linville;

A bill (S. 3049) granting a pension to Christian Wanzel; and

A bill (S. 3061) for the relief of Emma McCollum.

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

A bill (H. R. 9595) granting a pension to David A. Yeaw;

A bill (H. R. 8523) granting a pension to Susan F. Scott;

A bill (H. R. 7624) for the relief of Coburn D. Outten; and

A bill (H. R. 8953) granting a pension to Eliza Mathews.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1766) granting a pension to Stephen Butler, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 602) for the relief of James Millinger, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4069) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Meade, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

### HANNAH BABB HUTCHINS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to Hannah Babb Hutchins, which was, in line 6, after the word "pension," to strike out "during life;" 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 Hannah Babb Hutchins, a volunteer nurse in the war of the rebellion, and pay her a pension of \$25 per month, in lieu of the one now received by her.

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

The motion was agreed to.

### EMILY J. STANNARD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2657) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Stannard, which was, in line 5, after the words "rate of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-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 Emily J. Stannard, widow of the late George J. Stannard, brevet major-general of volunteers, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$75 per month, from and after the passage of this act, instead of the pension she is now receiving.

Mr. TURPIE. I move that the Senate non-concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives, and ask for a conference thereon.

The motion was agreed to.