Also, petition of John A. Swift, of Calloway County, Kentucky, praying that his claim for stores and supplies furnished the United States Army during the late civil war be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Petition of Warnock Bros., of Battle Creek, Iowa, against an increase of duty on breech-loading guns—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. D. Utter & Son, of Sloan, Iowa, against an increase of duty on breech-loading guns—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry & Arnold, Holstein, Iowa, against an increase of duty on breech-loading guns—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry & Arnold, of Holstein, Iowa, against an increase of duty on cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mr. Warnoch, of Battle Creek, Iowa, against an increase of duty on cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. D. Utter & Son, of Sloan, Iowa, against an increase of duty on cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Saur Bros., of Ida Grove, Iowa, against an increase of duty on cutlery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Saur Bros., of Ida Grove, Iowa, against an increase of duty on breech-loading guns—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: Protest of cigar-makers, cigar producers, and cigar manufacturers, of Denver, Colo., against the increased duties on imported leaf-tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of E. J. Sherman, of Davenport, N. Y., and others, citizens of New York State, protesting against an increase of duty on tin-plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William M. Steman, of Albany, N. Y., protesting against an increase of duty on granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also petition from 172 persons, firms, and citizens of the same city, protesting against the increased duty on Sumatra tobacco, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN SCHAICK: Petition of operatives in the Star Knitting Works, Milwaukee, urging the speedy passage of the McKinley tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENABLE: Petition of voters of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, asking that $6,200,000 be appropriated to Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WADDILL: Petitions of librarians from University of Virginia, in favor of copyright bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Myers, Ives & Co. and others, against Schedule F of tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLACE, of New York: Petition of John T. Bruen, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of W. C. Hulton and 60 others, from Cheatham County, Tennessee, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John W. McNeely and others, of Millers' Union, for the same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON: Communication from Post 472, Grand Army of the Republic, Pennsylvania, for a dependent-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Ackley Grange, No. 870, for free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, memorial of Valley Grange, No. 846, for same measure—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, communication from Post 141, Grand Army of the Republic, Pennsylvania, for the final passage of dependent-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, communication from Grand Army of the Republic post, Oil City, Pa., for same measure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, data concerning participants in forlorn hope storming party—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: Petition of Riley Sparks, of Franklin County, Alabama, praying for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of J. H. Atkins, of Madison County, Alabama, for the same relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of B. H. Glaze and 78 others, from Limestone County, Alabama, for the passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chestnut Grove Alliance, Alabama, for same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON, of Missouri: Petition of J. M. Gibson, E. Don McCrary, Jos. J. Robinson, and many others, citizens of Easton, Buchanan County, Missouri, in favor of House bill 5353 relating to options and and futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition and protest of Hans Neilson, florist, of St. Joseph, Mo., against the proposed increase of duty on the articles kept by florists in stock and which are not produced in this country—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *May* 20, 1890.

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a letter from James B. Nicholson, secretary of the Naval Veteran Legion of the United States, transmitting a petition of that organization, praying for the transfer of the revenue-marine service to the Navy; which was, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented sundry petitions of citizens of Texas, praying for the passage of the McKinley tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of P. A. Keller, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented a petition of Iowa Commandery, Loyal Legion of the United States, praying for the early publication of the official records of the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., praying for legislation in favor of reciprocity with Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON presented the petition of Sallie Lewis and 92 other operatives in the knitting mill at Girard avenue and Franklin streets, Philadelphia, Pa., and the petition of James P. Leach and 560 other operatives in the knitting mill at Pilling and Madeley streets, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the McKinley tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a petition of clerks of the Detroit (Mich.) post-office, praying for the passage of House bills 6448 and 7349, relative to vacations and the gradation of their salaries; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. WASHBURN presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Superior, Wis., remonstrating against the project of a third canal or entry into the harbor of Superior through Minnesota Point; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FAULKNER. I present a petition signed by J. B. McGregor and 57 other citizens of Doddridge County, West Virginia, praying Congress to enact a law making the carrying of intoxicating liquors from one State or Territory into another, contrary to the laws of the latter, illegal. I move that the petition lie on the table, as a bill for that purpose is now before the Senate for its consideration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COKE presented a petition adopted by the convention of lumbermen recently held in the city of Houston, Tex., praying that an appropriation be made for securing deep water at Sabine Pass, Tex.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Bell County, Texas, remonstrating against the passage of the bill known as the Conger bill in relation to compound lard; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition of the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of such laws and the making of such treaties as will promote reciprocity with Mexico in all business transactions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know whether that should be referred to the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Similar petitions were yesterday referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and afterwards transferred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. Very well; let the petition go to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present resolutions of the Mining and Stock Exchange of Kansas City, Mo., reciting that the brokers of the call board of that exchange on the 8th instant passed resolutions approving the proposed tariff on Mexican ores containing lead, and that such action has been unfavorably regarded by other members, and declaring that differences of opinion exist among the members of the exchange in this respect, and that it is inexpedient that any action be taken on the subject. I move that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented the memorial of the Bradford Thomas Company and C. F. Hovey & Co., importers and large dealers, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the great increase proposed in the rates of duty on dress goods, plushes, and velvets; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. EVARTS. I present a petition of the National Temperance Society, praying for the passage of the bill now to be brought before

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the Senate, I believe. It is a very brief petition in the shape of a resolution, quite as short as I could state it, and I would ask, as the matter is now to be discussed, that it may be read and go into the RECORD, if there be no objection.

There being no objection, the petition was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

To the United States Senate and House of Representatives:

At the twenty-fifty anniversary of the National Temperance Society, New York, May 13, the following memorial resolution was unanimously adopted for presentation to your honorable body:

Whereas the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court concerning the importation and sale of intoxicating liquors in "original packages" into prohibitory States under early action by Congress, which has constitutional authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce of the utmost importance: Therefore,

Resolved, That we hereby respectfully and most earnestly ask the Fifty-first Congress to promptly prohibit all importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage use into such States and localities as have declared the liquor traffic unlawful.

THEODORE L. CUYLER, *President.*

J. W. STEARNS,
Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. BERRY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fort Smith, Ark., praying for certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BLAIR presented a petition of Rev. W. R. Baldridge and 24 other citizens of St. Charles, Iowa, praying for the reconsideration and passage of the education bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Columbia Turnverein, of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the passage of measures designed to materially change the present national laws on immigration and naturalization; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BLAIR. I present the following petition of Noah Tucker:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, a citizen of Derry, in the State of New Hampshire, and veteran of the late war, would respectfully petition your honorable bodies not to grant a pension to any Union soldier until the last survivor shall be forever in his grave, as "economy is wealth."

Men who left their homes, their wives and little ones, perhaps never more to see those loved ones again, and placed themselves between their country and her foes, that they might transmit to generations yet to come our undivided Union, were amply repaid when they received $13 a month and three square meals of salt pork and hard-tack, although that $13 was paid in a depreciated currency, worth but 35 cents on a dollar. I should be pleased to send what I received to the "conscience fund."

But I would urge upon you to keep your plighted faith to those noble patriots who, when the nation was trembling on the verge of dissolution, charged $2.85 for their gold to save their country from ruin, and were deprived of the privileges and pleasures of the camp and battle-field, to listen to the dying agonies of their companions in arms.

Respectfully submitted.

NOAH TUCKER.

DERRY, N. H., *May* 19, 1890.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR. I present the following memorial of Barton & Co., and other merchants of the city of Manchester, N. H.:

MANCHESTER, N. H., *May* 9, 1890.

The undersigned, jobbers and retailers of domestic and foreign dry goods, respectfully protest against the great increase of duties proposed by the McKinley tariff bill on dress goods manufactured wholly or in part of wool, on the ground that the present rate, averaging over 70 per cent., is high enough to give American manufacturers sufficient protection, and that the sentiment of the country will not approve of the great advance proposed by said bill.

On the same grounds we protest against the great increase on manufactures of silk goods, especially the enormous increase of rates of duty on plushes and velvets.

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR. I present the opinion of Mr. Justice Cox and a letter of the president and secretary of the Columbian Harmony Society of the District of Columbia, bearing upon Senate bill 3583, in regard to the ownership of lots in Columbian Harmony Cemetery, in the District of Columbia. I move that the papers be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SAWYER presented the petition of H. C. Stayner and 160 other employés of knitting mills at Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of the McKinley tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. INGALLS presented a petition of Post 374, of Solomon City, Kans., Grand Army of the Republic, praying that the remainder of the Fort Dodge military reservation be donated for use as a soldiers' home; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the navigation of the Licking River in the State of Kentucky; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DOLPH presented four petitions of citizens of Oregon, praying for the passage of a bill providing for the manufacture of pure lard; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 2701) concerning the rank and pay of certain officers of the Navy having served a full term as chief of a bureau in the Navy Department, heretofore reported by him.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3542) granting a pension to Jacob Bernhardt, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6146) to increase the pension of George C. Quick;

A bill (H. R. 6402) granting a pension to Mrs. Harriet McMann; and

A bill (H. R. 3256) granting a pension to Anastasia McGrievy.

Mr. MOODY, 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. 3969) granting a pension to Seth M. Walter;

A bill (H. R. 3055) for the relief of W. P. Alexander;

A bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Ellen Shea;

A bill (H. R. 3262) granting a pension to Mary A. Selbach; and

A bill (H. R. 6863) granting a pension to Henry Stumpf.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3484) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Blake, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4980) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Blake, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1740) granting a pension to Mary J. Welch, an army nurse in the late war, 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 (H. R. 4495) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Riley, late of Company L, Seventh United States Cavalry;

A bill (H. R. 4987) granting an increase of pension to William Thompson;

A bill (H. R. 3531) to grant a pension to Eliza Richardson;

A bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Jones; and

A bill (H. R. 3983) granting a pension to Samuel Sterling.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Harriet E. Donaldson, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Donaldson, praying for an increase of pension, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 3874) granting a pension to Harriet E. Donaldson; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2749) granting an increase of pension to Augustus J. Wernitsch, 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 (H. R. 4355) for the relief of Emeline Beam, mother of Isaac W. Beam;

A bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of Isabel Hensley; and

A bill (H. R. 6726) granting a pension to Isaac Moore.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2361) for the relief of Asa Ellis, collector of internal revenue for the first collection district of California, reported it without amendment.

Mr. TURPIE, 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. 4851) granting a pension to Eliza J. Glass;

A bill (H. R. 5486) granting a pension to Eugenia A. Helston;

A bill (H. R. 8056) granting a pension to Mrs. Sallie J. Miner;

A bill (H. R. 2469) increasing the pension of Thomas Ward;

A bill (H. R. 2481) granting a pension to Bridget Tole;

A bill (H. R. 2049) to grant a pension to Jacob E. Goudy;

A bill (H. R. 2503) for the relief of Sarah D. Duke;

A bill (H. R. 2012) granting a pension to William V. Cronk;

A bill (H. R. 6757) granting a pension to William Crowford;

A bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to William H. Chapman;

A bill (H. R. 8865) granting a pension to Angelina Silver;

A bill (H. R. 6089) granting an increase of pension to George Uhl; and

A bill (H. R. 5777) for increasing the pension of Sarah Dabney, a Revolutionary pensioner.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3194) granting a pension to Joseph H. Scoopmire, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2238) granting a pension to Elizabeth Rumsey, army nurse, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the follow-

ing bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2201) to increase the pension of David Shively;

A bill (S. 2627) granting a pension to Fred. Pehin;

A bill (S. 2761) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah A. Aspold; and

A bill (S. 1056) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Elihu Jones.

Mr. PIERCE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 436) granting a pension to Lieuvisa A. Thompson, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

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

A bill (S. 961) granting an increase of pension to Richard W. Hubbell;

A bill (S. 2892) increasing the pension of Smith J. Shafer;

A bill (S. 1705) granting a pension to Ira Manley;

A bill (S. 754) granting a pension to James Malin;

A bill (S. 794) granting a pension to Margaret Myers; and

A bill (S. 3538) granting a pension to John W. Bennett.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2841) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. COKE introduced a bill (S. 3875) to amend an act approved February 4, 1890, changing the time and places for holding the United States district court in and for the western judicial district of Texas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 3876) to establish a port of entry at a point on the north boundary line of the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (S. 3877) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Moffitt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3878) granting a pension to Richard M. Shelton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3879) granting a pension to William A. Spencer and John Edward Spencer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 3880) granting pensions to Ida Button and May Button; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 3881) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis Steelman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3882) granting a pension to the widow of Maj. Gen. W. B. Hazen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3883) for the relief of William H. Young; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WASHBURN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3884) for the relief of George F. Brott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. INGALLS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3885) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3886) granting a pension to Clara B. Hoyt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3887) to abolish metal money, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. INGALLS. I introduce this bill by request of the Wage-Workers' Political Alliance, of Washington, D. C. They desire to have it publicly announced that they are responsible for its provisions, a desire in which I cordially concur. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STANFORD introduced a bill (S. 3888) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alameda, in the State of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3889) to provide for making loans by the Government and securing the same by liens upon land; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STANFORD. I ask that the bill be laid upon the table and printed; and I propose, with the consent of the Senate, if I can get the opportunity, to submit some remarks upon it on Saturday next.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Meanwhile the bill will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 3890) granting a pension to Elvira E. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAULKNER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3891) to suspend the operation in certain cases of the statute of limitations in force in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 3892) for the erection of a public building at Winchester, Ky.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 3893) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Nevada, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TURPIE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3894) to grant to the Montana and Wyoming Railroad Company a right of way through the Crow Indian reservation, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 85) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. MCPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7898) to allow right of way through Indian reservations.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3711) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MCCOMAS, Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, and Mr. CLEMENTS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 749) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at York, in the State of Pennsylvania;

A bill (H. R. 7770) granting a pension to Edwin S. Furman;

A bill (H. R. 7345) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to establish new harbor-lines in Portage Lake, Houghton County, Michigan;

A bill (H. R. 7985) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid vessels wrecked and disabled in the waters conterminous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada," approved June 19, 1878;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the heirs of Rear-Admiral Charles H. Baldwin to receive a snuff-box from the Czar of Russia;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 149) appropriating the sum of $500 to complete the engraving and printing the portrait of James N. Burnes, deceased, late a member of the House of Representatives of the Fiftieth Congress; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 153) to fill vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

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

PAPERS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. COCKRELL. In pursuance of the act of February 16, 1889, to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the Executive Departments, I submit the report of the joint committee appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House for that purpose, and I ask that the report may be received and printed in the RECORD, and also printed as a document. It does not need any action.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

The report is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

The undersigned joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States respectfully submit the following report:

In pursuance of the provisions of the law entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the Executive Departments," approved February 16, 1889, the Secretary of War under date of February 7, 1890, submitted to Congress a report calling attention to the letter of the Secretary of War dated February 26, 1889, printed in Senate Executive Document No. 133, Fiftieth Congress, second session, transmitting to Congress reports of the heads of bureaus of the War Department and of the chief clerk of the Department, showing the condition and character of papers not needed or useful in the transaction of current business, and which have no permanent value or historical interest. (See House Executive Document No. 197, Fifty-first Congress, first session.)

In pursuance of the same law the Secretary of the Treasury under date of January 27, 1890, submitted to Congress a like report showing the same facts in regard to papers in the files of his Department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of current business, and have no permanent value or historical interest. (See Senate Executive Document No. 44, Fifty-first Congress, first session.)

In each of these reports the Secretaries of the War and Treasury Departments respectively stated that these papers occupied much valuable space needed in the transaction of public business.

These reports were referred to your joint committee duly appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and your joint committee have met and fully examined the said reports and each of them, the statements therein, and the papers therein described, and respectfully submit to the Senate and House respectively their report of such examination and their recommendation.

Your joint committee respectfully report that the files of papers, records, and memoranda, which are described in said report of the Secretary of War as no longer needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of his Department, and as having no permanent value or historical interest, are of the character and condition described therein and should be sold as waste paper or otherwise disposed of upon the best obtainable terms, as provided in said law, with the exception of those "roughs of letters sent," contained in the twenty packages which may be in the handwriting or contain the autographs of President Lincoln, Secretary Stanton, General Fry, described on page 11, under the heading "Office Provost-Marshal-General United States," and also of the 10 tons of Confederate documents, consisting of property returns and abstracts, quartermaster, commissary, and medical requisitions and accounts, as described on page 13 of said report, under the caption "Confederate Archives Division." Some of these may be of value in determining questions of loyalty and property rights or of historical interest, while doubtless most of them are of no value or historical interest. They should be closely and carefully examined and assorted, and such as can be of no future value or historical interest should be sold or disposed of as waste paper, and the others carefully arranged so as to be acceptable and available.

Your joint committee further report that the files of books, papers, records, and memoranda which are described in said report of the Secretary of the Treasury as no longer needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of his Department, and as having no permanent value or historical interest, are of the condition and character therein described, and should be sold as waste paper or otherwise disposed of upon the best obtainable terms as provided in said law, with the following exceptions, to wit, the bound volumes of the Finance Reports and of the bureau officers, such as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Commissioner of Labor, Commissioner of Education, Comptroller of the Currency, Bureau of Statistics, Life-Saving Service, United States Official Registers, Executive Documents, and the Attorney-General, and bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the files of the New York Herald, complete for five years.

Your committee would respectfully suggest to the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the Congressional Library or some other public library the files of the New York Herald, and to transmit the bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to some public library desiring them, or the Secretary of the Interior, for distribution to libraries; and that he select from the files of the bound volumes of Finance Reports, and from the excepted bound volumes, as complete sets as possible of some 50 to 75 copies of such bound volumes for each year, and then distribute the remaining volumes to institutions and libraries upon applications therefor, and for such distribution that all such bound volumes be collected together in some suitable place for ready distribution.

In consequence of the very great mass of useless papers, files, etc., in the Treasury Department, stored in so many places from cellar to garret, the labor of collecting them all in one suitable place for disposition will be great, and may require some extra labor and employment of an extra force for a short time, and your committee suggest that a suitable sum of money, not exceeding $2,000, may be appropriated for such purposes.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

S. M. CULLOM,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Members on the part of the Senate.

W. C. COOPER,
JAMES H. BLOUNT,
Members on the part of the House.

IMPORTED LIQUORS—STATE LAWS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 398) subjecting imported liquors to the provisions of the laws of the several States, which by unanimous consent it was agreed should be taken up this morning after the routine business was finished.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That no State shall be held to be limited or restrained in its power to prohibit, regulate, control, or tax the sale, keeping for sale, or the transportation, as an article of commerce or otherwise, to be delivered within its own limits, of any fermented, distilled, or other intoxicating liquids or liquors by reason of the fact that the same have been imported into such State from beyond its limits, whether there shall or shall not have been paid thereon any tax, duty, import, or excise to the United States.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I desire to propose an amendment to the amendment of the committee. In line 10, after the word "duty," I move to strike out the word "import" and to insert "impost;" so as to read "tax, duty, impost, or excise."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter upon an extended discussion of this bill. I shall not venture beyond a brief explanation of the inducing cause of the bill as amended, and the nature, character, and extent of the bill.

In the case recently decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, the case of Leisy & Co. *vs.* Hardin, on writ of error to the supreme court of the State of Iowa, the court, in its opinion, held the following language:

The plaintiffs in error are citizens of Illinois, are not pharmacists, and have no permit, but import into Iowa beer which they sell in original packages, as described. Under our decision in Bowman *vs.* Chicago, etc., Railway Company (*supra*), they had the right to import this beer into that State, and in the view which we have expressed they had the right to sell it, by which act alone it would become mingled in the common mass of property within the State. Up to that point of time, we hold that, in the absence of Congressional permission to do so, the State had no power to interfere by seizure, or any other action, in prohibition of importation and sale by the foreign or non-resident importer. Whatever our individual views may be as to the deleterious or dangerous qualities of particular articles, we can not hold that any articles which Congress recognizes as subjects of interstate commerce are not such, or that whatever are thus recognized can be controlled by State laws amounting to regulations, while they retain that character, although at the same time, if directly dangerous in themselves, the State may take appropriate measures to guard against injury before it obtains complete jurisdiction over them.

To concede to a State the power to exclude, directly or indirectly, articles so situated, without Congressional permission, is to concede to a majority of the people of a State, represented in the State Legislature, the power to regulate commercial intercourse between the States, by determining what shall be its subjects, when that power was distinctly granted to be exercised by the people of the United States, represented in Congress, and its possession by the latter was considered essential to that more perfect union which the Constitution was adopted to create. Undoubtedly there is difficulty in drawing the line between the municipal powers of the one government and the commercial powers of the other, but when that line is determined, in the particular instance, accommodation to it, without serious inconvenience, may readily be found, to use the language of Mr. Justice Johnson in Gibbons *vs.* Ogden (9 Wheat., 1, 238), in "a frank and candid co-operation for the general good."

This bill in its amended form is a response to the suggestion contained in this declaration of the court, that whatever restraint the Constitution may have placed upon this subject, so far as the original action of the State is concerned, Congress can give its permission to the exercise of the restraining power or police power of the State, and it is for the purpose of giving that permission that the bill has been presented in its amended form.

The effect of the bill, if it shall become a law, will be to leave every State in the Union free to determine for itself what its policy shall be in respect of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. If a State shall desire prohibition it can adopt it and enforce it under the provisions of this bill. If it shall desire license, high or low, the same conditions will attend that policy so far as this bill is concerned. If it shall prefer to adopt the policy denominated local option, it may do that, so that the traffic may be allowed in such counties or cities as desire it and prohibited in others. But that each State shall be left to determine for itself what its policy in this regard shall be is the scope of the bill, its purpose and its effect.

Unless this bill or something which shall be its equivalent shall be enacted by Congress, then the several States are at the mercy of the citizens of other of the several States, and not only that, but the subjects of the Emperor of Germany, of the Queen of England, of the Republic of France, of the King of Spain, of all foreign Governments, will have in the States of this Union greater rights and privileges than the citizens of the States have themselves.

So, too, in respect of the several States, the citizens of Missouri, of Illinois, New York, of whatsoever State in the Union, can have greater rights within the State of Iowa than the citizens of that State will possess; and, Mr. President, that State, which I in part represent in this body, elected as its policy the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. The people of the State are satisfied with it; they desire the enforcement of their law; but, since the decision from which I have read an extract was announced, agents of distilleries and breweries in other States of the Union are already traversing Iowa and organizing "the original-package saloon" within the State, and there is no limitation as to what "the original package" may be. It may be a pint or a half-pint bottle of whisky; it may be a bottle or a keg of beer; it may be in any quantity and whatsoever form of package agreed upon between the manufacturer of another State and the agent that he may send to transact his business in Iowa.

All the States of this Union do not want prohibition. Some of them want license; some of them want local option; they have various desires in this respect. Some of them may want unrestrained traffic in the sale of intoxicants. The State of Iowa does not want that. She wants her present policy; at least, she should have an opportunity to administer it until her people determine to adopt something else in its place; and so with all the States.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Iowa will allow me to interrupt him for an inquiry.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator hold that under the decision of the Supreme Court the State of Iowa would have the right, after the package gets into that State, to prevent the sale or take control of it in any way after it crosses the line?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Undoubtedly the decision of the Supreme Court protects every package that may be transported into that State from abroad, from foreign countries or from other States, until it shall have passed from the hands of the importer and thereby become mingled with the common property of the State.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the State has the right to interpose by its laws and prevent the sale or any disposition of the article imported?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. After it shall have passed from the hands of the importer or his agent. But under this decision, whatever package may be introduced there—for instance, the brewer in Illinois, the distiller in Illinois or any other State may arrange to send his package in there, even in the shape of a vial containing a single drink, and organize his saloon on that basis, the importer holding possession, protected by the decision of the Supreme Court, until that package shall pass from his possession into the hands of his customer and that customer may drink a single drink of whisky in that original-package saloon in the good State of Iowa, and in spite of her laws.

This bill is simply to enable the States of the Union to organize for themselves and exercise their own right, their own police power in the protection of the health and morals and better condition of their people. If some think license is best, that they can have under this law. If some think local option is best, they can have it, as I have said. If others think that prohibition is best, that they can adopt and give it force. But each State is left to elect for itself the policy in this regard, and is not to be interfered with if we give this Congressional permission, as the Supreme Court has suggested we can, in order to relieve the States of the difficulties now surrounding their action.

Mr. President, I do not desire to continue the debate. I desire to get action, and I hope we may have speedy action upon this measure and thus assure to every State the right to determine for itself what its policy shall be and the power to enforce it.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee not able to agree with the majority in this report, I desire to submit some reasons for my action.

I will notice first the argument made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] as to the effect of the recent decision, without subsequent legislation by Congress, in regard to interstate commerce. He says that under the decision of the Supreme Court as it stands the citizens of Germany, of France, of any foreign country, would have more rights than the citizens of any of the States in this Union.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The Senator from Missouri misunderstood me. I said more than the citizens of Iowa.

Mr. VEST. More than the citizens of Iowa.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Or any other State which may have adopted the prohibitory system.

Mr. VEST. Exactly. Mr. President, the same argument would apply to any article of interstate commerce under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the argument of the Senator from Iowa, if worth anything, would sweep away the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States over interstate commerce.

I do not propose to go into a general discussion of the question of prohibition, because it would be entirely foreign to the debate now before the Senate. This is a question as to the power of the Congress of the United States and as to what are the reserved powers of the States. It is a question of constitutional law, and it would be unlawyerlike and improper to bring into this discussion anything else except those arguments that are strictly pertinent to the construction of the Constitution.

What has the Supreme Court decided? That is the first question. The Supreme Court has decided emphatically by a majority of its justices that alcoholic stimulants are an article of interstate commerce. That is conceded, I take it, upon all hands. They have decided, in the second place, that the power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes is an exclusive power vested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States.

A great deal has been said by lawyers and in the opinion of the majority and in the dissenting opinion of the minority of the justices of the Supreme Court as to the decision made in the celebrated License Cases, where Chief-Justice Taney and three of his associates rendered a dissenting opinion and five of the justices rendered an opinion that the interstate-commerce power of Congress was exclusive of any power within the States, and the other judges, some of them emphatically and some by indirection, held to the opinion that the power to regulate commerce was a concurrent power vested by the Constitution of the United States in certain cases in the States themselves. Justice Story, in commenting upon this decision upon which so much has been said, upon page 223 of his Commentaries upon the Constitution, in a note, says:

> The court was very much divided in opinion in these cases, five of the judges concurring in the doctrines as above stated, namely, Justices McLean, Wayne, Catron, McKinley, and Grier, and four of the judges dissenting, namely, Chief-Justice Taney and Justices Daniel, Nelson, and Woodbury. The four dissenting judges considered the power to regulate commerce as a concurrent power in the States and in the Federal Government, while Justices McLean, Wayne, Catron, Grier, and apparently McKinley, considered the power as exclusive. This case, therefore, reaffirms the doctrine of Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, 9 Wheat. R., 1.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case to which the Senator has referred, and which has called forth this proposed legislation, reaffirmed the doctrine of Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, and the doctrine of the five judges, comprising the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States in the License Cases, and upon one single expression which was *obiter dictum*—as I think I will show beyond a question—upon one single *dictum* of the Chief-Justice who delivered this opinion is based the bill now pending in the Senate.

Let us in the first place understand, in the language of the court itself, what it has decided. There has been a great deal of popular misapprehension, and misapprehension even among Senators, in regard to what the Supreme Court of the United States intended to say. I read now from the majority opinion. Chief-Justice Fuller says:

> The authority of Peirce *vs.* New Hampshire, in so far as it rests on the view that the law of New Hampshire was valid because Congress had made no regulation on the subject, must be regarded as having been distinctly overthrown by the numerous cases hereinafter referred to.
>
> The doctrine now firmly established is, as stated by Mr. Justice Field in Bowman *vs.* Chicago, etc., Railway Co., 125 U. S., 507, "that where the subject upon which Congress can act under its commercial power is local in its nature or sphere of operation, such as harbor pilotage, the improvement of harbors, the establishment of beacons and buoys to guide vessels in and out of port, the construction of bridges over navigable rivers, the erection of wharves, piers, and docks, and the like, which can be properly regulated only by special provisions adapted to their localities, the State can act until Congress interferes and supersedes its authority; but where the subject is national in its character, and admits and requires uniformity of regulation, affecting alike all the States, such as—

Now mark it—

> transportation between the States, including the importation of goods from one State into another, Congress can alone act upon it and provide the needed regulations. The absence of any law of Congress on the subject is equivalent to its declaration that commerce in that matter shall be free. Thus the absence of regulations as to interstate commerce with reference to any particular subject is taken as a declaration that the importation of that article into the States shall be unrestricted. It is only after the importation is completed, and the property imported is mingled with and becomes a part of the general property of the State that its regulations can act upon it, except so far as may be necessary to insure safety in the disposition of the import until thus mingled.

Now, says Chief-Justice Fuller, commenting upon this decision of Mr. Justice Field in the case of Bowman *vs.* Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company:

> The conclusion follows that, as the grant of the power to regulate commerce among the States, so far as one system is required, is exclusive, the States can not exercise that power without the assent of Congress—

Upon these words, a simple *dictum*, is based the bill that is now pending before the Senate—

> and, in the absence of legislation, it is left for the courts to determine when State action does or does not amount to such exercise, or, in other words, what is or is not a regulation of such commerce. When that is determined, controversy is at an end.

Now, Mr. President, I repeat that upon those simple words, a manifest *dictum* interpolated into this opinion, not necessary to the decision of the question pending before the Supreme Court, which intimates that Congress can give its permission to a State to regulate interstate commerce, is based the legislation that is now proposed.

Mr. Justice Field declared in the opinion in Bowman *vs.* Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company that wherever the question is a national one, wherever it requires uniformity of decision, then the power is vested exclusively in Congress and no State can interfere. I take it there will be no controversy in regard to the question as to the national character of the liquor traffic so far as the commerce of the United States and commerce between the States is concerned. It is well known, and goes without saying, that a party exists in the United States whose single platform consists in the contention that there should be no tax upon alcoholic stimulants, no manufacture of them, no importation of them; and it is to-day a national issue.

When the Supreme Court declares that alcoholic stimulants are a subject of interstate commerce, that takes out of this argument all that can be said in regard to the deleterious effects of stimulants, all the lurid eloquence we have heard in regard to the evils of intemperance, and we are limited to the single, solitary proposition—and I ask the attention of Senators to it, for no more important question can come before the Congress of the United States—can the Congress, when it is vested by the Constitution with exclusive power (and the Supreme Court has so decided in regard to the importation of alcoholic stimulants from one State to another), delegate that power to a State? That is all there is of it. It is not a question of the police power of the State; it is a question of delegation.

All of us are familiar with the history of the clause in the Constitution. All of us know that it originated from the defect in the old Articles of Confederation which permitted one State or colony to tax the product of another. That resulted in "confusion worse confounded." It resulted in anarchy as to taxation. Massachusetts taxed the products of New Hampshire and New Hampshire retaliated upon Massachusetts; Virginia taxed South Carolina and South Carolina retaliated upon Virginia, until, instead of union between the States, there was hostility, antagonism in regard to the great right of taxation.

In order to do away with that condition of things this clause was inserted in the Constitution, and if reference is made to the debates on the Constitution in the Madison Papers it will be found that that was the controlling reason when, after a discussion of days and weeks, it was finally determined to put into the Constitution of 1789 the clause which reads as it does now:

> The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

The Supreme Court has decided, as I have shown, that this is an exclusive power, and now it is proposed by this bill to delegate that power to one of the States of this Union. If that power can be delegated in regard to an article of merchandise, which alcoholic stimulants are admitted to be, it can be delegated, if sufficient political influence can be brought to bear in these halls, as to wheat, or corn, or oats, or oleomargarine, or any other article which is the subject of interstate commerce.

Are we to make this new departure? Are we upon the dictum of the Supreme Court to tear down the barriers of the Constitution? Are we to uproot the settled doctrine based upon the highest motives of policy to prevent confusion between the States and create uniformity? What is the meaning of the clause in the Constitution that taxation shall be uniform? It means exactly the same thing that this clause in the Constitution means, that the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce among the States.

Mr. President, in the Fiftieth Congress, when this question was before the Senate, a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary filed an opinion in regard to the matter of which I now speak, and I will ask the Secretary to read the parts which I have indicated in pencil, as I am suffering from a sore throat.

The Secretary read as follows:

It has been seen that an imported article remains a part of foreign commerce so long as it remains in the hands of the importer in the same shape and form in which it was imported. A prohibition or restriction on its sale whilst thus conditioned, made by State authority, would therefore be a regulation of foreign commerce by the State, and, as we have seen, would not be permissible under the Constitution. Can Congress give this power of regulation to the States? The answer to this would seem to be too plain for controversy. The dividing line between State and Federal powers is fixed by the Constitution. That instrument, the supreme law of the land, specifies what is granted and thus fixes also what is reserved. A State can not enlarge the powers of Congress even in its own limits. This would be a surrender to that extent of its constitutional equality with the other States.

The Constitution has formed and was intended to perpetuate a Union of equal States, equal in political dignity and in political power, and no diversity in these respects is possible. If it be true that Congress can not, in pursuance of the Constitution and without any assent of a particular State or States, make a regulation as to the sale of imported goods still remaining a part of foreign commerce, different in some States from the regulation in the other States, it must follow that no such different regulation can be established in the States which shall consent to it.

It is equally clear that Congress can not part with or delegate to a State any power which has not been reserved to it. Congress can not return to the States a power given by the Constitution to Congress; much more can not Congress delegate or surrender a granted power——

Mr. HOAR. What is that which is now being read?

Mr. VEST. That is the opinion of the majority of the Judiciary Committee in the Fiftieth Congress on this subject.

The Secretary continued the reading, as follows:

to any portion of the States, for that would *pro tanto* invest those States with powers not possessed by the others. We may safely rest, therefore, on the conclusion that this bill is unconstitutional in submitting the foreign commerce named in it to regulation by State laws, unless we shall find that Congress may, without any aid from State laws, make different regulations as to importations in different States. We are thus brought face to face with this proposition, that Congress has power to enact that a particular imported article, after payment of duties according to law and still in the hands of the importer and in the original package, and therefore still a part of foreign commerce, may be freely sold in some States, and in others shall not be sold at all or sold only with burdensome restrictions.

To that proposition thus expressed we are confident that none would assent. Such a law would not only contravene that provision of the Constitution which requires impost taxation to be uniform throughout the Union, but also that provision which prohibits Congress from giving, by any regulation of commerce, a preference to the ports of one State over those of another. It would destroy uniformity in taxation, because in one State the payment of the impost tax would include in it, as its rightful and necessary effect, the right to sell, and in the other it would include no such right.

Taxation to be uniform, as required by the Constitution, must not only be the same in amount on the same thing, but payment of it must be followed by the same legal consequences. A preference is given to the ports of one State over the ports of another by a regulation of commerce, when, by a law of Congress, importations into the ports of the one upon payment of the duty may be sold, and in the other they may not. That the State discriminated against consents to the discrimination can make no difference, as we have seen. It is not in the power of a State to give force and validity even within its own borders to an act of Congress passed in violation of the Constitution.

There is one other aspect necessary to be considered. It being shown, as we think it has been, that Congress can pass no such law, and that the States can pass no such law, and that Congress can not delegate to the State the power to pass such a law, and that a State can not invest Congress with the power of enacting such a law, to be operative only within its own borders, we have now further to inquire whether the conjoint action of a State and of the Congress can make such a law valid within the limits of the State. There is such a thing in the Constitution as concurrent powers in the several States and in the United States, whereby each sovereignty may legislate independently on the same subject. But these powers are of that kind where conjoint action is not contemplated. The concurrent power of the State is subordinate, and can only be exercised when not in conflict with the law of Congress, which is supreme. This is not a case of that kind, for here neither has independently any power whatever.

There are a few conjoint powers specified in the Constitution; that is, certain reserved powers of the States are not reserved to them absolutely, but only to be exercised by the consent of Congress.

Among these is the power to levy imposts and duties, the net proceeds of which are to go into the Treasury of the United States; making compacts between two or more States; laying duties of tonnage; keeping troops and ships of war in time of peace. But among these is not included the power claimed in this bill. The power here claimed is a power denied both to the States and to Congress; and the effect of the bill is to create a constitutional power by the joint action of two parties, to both of which it is prohibited. This we confidently assert can not be done.

* * * * * * * *

It should not be overlooked that the province of State control over what concerns the police regulation of domestic health, peace, and general good order and well-being within each State is, under the Constitution, as secure against intrusion from Federal authority as the regulation of foreign commerce by the General Government is from encroachment upon that province by State authority. It is not desirable that Federal legislation should seem, by inference even, necessary to impart or maintain aid or protection to the State's exercise of its authority within the province of State domestic control. The State and the Federal control in the premises are divided by the Constitution, and neither for its vigor depends upon the other. The experience of the wise administration hitherto of this judicial question, in defining these respective provinces, in the opinion of the committee, makes it best to leave this as it now is, a judicial question, in the highest interest of both the Federal regulation of commerce and the State control of its police authority.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President——

Mr. INGALLS. Will the Senator have the names of the members of that committee who signed that report read?

Mr. VEST. I was about to state that, but it can be done.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the names be read, and let the views of the minority be read.

Mr. INGALLS. There were two dissenting reports made.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Read the names signed to the majority report and then what follows.

Mr. VEST. The majority report was not signed. Five of the members of the committee concurred in that report. The minority report is signed by three members and then there is a separate opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. EDMUNDS. Read the minority report.

The Secretary read the names "JAMES F. WILSON, JOHN J. INGALLS, GEORGE F. EDMUNDS."

Mr. EDMUNDS. We did not agree to that majority report. We agreed to the minority report.

Mr. EVARTS. Those are the dissenting names.

Mr. INGALLS. Four members of the committee dissented from the report of the majority.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Read the minority views.

The Secretary read as follows:

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY RELATIVE TO THE BILL (S. 1067) RELATING TO IMPORTED LIQUORS.

The views of a majority of the committee are submitted in writing, and, of course, constitute the report of the committee.

The non-concurring minority beg leave to present their grounds of dissent from the report of the committee.

The committee states that the bill was referred to it for examination of the constitutional questions involved.

The bill was first referred to the Committee on Finance. It was reported from that committee on January 31 last. The RECORD contains this statement relative to the report, namely:

"Mr. VANCE. I am instructed by the Committee on Finance to report back the bill (S. 1067) relating to imported liquors to this body and to ask that the committee be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as it involves questions which we think that body should pass upon.

"The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That change of reference will be made, if there be no objection."

This does not seem to indicate a reference of the limited character suggested in the report of the committee. As no particular points or questions are mentioned, the reference may well be treated as covering all of the features of the bill.

The Constitution says:

"The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

This provision of the Constitution makes no distinction relative to the character of the duties, imposts, and excises, nor as to the purposes for which they may be imposed. It does not say that these methods of raising revenue for the purposes of paying the debts, providing for the common defense and general welfare, can be exercised in such manner as to violate the rule of uniformity prescribed. No matter under which distinctive power of Congress they may be imposed, they must be uniform throughout the United States. If they be imposed by a law which provides for the collection of duties on articles imported from foreign countries, they must be adjusted to the standard of uniformity. If they be established by a law for the collection of internal revenue, no departure can be had from the rule of uniformity, no matter whether the legislation be enacted in pursuance of the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, or of any other power; in each and all the one dominating element of uniformity must be present. This is the command of the Constitution. Applying this rule to the bill in question what result will we reach? The bill is in terms as follows, namely:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the consent of Congress is hereby given that the laws of the several States relating to the sale of distilled and fermented liquors within the limits of each State may apply to such liquors when they have been imported in the same manner as when they have been manufactured in the United States."

Is it obnoxious to the constitutional objection interposed by the committee? Keeping in view the rule of uniformity imposed by the Constitution, can we find in the legislative and judicial history of the country a satisfactory answer to this question? Section 3243 of the Revised Statutes would seem to furnish a pretty conclusive legislative answer. But the committee in its report says that—

"The power therein exercised by Congress is in reference to things purely internal and domestic in the States—a power of internal taxation—and not the same power as is attempted to be exercised in this bill. If it is the same power, however, it has been proven to be unconstitutional."

It is the same power in so far as that it is subject to the constitutional rule of uniformity and is contained only in the very same words that apply to all other forms of taxation. Indeed, the legislative answer seems to be pretty conclusive.

But the committee, as already quoted, says:

"If it is the same power, however, it has been proven to be unconstitutional."

By whom? Certainly not by the Supreme Court of the United States, for that tribunal has held to the opposite doctrine. In McGuire *vs.* The Commonwealth (3 Wall., 387), and in the License Tax Cases (5 Wall., 462), its decisions are adverse to the position of the report from which we dissent.

So it would seem that the legislative and judicial departments of the Government concur in the answer that the character of legislation presented by this bill is within the constitutional power of Congress; that it does not violate the injunction of the Constitution that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." Do not these terms include the taxes imposed by the internal-revenue laws? If not, then is it to be understood that Congress has the power to disregard the rule of uniformity in levying internal-revenue taxes? Surely the report from which we dissent is not intended to be understood as an assertion of such a doctrine as this. If not and if it recognizes the constitutional rule of uniformity in the imposition of taxes, in whatever form it may be attempted, then it must abandon its contention that this bill is not within the constitutional power of Congress.

Section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, and the action of the courts in respect of it, presents another answer to the reasoning of the committee concerning this bill. In McCulloch *vs.* The State of Maryland (4 Wheaton, 316) the power of the State to impose a tax on an instrumentality adopted by Congress for giving effect to the powers delegated to it by the Constitution was most exhaustively considered. The conclusion of the Supreme Court, as announced by Chief-Justice Marshall, in the opinion prepared and read by him, was adverse to the claim of the State. It was declared that—

"The court has bestowed on this subject its most deliberate consideration. The result is a conviction that the States have no power, by taxation or otherwise, to retard, impede, burden, or in any manner control the operations of

the constitutional laws enacted by Congress to carry into execution the powers vested in the General Government. This is, we think, the unavoidable consequence of that supremacy which the Constitution has declared.

"We are unanimously of opinion that the law passed by the Legislature of Maryland imposing a tax on the Bank of the United States is unconstitutional and void."

What the Bank of the United States was in its time the national banks are now. It was a means adopted by Congress for giving effect to the powers granted to it by the Constitution. It could not be taxed by the States. The national banks were created by an exercise by Congress of the same powers that were exerted when the Bank of the United States was chartered. It could not be taxed, while they can be. Why is this? Simply by force of section 5219 of the Revised Statutes. By force of this section all of the States do now impose taxes on the shares of national banks, and its constitutionality has been declared in numerous cases by the Supreme Court of the United States. The constitutional power which supports that section of the Revised Statutes is not less effective in respect of the bill under consideration.

An importer of ardent spirits or of any other article of foreign production, is entitled to no greater protection under the Constitution than is the dealer in like articles of domestic manufacture. The man who manufactures ardent spirits in a State where it is lawful so to do is not in a condition inferior in matter of constitutional right to the person who imports such spirits from abroad. The one pays an internal-revenue tax, the other pays a tax levied by the customs laws; and what Congress may constitutionally say about one it may repeat as to the other. It has said that no payment of internal-revenue tax shall exempt the manufacturer or dealer in domestic spirits from the operation of the laws of the several States. This the courts have said is constitutional.

The bill under consideration proposes to enact a like declaration relative to the importer of foreign spirits. It is not doubted that the judicial result will correspond with that reached in the other case. The attempt of the committee to establish a distinction between the dealers in the foreign article by importation and those engaged in the field of domestic commerce can not be made successful. There is nothing in the Constitution assuring superior advantages to foreign commerce over that which is domestic. Nor is there anything in the bill submitted by the Senate to the committee which suggests a violation of the rule of uniformity prescribed by the Constitution. It proposes no new departure in the legislation of Congress. The legislative precedents cited justify its terms. They have stood the test of judicial scrutiny and have been approved.

But in order to conform the bill more nearly to the precedent contained in the internal-revenue law an amendment is herewith presented to the Senate and its adoption recommended.

JAMES F. WILSON.
JOHN J. INGALLS.
GEO. F. EDMUNDS.

Amendment reported to Senate bill 1067.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following, namely:

"That the payment of any tax, duty, impost, or excise upon, or in respect of, the importation into the United States of any fermented, distilled, or other intoxicating liquids or liquors shall not be held to exempt the importer thereof, or any other person or any such property from any penalty, forfeiture, or proceeding that now is or hereafter may be provided for by the laws of any State applicable equally to all property of the same nature, respecting the manufacture, sale, furnishing, or possession of liquids or liquors; nor shall the payment of any such tax, duty, impost, or excise be held to prohibit or preclude any State from imposing a tax or duty on any such liquids or liquors or from making regulations in respect of the same, in common with and in respect of other such liquids or liquors not imported, or from enforcing its laws operating equally in respect of property imported and property not imported, against any such importer or person or against any such property, whether the same be in the original package of importation or not."

VIEWS OF MR. HOAR.

I concur in the recommendation of the minority of the committee. If the opinion of the Supreme Court shall prove to be, as I incline to think it will from expressions found in opinions already given, that the imposition by act of Congress of a duty on an imported article does not, under the Constitution, have the effect to prevent the States from prohibiting the sale of such article or imposing conditions on such sale, in the exercise of their police power, the only objection to the measure proposed is that it is unnecessary. But it will tend to remove a doubt which hangs over the police legislation of the States for the suppression of crime and intemperance, and will do no possible harm.

GEORGE F. HOAR.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is no reflection upon the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] as a lawyer to say that he was mistaken about what the Supreme Court would decide. They decided exactly the opposite from what he thought they would. All of us have made mistakes of that sort. Lawyers will make them, I suppose. What the Supreme Court did decide was that the police power of the States did not attach to any article of interstate commerce; that until the original package was broken and its contents mingled with the general property of the citizens of the State, the police power of that State did not attach.

Mr. President, the opinion of the majority of the Judiciary Committee of the Fiftieth Congress, which has been read by the Secretary, was prepared by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] to show what his construction of the Constitution was—and I thoroughly and cordially agreed with him. I propose now to read from his views filed at the present session of Congress in behalf of the bill which is now pending. It is due to the Senator from Mississippi to state that when he prepared the report representing the views of five of us in the last Congress there was no question raised as to the police power of the State. The question upon which we decided the bill then pending, which was substantially the same bill as now, only in a different form, was the question I have stated here and to which I ask the earnest and serious consideration of Senators, whether the Congress of the United States can delegate a constitutional power exclusively vested in it to any of the States. That is the question. There can be no evasion about it. You may pass this bill, and repass and repass it, but the Supreme Court of the United States will be called upon to decide that question, and every lawyer here must cast his vote with reference to it. I believed then and I believe now that Congress can not delegate any of its exclusive constitutional powers to any of the States. For it to do so here would be to destroy the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution and all the purposes for which it was enacted originally, and so far from having uniformity we should have diversity and hostility; so far from there being an interstate article of commerce, recognized as such and which could be carried in the original package to every State in the Union, Missouri would shut out one article, and Iowa another, and Kansas another, and South Carolina another, and so on, until there would be chaos from one end of the Union to the other.

The Senator from Mississippi has put it forcibly and fairly, but I do not agree to his proposition because—and I say that not offensively—he says he simply now adheres to what he considers the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not agree with him as to what that opinion is. With his construction of it he is consistent in his two opinions. Here is what he says as to his former report:

In the Fiftieth Congress the bill before us was considered by this committee, and a conclusion reached by a majority that it was unconstitutional. The basis of this opinion, as stated in the report, was that Congress had no power to grant a jurisdiction to a State which was by the Constitution vested in the Federal Government. The committee thought that the division of power between the States and the Federal Government was fixed by the Constitution and could not be changed either by the action of Congress alone or by the conjoint action of Congress and any State in which it was attempted to vest a part of this power delegated to Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. I should be glad to have the whole of it read at the desk.

Mr. VEST. I have not the slightest objection, but that is the syllabus of this whole case. Whether Congress, in which the Constitution has vested the exclusive power to regulate commerce among the States, can delegate the whole of that power or part of it to any State or any number of States, is the question. If the Senator wants his report of this session read he can have it done.

Mr. GEORGE. Let it be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

VIEWS OF MR. GEORGE.

In the Fiftieth Congress the bill before us was considered by this committee, and a conclusion reached by a majority that it was unconstitutional. The basis of this opinion, as stated in the report, was that Congress had no power to grant a jurisdiction to a State which was by the Constitution vested in the Federal Government. The committee thought that the division of power between the States and the Federal Government was fixed by the Constitution and could not be changed either by the action of Congress alone or by the conjoint action of Congress and any State in which it was attempted to vest a part of this power delegated to Congress.

The committee did not consider that any question relating to the power of the State to deal with intoxicating liquors under their reserved power was submitted for their consideration, and for that reason they expressly declined to express any opinion on that subject.

Since that time the Supreme Court has determined that the reserved powers of the States did not authorize them to prohibit the sale of imported intoxicating liquors within their respective limits, and that Congress might grant to a State the power thus denied to them. We are now called upon to act upon this bill after a decision of the Supreme Court overruling the opinion then entertained by the committee as to the power of Congress to donate a power to the States, and also at variance with the views entertained by the undersigned as to the extent of the reserved powers of the States.

Under these differing circumstances, the question of donating this power to the States is presented for our consideration. If we adhere to the opinion expressed in the former report, we do so in direct conflict with the decision of that tribunal appointed by the Constitution to determine authoritatively the extent of the delegated and reserved powers. And so if the undersigned adheres in practice to the opinion that the reserved powers of the States are ample to control and prohibit the sale of imported intoxicants, he would vainly insist on a jurisdiction which, under the decision of the Supreme Court, no State would be allowed to exercise. It is his duty, therefore, to conform his action to the decision of the court.

The court having decided that the power may be delegated by Congress to the several States, the only question left is as to the expediency of the exercise of the power.

The undersigned, though yielding obedience to the decision of the court, entertains the opinion that the States have, under the Constitution, the power yielded by this bill, and that this power in the States is necessary for their welfare and even to the proper working of our complex political system.

It is certain that Congress can not exercise the police power of regulating the traffic in intoxicants within the several States, and the Supreme Court has denied this power to the States, except as to liquors manufactured within their respective limits. So that unless we agree that Congress shall grant this power to the several States, as decided by the Supreme Court may be done, then there remains no power by which this police regulation may be made or enforced as far as imported liquors are concerned, whilst they are in the original packages.

The Supreme Court has assented to the power of the several States to regulate, control, and prohibit the sale of intoxicants manufactured within their respective limits as a necessary police power, but denies this power as to intoxicants imported from another State or from a foreign country. The result is that, however harmful a State may determine the traffic in intoxicants to be, the power to prohibit it is restricted to such liquors only as are manufactured in its borders. Foreigners and citizens of other States may, under this new law, invade a State with their intoxicants, dispose of them in their original packages, and thus carry on a business which the State has determined is destructive to the peace and good order of the community and to the health and morals of the people.

In this singular and anomalous condition has the State been placed by the decision of the Supreme Court.

The Court, however, has allowed a means of correction by affirmative action on the part of Congress, granting permission to the State to deal with imported intoxicants in the same way and to the same extent as they may deal with liquors manufactured within their respective limits.

The undersigned believes the true rule to be to concede the power to the States as a power reserved under the Constitution, and not require them, as the Supreme Court has decided, to hold it as a Congressional grant, and therefore subject to the will of Congress to give it in the first instance and afterwards to withdraw it. Yet, as he deems it a power reserved to the States under the Constitution and one necessary to the maintenance of a rightful authority by the States over their own domestic affairs, he feels constrained to support the bill,

since only by such legislation can the States, under the decision of the Supreme Court, exercise their rightful and necessary jurisdiction over a subject of the utmost importance to their welfare.

The undersigned expresses no opinion as to the propriety of the exercise of this power by the several States. That is not a matter for Congressional consideration. Whether there shall be a free or a regulated traffic in intoxicants or total prohibition is a matter for each State to determine for itself. It is not a matter either of Congressional action or advice.

Believing that the Supreme Court, by its decision in Leisy & Co. vs. Hardin, erroneously denied to the States the power conceded to them by this bill, the undersigned gives support to the bill as the only means left whereby the States may exercise their rightful authority over a matter of the utmost gravity and concern to them. The result attained by this action on the part of Congress is the same, so long as Congress shall yield the power, as if the constitutional power of the States to act as they saw proper had been recognized. It is a matter of sincere regret that the States are compelled to rely on Congress for a grant of this essential power. It is also to be deplored that the Constitution has been authoritatively construed so as to reverse the well recognized rule that Congress is the grantee of powers from the State, and is not the source of power which may be parceled out at its will to the States. Yet, finding the Constitution thus construed as to this particular matter by the tribunal which is appointed as the final arbiter in such matters, the States must submit to hold the power at the will of Congress until such time as the court, upon being better advised, shall reverse its action.

J. Z. GEORGE.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to inquire if that is the minority report on the bill under consideration.

Mr. VEST. It is the individual report of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GEORGE. On the pending bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I inquire whether there was any majority report made in favor of the bill.

Mr. VEST. Yes, sir; a report submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. CULLOM. I understood at first that there was no report.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. There was a report made by the majority of the committee, and these are concurring views in the result arrived at by the majority submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. VEST. I will state, so that the Senator from Illinois can distinctly understand how this matter comes before the Senate, that in the Fiftieth Congress a bill was offered by the Senator from Iowa which had the same effect as the bill now pending, but differently constructed. That was referred to the Judiciary Committee. It first went to the Finance Committee, and at the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] it was sent from the Finance Committee to the Judiciary Committee. It was considered in the Judiciary Committee and five of us voted that the bill was unconstitutional and made a report against it, which was drawn by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. CULLOM. I understood all that history, but at the beginning of the discussion it was intimated that there had been no written report on this bill at all, and I did not hear the reading of the majority report.

Mr. VEST. There is a majority report and no minority report, because the Senator from Mississippi substantially agrees with the majority of the committee. Before, he wrote the report of the majority against the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. It was stated in my hearing that there was no majority report either. I merely wanted to find out the fact.

Mr. VEST. Now, Mr. President, it will be seen from the report of the Senator from Mississippi that he comes to the conclusion that the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that Congress can give permission to a State to interfere in interstate commerce. That is his opinion, but it is not my opinion. I do not believe the Supreme Court of the United States has decided any such thing, nor shall I ever believe it until that question is brought directly before that Court, as it will be if this bill passes both Houses of Congress and is signed by the President. I will not believe, until the court then decides that Congress can delegate its power to regulate interstate commerce to a State, that any such opinion will ever be entertained by a majority of that tribunal.

As a matter of course, I have had no communication with any justice of the Supreme Court on such a subject, but from the life-long opinions of some of the judges upon that bench and for the reasons stated in the concluding portion of the report of the Senator from Mississippi, I shall never be forced to believe, until it is put beyond any sort of question, that they can reverse the opinions of their whole lives and come to a conclusion abhorrent to me, that the powers of this Government do not come from the States, but that they come from the Federal Government to the States.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to call his attention to the bill and inquire of him for information on the subject as to his belief whether if the words "or the transportation" were out of the bill, so that the bill would prohibit the sale of liquors in the State, whether in the original package or otherwise, that would not improve the bill in his judgment, in view of the question whether it is constitutional or not to interfere with transportation, and whether it would not reach the same end.

Mr. GRAY. How would it read then?

Mr. CULLOM. It would then read:

That no State shall be held to be limited or restrained in its power to prohibit, regulate, control, or tax the sale, keeping for sale as an article of commerce or otherwise, to be delivered within its own limits, etc.

Leaving out the words "or the transportation."

Mr. VEST. That would not reach it.

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me that if the words "or the transportation" were out it would avoid the question as to interfering by this legislation with interstate commerce and would allow a State to prohibit the sale of an article whether it came there in original packages or otherwise.

Mr. VEST. That would simply defer the adjudication of the question, but it would come up exactly as it is now, and the Senator from Illinois will see that upon a little reflection, it seems to me.

Mr. CULLOM. I want the Senator's view of it. Would it not improve the bill?

Mr. VEST. Suppose we agree to strike out the word "transportation" and then this identical case should come before the *nisi* court and then go up to the Supreme Court of the United States; we should then have a citizen of Illinois bringing an article of interstate commerce, which alcoholic stimulants are adjudged to be, from the starting point into the State of Iowa in the original package, and he would be arrested for violation of the laws of Iowa, and his defense would be that it was an article of interstate commerce in the original package and brought from one State to another. So then we are exactly in front of the question presented now. The fact is there would necessarily have to be adjudication.

Mr. PUGH. Will my friend from Missouri permit me to say a word?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. PUGH. It is perfectly manifest that the bill before the Senate could not pass if it were not for the suggestion in the opinion of the Supreme Court that Congress can grant permission to a State to exercise the power of prohibiting the importation of intoxicants into her limits in the original package. Can that question of the power of Congress to give its consent, its permission, ever be raised and decided by the Supreme Court if this bill is not passed by Congress? How can we ever get the question decided?

I agree with the Senator from Missouri, and I do not believe that the Supreme Court upon argument and upon investigation will hold that this bill is constitutional; and that it can never become a law I fully agree with the Senator from Missouri. But they have made an intimation in their opinion that puts the responsibility upon Congress of not allowing that question of the right of Congress to give that permission to be raised and settled by the Supreme Court; and would it not be wise, in the line of the Senator's argument and opinion and my opinion, to have this important constitutional question settled in accordance with our opinion? And it can never be settled if we do not undertake to give our consent, as is required in this bill.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if I were requested courteously to frame a case for a moot court in a law university, I might be then willing to do what the Senator from Alabama intimates we ought to do; but I must feel like apologizing after the lectures which have been read to us about talking in regard to the Constitution, though I still have an old-fashioned idea that I have sworn to support that instrument and that I can not vote for a bill which I think violates it. That is the only trouble. It is not much of a one in these days, but still I mention it for what it is worth. I do not believe that Congress has any right to delegate its power under the Constitution to regulate commerce. I think it is an exclusive power, and the Supreme Court has so decided; and I do not believe the Supreme Court of the United States will ever decide that Congress has the right to do it, and I will not vote here now to make a case in violation of the Constitution and in violation of my oath to support it, in order to get out of the way of this *dictum* of the Supreme Court. With all respect to my friend from Alabama, I can not do it and I will not do it.

We have the question presented to us and we can not evade it; Senators must vote upon it and the Supreme Court must decide upon it: Is this power to regulate interstate commerce exclusive in Congress, and, if it is, can Congress delegate it to a State? The Senator from Mississippi states it in his last report and deprecates the idea that Congress is to be asked permission by a sovereign State, and I belong to his political school, and if the declarations of Senators on the other side are to be believed, as they are unquestionably, that the powers of this Government come from the States originally to the General Government and that the powers not granted to the General Government are reserved to the States or to the people——

Mr. GRAY. May I interrupt the Senator, to ask him a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. I quite agree with the Senator from Missouri in the view that he takes of the duty of each individual Senator, that he owes it to himself in voting upon the passage of the bill to consider whether it is in the constitutional power of the body to which he belongs to pass it. I do not think he can abdicate that duty in deference—I even go further than he has gone, but I do not know but that he will agree with me—in deference even to the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe that the duty is positive and obligatory upon each member of this body and of Congress to consider for himself and decide for himself in the view he takes of his duty whether a pro-

posed action by Congress is within the constitutional legislative power of that body or not. Of course he may have very persuasive and high authority in the judgment of the Supreme Court to support any view he may take, but he can not surrender his own judgment or abdicate the duty he owes to himself and the people whom he represents to vote for a measure that he believes unconstitutional, even if the Supreme Court decides otherwise. Of course the judgment of the Supreme Court as to the constitutionality of a given measure will bind a member of the Senate or of the other House so far that he will not be permitted to say that a given power shall be exercised when the Supreme Court had decided that it was not within the powers of Congress. But that is not the case here.

The Senator will excuse me for making so long a preamble. I should like to ask this question. I observe in the opinion of the Supreme Court upon this case there is this language:

Whatever our individual views may be as to the deleterious or dangerous qualities of particular articles, we can not hold that any articles which Congress recognizes as subjects of interstate commerce are not such or that whatever are thus recognized can be controlled by State laws amounting to regulations, while they retain that character.

Now, without going into the matter of fact whether Congress has affirmatively recognized any particular article, such as intoxicating liquors, as a subject of interstate commerce, as it decided in the case of Brown *vs.* The State of Maryland that Congress had recognized that the articles there were the subjects of foreign commerce by imposing a duty upon them and including them in the schedule of dutiable articles, I ask the Senator whether it is not competent, within the meaning of the language of the Supreme Court just quoted, for Congress to decide by the passage of a bill that its jurisdiction under the commerce clause of the Constitution shall be confined to certain subjects-matter of commerce, or the converse of that proposition, that certain subjects-matter, or things that might be considered subjects-matter of commerce, shall be excluded from the jurisdiction under the commerce clause of the Constitution. And would not a bill which in effect would decide that intoxicating liquors for the purposes of interstate commerce are not subject to the action of Congress, are not to be considered subjects of interstate commerce within the competence of Congress to pass—in other words, is it not true that Congress may limit the scope of the exercise of the power conferred upon it by the commerce clause of the Constitution?

Mr. VEST. I do not think so, because that is liable to the very objection which I have urged and which is at the bottom of this whole discussion. That clause of the Constitution gives an exclusive power to Congress, and the reason it was given to Congress was to prevent the very thing which would happen if the contingency arose contemplated by the Senator from Delaware; and what the framers of the Constitution meant was that there should be an impartial tribunal, the Congress of the United States, which should dispose for itself and in and of itself of all questions of interstate commerce, and which was intended to do away with the evil that was a giant one under the Articles of Confederation, when every State undertook to regulate that matter for itself.

If the Congress of the United States should do what the Senator from Delaware says, then it would only change the form of this action, and the same evils would come eventually. In other words, when they had said certain articles are articles of commerce, at the expense of one State, another State would come and add certain other articles, and if it had the power to carry Congress that would be the result.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We are now on purely a question of constitutional law. I suppose that the Senator will agree that the traffic in passengers, the movement of persons from foreign countries to the United States and from State to State, is commerce, as the Supreme Court has decided.

Mr. VEST. Not all of it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Where is the exception?

Mr. VEST. It goes further than the actual transit from one State to another or from a foreign country to this.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, it is not all commerce, but it is a part of commerce.

Mr. VEST. Unquestionably.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now, then, Congress has not chosen to pass any law on the subject of preventing the introduction of lepers into the United States——

Mr. VEST. I will come to that.

Mr. EDMUNDS. And the State says by law "that no person afflicted with leprosy shall come within the borders of this State at all, either from a foreign country or from another State." The movement of a leper, as a physical fact and as a mercantile fact, the paying transportation and all that, is just as much commerce as the movement of a healthy man is. Now, can Congress allow, or take its hands off, or whatever phrase you like to employ, and permit a State to say that no leper shall come into this State at all from anywhere?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, we come back to the same question, no matter which road we travel; and that is whether this is not an exclusive power in the Congress of the United States and whether they can delegate it to the States in one form or another. The proposition made by the Senator from Vermont as to a leper does not touch this case at all, because the Supreme Court has decided that the commerce clause of the Constitution never was intended and never could have been intended to take away from the States the reserve police power to protect the life and health of their own citizens, and it has decided over and over and over again, as my friend from Vermont knows, that an article which is diseased and deleterious to human life and health can not be an article of commerce.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Where is the right to decide whether the article is diseased or not? Is it in the States or is it in the United States?

Mr. VEST. The power at last would be a judicial one; that is a question of construction, and it would rest with the Supreme Court. That brings us to the very point of this whole matter. No State has the right to say what shall be an article of commerce, and the Supreme Court has decided over and over again that that is a question for Congress to determine.

Mr. GRAY. Then, Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri will answer me whether Congress can not have the right to say that a given article, such as intoxicating liquor, shall not be, for the purposes of action, a subject of interstate commerce.

Mr. VEST. I think it brings us at last to the same question, whether the bill as framed was intended to pass the power of regulating commerce from Congress to the States. Congress must decide that question as to its regulation of commerce between the States. It can not delegate it to a State.

Now, Mr. President, let me go one step further in this argument. My friend from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], for whose opinion as a lawyer I have unqualified respect, comes to the conclusion that the Supreme Court has decided this question and therefore he files his opinion before this body on the pending bill, and the majority of the committee say that these words in the opinion of the Supreme Court have decided as the Senator from Mississippi claims. They are very few and are as follows:

To concede to a State the power to exclude, directly or indirectly, articles so situated, without Congressional permission.

Those three latter words are held to intimate that Congress can give the power to a State to regulate interstate commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. They are repeated.

Mr. VEST. I know they are repeated, but they are substantially the same, with the permission of Congress. I appeal to every lawyer whether that question was before the Supreme Court of the United States in this case. If it was not there; this was a mere *dictum*. It is entitled to respect, coming from so high a tribunal, but it is not law and we are not bound by it and no lawyer is bound by it.

What were the points before the Supreme Court of the United States? They were two. One was, are alcoholic stimulants the subjects of interstate commerce? They decided that in the affirmative unanimously. Second, is the power to regulate commerce among the States an exclusive power in Congress? A majority of the court decided that in the affirmative. Those were the two questions. The question as to the power of Congress to delegate its authority was not before the Supreme Court. What is said in regard to it is *obiter dictum*, and it is entitled to no more authority here than the personal opinion of the Chief-Justice or any of the other judges.

Mr. HOAR. They did not use the word "delegate."

Mr. VEST. No, they said "permission." I simply used another word, but that was very evident. "Without permission" is the language. That was not before the Supreme Court of the United States.

I commend to the advocates of this bill a part of the minority opinion of Justices Gray, Harlan, and Brewer. I read now from page 23, in the *obiter dictum* of Chief-Justice Marshall. They dispose of it by quoting his own authority, and here it is:

Chief-Justice Marshall himself in an earlier case, where, having occasion to explain away some *dicta* of his own in delivering judgment in Marbury *vs.* Madison (1 Cranch, 137), he said: "It is a maxim not to be disregarded that general expressions in every opinion are to be taken in connection with the case in which those expressions are used. If they go beyond the case they may be respected, but ought not to control the judgment in a subsequent suit when the very point is presented for decision. The reason of this maxim is obvious. The question actually before the court is investigated with care and considered in its full extent. Other principles which may serve to illustrate it are considered in their relation to the case decided, but their possible bearing on all other cases is seldom completely investigated." (Cohens *vs.* Virginia, 6 Wheat., 264, 399, 400.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. VEST. I will ask the permission of the Senate to proceed. I will speak but a minute longer.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us have unanimous consent to go on and finish this bill. It is of great importance to everybody.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the title of the unfinished business.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2350) authorizing the issue of Treasury notes on deposits of silver bullion.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished

business be informally laid aside and that we continue the consideration of the bill which has been under discussion until it is disposed of.

Mr. BUTLER. Does that displace the regular order?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the regular order be laid aside informally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside informally, and that the consideration of the bill which has been under consideration be continued.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that there is a Senator prepared to speak on the regular order of business, and I shall therefore have to object.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill to its conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill which has been under discussion to its conclusion.

The question being put, the Chair declared that the ayes appeared to prevail.

Mr. BUTLER. I call for a division.

Mr. ALLISON. Before that is done, under the understanding at the time of adjournment last evening, I supposed this bill would go on to-day until the hour of 4 o'clock arrived. We all understand what is to occur then. I should be glad to have read the understanding which was arrived at the close of yesterday's session.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That only binds Senators, and not the Senate.

Mr. ALLISON. I know.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not so understand it. If there is any such agreement, I shall not violate it; but my understanding was that the bill which has been under consideration should be taken up immediately on the conclusion of the routine morning business, and to that extent unanimous consent was granted. I did not, however, understand that there was unanimous consent that it should go on until 4 o'clock.

Mr. CULLOM. Was not 4 o'clock mentioned?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The agreement was that the bill was to be acted upon to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] desire that the consent which was agreed to shall be read?

Mr. ALLISON. I will just say one word on this point. Here is what occurred yesterday as recorded in our official RECORD of debates:

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I will modify the request, and propose to take up the bill immediately after the conclusion of the formal morning business to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion, then, is withdrawn.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I withdraw the motion if I can have unanimous consent to the proposition I now make.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not object, but the Senator perhaps has forgotten that we are to have some eulogies to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At 4 o'clock.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. These are not to occur until 4 o'clock. I hope to be able to dispose of the bill before that hour.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa withdraws his motion that the Senate proceed to the present consideration of the bill and asks unanimous consent that the Senate will proceed to its consideration immediately after the routine morning business is finished to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. I was right about it. It was that the bill should be taken up immediately after the routine morning business.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well. Let us have the division.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not particularly anxious about it; but I think this is an extremely important measure, and, for one, I should like to look at the RECORD to-morrow so as to read the debate which has occurred on the bill to-day. I am not making the objection for the purpose of delay, but, I repeat, I would like very much to see the debate which has occurred here before voting upon this measure, and it is for that reason more than anything else that I desire the Senator from Alabama to proceed with his speech on the silver bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa, on which a division has been asked for.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 21, noes 11; no quorum voting.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASCO. I suggest that the call for the yeas and nays can not be had until it is ascertained whether there is a quorum present by a call of the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to have the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASCO. A call of the Senate is first in order.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is the common practice to call for the yeas and nays before the Chair has announced the result.

Mr. VEST. The Chair has announced the result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has announced the result. No quorum being present, the roll will be called.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators responded to their names:

PRESENT—55.

Aldrich,	Blackburn,	Cameron,	Cullom,
Allen,	Blair,	Casey,	Daniel,
Allison,	Blodgett,	Cockrell,	Davis,
Bate,	Butler,	Coke,	Dixon,
Berry,	Call,	Colquitt,	Dolph,
Edmunds,	Hawley,	Moody,	Sanders,
Eustis,	Hearst,	Paddock,	Sherman,
Evarts,	Higgins,	Pasco,	Stanford,
Farwell,	Hiscock,	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Faulkner,	Hoar,	Pierce,	Vest,
George,	Ingalls,	Platt,	Walthall,
Gorman,	McMillan,	Power,	Washburn,
Gray,	McPherson,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.
Hale,	Mitchell,	Reagan,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have responded to their names; a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], on which the roll will be called.

Mr. BUTLER. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that inasmuch as a quorum has been disclosed by the calling of the roll, we can now settle it by a division without the necessity of a roll-call.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am willing to try a division first, though I should like to take the yeas and nays very much on this question of State rights.

Mr. BUTLER. I am perfectly indifferent myself.

Mr. EDMUNDS. To save time, I am willing for the moment to take a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the demand for the yeas and nays will be withdrawn, and the question will be taken by a division on continuing the pending measure until 4 o'clock, as the Chair understands the motion to be.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Until it is displaced by what has been agreed to before.

The Senate proceeded to divide; and the ayes were 36.

Mr. BUTLER. No further count is demanded, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, a further count will be dispensed with. The bill is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I come now to what with me is the overwhelming consideration and argument in this debate. I have alluded to it briefly, but I now state it with a little more elaboration. I shall proceed to read from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Bowman case to emphasize what I shall say.

It seems to me that if we pass this bill it is but the opening up of opportunity for a successive series of such bills, just as the emergencies or the opinions of different States may call for such legislation. We are now asked to enter the domain of interstate commerce, vested according to the decision of the Supreme Court exclusively in Congress, and make an exception as to alcoholic stimulants, which the Supreme Court has decided to be as much an article of commerce as any other merchandise in this country. How long will it be until another demand is made upon Congress to give permission to all the States to exclude something else, tobacco, for instance, or oleomargarine? In a country like ours, where we see from year to year popular excitement springing up in different localities and finally permeating and pervading the entire Union as to certain interests, how long will it be until some other State finds some other article about which it proposes to legislate, and then appeals to all its sister States, and is enabled to bring enough political influence to bear upon Congress to have just such a law passed as that now proposed in regard to an article which it considers antagonistic to the interests of its people?

I ask Senators now to pause before they throw this question into the arena of Congressional debate. If this precedent is established it is simply a question of Congressional influence as to how far we are to go. When you once make an exception and establish the doctrine that Congress can permit a State to prohibit any article of interstate commerce from coming into its limits, you tear out that clause of the Constitution of the United States which gives that power to the national Congress and you absolutely destroy that grant.

I will now read from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Bowman case.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question before he goes to that?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether in his opinion the right to import an article implies the right to sell it and the unrestricted use of all the channels of importation, whatever they may be, to the consumer. For instance, take the right to import a package of liquor into a State, which I understand Congress has not interdicted in any way, it being interstate commerce, where there were prohibition laws, where does the power of the State begin and where does the power that you get under the right to import cease?

Mr. VEST. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that in the case of Ward *vs.* Maryland, and the authority has been unbroken. It is decided in the case which is now before the Senate in regard to which this proposed legislation is asked. The broad doctrine is this: The power to import carries with it the power to sell, because the Supreme Court has said without the power to sell the other grant of power is nugatory and void. The interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution attaches so long as the merchandise remains in an unbroken package in the hands of the importer. When it is sold,

when the package is broken and the goods are mingled with the other goods of the citizens of the State, the merchandise ceases to be interstate-commerce merchandise and becomes subject to the police power of the State. That is the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States simply repeated in the case which has been read here.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then the regulation of the State begins when the package is broken?

Mr. VEST. The regulation of the State begins just so soon as the original package goes out of the hands of the importer and the goods become mingled with the other goods of the State.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If I may ask the Senator a question, how can that be so on the logic of what my friend is saying? The Supreme Court, he says, has held that anything that a State does which tends to restrain interstate or external commerce is a regulation of commerce, indirect but still effectual. If a man imports a ton of dynamite into the city of New York for use in the State of Missouri, to blow up St. Louis, etc., as his motive may be, but nobody knows that, upon what principle is it that Congress or the Supreme Court can say (Congress may say it, the Supreme Court can not) that that is secure in the hands of the man who imported it, while it is not secure in the hands of the man to whom he has agreed to sell it? because the effect of the repression is just as great when the property comes into the hands of the second owner as it is in the hands of the first, as everybody knows. The line is in another place, when the Supreme Court comes to find it out.

Mr. VEST. The Supreme Court of the United States has always held that so far as the health and life of the citizens of a State were concerned the State had the power, it has it now, and always has had it by its police power, its reserved power, to protect that life and that health. If it is dynamite or gunpowder every Commonwealth in the Union has the power, whether it is the Government of the United States or the government of the State of Missouri or Vermont, to protect the health and life of its citizens. That is a power which always exists. It is an attribute of sovereignty. It is something the State can not divest itself of, for the Supreme Court has said that no State would have the right to divest itself of the power to protect the health and life of its own people. That shows how great and sovereign is their power and how absolute is the necessity of its exercise.

But, Mr. President, I come now to the point I was attempting to discuss: What would be the effect of this legislation? I will answer it in the language of Mr. Justice Matthews in Bowman *vs.* The Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company:

> If the State of Iowa may prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquors from all other States, it may also include tobacco or any other article the use or abuse of which it may deem deleterious. It may not choose, even, to be governed by considerations growing out of the health, comfort, or peace of the community. Its policy may be directed to other ends. It may choose to establish a system directed to the promotion and benefit of its own agriculture, manufactures, or arts of any description, and prevent the introduction and sale within its limits of any or of all articles that it may select as coming into competition with those which it seeks to protect. The police power of the State would extend to such cases, as well as to those in which it was sought to legislate in behalf of the health, peace, and morals of the people.

The power, you see, Justice Matthews concedes to the States, but he says they may pervert that power, and under the guise of exercising the police power they may exclude competition of all articles coming into antagonism with the products of their own people.

> In view of the commercial anarchy and confusion that would result from the diverse exertions of power by the several States of the Union, it can not be supposed that the Constitution or Congress have intended to limit the freedom of commercial intercourse among the people of the several States.

Mr. President, that would be the result of this proposed legislation. I repeat, it is simply a question of political influence which would determine the extent of the exercise of this power, if we once assert the doctrine which is now claimed here under this *dictum* of the Supreme Court, that Congress can permit any and every State in the Union to wipe out its control and jurisdiction over interstate commerce.

It has been said that a remarkable spectacle is presented, and extreme State-rights men defend the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Sir, it has always been the doctrine of the State-rights school that the safety of the people of the United States existed in drawing a distinct and unmistakable line between the power of the General Government and that of the States. It is the highest assertion of State rights to declare that the General Government has exclusive jurisdiction of certain questions and that the General Government alone can exercise that jurisdiction. If you once break down that barrier you destroy the doctrine of State rights. I, therefore, a State-rights man beyond question, stand here to-day to defend this decision of the Supreme Court, and to declare that the contemporaneous debates of the convention that formed the Constitution of 1789, the unbroken weight of judicial authority in the United States, and what I believe to be the calm, conservative, reflecting judgment of the people of the United States will defend this opinion and will say that with Congress alone rests the exclusive power to declare what shall be a subject of interstate commerce and to regulate it. It is a mistake to declare that those of us who believe in State rights are at all inconsistent when we claim that the Constitution, as we understand it, which gives this power to Congress, should be regarded, maintained, and observed.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, if this bill be not within the constitutional power of Congress, I think we must all agree that the condition of the American people in regard to this particular subject is more miserable than that of any other civilized nation on the face of the earth. I suppose there does not exist a community where men live together under law where the danger of permitting the unrestricted sale of intoxicating liquor is not recognized and guarded against by public authority.

Unless what we propose or its equivalent can be done, what is the result? The law, as I understand it, in the United States is this for the present and for all future time (unless we have a new Constitution in this respect), that any person, a dweller in another State or in a foreign country, may through his own agencies send intoxicating liquor into any of the States of this Union, and having selected the kind of package in which he chooses to put it he may, by those agencies, deliver it for use to any citizen of the State or dweller therein; and that it shall not be competent for any State authority to prohibit that delivery to a drunken man who has just come from a frenzy in which he has threatened the life or safety of his wife or children, to a criminal who desires it to fortify his courage for the commission of a crime, to a maniac or idiot whose slender intellect overcome by it will be simply the moving force to some arson or murder or assault by which the life and health and safety of innocent persons are threatened.

It is declared by the honorable Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] that, as he understands the law expounded by the supreme legal tribunal in this country, that is the condition of things to which we are to be hereafter exposed, with the supposable and practically impossible alternative that Congress itself shall enter upon the regulation of the traffic in intoxicating liquor so far as it is carried on by the agents of citizens of other States or citizens of other countries than the place where the liquor is to be sold and delivered.

Mr. President, one thing I think no man will question who knows anything of the history and character of the people of this country, and that is that if it had been supposed that the adoption of our fundamental law would have led to any such constitutional result there would not have been a State of the Union that would have given its assent to the adoption of the Constitution. It was hard enough as it was, and required the utmost exertion of the authority of the weightiest, and wisest, and best citizenship of that day, to induce nearly all the States to give their assent to the adoption of the Constitution; but if it had been said, "You are proposing an instrument to take from you the right to control your own beer shops or the sale of intoxicating drinks within your borders when it is attempted to be exercised and accomplished by the agency of persons living without your borders," I do not believe there would have been a hundredth part of the citizens of any State existing at that day who would have given their votes for the adoption of the Federal Constitution.

My honorable friend from Missouri spoke of this, in the close of what he said, as a question of State rights and of the boundary between the constitutional right or authority of Congress and the constitutional rights of the States; and the Senator claimed to be a member of what he called an extreme State-rights school. I do not so understand this question, and I do not so understand the position of the honorable Senator in regard to this subject or in regard to other kindred subjects in relation to which I differ with him. It is not a question of State rights. It is the question of the right being lodged anywhere to control crime.

When certain classes of our citizens or certain classes of political opinions are found now denying to the State, now denying to the United States, the power to exercise this, that, or the other function of legislation, it is not because they want to save the right, however they may deceive themselves, to do the thing to the place where the Constitution has lodged it; it is because they do not desire the legislative control over that thing to be exercised anywhere. As a rule, you will find that that class of citizens who are in favor of the most ample, thorough, and beneficent exercise of the constitutional and national rights of this Government are also in favor of the most ample, thorough, and constitutional exercise of the legislative powers and rights of the States for the public good; and they are also, as a rule, equally in favor of the most ample, thorough, and constitutional exercise of the right of the citizen to govern himself in regard to the matters where the human will goes astray, unless it is submitted to its own moral government. You will find in those sections of the country where the advocates of the powers of the nation dwell State vitality, State life, individual vitality, individual life, individual enterprise, all in the fullest and most benignant and most complete play.

Now, the Supreme Court of the United States, both majority and minority, in the decision which has been under discussion, have declared their opinion. Of course it is an *obiter dictum*, as the Senator from Missouri has said; but the concurrent opinion of these nine great lawyers on a grave constitutional question before them which they are considering in all its relations, even if not essential to the judgment which they are about to render, is entitled, I suppose, to the highest respect, a respect only surpassed by that which we owe to the constitutional judgment of the court itself.

What is it they have said Congress may do to remedy this difficulty?

They have not declared that we may delegate power to the States of this Union. They have not declared that the reserved power which the Constitution leaves to the States or to the people thereof respectively can be enlarged or abridged one whit by act of Congress. They have not undertaken to say that there can be any legislative action of a State of this Union (unless, perhaps, it relates to some matter of national property which we may cede to them) which can derive the least vitality from any denial of our own power or affirmation of theirs by legislation. What they have undertaken to say is this—and it is what was suggested during the remarks of the Senator from Missouri by the honorable Senator from Delaware—they have undertaken to say that, recognizing the complete and exclusive control of Congress over interstate and international commerce, Congress may also by legislation declare that certain subjects shall not be for legislative purposes treated as subjects of interstate commerce, and that the question whether a particular contract is a contract of interstate or international commerce within the legislative power is not to be determined by the Supreme Court as a question of absolute fact of which they take judicial notice, but may be determined by the Congress of the United States in declaring that for all legislative purposes this shall not be considered as within the domain of interstate commerce.

Whether that is sound or not it is the opinion of the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, and, as I understand, it is an opinion affirmed and reaffirmed almost from the beginning of our judicial history. Take the case in which the honorable Senator from New York who sits near me [Mr. EVARTS] was counsel, the case of the Morgan Steam-Ship Company *vs.* The Louisiana Board of Health, which was decided, in 118th United States Reports, at the October term, 1885. I will read the head-note. That was the case of the quarantine laws. I suppose there is nothing more completely settled and more clear on its face than that quarantine is a proper and fit subject of regulation as a regulation of interstate commerce and that Congress may establish any regulations it shall see fit on that subject. But it is also very well settled that the States by the permission of Congress may make their own quarantine laws as their own view of duty to their own public health requires. The statute of Louisiana undertook to establish such a quarantine system. Let me read the marginal note, which states this thing as clearly as I could state it:

> The system of quarantine laws established by statutes of Louisiana is a rightful exercise of the police power for the protection of health, which is not forbidden by the Constitution of the United States.

Just as they have said in other cases that the regulation of intoxicating liquors was a rightful exercise of the police power.

> While some of the rules of that system may amount to regulations of commerce with foreign nations or among the States, though not so designed, they belong to that class which the States may establish until Congress acts in the matter by covering the same ground or forbidding State laws—

Which is the second proposition.

> Congress, so far from doing either of these things, has, by the act of 1799 (Ch. 53, Rev. Stat.) and previous laws and by the recent act of 1878 (20 Stat., 37), adopted the laws of the States on that subject, and forbidden all interference with their enforcement.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that that is the whole of this matter. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] suggests to me that the same principle is involved in the case where Congress authorizes a State to build a bridge over navigable waters and allows it to remain until Congress interferes. In other words, Congress has the right to withdraw wholly or in part the waters of a particular State from the category of navigable waters of the United States within the constitutional contemplation. While the exclusive regulation of the use of navigable waters is within the power of Congress, and while any State law in conflict with any exercise of that power by Congress is void and unconstitutional, it is also equally well settled that Congress may declare that a particular water which in effect and physically is navigable shall not be treated as a navigable water within the definition in defining the limits of its jurisdiction, or shall be treated so only to a certain extent or only for a limited time, or shall not be treated so until after a limited time.

Whatever Congress ought to do or might properly do in respect to the District of Columbia or the Territories, I suppose no Senator who differs from me on this question believes that Congress is likely to enact uniform laws for the entire country for the regulation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors which are conveyed from State to State or from foreign countries into any State.

Mr. DAWES. I should like to ask my colleague what would be the condition of things in a State if Congress should undertake to do that thing? As Congress can not regulate it among the citizens of the same State, there would be one rule for the foreigner and another rule for the inhabitant of the State.

Mr. HOAR. That suggestion of my colleague, as well as many others which might be added to it, would of course make it unlikely that we shall enter upon that field of legislation just now.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HOAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HISCOCK. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts in respect to the constitutionality of this provision, whether it would make any difference if, instead of the words "of any fermented, distilled, or other intoxicating liquids or liquors," there were inserted the words "manufactures of wool?"

Mr. HOAR. I do not think it would. I am speaking now simply of the matter of the constitutional power, not the matter of discretion, or wisdom, or policy.

Mr. HISCOCK. I ask, then, as a constitutional question, if, in the Senator's judgment, it is within the power of Congress to delegate to a State the right to prohibit the introduction into that State of any article of manufacture.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think I should go quite as far as that, but I would say that of course to do that in regard to the manufacture of wool would be a plain and gross violation of the sworn public duty of all of us.

Mr. HISCOCK. I suggest it purely as a constitutional question.

Mr. HOAR. But this is a question of the boundary line between two conflicting powers, one the police power, clearly reserved to the States, and one the power to regulate commerce, exclusively confided to the Government of the United States. Either that boundary is to be determined as a question of fact, if we may speak of this as a question of fact, a judicial question, to take judicial notice of it by reason of the nature of the subject-matter, which is practically impossible or difficult of attainment, or it is to be treated as a matter of law.

If it be a matter of law, it is a matter which the law-making power of the country may declare and determine and define. I hold, just as the Supreme Court said in the Louisiana case (to take that single illustration, which is better than any other, because it is one which the court itself has affirmed), that, it being clearly a reserved power and a duty of the people of the State of Louisiana to protect the city of New Orleans from infection or pestilence as a police power, the power of preserving and looking after the safety of their citizens, it being also a power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, and in the course of that regulation to prohibit, if it see fit, the introduction of diseased and unhealthy persons or things, as the case of the leper put by the Senator from Vermont, there comes a domain which as a matter of fact could clearly be within one of these powers if the other did not exist. Suppose there were nothing but the United States as a Government where you come to these conflicting and overlapping domains. The Supreme Court of the United States say, as I understand the entire current of their decisions and as I understand the affirmation both of the minority and the majority in this last case, Congress may determine, as a question of law, as a matter of legislative enactment, the boundaries and limitations of those two jurisdictions, and as Chief-Justice Fuller said in the course of his opinion in the case which has given rise to this bill:

> Undoubtedly there is difficulty in drawing the line between the municipal powers of the one government and the commercial powers of the other, but when that line is determined, in the particular instance, accommodation to it, without serious inconvenience, may readily be found, to use the language of Mr. Justice Johnson in Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, 9. Wheat., 1, 238, in "a frank and candid co-operation for the general good."

Mr. HISCOCK. The other suggestion that I desire to make to the Senator is this: In respect we will say to the quarantine laws and in respect to navigable waters, they are entirely within the jurisdiction of the State for certain purposes and the State has the jurisdiction to legislate in respect to them until Congress takes that jurisdiction itself, absorbs it, takes the domain of it, because it in its wisdom thinks it wise to exercise certain powers or pass certain laws. Now, my mind is rather bent on inquiry than otherwise in respect to this provision. The State has no power primarily to regulate or to interfere with the goods against which this prohibition is aimed. It has no jurisdiction of the subject whatever. That has been decided. Now, having no jurisdiction originally, and that jurisdiction being absolutely vested in the Federal authority, can Congress delegate it? Is there not a wide difference between that class of cases and the class which the Senator has suggested, where the State has the power, until Congress has taken jurisdiction of the subject, to pass such laws and regulations as it chooses? It seems to me that there is a wide distinction.

Mr. HOAR. I differ with the Senator from New York in the premises.

Mr. HISCOCK. In one case the court holds that while the State has jurisdiction of the subject it can pass its regulating laws until Congress steps in and says, "No, you can not; we take jurisdiction of the subject, and your jurisdiction must yield to ours. It must yield to the Federal jurisdiction; you can not override it." In this case, I suggest to the Senator whether it is not a change in which the State has no jurisdiction whatever. The State can not touch it or legislate in reference to it, and the Supreme Court has so decided, until that power is given to it by Congress. The question is whether Congress can grant that power.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I have endeavored in what I have said to express my own idea. On the question of delegating the right I certainly agree with the Senator from New York and with the Senator from Missouri, and I can designate it as strongly as I can make the statement. I think the State has an original and primary power to

protect a child of ten years of age within its limits against danger to its morals, and the State has an original and primary power to say that nobody shall sell intoxicating liquor or opium to a baby of that age. It being the power of the State to do that thing, Congress has authority to say that the right to engage in interstate or international commerce shall not be understood to allow an Englishman or a citizen of another country to sell by himself or his agent his intoxicating liquor or opium to a child ten years old. That is clear. There is a primary power of the State and a power of Congress to restrain that.

Now, if it may do that, Congress may go further and it may say the power to engage in interstate or international commerce shall not be understood as permitting anybody to sell opium or intoxicating liquors to anybody else, and that they shall be excluded altogether from the domain of interstate commerce. That Congress has a right to say. If Congress, according to my interpretation of these decisions, has the right to say no person dwelling in another country or in another State shall sell opium or intoxicating liquors to children ten years old or under, if the State where they dwell has prohibited that act; and if it has a right to say that no citizen of another State or another nation shall sell or deliver intoxicating liquors or opium to any citizen of the State whose Legislature has prohibited that act, then this bill is clearly within our power. That is not a question of delegated power. It is not a question of permission to the State. It is a question of the right of Congress to prescribe what shall be the limit of interstate commerce, and it may bar it out by a definition of its own, or it may say interstate commerce shall be kept within the limits in regard to a particular subject matter where the police power of the State comes in, which the Legislature of the particular State has defined.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, I assume, from the fact that this amendment is here, that independent of an act of Congress no State has the right to do those acts and things the power to do which is granted to it in this provision. I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to argue that it has in his last argument which he has made.

Mr. HOAR. No; I said that the primary power of the State is not delegated.

Mr. HISCOCK. I say the State has no primary power. That is my point. The State has no primary power.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator mean by that to say that the State has no primary power except for the restraints of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HISCOCK. Let me understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HOAR. When the Senator says the State has no primary power, he does not mean to be understood as saying that it has not the primary power except for the restraint of the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HISCOCK. Certainly not.

Mr. HOAR. Then we agree about that.

Mr. HISCOCK. What I say is this: The fact that this provision is here is due to the further fact that except for such a law the State would be limited or restrained.

Mr. CULLOM. In its power?

Mr. HISCOCK. In its power. The Senator from Massachusetts in the course of his illustrations has used opium and whisky, and it was because I supposed that he might do so that I asked him the question if in his judgment it would be unconstitutional if, instead of intoxicating liquids or liquors, manufactures of woolen goods were inserted.

I say frankly for myself that I accept very doubtfully the proposition as being constitutional that Congress has the power to delegate to any State the right to prohibit the transportation or sale within the borders of that State of wheat, of butter, of the farm products, or of the manufactures of our country, if under the provisions of the Constitution and under the limitations of the Constitution the State has the power to do it until the General Government exercises that power.

Mr. HOAR. Allow me to ask my honored friend how he interprets this clause of the Constitution:

> No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws.

Does the Senator mean to say that the States can not do that with the consent of Congress?

Mr. HISCOCK. Oh, yes; certain things they can do without the consent of Congress.

Mr. HOAR. That answers the general question.

Mr. HISCOCK. Yes, in part it does, so far as that goes. But this provision is that no State shall be held to be limited or restrained in its power to prohibit, regulate, control, or tax the sale. It goes further than that. As I was about to say, if a State has the power to do these things until the General Government exercises that power, there is not any sort of doubt that the General Government can give it power to continue it. It can grant it power to do it, or it can fail to exercise the power and the State may then go on to do it. There is where I make the distinction between the doctrine which the Senator has cited and the doctrine which I believe is involved in this case.

I do not want it understood that I may not vote for this provision. It may be so doubtful that it is wise to submit it for the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon it. It is a very serious question when we understand the object which it has in view and the class of goods that it delegates to a State the power to permit the sale of, to regulate the transportation of, and all that.

It may be a very serious question whether, in view of the public sentiment upon the subject, a great State should not have the right to go to the courts upon that question and have it settled and decided.

I may be influenced to vote for this bill, very likely I shall, so that the question may be tested and tried, doubtful as it is. I have said what I have simply because in giving that vote I want it understood that I so far have not yielded to the opinion that as to every industry which may be prosecuted in one State Congress has the power to grant it to another State to prohibit or regulate the sale of the goods produced in that State. It is rather for that reason that I propounded the question I did to the Senator from Massachusetts and made the statement I have made than for the purpose of expressing an opinion and intention of opposing the bill.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, this bill and the discussion arising upon it relate to a subject of very great interest to the American people, the regulation and control of the use of intoxicating liquors. If we are to debate it upon the question as to the propriety of the use of intoxicating liquors, that would be one subject. If we are to discuss the authority by which it is to be regulated, that is certainly another subject.

The Constitution confers upon Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States; and the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the power of Congress for the regulation of commerce among the States and with foreign nations was as complete and perfect as the power of a State to regulate its local commerce, its internal commerce. It is an absolute power, unqualified, according to the determinations of the Supreme Court.

Now, are the transportation and sale of alcoholic liquors commerce? I understand that the courts hold that they are commerce. As to the use of them, there are very great varieties of opinion. As to their being commerce there can hardly be two opinions.

The Congress authorizes the importation of alcoholic liquors. It levies a tax upon alcoholic liquors; it taxes and collects revenue from them. The action of Congress makes alcoholic liquors commerce. Some of the States prohibit the use of alcoholic liquors; a majority of them do not prohibit the use of alcoholic liquors. So the current opinion among the States would make alcoholic liquors an article of commerce.

If the Constitution of the United States were amended so as to declare that alcoholic liquors were injurious to the public morals and the public health and to repeal the laws which recognize them as commerce by recognizing their importation and levying duties upon them, that would be an act of outlawry which might place them and would place them under the control and power of the State Legislatures. It would then cease to be an article of commerce—that is, it would cease to be an article of commerce if the States took the same view of it and outlawed it as the Government would under such a change.

If this condition of things—that is, the outlawry of alcoholic liquors by the Federal Government and by the States—existed, the States, then, of course, could exclude intoxicating liquor under their police power, as they may exclude anything that they hold to be injurious to health and public morals or dangerous to life.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] called attention to a number of things to illustrate his view that the Congress might confer the power upon the States or at least might consent that the States should tax alcoholic liquors because of certain other things that they could do. There are a number of things in which the power of Congress and of the States is concurrent. Attention was called to those things by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], and I call attention to them again, as they are recited by Mr. Justice Field in the Bowman case. Mr. Justice Field said:

> That where the subject upon which Congress can act under its commercial power is local in its nature or sphere of operation, such as harbor pilotage, the improvement of harbors, the establishment of beacons and buoys to guide vessels in and out of port, the construction of bridges over navigable rivers, the erection of wharves, piers, and docks, and the like, which can be properly regulated only by special provisions adapted to their localities, the State can act until Congress interferes and supersedes its authority; but where the subject is national in its character and admits and requires uniformity of regulation, affecting alike all the States, such as transportation between the States, including the importation of goods from one State into another, Congress can alone act upon it and provide the needed regulations. The absence of any law of Congress on the subject is equivalent to its declaration that commerce in that matter shall be free. Thus the absence of regulations as to interstate commerce with reference to any particular subject is taken as a declaration that the importation of that article into the States shall be unrestricted. It is only after the importation is completed, and the property imported is mingled with and becomes a part of the general property of the State, that its regulations can act upon it, except so far as may be necessary to insure safety in the disposition of the import until thus mingled.

Now, that meets all the suggestions on that subject made by the Senator from Massachusetts, except those which relate to quarantine. That is a matter which relates to the security of life and health, and the police powers of the State have at all times been held to authorize the State to protect its people against epidemic disease and those things which may endanger the lives and the health of the people. That is not a regulation of commerce in the sense in which the Constitution speaks of the regulation of commerce, as we now have it under consid-

eration. The regulation of commerce as we now have it under consideration means the regulation of trade and transportation between the States.

As I have mentioned, the laws of the United States recognize alcoholic liquors, whether rightly or wrongly it is not for us now to say, as articles of commerce. The laws of most of the States recognize liquors of this description, whether rightly or wrongly we have no authority here to determine, as articles of commerce. Being articles of commerce and the exclusive power being given to Congress to regulate commerce among the States, it seems to me concludes that portion of the argument.

But it is assumed that Congress may permit the States to take its place to a limited extent in the regulation of commerce. I understand, Mr. President, that jurisdiction even in the courts is not a matter of consent, but a matter of law. It is certainly true, I think, that where the Constitution has conferred a power upon Congress the consent of Congress and the States can not take from Congress its jurisdiction, nor can the consent of Congress and the States confer upon the States a jurisdiction which by the Constitution is conferred upon Congress. If that be true, it would conclude this portion of the argument.

Now, then, the people of the States are not powerless because they can not regulate commerce between the States in regard to alcoholic liquors. They are not powerless to protect themselves against the use and the abuse of alcoholic liquors. It may be and doubtless is, to States where they prohibit the sale and use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage, inconvenient to them that persons may have a right under the Constitution and laws of the United States to carry into those States alcoholic liquors; but when they are there the protection of the Constitution and laws only exends to them as interstate commerce so long as they remain in the original packages. When those packages are broken and they go into commerce they pass under the jurisdiction of the State government and the State has a right to tax or exclude them or to punish persons for dealing in them, as it sees proper.

So while there is some inconvenience growing out of the existing condition of things, out of the power to regulate interstate commerce, it is not a barrier to the power of the State to protect their people against the improper use or abuse of these liquors when they are taken within the State. That power remains with them.

Mr. President, it often happens in the discussion of questions that our desire to do good, that our desire to promote the public welfare, that our desire to accomplish some beneficent purpose leads us away from the consideration of our power to accomplish that end and causes us to forget that we are acting under a Government of delegated and limited power. Whether that be convenient or inconvenient, it is the Government which our fathers made for us and adopted, and which has existed in all its beneficence as the grandest monument of human wisdom for more than a hundred years. If inconveniences arise they are but those inconveniences which may arise under any possible form of Government. We should not forget that in the language of President Washington that Constitution is the sheet-anchor of our liberties, and that adherence to it and the preservation of it scrupulously are essential to the maintenance and perpetuity of the Union and to the transmission of its blessings to posterity as we received them from our fathers.

In our efforts to do good we should not forget that there is a restraint upon our power to act, that we are not free like a town meeting, with no restriction upon our power; but we are here under a Government having specified and delegated powers of a national and interstate character, which leaves to the several States the control of questions of domestic policy and internal administration. If we forget on this subject, as we have on some others, that we have a Constitution which we have taken an oath to support, and if we undertake to do whatever interest, believing that we are doing right, or passion may tempt us to do, we cut loose from our anchorage, from our security, from the safety of the people and of the Government.

The Senator from Massachusetts made the observation that the State had the right (I believe he used the word the inherent or original right, or some word indicating exclusiveness) to prohibit the sale of opium or liquor to children under ten years of age. So the States have exactly that right, because it relates to the internal policy of the State and does not relate to commerce among the States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Except in the original package.

Mr. REAGAN. That did not illustrate the view it seemed to me which the Senator was stating. The State has a right to do a great many things where they are not prohibited to do them by the Constitution or where the power is not conferred upon Congress to do the same things to the exclusion of the right of the State.

Mr. President, whatever my individual opinions may be upon the subject, and I have very clear and very strong opinions upon the subject, whatever my wish is to see temperance promoted in this land, strong as my view may be that the use of intoxicating liquors is injurious to the public health and public morals, I am not willing to lay my hands upon the Constitution and tear it down in order to furnish a better remedy than the one which now exists, and because of my views upon this subject I sought to give this expression of opinion before casting a vote upon the measure before the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, it is a very curious circumstance, an interesting one, that we have reached a condition of things where, according to the debate here and the judgments of the Supreme Court of the United States, the States, as the Supreme Court say, have no power to deal with this subject; and now we are told here that Congress has not any power to deal with it. So the result of the performance is that under the Constitution of the United States there must be an inherent, individual, civil, personal right in every man in one State to carry whatever another State considers to be injurious to its safety and life and welfare into it and sell it; that Congress can not stop it; the States can not stop it, say the Supreme Court, unless Congress does something, and we all say Congress can not do that something.

Is not that a perfectly absurd result to come to in the Government and country, unless you say that it is one of the innate human rights that the Declaration of Independence intended to include when it said that every man had a right to pursue the avocations of peace, happiness, and prosperity, or whatever the phrase was (I have not quoted it correctly, but that is the idea), and therefore the right to carry dynamite, and smallpox, and rum, and deleterious drugs, and adulterated teas, and obscene literature from one State to another was one of the few things that the Declaration of Independence and the fundamental Constitution of the United States had put in such a position that, as the Supreme Court says, the State can not do anything about it, and, as gentlemen say here, that Congress can not do anything about it. It is only enough to state such a proposition to show that somewhere there is a fault in the logic of somebody.

Now, let us begin with the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court of the United States is an independent and co-ordinate branch of the Government. Its mission is to decide causes between parties, and its decision of causes between parties all good order and government require shall be carried out and respected as between parties. But, as it regards the Congress of the United States, its opinions are of no more value to us than ours are to it. We are just as independent of the Supreme Court of the United States as it is of us, and every judge will admit it.

Suppose we think that this court has gone wrong and has made a mistake in deciding a given case between A and B that involves the safety and happiness of all the people of the United States in their respective States covering a continent, and that an internal policy may be good for the Pacific coast and bad for a State on the Atlantic coast, are we to stop and say that is the end of the law and the mission of civilization in the United States for that reason? I take it not. It may be that when the next case comes up on a further and wider consideration the very gentlemen who now compose the court, differing as some of them did with the majority, may come to the conclusion that they had been led into an error and that they may still hold that the States of the United States in respect of what shall be done in those States and not among them is a matter that the Constitution leaves to those States to regulate as they will.

So I do not feel absolutely condemned and overpersuaded and feel myself as put in a box by what the Supreme Court of the United States have so recently said. It is their mission to decide causes between parties as they think they ought to be decided; and, as they have often done, it may be their mission next year to change their opinion and say that the rule ought to be the other way. So I do not feel deeply embarrassed by the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has taken the largest step that in the whole hundred years of the Republic has ever been taken toward the centralization of power somewhere, either in the Supreme Court or in Congress, one or the other.

I do not believe, for one, in the centralization of power. I believe in its segregation and separation in every respect that concerns the internal affairs of the body of the people in every one of the States, leaving out of the question those universal human rights that everybody agrees are intrinsic in man and citizen.

So I am not greatly disturbed in respect of what the Supreme Court of the United States have said and done, except so far as it makes it now the mission of Congress to exert its power upon the subjects according to the light that it thought it had shone upon it, in order to preserve the internal policy and police of every State for itself, whether you call it an independent right or the execution of a national power under agencies that Congress provides, whichever way you choose to state it.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States has not said that Congress may regulate commerce in the States. It has said that it may regulate commerce among the States. What does that mean? Has anybody until now undertaken to say that that implied and involved and embraced an authority in the United States that no State could come in contact with, to declare that because a fabric, wool, if you please, to which my friend from New York referred, was made in one State and sent to another, whatever became of that wool in the other State was beyond the power of the State to which it went? I take it not. Congress may say, and the Constitution says it may, that wool may go from one State to another. Very good. The Constitution has not given to Congress the power to say what shall become of or be done with that wool after it has gone there. Would my friend from New York maintain that the State of New York can not say that no manufacturer of woolen goods should put in more than 75 per cent.

of shoddy when he made up the wool? I suppose that is about the amount that they put in.

Mr. HISCOCK. May I interrupt the Senator right here?

Mr. EDMUNDS Yes; right here.

Mr. HISCOCK. My friend says that one State may prohibit the introduction of woolen goods into that State manufactured in another.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have not said anything of the kind.

Mr. HISCOCK. Or that Congress can grant it the power.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have not said anything of the kind.

Mr. HISCOCK. That is the suggestion which I understood the Senator to make.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What I say is that when wool from Ohio or Vermont comes to the State of New York it is within the competence of the State of New York to say that wool shall not be turned into shoddy and put off as a fabric that cheats every laboring and other man who wishes to buy a coat or a pair of trousers.

I say, with great respect to the Supreme Court of the United States (although the logic of their opinion goes the full length of it, because in logic you can not stop at the original man who brought the wool), the action of the State in repressing shoddy is practically just as effectual when it comes into the second hand as it is when it is in the first hand. You can not get away from that, and if the Supreme Court of the United States follow out the logical sequence of what they have said there is no power in any State to regulate the transactions, and sales, and dealings in any commodity whatever which may be brought from one State, for all the States produce almost everything that may be used, if one likes, in another State.

Now, where is the line? The line is, I think, a line which the Supreme Court of the United States appears to have gone over, that when your act of transportation, your act of commerce among the States or from foreign nations has become complete, and the word "among" no longer applies, and the commodity is in the State where its transportation is ended, and it is in the hands of its owner there, whether that owner be a citizen of one State or another makes no difference, it is then just like the commodity of the same nature, all the laws being equal, in the hands of the citizen of the State who made it there himself, the subject of the State law; and that is what the Supreme Court of the United States within the next twenty years will come to.

You may say that that may interfere with the income of the United States on the importation of silks, if you please, or liquors, or whatever you please to call it. Very good. The power of the United States to regulate commerce and to levy taxes is no greater within its sphere than the power of the State is to deal with commodities and the conduct of people in that State over every one of the objects that the United States may choose to tax or allow the importation of. Both powers are supreme, and each must be exercised in its own order. The Constitution has declared that in respect of the regulation of commerce Congress shall have power to regulate it. It has left to the States the power to deal with these objects of commerce after they get there, according to their own sense of what is wise and right. Whenever the Constitution undertook to impose a limitation upon the powers of the States it did impose it, and declared in the respect that my friend from Massachusetts has referred to in regard to their inspection laws, that they should only go to a certain extent. So in a great many other instances that might be mentioned. Wherever there was intended to be a limitation upon the internal power of the State the men who framed the Constitution stated it in clear and express terms.

Now, look at it in another point of view, Mr. President.

Mr. HOAR. Before the Senator passes from that point, will he allow me to make a suggestion in that connection, which I omitted myself? The expression in the Constitution that the States should not put imposts on articles without the permission of Congress implied that the framers of the Constitution thought that under that clause they would have a right to do it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Most clearly. That is obvious. Then you will notice the other limitations in this same line, which I should have passed over in order to save time but for what my friend from Massachusetts has said. It has provided that Congress shall not make any regulations of commerce in favor of one port of a State as against another; that the external operations of the United States as regards the ports should be equal everywhere. So as to taxes. When it comes to the regulations of commerce as distinguished from the taxing power, no such limitation or reservation or proviso was imposed upon it. Congress was to have the universal power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations, according to its judgment of what should be expedient for the public welfare.

So Congress for a hundred years, from time to time, with the assent and acquiescence of everybody as sound and just constitutional action, has prohibited the introduction of one article, allowed the introduction of another, and has authorized some agency or another that it chose to employ to declare whether given objects under given circumstances should be admitted into the United States at all. It has employed an agency to exclude diseased cattle. It has authorized the President of the United States over and over again, by proclamation or in some other way that would be equal and fair among all the citizens of the United States, to stop the importation or regulate the importation or transportation of this, that, and the other thing. Did anybody ever question it? Very well.

Now, on this aspect, what is Congress doing by this bill? The phraseology is not mine. I had a phraseology that I thought would be better. That is a question of taste; it all comes to the same thing. What does this bill do? If Congress has the power to regulate this commerce among the several States, it has the power to limit it, and it has the power to declare that no intoxicating liquor shall go from one State to another, has it not? If it has the power to say that no intoxicating liquor, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, shall come into the United States from abroad, under the same right it has the power to say that nothing of that kind shall pass from one State to another. The court itself puts this entirely upon the ground, and rightly in that respect, that there is no distinction in respect of constitutional power between foreign commerce and interstate commerce. All are within the regulation of Congress. Congress may say as it does about a great many things, obscene literature and a great variety of other things, that they shall not come into the United States at all.

Has it not the power to say that they shall not go from one State to another, if this decision of the Supreme Court is right, even in its narrowest application of the construction, and therefore to say that it shall not be lawful to transport from one State to another intoxicating liquors? If it has, has it not the right to affix, as it has on foreign commerce from time immemorial, the agencies and conditions and inspections and regulations that it thinks in its wisdom are right and just? Now, then——

Mr. VEST. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. EDMUNDS. If my friend will pardon me just a moment until I finish this sentence. Now then, Congress undertakes to regulate the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I wish it went a great way further and included diseased meats, fraudulent teas, dishonest drugs, and so on; but it does not. We stop here now. Congress has the power to regulate the transportation of intoxicating liquors from one State to another.

The objection that has been made to this bill is that we are delegating it to a State. I deny the proposition. I say that by this bill, although its mere terminology is not what I would have adopted, but in substance it comes to the same thing, Congress is undertaking to regulate the traffic among the States of this thing by saying, "We employ the agency of the people through its legislative authority, of the State of Missouri, for instance, to say whether it is wise to admit this thing in the community that is there, from the State of Illinois or not." We say to the State of Vermont, "We employ you as the agent of Congress in the regulation of this traffic to determine whether the condition of things as to the state of public morals there will warrant that thing."

Congress, therefore, instead of delegating a power is exerting the same power in respect of internal commerce that it has always exerted in respect of external commerce, to authorize somebody to determine how and under what conditions this commerce, if you call it that, shall be carried on. Giving no preference to one State over another, not as a remitted or delegated authority, but as the exertion of the power of Congress to regulate this traffic among the States, on the theory of the Supreme Court, it says to one body of people, "You may carry it into that State if our agents there think it right to admit it; you may carry it into another if our agents there think it right to admit it; you may not carry it into another if our agents there think it right to exclude it."

So, in whatever aspect you look at it, if the power to provide for the safety and regulate the transactions among men in the several States is in the States, as I think it is, it can not be touched at all; but on the strength of these decisions, and assuming it to be in Congress, we are exerting the very power which gentlemen say belongs to Congress exclusively in making an elastic regulation which is equal among all and applies to everybody as to the terms upon which this internal commerce shall be carried on.

It does not appear to me, therefore, that in any aspect of the case there ought to be any difficulty in our relieving the people of the United States, in each State according to its own local needs and necessities. If it be free liquor in Missouri, free liquor it is, Congress says; and if it be prohibition in Vermont, prohibition it is—equal everywhere, according to the adjustments that the needs of the societies in the various States require.

I can not see, then, Mr. President, unless we are in favor of having a universal stir-up of everything—because liquor is only an incident of everything that may affect the health, the welfare, and the safety of the people of these various localities on the continent—if we are to do anything at all, which I think the court ought not to have required us to do, for safety we ought to do it now, and this is the way to do it.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the position of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] simply amounts to this—and all his ability is not able even to disguise it—that the Legislatures of the States shall regulate commerce among the States, and not Congress. He says that if the Legislature of Missouri says free liquor, free liquor it is, and if Kansas says prohibition, prohibition it is, and all that Congress is to do is simply to turn loose the State authorities to do as they think proper. What does that amount to, except an absolute destruction of the discretion of Congress and of the power of Congress to regulate

commerce among the States? What is the use of talking about instrumentalities when you adopt what the instrumentalities may do? Where is the discretion if Congress says "Gentlemen of the States, go on and exclude what you please and we indorse it in advance; we give you a complete and absolute *carte blanche* to shut out of your respective States whatever you please?"

Why, sir, it is impossible to contemplate a case of more absolute abnegation of a constitutional power than that. It absolutely gives away the constitutional grant and says to every State in the Union "Do as you please."

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont repeatedly in this debate has injected here the idea of diseased commodities, diseased meats, and dynamite, and he has even invoked leprosy, the most horrible of all human diseases. I will answer him in the language of the Supreme Court:

Articles in such a condition as tend to spread disease are not legitimate subjects of trade and commerce, and the self-protecting power of each State, therefore, may be rightfully exerted against their introduction, and such exercise of power can not be considered a regulation of commerce, prohibited by the Constitution; and the observations of Mr. Justice Catron, in the License Cases (5 How., 504, 599), are quoted to the effect that what does not belong to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the police power of the State, but that which does belong to commerce is within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, if my friend will permit me, that amounts to saying really, in the way that whatever judge it was who said that put it, that the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States had been committed by the Constitution to the Supreme Court, and not to Congress. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. VEST. It amounts to this, that a diseased article is not an article of commerce, and that the power to exclude a leper, a small-pox patient, diseased clothes, or articles of food is a police power which inures in every Commonwealth, whether it be a national or a State government under our form of government. It is the power of self-preservation, and the Supreme Court says in another case that the State could not give it away if it tried to do so.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then the State says that the unlimited sale of intoxicating liquors is just as injurious and more so, as it is if you take the number of instances of each kind, to the health and welfare of the State as the sale of diseased meat is, for only one ox out of a thousand probably will be diseased, while every bottle of whisky is diseased, and the Supreme Court is to be the determining power as to what it is good for a State to have.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared in so many words that under the pretense of exercising the police power no State has the right to declare what is the subject of commerce and what is not. That is a question to be decided by the Congress of the United States, and the law of Congress is afterwards to be construed by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States and Congress have both declared that alcoholic stimulants are a legitimate subject of interstate commerce, and that question is settled and eliminated from this debate and no longer open to discussion. A barrel of whisky is as much an article of commerce as a bushel of wheat or a bushel of corn, and it is begging this question entirely for the Senator to claim that a State has the right to declare that a bottle of whisky is injurious to its citizens and therefore can be excluded. The Supreme Court of the United States says the State can do no such thing. We collect taxes off whisky brought in from foreign countries and we have an internal-revenue tax upon it, and so long as we do this it is a legitimate subject of commerce and no State can come in and with its assumption of superior intellect and superior morality declare that it is to be interdicted and to be under the ban of that State and of the other States.

Mr. EDMUNDS. And yet, if the Senator will pardon me, when the Congress of the United States imposed its internal-revenue tax upon the manufacture of alcoholic drinks it carefully provided, supposing then, erroneously perhaps, that it had some power over the subject, that that should not interfere with what was then regarded as the power of the State to prohibit the sale or disposition or movement a single foot after it left the distillery of any of the things that Congress taxed, and thereby by the same implication of an impost tax on an importation that it should not prevent the State from dealing with it; and nobody now for twenty-five years (even the Supreme Court of the United States, which is going pretty fast just now) has ever yet thought, and no liquor manufacturer in any State that I know of has ever yet thought, of undertaking to stand in the face of the law and say that Congress exerted the power—call it delegated or call it administrative or whatever—declaring that its action in that respect should not interfere in any way with the police power of the State to prohibit the traffic or the disposition of the property that had thus been once taxed.

Mr. VEST. Is there any contention here by the opponents of this measure that, after alcoholic stimulants go out of the original package and come under the territorial jurisdiction of a State and become mingled with the balance of the goods of the people of that State, that State has not the police power to regulate that subject?

Mr. EDMUNDS. What do you mean by mingled with the other property? Is it any more mingled after it has gone out of the hands of the producer?

Mr. VEST. I do not propose to go into the question of mixing drinks. *De gustibus non est disputandum.* That is for every gentleman to determine for himself. I do not take it myself in either form, but that is my own business. The Supreme Court of the United States made this question very clear in the following language:

For the purpose of protecting its people against the evil of intemperance it—

The State—

has the right to prohibit the manufacture within its limits of intoxicating liquors; it may also prohibit all domestic commerce in them between its own inhabitants, whether the articles are introduced from other States or from foreign countries; it may punish those who sell them in violation of its laws; it may adopt any measures tending, even indirectly and remotely, to make the policy effective until it passes the line of power delegated to Congress under the Constitution. It can not, without the consent of Congress—

And that is the language upon which this bill is framed—

It can not, without the consent of Congress, expressed or implied, regulate commerce between its people and those of the other States of the Union in order to effect its end, however desirable such a regulation might be. * * * Can it be supposed that, by omitting any express declaration on the subject, Congress has intended to submit to the several States the decision of the question in each locality of what shall and what shall not be articles of traffic in the interstate commerce of the country? If so, it has left to each State, according to its own caprice and arbitrary will, to discriminate for or against every article grown, produced, manufactured, or sold in any State and sought to be introduced as an article of commerce into any other.

It is impossible to make anything more distinct and clear than that, and in this sentence is contained this whole issue; and is it a regulation by Congress to say to every Legislature in the United States, "Do with every article what you please?" Suppose, sir, that I am invested with authority, with a public duty to regulate and to exercise my judgment upon a given subject, and I turn around and say to the whole world, "I give you permission to do what you please;" is that a regulation? I put it to any sensible man, I put it to any man, no matter how prejudiced he may be upon the question of prohibition, is that a regulation? I understand "regulation" to be the exercise of my discretion, my judgment, my control, and not to say to the whole world, "I refuse to act; do what you please."

I repeat, sir, that, if the position of the Senator from Vermont be correct, you tear out of the Constitution the grant of the power to regulate by Congress interstate commerce, and you leave the State authorities, their respective Legislatures, upon the broad sea of caprice, prejudice, interest, or whatever you please to term it, to do as they choose.

The very object of this clause in the Constitution was to create uniformity, and yet the position taken by the Senator from Vermont would destroy all uniformity. He alludes to the provision in regard to the ports of the respective States. Why, sir, to go back to Elliot's debates as to the Constitution of 1789, we find that clause and this clause regulating commerce were based upon the same idea to produce uniformity, equality among the States, and to do away with the evils which had existed under the old Articles of Confederation, when it was simply a grab game, when some colonies were seeking to obtain all the commercial advantage they could at the expense of the other colonies which were existing with them under those articles, and we now propose to bring back that same state of things.

As Justice Matthews said, suppose Missouri thinks it wise to taboo or to ostracize an article produced in Illinois; suppose it says, "We do this under the police power, and we will not have any Illinois corn because you make whisky out of corn and whisky produces crime and crime fills the penitentiary," and suppose Illinois says, "You can not bring Missouri wheat into Illinois and we exercise our police power to prevent it. Wheat is not a good article of food; it produces dyspepsia, and dyspepsia in turn produces bad temper, and bad temper produces crime"—*quod erat demonstrandum*—each one taking care according to its own ideas of every article that comes under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution; and yet the Senator from Vermont says this is the political millennium which the authors of the Constitution contemplated! I do not so understand it.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the pending bill will be laid aside.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask for the reading of the resolutions from the House of Representatives in relation to the death of the late Hon. William D. Kelley.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. William D. Kelley, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy of the same to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. William D. Kelley, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute may be paid to his memory.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect the Senate shall, at the conclusion of these ceremonies, adjourn.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, so much has appeared in the press of the country concerning Judge Kelley that it is impossible on this occasion to do more in the remarks I am about to make than to repeat much that has already been said.

William Darrah Kelley was born in the Northern Liberties of Philadelphia, April 12, 1814, and at 20 minutes past 6 o'clock, in this city, on Thursday, January 9, 1890, he quietly passed away, surrounded by his family and a few friends, having lived a useful life of 76 years.

The ancestry of Judge Kelley were Irish. His father, David Kelley, located in Philadelphia at an early age and started in business as a watch-maker and jeweler. He married Miss Hannah Darrah, whose ancestors were early settlers on the Neshaminy Creek, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. After the war of 1812—in 1816—David Kelley, having indorsed the paper of one of his relatives, became pecuniarily involved, and was, in consequence thereof, sold out under the sheriff's hammer, and was thereby bereft of the small fortune he had accumulated. Shortly afterwards he fell dead on the street, leaving four small children to the care of his widow, of whom William Darrah was the youngest and only son, and but two years old. His mother having no means of her own to support her family, kind friends gave her some pecuniary assistance, with which she opened a boarding-house.

In this way the heroic and noble woman, by her skill, industry, and indomitable pluck, supported and schooled her children. William's school days, however, terminated at the age of eleven, for at this time the circumstances of his mother had become such as to compel him to leave school to seek employment, so as to afford her whatever aid he could, no matter how small. He first obtained work in a lottery office as an errand boy, at a weekly salary of $1. Tiring of this, he secured a place in an umbrella-store, but, being of an ambitious turn of mind, he sought and succeeded in getting employment as a copy-holder in the printing establishment of Jasper Harding, of the Philadelphia Inquirer, and it was while employed there, as he always asserted, that he acquired that remarkable clearness of articulation which was the charm of his oratory through life.

His last avocation becoming distasteful to him, he left that—being now sixteen years of age—and concluded to learn his father's trade and was indentured as an apprentice to the firm of Rickards & Dubosq, manufacturing jewelers. He was engaged with them for six years. As he was approaching manhood, he realized that his education was very limited, and he at once began to search for knowledge. He spent his leisure hours reading, and became a member of debating societies, where he made for himself considerable reputation as a debater. He associated himself with a number of young friends in founding the Youths' Library, the name of which was afterwards changed to the Pennsylvahia Library Institute and in time they accumulated several thousand volumes and instituted an annual course of lectures.

Here his taste for study and knowledge was gratified beyond his expectations and the foundation was laid for that remarkable store of learning which made him so useful to his constituents in afterlife. His specialty in books was for those on political and economic questions, for which subjects he had a natural and instinctive gift.

During his apprenticeship the business of the country was very much depressed in consequence of the memorable quarrel between President Jackson and the United States Bank, and in Philadelphia the employers and capitalists were almost unanimous for the bank. Young Kelley took sides with the Democratic minority and soon became a noted leader among the apprentices and young Democrats.

Of course, as might have been expected, the result was that he, with many others who were too outspoken in their opinions, were thrown out of employment. It was a very distressing period in the history of our country. Party war raged fiercely and bitterly. Capitalists and employers declared publicly that as the President was making war upon them those whom they employed should take sides with them or be treated as enemies.

Said the New York Tribune:

> Democratic workmen were discharged on all sides. One instance is narrated where a tailoress was refused work because her brother had spoken at a Democratic meeting. Petitions for the "restoration of the deposits" were circulated, and workingmen refusing to sign are said to have been marked for discharge.

Young Kelley entered the fight with a vigor that was characteristic of him, and so enthusiastic and active was he in his efforts that he dissuaded many workmen from attending meetings called in the interest of the bank.

No wonder, therefore, that he found it difficult to obtain employment at his trade. However, on the revival of business in 1835, young Kelley went to Boston, where a former shop-mate had found work and opened a way for him. He secured a good place and he was more prosperous there than he had been in Philadelphia.

His specialty was enameling, and his success in it was so great that a costly set of gold cups, ordered for the Imaum of Muscat, brought his employers a gold medal from the Massachusetts Mechanics' Association.

It was not in his nature to remain long in seclusion or inactive, and an opportunity soon occurred that enabled his restless spirit to assert itself. The anti-Catholic excitement was then at its height in Eastern Massachusetts, and a result of the agitation was the burning of the convent at Charlestown. This was a chance for young Kelley to display his ability, and he was not slow to avail himself of it. He attracted general attention by his fearless and eloquent utterances at public assemblies in opposition to what seemed to him to be the prevailing prejudices. Possessed of a good voice, with perfect articulation and clear enunciation, he had no trouble in holding and interesting an audience, and he soon acquired considerable fame as a lecturer and debater.

At that time it was customary, as it is now, for both political parties to hold mass meetings just before the annual elections, and it was at one of these meetings in Faneuil Hall that Kelley acquitted himself to such an extent that his reputation as a speaker was made. It is said of him that he was sitting in a corner of the stage, where, although not seen, every word of the speakers reached his ear. Harvey Prince, esq., of Salem, an eloquent lawyer, had just concluded his speech, when, by one of those sudden impulses which characterized him in after-years, Kelley rushed to the front of the stage just as the chairman of the meeting was about to introduce United States District Attorney Hallett. Every eye in the vast audience was riveted upon him, as but few knew who the intruder was. "Who is he?" and "Who are you?" was heard on every side, and a suppressed murmur pervaded the hall. Kelley heard this, and, straightening himself to his full height, he replied in a voice that could be heard by every one in the assemblage:

> Who am I? I will tell you who I am directly. I am an American citizen, a man who can earn his living by the sweat of his brow and the cunning of his good right hand, one who has come to this cradled temple of liberty to pledge himself to stem the tide of time on board the good ship Democracy, with her to swim or with her gloriously to sink.

After such an introduction it was not surprising that this young mechanic should have been frequently sought to speak in public for the purpose of firing enthusiasm into the hearts of sluggish and doubtful voters. On several occasions he spoke upon the same platform with many distinguished speakers of the State.

Soon after the Faneuil Hall episode Mr. Kelley was tendered a place in the Boston post-office or in the customs service, but he declined on the ground that he "did not wish to give up his independence and individuality and become a waiter on the tide of affairs."

Such was his promise that he was advised by some of his admirers to seek a scholarship at Harvard, but he refused to accede to their kindly advice.

After remaining in Boston four years he longed for and did return to his old home and its associations in Philadelphia, where he entered upon the study of the law in the office of Col. James Page, then a leading lawyer of that city, who was so pleased with the address that Kelley made at Faneuil Hall that he persuaded him to study law under his supervision. He began his studies on March 9, 1839, and on April 17, 1841—being then twenty-seven years old—he was, on the motion of his friend, Colonel Page, admitted to the Philadelphia bar. Before going to Boston he had been a member of a volunteer fire company—in those days they were very numerous and political in their character—and also of a volunteer military company, and his former associates were, naturally enough, very proud of his elevation. Colonel Page was his military commander.

Success attended him at the bar from the start, and he at once entered upon a large and lucrative practice.

Prior to his admission to the bar he had taken part in local politics, and in 1842, when he was active in trying to allay the excitement following the suspension of specie payments, he had become so well known and so popular that one of the papers called him "the tribune of the people." In the campaign of 1844, which made Francis R. Shunk governor of Pennsylvania and Polk President, Mr. Kelley took a prominent part, in his own State first and later in New Jersey and Delaware. Governor Shunk's attorney-general, John K. Kane, promptly appointed him prosecuting attorney for the county of Philadelphia, which place he held for two terms by reappointment. He thus became the prosecutor of all persons arraigned for participation in the memorable riots of 1844, a duty which he discharged with distinguished ability and force. One of Governor Shunk's last acts was to make him one of the judges of the court of common pleas of Philadelphia, which he did on the 13th of March, 1847.

In this position he was put to a severe test in the well known contested-election case of District Attorney Reed *vs.* Kneass. He united in a decision by which a Democrat who had secured a fraudulent return of votes was removed from the district attorneyship and his Whig opponent seated. Judge Kelley was known to be largely reponsible for this act, and he was consequently ostracized by those with whom he had formerly sympathized. The judicial office in Pennsylvania having been made elective by the constitutional amendments adopted in 1850, the Democratic convention in 1851 refused to renominate him because of his prominence in securing the removal of their candidate for district attorney.

He was then taken up and elected for a ten-year term by the People's party, which comprised some of the best elements of the Whig

and Democratic parties. He severed his connection with the Democratic party when the Missouri compromise was repealed in 1854, and on the reopening of the slavery controversy in that year he became earnest and outspoken in his opposition to slavery. In fact, he had always been an anti-slavery man. How he became converted to the doctrine of protection is graphically told in his Reasons for Abandoning the Theory of Free Trade and Adopting the Principles of Protection to American Industries.

His entry into the political arena dates from this time. He at once gave his strongest efforts and influence in organizing the Republican party, and in 1856 he entered his new field by a public address in Philadelphia on "Slavery in the Territories," which became widely known and gave him quite a reputation beyond the limits of his own State. In this year he was nominated as the Republican candidate for Congress by the new party—he having resigned from the bench—and vigorously entered the campaign for the new party and its Presidential candidates, Frémont and Dayton, and after a severe fight he was defeated, and again returned to the practice of his profession.

In 1860 he was sent as a delegate to the national convention at Chicago that nominated Abraham Lincoln, and was selected by the Pennsylvania delegation to represent that State on the committee to notify Mr. Lincoln personally of his nomination to the Presidency. On his return from Chicago he was—in the autumn—nominated a second time for Congress and elected to the Thirty-seventh Congress to represent the Fourth Congressional district in Philadelphia. He was sworn in at the special session which convened in July, 1861, and held his seat by fourteen successive re-elections, and was entering his fifteenth term—or a service of nearly thirty years in the House of Representatives—a distinction enjoyed and a record equaled by no other man of the thousands who have served in the House of Representatives from the foundation of the Government.

It is hardly credible, yet nevertheless true, that in all of his successive elections he was only on two occasions required to struggle for his election. His first election in 1860 was warmly contested, and in 1862 he defeated James B. Nicholson by only 828 majority. Since that time he has always been elected by from 2,500 to 12,000 majority.

It is a historical fact that Philadelphia has furnished the three oldest Congressmen in point of continuous service: William D. Kelley, thirty years; Samuel J. Randall, twenty-nine years; and CHARLES O'NEILL, twenty-five years.

On account of his long and continuous service in the House Judge Kelley acquired the sobriquet of the "Father of the House," but although the oldest man in service he was not the oldest member in that body in point of age. Up to the time of his death Judge Kelley had administered the oath of office to five different Speakers of the House, and for some years past on account of his long and faithful service he was at the beginning of each Congress allowed to select his seat, instead of drawing for it, an honor very rarely conferred.

The life of Judge Kelley is a fair illustration of what can be accomplished under our free institutions. Commencing his career in an humble occupation, without the advantages of the common school now afforded the very poorest boy, by his indomitable pluck and untiring energy he became the peer of any man who ever sat in that body of which he was a member.

Judge Kelley was from the first a warm and enthusiastic supporter of President Lincoln in the prosecution of the war. He was on very intimate terms with both Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Stanton, and no man in political life at that period more absolutely enjoyed their confidence and friendship. He was frequently consulted by them on important contemplated movements, and his advice and counsel had much weight. He stood side by side with the most able and enthusiastic defenders of the Union cause; he zealously advocated the most vigorous conduct of the war, no matter at what cost; he favored speedy emancipation of the slaves and the bestowal of the right of suffrage on the newly made citizen, and as early as 1862 he was a strong advocate for arming the negro; and he took an advanced position on the question of the reconstruction of the Southern States. His acquaintance with the principal leaders in suppressing the rebellion gave him an opportunity of learning many important facts which were of great assistance to him when he replied with great effect to General McClellan's article in The Century and also in defending Secretary Stanton against the attacks which were made upon him in the House of Representatives.

Judge Kelley has always been a thorough student of national finances, the relations of capital to labor, and all kindred economic subjects. He was a hard and incessant worker. When in pursuit of certain knowledge and facts he was untiring and unceasing until success crowned his efforts. He possessed a perfect store-house of dates and figures. He not only studied these questions in books, but the great fund of his knowledge was obtained by constant contact with the business men and manufacturers of the country, by visiting industrial establishments of every kind and description, by personal interviews with the operatives, mechanics, and miners, not only in this country, but in England, France, and Germany. He was therefore thoroughly informed. For this reason there was no man in either House of Congress who was better equipped for discussion or a more ready debater on tariff questions of this and other countries.

Having a remarkably fine voice, famous for its clearness, he always commanded attention and respect when he spoke, which was only when the subjects with which he was most familiar were up for discussion, and then he spoke with great effect and earnestness and full of enthusiasm.

Judge Kelley was an indefatigable and industrious writer. Besides the numerous speeches which he delivered both in and out of Congress he published many pamphlets, such as Colored Department of the House of Refuge, Reasons for Abandoning Free Trade, Letters from Europe, and one of his productions was The New South, which attracted much attention throughout the country.

His history while in Congress is familiar to all. He did faithful work on many committees to which he was assigned, such as the Committees on Agriculture, Naval Affairs, and Indian Affairs. He was, in the Fortieth Congress, chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and also chairman of the Philadelphia Centennial Celebration Committee in 1876. He was appointed a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1869; in 1873 he had risen to the second place on that committee, and when Mr. DAWES, of Massachusetts, was elected to the Senate in 1875 he became the senior Republican member. In 1879, when the House of Representatives was under Democratic rule, Mr. Garfield was placed ahead of him on the committee, but when the Republicans again got control of that body in December, 1881, he was made chairman of that committee, and thereby the leader of the House, and served as such until March, 1883, when the political complexion of the House of Representatives again changed.

He, however, continued a member of this committee until last December, when on account of his enfeebled health he requested to be assigned to a committee which would not require so much labor, and he was therefore made chairman of the Committee on Manufactures. This short history of his services in the House shows the secret of his success. He zealously labored in behalf of a constituency whom he loved so well and who in return showed their high appreciation of him.

To illustrate what a wonderful hold he had upon his constituents in his district is shown in the answer of a prominent citizen of Philadelphia to a delegation who asked his assistance to place another man in nomination instead of Judge Kelley. "What!" exclaimed the gentleman, "send another man to Congress from the fourth district while Judge Kelley lives? That would be an act of base ingratitude which would justly receive the execrations of the Republican masses of the country and would be a blow at the cause of protection more damning in its effect than could be delivered by the combined free-traders on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. No, gentlemen, while Judge Kelley lives no other man can be chosen to represent his district in Congress."

The board of directors of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, composed of some of the most prominent and influential men in our State, held a special meeting January 11, 1890, two days after Judge Kelley's death, and the following was their action. It shows the high esteem in which he was held by them:

The death of Hon. William D. Kelley on the 9th of January, 1890, in the seventy-fourth year of his age, having closed a public career of unusual length and of remarkable distinction, the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, while deeply regretting the loss thus sustained by Judge Kelley's family, by the nation, by the city of Philadelphia, and by his immediate constituents, desires to express, in the following minute, its sense of the greatness of the career thus ended, of the lofty character of the man as a patriot and a statesman, and of the value of his services to his native land.

MINUTE.

It was the fortune of Judge Kelley to sit in the national House of Representatives as the Representative of the Fourth Pennsylvania district for nearly thirty successive years, a continuous length of service in that body that has rarely been equaled and not more than once or twice surpassed. This unusual honor came to Judge Kelley as the acknowledgment and reward of his strict fidelity to and his wise and valiant maintenance of principles that seemed to have justice for their basis and the material prosperity of the people for their practical purpose.

The years of Judge Kelley's public life included the most momentous period in the history of this country, and the part that he played in the great events of the time was large and conspicuous. The most unfriendly scrutiny of his conduct will find little that deserves the condemnation of the prudent and nothing that can cast reflection upon the purity of his motives. Upon the other hand, it will be hardly possible to discover in the records of the legislation of thirty years any measure that has produced beneficial results for any nation which does not bear the impress of his sagacity and foresight or was not the recipient of his hearty approval and support.

In the dark hours of the civil war the great President whom he helped to nominate and to elect found in him an eager coadjutor in every movement for the courageous conduct of the struggle for national existence and in every scheme for uplifting the credit of the Nation and for strengthening the forces for the maintenance of the Union.

In the troubled years that followed the final victory he relaxed none of the intensity of his patriotic devotion in giving his sanction to all wise and safe action for the political and industrial rehabilitation of the Southern States. He was one of the first to perceive the industrial possibilities of the South, and to the latest year of his life he regarded the swift development of Southern industry with the eager enthusiasm of a patriot who saw in it a promise of a peaceful and happy readjustment of the relations of that section to the rest of the country.

Representing, as the Manufacturers' Club does, American industry generally, and the manufacturing industries of Pennsylvania particularly, we record with gratitude and pleasure our sense of the obligation of American industry to Judge Kelley's persistent, able, and eloquent advocacy of the principles of tariff protection. To no one public man, with the possible exception of Henry Clay, do the toilers of the country owe so much; and we rejoice, as he rejoiced, that his life was extended so far into the century as to permit him to witness the triumph of those principles in the development of home industry under their shelter to proportions of magnificent and unsurpassed greatness. He lived to

observe the reaping of the fruits of his early labors and the rich fulfillment of his prophecies. The full justification of his constant efforts came before he died, in the near approach of his people to industrial independence, in large earnings for the workmen, in lower prices of commodities, and in the advancement of his country to a condition of prosperity without precedent in history.

His public life was characterized by complete devotion to duty, and both his public and his private life by perfect purity. No breath of suspicion ever assailed his integrity. The familiar defilements of politics left no stain upon him. His successes at the polls were not won by art or by skillful manipulation of machinery. He owed no allegiance to any master, and no clique looked to him to do its bidding. His constituents returned him to Congress without any other incentive than a full appreciation of his high qualities and a complete sense of the value to them and to the nation of his services. His claim to such honor was that he was a statesman in breadth of mind and in practical equipment for performance of the functions of statecraft. To his natural mental power he added learning, to his learning unusual eloquence, and to all his faculties a deep, intense, overmastering love for his country and its political institutions.

No better tribute could be paid to the memory of Judge Kelley than that in the act of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress when they passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the State of Pennsylvania has lost, by the death of our distinguished colleague, Hon. William D. Kelley, a Representative in the full sense of that term. An actual service of over twenty-nine years, unbroken in continuity, with unremitting faithfulness to every duty, has made the name of our deceased colleague known from one end of the land to the other; and we feel that the citizens of the United States are sorrowing with us on this sad occasion.

Resolved, That, in testimony of our esteem to the memory of the "Father of the House," the members of the Pennsylvania delegation attend the funeral services in a body.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

Judge Kelley was a man of dignity and refinement and possessed of a simple and amiable yet strong and forcible character, which won him the love as well as the respect of all who were associated with him. He was neither afraid nor ashamed to assert his convictions with a boldness that not only startled, but made his opponents respect him.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, my acquaintance with Mr. Kelley began upon his entrance as a member of the House of Representatives in 1861, where I served with him until 1867; and our friendly personal relations were ever after unbroken. I remember that he at once took rank as a ready and cogent debater, showing deep interest in the subject of the tariff, often exhibiting special knowledge of details, and having a voice of dramatic power he was not only heard, but understood in a House where many found it difficult even to be heard. He was a model of industry, shunning no labor that was required to obtain the mastery of the subject, and he also recognized the duty of being an unfailing attendant upon the daily sessions of the House.

Mr. Kelley was not unfamiliar with the British free-trade theories of Adam Smith and of his successors, and above all he was familiar with the works on political economy of Henry C. Carey, early becoming perhaps one of his most distinguished disciples, and, it is hardly necessary to say, a learned and robust supporter of the principle of American protection. In the application of this principle he was thoroughly impartial, not limited to the local boundaries of his district, but, believing that it covered his country with blessings to multiply industries and broaden home markets, he seemed as ready to have these blessings conferred upon the people of the most distant States as upon his own neighbors. He was alert to see that no public interest should anywhere be slighted or ignored, whether represented by political friends or opponents. He would ask nothing for Pennsylvania that he would not grant to Florida, or to Alabama, or to any other State.

He was as courteous in debate as a gentleman of the olden time, and therefore made no personal enemies. As a representative of the Quaker City he was sternly opposed to slavery; but, while he hated the sin, he did not so much hate the sinners, believing that they inherited rather than originated this blot upon free institutions.

Proud of his own early experience as an artisan, he favored all measures tending to promote the welfare of workingmen. He was their friend. He cheerfully accepted the sportive nickname of "Pig-iron Kelley," bestowed upon him by those unable otherwise to meet his arguments, and he used the epithet as a club furnished by his foes to win for himself greater renown.

Mr. Kelley was one of many typical examples of American life. Starting, with a good English education, as an apprentice in the trade of a jeweler, and working as a journeyman for five years, then studying the profession of law, he was soon advanced to the position of a judge in one of the courts of Philadelphia, his native city, and at length, in our country's great crisis of 1860, he was chosen as a member of the House of Representatives, at the ripe age of forty-seven years, by a district whose confidence and affection he successfully retained through life. After a continuous and conspicuous service of twenty-nine years, honorable alike to himself and his constituency, and after a long and useful life, undimmed by spot or blemish, his career has ended, but a national reputation will long cling to the name of William D. Kelley.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, Hon. William D. Kelley served the people of Pennsylvania acceptably and continuously in the House of Representatives for about twenty-nine years.

He enjoyed the distinction of being the senior member of the House for many years, and was spoken of as the "Father of the House."

I do not propose to deliver a eulogium on the life and services of this distinguished man. That task has been better performed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. I shall only occupy a few moments to express the respect and esteem I entertained for Mr. Kelley while living and my respect for his memory, now that he has gone from among us.

The first four years I served in the House ended with the Thirty-sixth Congress. Mr. Kelley's service in the House commenced with the Thirty-seventh Congress. When I returned to the House in the Forty-fourth Congress I found Mr. Kelley its senior member by continuous service. We were then associated as members of the House for twelve years. While in politics and on some leading questions we did not agree in opinion, our intercourse was always friendly.

Mr. Kelley, by his courteous bearing and by the frankness, earnestness, and sincerity of his conduct, commanded the respect of his associates.

His life was a splendid illustration of a type of American character which is one of the chief glories of the Republic. Commencing life in poverty and obscurity he learned to be a printer and afterwards served an apprenticeship to the jeweler's trade and worked at it as a journeyman. By the aid of a superior intellect and by energy and perseverance he afterwards became a lawyer, then prosecuting attorney for the city and county of Philadelphia, and still later he was for ten years judge of the court of common pleas of Philadelphia. To these honors was added his long and useful career in Congress.

Such a life and such achievements under such circumstances are a noble example and a great encouragement to the youth of our country, and especially to those who have to fight life's battles unaided by fortune or family influence. Mr. Kelley's public experience covered a very interesting and exciting period of American history, during which he took his part in the disposition of great public questions in such a manner as to command the approval of his constituents.

Mr. President, while commemorating the services and the virtues of our deceased friend sad memories are called into review. A number of the most distinguished members of the Fifty-first Congress have passed from life into the shoreless sea of eternity. The bright, the brilliant and learned, and noble-hearted Samuel S. Cox was the first to leave us. Then our able and patriotic friend, William D. Kelley, whose services and worth we now commemorate.

Soon after he was followed by his distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Samuel J. Randall, a man of great ability and great labor, of the broadest patriotism, a born leader of men, who during his long service in Congress preserved an unsullied reputation. And still another, an honored son of New York, David Wilber, who had been elected to the Fifty-first Congress, died without having been able to take his seat as a Representative. And we are painfully reminded that a member of this Senate, so recently with us, Hon. James B. Beck, of Kentucky, whom we all loved and honored for his noble qualities of head and heart, is no more.

It is not permitted to us to know how soon others of us are to be separated from all that is dear to us on earth and to follow our friends to the unknown hereafter.

Mr. President, we go on in the performance of our duties, studying until the brain is sometimes dizzy, working until the body is often worn and exhausted, and looking to the future as if time belonged to us, and as if eternity were never to be reached. And amidst the busy scenes of life we may fancy ourselves more or less important factors in our country's welfare, if not in the world's progress.

We seldom pause to think how unimportant we really are and how little the world, even our own country, will miss us when we are gone. However much importance we may attach to ourselves and to the parts we play in life, when we have joined our friends on the other shore the world will move on, and our own country will continue its march to the great destiny which awaits it, the same as if we had never lived, and we shall soon be remembered no more.

This is not a cheerful reflection, except for the promise beyond the grave, for those who have done well in this life. But if such reflections shall teach us greater humility, cause us to be more just, make us more charitable to one another, and lead to a broader philanthropy, they are not without their uses.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, William D. Kelley entered the House of Representatives in 1861, as I left it for the Senate. Therefore, I had not the same opportunity for acquaintance with him as if we had served together in the same House and on committees, where intimate personal friendships are often formed for life. Still, frequent association and meetings with Mr. Kelley, socially and in the consideration of bills of a financial character since he became a member, led to a friendship which was unbroken, and which, now that he is dead, imposes upon me the duty of responding to the resolutions before you.

When Mr. Kelley entered the House of Representatives as a member from the city of Philadelphia he had arrived at the mature age of forty-six and had an established reputation for ability, industry, and fidelity to duty. He had been trained in the school of poverty, making his own way in the world, gathering knowledge by the wayside. He labored for several years at his trade as a mechanic, but, prompted

by a restless thirst for knowledge, he studied law, and for several years he practiced the legal profession. In due time he became a judge and served as such for ten years, so that when he entered public life as a member of the House he was a trained lawyer, with strong convictions upon economic questions, and bold and earnest on all the stern issues of the civil war.

The creed to which he devoted himself consisted of but three articles: That the Union must be preserved at all hazards, that the National Government should exercise its exclusive power to provide money for the people of the United States, and that the laborer of our country should be protected in his industry from undue competition. To the establishment of each of these theories as the public policy of the country he contributed his full measure of effort and success. By instinct he was opposed to slavery. All his early struggles and his innate perceptions of the rights of man made him an enemy to all forms of oppression. Still, he would have respected the right of each State to deal with this question, but when it became manifest that slavery was the real cause of the attempt at secession he was among the first and foremost to demand that it should be abolished. But especially as the recognized leader in the support of protection to American industry he exercised commanding influence and authority.

Whatever opinions may be honestly entertained as to the nature and extent of this protection, Judge Kelley had no doubt, but impartially and freely extended it to every industry without regard to its nature or the section in which it was pursued. On all economic questions he had accurate knowledge of details. His patient industry enabled him to master every shade and side of such a question, and especially so as to the policy of protection by discriminating duties. On other matters he was a follower, but in this always a leader. His writings and speeches upon this and kindred questions constitute a store-house of information, and the best evidence of his industry and ability.

From the time he entered public life until the hour of his death he commanded the full confidence of his people. No fluctuation of opinion, no personal rivalries, no contests for patronage or office could weaken their confidence in his integrity and justice. All these obstructions in the paths of public men, often fatal, did not affect him. For thirty years he was the chosen representative of one constituency, a remarkable, and in our country an unexampled, event. In the House of Representatives, famous for its sudden changes, he was for many years "the Father of the House," and no doubt, if his life had been prolonged to the extreme period allotted to man, his seat in the House would have been safe for him.

No one could have so secured such an honor from such a constituency without possessing marked ability, superior intelligence, and an unblemished character. The history of political life is full of fading shadows crowding each other, tired and tossed as upon a stormy sea, coming and going without mark or memory; but when a man appears, like Judge Kelley, thoroughly equipped for public duty, courting no man and fearing none, supported as he was without wavering or a break by a constituency who knew every act of his life, until he had outlived nearly all his contemporaries and had reached the venerable age of seventy-six years, such an example gives assurance that there are conservative forces in a government by the people and that faithful services honestly rendered will meet with the highest reward. The life of our Republic is but short as measured by the life of European nations, but it has been long enough to disprove the common theory that to secure stability and strength in a government it must be controlled by the privileged and educated classes.

In every period of our history it has been shown that from the ranks of the people, without special training and often in the face of the most adverse difficulties, have come the men who have led in Congress, in the judiciary, in the Army and Navy, and in the highest fields of invention, literature, and science. Judge Kelley is only one of many of these. Death has taken from among us within a brief time many of the most illustrious actors in the great events that have marked the period of our lives, and almost without exception they have been typical American citizens, who commenced without advantage, were baptized in poverty, and made their way by personal ability and proven fitness for the duties assigned them.

The living principle of our Government, that every man shall have equal opportunity without favor or prejudice to win his way and enjoy his honest gains and honors, has been shown to be the true policy by the production of men of superior ability for every task and every duty. It is the chief cause of the wonderful development of our resources and is the conservative and enduring force that we believe will, under Divine Providence, strengthen our institutions and enable us to resist alike the corruption of wealth and the ravings of ignorance. The mass of the people, under the influence of free institutions, will, by their unbiased choice, furnish leaders and representatives to keep the ship of state free from these dangers.

Death may take from us such men as Kelley and Randall, but the principles and training that brought them into public life and kept them there to the hour of their death will supply their places until in the time, far distant, as I hope, when our Republic, like all forms of government, will perish from corruption and ignorance. The impressive lessons taught us by these frequent ceremonies need not disturb our hope for the future of our country, but they should impress upon us the uncertain tenure by which we hold our representative trusts, and our sacred duty to perform them so that when we taste the bitterness of death our survivors may say of us, as we say of these, "Well done, good and faithful servants."

Mr. HAMPTON. Mr. President, few men in the United States during the half century which has just closed occupied a more conspicuous position in his party than did the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, to whose memory all of us this day, putting aside the strife of party conflicts, pause from our daily routine of duty to pay kind and respectful homage. We do this, not on account of his long public service, but because he was a brave, conscientious man, upon whose character no stain of dishonesty ever rested, a good type of those men who have made the name of American citizen as proud, as powerful, and as honorable as that of Roman. The boast of the Roman was predicated on the fact that the seven-hilled city dominated the world by arms; the nobler boast of the American is that his country is showing how the world can be governed by ideas, and all christendom now recognizes that the weapons we use are more potent than those with which Rome conquered the world.

It was in this intellectual field of conflict that Judge Kelley won his proudest triumphs, for, while his patriotic ardor impelled him to brave the perils and the hardships of war, it is his greatest distinction that he was in the Halls of Congress a potent factor in shaping the policy of the party to which he belonged, a policy which, whether right or wrong, was brought to a successful issue, and to the success of which he contributed in no small measure. It is scarcely necessary for me to say, Mr. President, that the policy he advocated with such zeal and ability was utterly repugnant to the political creed held by myself, but in the advocacy of his measures he manifested such implicit faith, such honest, brave consistency that, while I never agreed with him, my respect for the man was sincerely entertained.

Nor can I forget that when time had softened the asperities engendered by our civil war he manifested an earnest interest in the welfare and prosperity of the South and expressed the kindest wishes for its people. All his utterances of late in reference to our people were marked by broad charity and sincere good-will and he thus evoked from many who were his political opponents feelings of a kindred character. We of the South recall with kind emotions one of his latest expressions in reference to that portion of the country when he said: "The South is the coming El Dorado of American adventure. May the Almighty speed and guide her onward progress!" It is therefore not only natural, but proper that Representatives of the South should join their Northern colleagues in doing honor to his memory. He was emphatically a tribune of the people; no adventitious circumstances of birth, of wealth, or of influence were his to speed him on in the race of life. Errand-boy, apprentice, artisan, he, without the advantage of an early education, not only filled high positions with honor and distinction, but he rose by the force of his character and power of his intellect to a commanding place in the councils of the country.

An intelligent and confiding constituency returned him as their Representative in the other branch of Congress for fifteen consecutive terms, a distinction conferred on no other member since the organization of the Government, and, however men may differ with his political views, they must admit that a man who could thus command the unbounded confidence, the unanimous support, the life-long respect and esteem of his fellow-citizens must have been a man of mark. The fact that he held his seat in the House of Representatives so long and so uninterruptedly was honorable alike to himself and to his constituents, for it proves that he was worthy of their confidence and that they recognized his ability, his worth, and his services. No man with such a record as he made for himself can fall out of the ranks of the living without leaving a wide gap and one difficult to fill. That great State, which is still in mourning for Judge Kelley, has again recently had the heavy hand of affliction laid on her, for she deplores the loss of his illustrious colleague, that great commoner, whose fame was as broad as our land and whose death is felt as a national calamity.

There was a striking similarity in the public career of these two distinguished sons of Pennsylvania—William D. Kelley and Samuel J. Randall—and by a strange coincidence their long, arduous, and devoted services to their State were ended by death at nearly the same time. Differing widely as they did in politics, often brought into sharp political antagonism, there were many points of character in which they resembled each other. Both were brave, positive, aggressive, and conscientious men, and each could justly be called "an honest man, the noblest work of God," and while each battled with earnest zeal and unfaltering courage for the triumph of his principles and his party—

> Theirs was no common party race,
> Jostling by dark intrigue for place.

In contemplating the careers of these two great actors on the public stage, similar as they were in so many particulars, and yet so divergent in others, we are reminded of England's immortal rivals, Pitt and Fox, and the touching tribute paid to their memory, when they were laid at

rest in Westminster Abbey, by Scotland's border minstrel might appropriately be applied to the dead sons of Pennsylvania:

Genius and taste and talent gone,
Forever tombed beneath the stone.
Where—taming thought to human pride!—
The mighty chiefs sleep side by side. * * *
The solemn echo seems to cry
Here let their discord with them die.
Speak not for those a separate doom
Whom Fate made brothers in the tomb.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, there are vast opportunities among a great people numbering 60,000,000, where every man has the opportunity to become all that Heaven gives him power to be. Whether or not a republic shall develop greater men than are to be found elsewhere I do not know, but it is certain, I think, to develop a greater number of men of a useful type. In conversational debates, newspaper readings, political meetings, and conventions, in the absolute freedom of association, so that nearly every adult has been a chairman or secretary or a committeeman over and over again, all knowledge of affairs and qualities of leadership are cultivated. In the city governments and legislatures and congresses are needed men qualified to speak and to hold delegated power.

When masses of men find themselves with opinions and purposes that they think exceedingly important, they must find a representative man, and our institutions develop him. He is sent to a Legislature or Congress, and there he "represents" with vigor and sincerity. The people speak through him; he confers with them constantly and he seeks to please them. A captious and pessimistic critic may say the man is a demagogue, but the people know him better. He is there because they send him, and they send him because he is evidently the warmest and strongest man among them. He is of and for the people. The demagogue may sometimes circumvent him, but he has a vast advantage in the evident earnestness, sincerity, and absolute honesty of his character. He touches elbows with all ranks and classes.

Such a man was Judge Kelley, of the great class of commoners, of whom Lincoln was the type and chief. Judge Kelley's hold on his constituents could not be shaken. It never could have been purchased. Such characters are born, not made. Some doubters of human nature thinks it evidence against a man that all the people appear to like him. Yet it is said of the Divine Man, and it is one of the most precious lines of the Holy Scriptures, that "the common people heard him gladly."

Let us take comfort in thinking that these things give us more respect and hope for our fellow-men. The generation that grappled Judge Kelley to themselves with hooks of steel, and would have re-elected him for a hundred years, can not be a very bad people. The country is richer and stronger that such men have lived. His countrymen are not unduly mourning that at the age of seventy-six he has closed his long and noble record. They are taking courage and thinking better of human nature and of the institutions that can produce a man so typical of what American statesmen ought to be.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, William Darrah Kelley, a Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States, was born in Philadelphia on the 14th day of April, 1814, and died in Washington City on the 7th of January, 1890, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. He was a self-made man, who rose to eminence by dint of strong natural capacities, resolute energies, concentrated purpose, and the high endeavor to be useful to his constituents, his country, and his fellow-men.

American in birth, tastes, intuitions, and aspirations, he illustrated in his history the beneficence of free institutions, and in his character some of the best traits typical of his countrymen. His early boyhood was a scuffle for livelihood. His youthful manhood was a struggle for education and recognition. His maturer years were conflicts for the honors of his profession. From the meridian of life to its close he was in the thick strifes of public business.

The sunset of life found him with—

That which should accompany old age:
Love, obedience, troops of friends.

Full of years and wearing honors fairly won, he has at last suffered the common lot; and we pause in the midst of public cares to tender our sympathies to his bereaved family, to pay our respect to his memory, and to lift the example of his usefulness above his new-made grave.

To those who were familiar with him in the social walks of life and between whom and himself existed the endearments of private friendship I leave the part, to them now sad indeed, yet graceful and most fitting, of portraying those qualities which tied to him in confidence and affection the companions of his labors and the constituents of his political career.

I knew him scarce more than in that large sense in which we know the distinguished men of our country by their writings, speeches, and public works, though I was occasionally brought in contact with him and had opportunity to observe his bearing and take cognizance of his abilities while an associate member of the House of Representatives in the Forty-ninth Congress.

Judge Kelley was a manly man. This his tall figure and strongly marked countenance indicated, and this his conduct proved. He was independent and self-poised in character; bold, frank, and direct in his methods of procedure; ardent in temperament; strong in conviction; earnest in advocacy. As a debater he took high rank. His researches were untiring. He shed light on every question he discussed, and he took a leading part in nearly every issue joined between his party and its opponents. He was thoroughly informed on the questions which he undertook to elucidate; well cultured in literature; and his utterances were delivered with dramatic power. But his mind was business-like and practical; and, while his general information was large, it was in the power to apply what he knew and prove its weight and influence upon the point of disputation that he displayed the possession of sound learning and the high faculties of sound judgment and common sense.

It was as an economist that Judge Kelley was most distinguished. Questions of finance, of commerce and manufactures, of taxation, of material development, were the questions which chiefly attracted his attention. And his lectures, speeches, and essays on these topics denote the fidelity of his researches, the breadth of his acquisitions and comprehension, and his powers of presentation.

We all owe a debt, society at large owes a debt, to the able disputant, whether there be concurrence of sentiment or no; just as the judge and jury owe a great debt to the honest and learned lawyer who lays before them the learning and logic of a case.

Political science owes a debt to Judge Kelley, and those of us who on some points disagreed with him owe our full share for the honest, patient toil and fine intelligence with which he illustrated the field in which we are gleaners seeking for the truth.

Judge Kelley entered Congress on the 4th of July, 1861, when the drum-beat was summoning millions to arms.

He remained there by successive elections throughout the war and its unhappy aftermath, and, indeed, until the 9th day of January, 1890, when, at the age of seventy-six, he lay cold in death. He had become "the Father of the House," and was venerated as a patriarch by his colleagues. He saw war divide and then peace restore the Union and settle into peacefulness.

While a Representative in Congress he saw his country grow from 31,000,000 to 60,000,000 of people and the States multiply from thirty-four to forty-two. A partisan while strife was flagrant, he did much to point out the paths of restoration when strife ended. Hatreds he did not cherish. Toward the South he felt kindly, and his sagacious mind was among the foremost to realize the vast resources and possibilities of that section; and his tongue and pen were eloquent in pointing them out and in inspiring hope and good cheer amongst its people. The South appreciated alike the generous promptings of his heart and the rich genius of his intellect, and mourn his death.

That for thirty years he stood in one place, doing one thing and looking one way, is a proof of constancy that no eulogy could heighten.

That no suspicion ever haunted his good name is a proof of honesty that needs no witness.

That he maintained himself amongst the foremost champions and held through all shifting scenes the confidence and support of his constituency is a monument to their fealty and friendship and to his merit more enduring than brass or marble.

That ambition did not tempt him to seek other positions than that which he held shows his appreciation and his countrymen's appreciation of a fact noteworthy and honorable, that in our free Government to be a representative of the people is an honor in itself than which none is higher.

We can not solve the bright mystery of life or the dark mystery of death.

But at the end of a life like this, rounded in years, usefulness, and honor, fond memories soothe the aching hearts of grief and hope points upward from the home of sorrow.

Mr. CAMERON. I move the adoption of the resolutions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 21, 1890, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May* 20, 1890.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF CUARTEL LOT, CITY OF MONTEREY, CAL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I inclose herewith a draught of a bill submitted by the Secretary of the Interior providing for the survey and disposal of a tract of land situated in the city of Monterey, Cal., known as the "Cuartel" lot.

The lot referred to is one of the tracts excluded from the survey of the pueblo lands of Monterey, Cal., by the decision of Acting Secretary of the Interior Muldrow, of October 4, 1887, 6 Land Decisions, page 179, on the ground that it was in a state of reservation for national purposes.

A communication from the Secretary of War to the Secretary of the Interior, copy herewith, states that this lot has been occupied, at intervals, by the War Department for military purposes, but as it is not within the limits of any declared military reservation the act of July 5, 1884 (United States Statutes, volume 23, page 103), providing for a transfer to the Interior Department of abandoned military reservations, does not apply.

The lot is no longer required for military purposes, and a willingness is expressed by the War Department that the Department of the Interior should assume control of it. A copy of a tracing, with notes, is inclosed, showing an approximate survey and describing the situation of the lot.

I also inclose a copy of a report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the Secretary of the Interior, setting forth that, under the decision of Mr. Muldrow, the tract of land known as the "Cuartel" lot belongs to the United States by conquest and by treaty, and is in a state of reservation for national purposes, and respectfully submitting that Congress may continue its status as fixed by said decision or enact appropriate laws providing for its disposition as public lands.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1890.

INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President; which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report of the International American Conference, recently in session at this Capital, recommending the survey of a route for an intercontinental line of railroad to connect the systems of North America with those of the southern continent, and to be conducted under the direction of a board of commissioners representing the several American Republics.

Public attention has chiefly been attracted to the subject of improved water communication between the ports of the United States and those of Central and South America. The creation of new and improved steam-ship lines undoubtedly furnishes the readiest means of developing an increased trade with the Latin-American nations. But it should not be forgotten that it is possible to travel by land from Washington to the southernmost capital of South America and that the opening of railroad communication with these friendly States will give to them and to us facilities for intercourse and the exchanges of trade that are of special value.

The work contemplated is vast, but entirely practicable. It will be interesting to all and perhaps surprising to most of us to notice how much has already been done in the way of railroad construction in Mexico and South America that can be utilized as part of an intercontinental line.

I do not hesitate to recommend that Congress make the very moderate appropriation for surveys suggested by the conference and authorize the appointment of commissioners and the detail of the engineer officers to direct and conduct the necessary preliminary surveys.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1890.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7898) to allow right of way through Indian reservations, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read, as follows:

In section 2, line 16, after the word "compensation" to insert "and right of way;" so as to read:

"But no right of way of any kind shall vest in said railroad company in or to any part of the right of way herein provided for until plats thereof made upon actual survey for the definite location of such railroad and including the grounds for station-houses, depots, machine-shops, side-tracks, turn-outs, and water-stations shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and until the compensation aforesaid shall have been fixed and paid, and the consent of the Indians on said reservation as to the amount of said compensation and right of way shall have been first obtained in a manner satisfactory to the President of the United States."

And amend the title so as to read: "An act granting to the Duluth and Winnipeg Railroad Company a right of way through certain Indian reservations in Minnesota."

Mr. COMSTOCK moved to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back to the House the bill (H. R. 3711) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes. The committee recommend non-concurrence in the Senate amendments mentioned in the accompanying report and ask for a committee of conference.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3711) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes, together with the amendments of the Senate thereto, having considered the same, beg leave to report as follows:

They recommend non-concurrence in the amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, and 165.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I move that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as conferees on the part of the House Mr. MCCOMAS, Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, and Mr. CLEMENTS.

TARIFF BILL.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the resolution previously adopted, the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9416.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9416, and the pending amendment when the committee rose was the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the amendment will be reported.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I ask to strike out the words "eighteen hundred and eighty-nine" and insert "eighteen hundred and ninety;" so that as amended it will read: "July, 1890."

Mr. MCKINLEY. I have no objection.

There was no objection, and it was agreed to.

The amendments were read, as follows:

Amend section 35 by adding the following:

"*Provided, however*, That whenever in any statute denouncing any violation of the internal-revenue laws as a felony, crime, or misdemeanor there is prescribed in such statute a minimum punishment, less than which minimum no fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment is authorized to be imposed, every such minimum punishment is hereby abolished; and the court or judge in every such case shall have discretion to impose any fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment not exceeding the limit authorized by such statute, whether such fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment be less or greater than the said minimum so prescribed.

"SEC. —. That no warrant in any case under the internal-revenue laws shall be issued upon an affidavit making charges upon information and belief, unless such affidavit is made by a collector or deputy collector of internal revenue or by a revenue agent; and with the exception aforesaid no warrant shall be issued except upon a sworn complaint, setting forth the facts constituting the offense and alleging them to be within the personal knowledge of the affiant. And the United States shall not be liable to pay any fees to marshals, clerks, commissioners, or other officers for any warrant issued or arrest made in prosecutions under the internal-revenue laws, unless there be a conviction or the prosecution has been approved in writing, either before or after such arrest, by the attorney of the United States for the district where the offense is alleged to have been committed, or unless the prosecution was commenced by information or indictment: *Provided*, That in each case where such prosecution has been approved by the district attorney as herein required, he shall make out a written statement of the grounds upon which he rests such approval and shall send a copy of the same to the Attorney-General.

"SEC. —. That whenever a warrant shall be issued by a commissioner or other judicial officer having jurisdiction for the arrest of any person charged with a criminal offense, such warrant, accompanied by the affidavit on which the same was issued, shall be returnable before some United States judicial officer named in section 1014 of the Revised Statutes residing in the county of arrest, or in the county in which the offense is alleged to have been committed, or, if there be no such judicial officer in either of said counties, before some such judicial officer residing in another county nearest to the place of arrest. And the judicial officer before whom the warrant is made returnable as herein provided shall have exclusive authority to make the preliminary examination of every person arrested as aforesaid, and to discharge him, admit him to bail, or commit him to prison, as the case may require: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the Indian Territory.

"SEC. —. That the circuit courts of the United States, and the district courts or judges thereof exercising circuit-court powers, and the district courts of the Territories are authorized, with the approval of the Attorney-General, to appoint in different parts of the several districts in which said courts are held as many discreet persons to be commissioners of the circuit courts as may be deemed necessary. And the Attorney-General shall have authority to remove at pleasure any commissioners heretofore or hereafter appointed in said districts.

"SEC. —. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may discontinue any civil or criminal case upon such terms as shall be deemed reasonable before final judgment.

"SEC. —. That section 3332 of the Revised Statutes, and the supplement thereto, shall be amended so that said section shall read as follows:

"'When a judgment of forfeiture, in any case of seizure, is recovered against any distillery used or fit for use in the production of distilled spirits, because no bond has been given, or against any distillery used or fit for use in the production of spirits, having a registered producing capacity of less than 150 gallons a day, every still, doubler, worm, worm-tub, mash-tub, and fermenting-tub therein shall be sold, as in case of other forfeited property, without being mutilated or destroyed. And in case of seizure of a still, doubler, worm, worm-tub, fermenting-tub, mash-tub, or other distilling apparatus of any kind whatsoever, for any offense involving forfeiture of the same, it shall be the duty of the seizing officer to remove the same from the place where seized to a place of safe storage; and said property so seized shall be sold as provided by law, but without being mutilated or destroyed.'

"SEC. —. That whenever it shall be made to appear to the United States court or judge having jurisdiction that the health or life of any person imprisoned for any offense, in a county jail or elsewhere, is endangered by close confinement, the said court or judge is hereby authorized to make such order and provision for the comfort and well-being of the person so imprisoned as shall be deemed reasonable and proper.

"SEC. —. That all clauses of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, and all laws amendatory thereof, and all other laws which impose any special taxes upon manufacturers of stills, retail dealers in liquors, and retail dealers in malt liquors are hereby repealed.

"SEC. —. That this act shall be in force from and after July 1, 1889, and all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped——

Mr. MCKINLEY. Debate is exhausted on the amendment to the tobacco provisions.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. But, Mr. Chairman, two points of order were raised against this amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I ask the gentleman from

Ohio whether he has examined this amendment. I was in hopes that he would examine the amendments and agree to insert them in his bill.

Mr. McKINLEY. I regret to have to inform the gentleman from North Carolina that I have not had an opportunity to carefully examine them.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I do not wish to discuss the amendment at any length, but most of the provisions were considered by the House of Representatives of the Forty-ninth Congress, on March 3, 1887. I quote from the RECORD, volume 86, page 2681:

MODIFICATION OF INTERNAL-REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"A bill to modify the internal-revenue system of legislation, and for other purposes.

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the proviso contained in subdivision 6 of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which reads as follows: '*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt from a special tax any farmer or planter who, by peddling or otherwise, sells leaf-tobacco at retail directly to consumers, or who sells or assigns, consigns, transfers, or disposes of to persons other than those who have paid a special tax as leaf-dealers or manufacturers of tobacco, snuff, or cigars, or to persons purchasing leaf-tobacco for export,' be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

"SEC. 2. That section 3361 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all laws and parts of laws which impose restrictions upon the sale of leaf-tobacco by the producers thereof, or by guardians, executors, or trustees having the control of the land on which the same was produced, or by owners of land who have received tobacco as rent from their tenants, and all laws and parts of laws imposing penalties therefor, be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and none of the persons or classes of persons above mentioned shall be deemed dealers in leaf-tobacco or retail dealers in leaf-tobacco or be subject to any special or other tax as such.

"SEC. 3. That section 3255 of the Revised Statutes shall be amended by adding at the end of said section the following:

"'The Secretary of the Treasury shall exempt all distilleries which mash 5 bushels of grain or less per day from the operations of the provisions of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the payment of the tax, which said tax shall be levied and collected on the capacity of said distilleries; and said distilleries shall be run and operated without storekeepers or "storekeepers and gaugers." And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of said Secretary, may exempt any distillery or all distilleries which mash over 5 and not more than 25 bushels of grain per day from the operations of the provisions of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the payment of the tax, which said tax shall be assessed and collected upon the capacity of the distillery so exempted as hereinbefore provided. And the said Commissioner, with the approval of said Secretary, may establish special warehouses, in which he may authorize to be deposited the product of any number of said distilleries to be designated by him, and in which any distiller operating any such distillery may deposit his product, which, when so deposited, shall be subject to all the laws and regulations as to bonds, tax, removals, and otherwise as other warehouses. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is hereby authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That such regulations shall be adopted as will require that all the spirits manufactured shall be subject to the payment of the tax as required by law.'

"SEC. 4. That section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by striking out all after said number and substituting therefor the following:

"'And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may exempt distillers of brandy made exclusively from apples, peaches, grapes, or other fruits from any provision of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the tax thereon, when in his judgment it may seem expedient to do so.'

"SEC. 5. That the provisions of an act entitled 'An act relating to the production of fruit-brandy and to punish frauds connected with the same,' approved March 3, 1877, be extended and made applicable to brandy distilled from apples or peaches, or from any other fruit the brandy distilled from which is not now required or hereafter shall not be required to be deposited in a distillery warehouse: *Provided*, That each of the warehouses established under said act or which may hereafter be established shall be in charge either of a storekeeper or a storekeeper and gauger, at the discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"SEC. 6. That section 3332 of the Revised Statutes, and the supplement thereto, shall be amended so that said section shall read as follows:

"'When a judgment of forfeiture, in any case of seizure, is recovered against any distillery used or fit for use in the production of distilled spirits because no bond has been given, or against any distillery used or fit for use in the production of spirits, having a registered producing capacity of less than 150 gallons a day, every still, doubler, worm, worm-tub, mash-tub, and fermenting-tub therein shall be sold, as in case of other forfeited property, without being mutilated or destroyed. And in case of seizure of a still, doubler, worm, worm-tub, fermenting-tub, mash-tub, or other distilling apparatus of any kind whatsoever, for any offense involving forfeiture of the same, it shall be the duty of the seizing officer to remove the same from the place where seized to a place of safe storage; and said property so seized shall be sold as provided by law, but without being mutilated or destroyed.'

"SEC. 7. That whenever, in any statute denouncing any violation of the internal-revenue laws as a crime or misdemeanor, there is prescribed in such statute a minimum punishment, less than which minimum no fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment is authorized to be imposed, every such minimum punishment is hereby abolished; and the court or judge in every case shall have discretion to impose any fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment not exceeding the limit authorized by such statute, whether such fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment be less or greater than the said minimum so prescribed.

"SEC. 8. That no warrant, in any case under the internal-revenue laws, shall be issued upon an affidavit making charges upon information and belief, unless such affidavit is made by a collector or deputy collector of internal revenue, or by a revenue agent, nor unless such affidavit is first approved by the district attorney, and written instructions given by him for the issuing of the warrant; and, with the exception aforesaid, no warrant shall be issued except upon a sworn complaint, setting forth the facts constituting the offense and alleging them to be within the personal knowledge of the affiant; and no warrant shall be issued upon the affidavit of a person other than such collector, deputy collector, or revenue agent, unless the commissioner or other officer having jurisdiction shall indorse upon the warrant and shall enter upon his docket an express adjudication that the examination on oath of the affiant shows that there is probable cause for charging the person prosecuted with the offense.

"SEC. 9. That whenever it shall be made to appear to the United States court or judge having jurisdiction that the health or life of any person imprisoned for any offense, in a county jail or elsewhere, for a period of one year or less, is endangered by close confinement, the said court or judge is hereby authorized to make such order and provision for the comfort and well-being of the person so imprisoned as shall be deemed reasonable and proper.

"SEC. 10. That the circuit courts of the United States and the district courts of the Territories are authorized to remove from office any commissioner appointed or authorized to be appointed by said courts under section 627 or 1983 of the Revised Statutes.

"SEC. 11. That all clauses of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, and all laws amendatory thereof, and all other laws which impose any special taxes upon manufacturers of stills are hereby repealed."

Two-thirds being required the rules were not suspended and the bill was not passed. The affirmative vote consisted of 130 Democrats and 9 Republicans, and the negative vote of 106 Republicans and 6 Democrats. Sections 4 and 5 of this bill were enacted into law by the Fiftieth Congress, and the other sections of the bill, with slight alterations, were passed through the House of Representatives of said Congress; some of them are contained in bill H. R. 5931, which passed the House on my motion on February 8, 1888, and all of them were contained in the Mills tariff bill as it passed the House. I am not permitted to debate my amendments, but they are very desirable and proper and certainly ought to pass. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, upon this amendment two points of order were reserved. I would call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to the fact that two points of order were reserved, one by the gentleman himself and the other by myself. The first was that it was not germane and the second was that it was the provision of another bill pending before the House.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. If the point of order is raised I desire to be heard.

Mr. McKINLEY. It will take less time to take a vote than to discuss the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. It may be quicker to dispose of it in that way. This is a moonshine amendment.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 76, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COWLES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of Schedule F (relating to tobacco and manufactures thereof) and insert the following:

"That all laws now in force whereby farmers and producers of tobacco are restricted in the sale and disposition of the same, and all laws and parts of laws so far as the same relate to the internal-revenue taxes herein specified, be, and the same are hereby, repealed, namely: The taxes on manufactured tobacco, snuff, cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes, and the special taxes required by law to be paid by manufacturers of and dealers in leaf-tobacco, retail dealers in leaf-tobacco, dealers in manufactured tobacco, peddlers of tobacco, snuff, and cigars, and manufacturers of snuff and of cigars: *Provided*, That on all original and unbroken factory packages of smoking and manufactured tobacco, and snuff, cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes, held by manufacturers, factors, jobbers, or dealers at the time such repeal shall go into effect, upon which the tax has been paid, there shall be a rebate in favor of said manufacturer, factor, jobber, dealer, or other owner of said tobbacco, snuff, cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes to the full amount and extent of the tax so paid thereon; but the same shall not apply in any case where the claim has not been presented within ninety days following the date when such repeal shall take effect; and no claim shall be allowed for a less amount than $5; and any special-tax stamp covering taxes repealed by this act may be redeemed for the portion of the special-tax year unexpired at the time of the repeal, when the amount claimed for such stamp shall not be less than $5; and all sums required to satisfy claims under this act shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt such rules and regulations and to prescribe and furnish such blanks and forms as may be necessary to carry this section into effect.

"SEC. —. That all internal-revenue laws limiting, restricting, or regulating the manufacture, sale, or exportation of tobacco, snuff, cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes are hereby repealed, and that there shall be no drawback allowed upon any such articles which shall be entered for export on or after that date: *Provided*, That all laws now in force shall remain and have full force and effect in respect to all offenses committed, liabilities incurred, or rights accruing or accrued prior to the date when the repeal of the taxes specified in this act shall take effect.

"SEC. —. That all offices established and now existing for the purpose of collecting the revenues abolished by this act or executing the laws repealed by the same and not required under existing laws for other purposes, are hereby abolished."

Mr. McKINLEY. Vote.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. COWLES. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 74, noes 101.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I want to give notice that only one Republican voted for this amendment and not one voted for mine.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COWLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understood some gentleman to state that only one Republican had voted for my amendment. Is that true? [Laughter.] I am amazed at the statement, in view of the professions and platforms of the Republican party for the past two years. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair knows no Democrats and no Republicans. [Laughter.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by me on yesterday is printed in the second column of page 5153 of the RECORD, and I will now ask the Clerk to read it.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out the following words in lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 of paragraph 144:

"*Provided*, That hoop or band iron or hoop or band steel, cut to length or wholly or partially manufactured into hoops or ties for baling purposes, barrel-hoops of iron or steel, and hoop or band iron or hoop or band steel flared or splayed shall pay two-tenths of 1 cent per pound more duty than that imposed on the hoop or band iron or steel from which they are made."

And in lieu thereof insert the following:

"*Provided*, That iron and steel cotton-ties or hoops for baling or other purposes, not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, shall be admitted free of the payment of duty."

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] how much time he desires for debate on this amendment.

Mr. SAYERS. I would ask the gentleman in charge of this bill if he can not allow this side of the House as much as three-quarters of an hour upon this amendment. It is a very important one.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and amendments be limited to one hour and a quarter, and that three-quarters of an hour be accorded to gentlemen upon the other side.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Before my colleague's request is put I want to suggest to him that if so much time is taken up on one amendment it will be quite impossible to consider more than 1 per cent. of the other amendments. I hope a less time will be satisfactory upon this amendment.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I should be very glad to shorten the time, and before the gentleman from Texas made his request I was going to suggest half an hour for this amendment.

Mr. SAYERS. I will state to my friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] that this is an amendment which affects one of the most important industries in the country.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I am aware of that; but we have fought this question over pretty extensively heretofore. My suggestion was made in deference to the rights of other amendments which ought to be offered, and, in my judgment, ought to be voted upon favorably.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let us remove the limit. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, if permitted I will modify my request so as to ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and amendments be limited to one hour and that forty minutes of that time be assigned to those favoring the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. MCCREARY. Is this the amendment which relates to cotton-ties?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Yes.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Yes; and to hoops upon barrels and other vessels of that kind. The bill increases the duty on those articles a little over three times what it was.

Mr. MCKINLEY. That remark comes out of the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It is suggested to me by a friend here that this comes out of the people, not out of the time. [Renewed laughter.]

The question was put upon the request of Mr. MCKINLEY for unanimous consent.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration proposes to increase the duty on cotton-ties from 35 to 103.71 per cent. The amendment which I offer places them on the free-list and is identical with a similar amendment offered to the Mills bill by the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fiftieth Congress, and for which the Republicans from Iowa, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and other Republicans voted upon a yea-and-nay vote.

I have examined the testimony taken by the Committee on Ways and Means, by whom the present bill was reported, and have failed to find anything upon which the committee could have based this proposed increase of duty upon cotton-ties.

Now let us see how such an increase will, if it becomes a law, affect the cotton planter.

Six million nine hundred and thirty-five thousand and eighty-two bales of cotton, of the value of $292,139,209, were grown in this country and marketed during the last year.

Allowing six ties to the bale and at an average value of 24 cents, we have as the total cost of ties for the entire cotton crop $1,664,419.68, 35 per cent. of which, or $582,546.88, may be fairly considered as the result of the duty imposed.

How much greater the cost will be to the planter should the rate of duty be increased to 103.71 can be readily estimated. Such a rate will amount to absolute prohibition and will place the cotton planters at the mercy of the tie manufacturers.

In connection with this subject I desire to refer to the bagging, which is required in order to put the cotton into a marketable condition.

Allowing 7 yards to the bale, and, if jute bagging was used, at the average price of 13½ cents per yard, it required 48,545,574 yards of bagging, at a cost of $6,553,652.49. Adding to this the cost of the ties which were used, $1,664,419.68, and we have the total cost of bagging and ties for the crop of 1889 (supposing jute bagging to have been used) the sum of $8,218,072.17 as the amount paid by the farmers of the South for binding and covering their cotton.

Notwithstanding this, it is proposed to add to this great burden, such as is imposed on no other agricultural industry, an increase of the duty on ties amounting to three times as great as the present tax. No compensation whatever is given in any portion of the bill for this unconscionable imposition. Everywhere, from the enacting clause to the conclusion, it is bristling with duties, the consequences of which must be borne by the cotton industry.

But, sir, it has been asserted that the cotton producer is more than repaid by the manufacturer for the cost which he incurred in the purchase of his bagging and ties, as the manufacturer purchases the cotton in the bale and the weight of the bagging and ties is counted as so much cotton.

That this is not true I will read a portion of the address of the executive committee of the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry to the President, members of Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture. These gentlemen say:

The uniform "tare" of 6 per cent., which is deducted from the weight of all cotton bales by American and European manufacturers, was adopted by the European cotton exchanges when the average weight of American cotton bales was but 430 pounds, and the weight of the canvas (Indian bagging) was about 13½ pounds, and the cordage, or iron bands, about the same weight—making 27 pounds per bale of actual tare. It will be seen that the tare then taken was excessive, but so little that the cotton growers submitted to it without serious complaint. But since the adoption of this 6 per cent. tare the weight of American cotton bales has been increased to an average of 505 pounds, and manufacturers of cotton-bale coverings have reduced the weight of ties or bands to 10 pounds per bale, and the jute or Indian bagging to about 9½ pounds, while cotton-bagging—now coming into use—does not weigh to exceed 5 pounds per bale. We believe it safe to estimate the average between jute and cotton-bagging at 8 pounds, which, with the ties or bands, will make not to exceed 18 pounds of actual tare per bale, while 30 pounds is taken.

Mr. O'FERRALL. Is not this increased duty a blow at the grower of hay as well as the grower of cotton?

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly. My amendment is intended to benefit not only the growers of cotton, but also the growers of hay and those who buy tubs, buckets, and everything of the kind which must be used, not only by the farmer, but by every householder in the country. These gentlemen representing the National Grange go on further to say:

It will be seen that this is a clear loss of 12 pounds of cotton in each bale to the producer, which, upon the crop of 1889, amounted to 85,000,000 pounds, or (at 10 cents per pound) to $8,500,000. By this system manufacturers gain not only that amount—

Mark the language—

By this system manufacturers gain not only that amount, but realize from the sale of the wrappings more than one-third of their original cost to the cotton-grower, for which no credit is given. This item alone is estimated at $1,500,000, making a net gain to the cotton manufacturers of nearly $10,000,000 on the crop of this country of 1889.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the estimate in the tabulated statement before us is not accurate. If gentlemen will refer to section 144 of this bill they will perceive that two-tenths of 1 cent per pound is to be added to the previous statement of 1.3 cents per pound; so that the proposed rate on cotton-ties and band-iron used in the cooperage business and for baling purposes generally is not 1.3 cents, as stated in our schedule, but is 1.5 cents.

Therefore, if 1.3 increases the tax from 35 per cent. to nearly 104 per cent., 1.5 makes a very material addition to that increase. I have not made the calculation, but will do so, and I think it will be found that the increased tax upon this necessary article is nearly four times as great as the present rate. It is an increase from 35 per cent. to, say, 120 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary, even under the theory of protection, that every item in the metal industries should be made in this country. There are sometimes exceptions even under that doctrine, as for instance tin-plate, which is not made here, and cotton-ties, which are not made here. They are both destroyed in the using. Especially is this true of cotton-ties. Both are largely used upon goods exported. This, too, is principally true of ties. I will refer to this again, later, to further show that this article should not be taxed, even from the standpoint of protection.

If gentlemen will look at the imports for the last year they will see that they are in excess of 67,000,000 pounds. In the regular statement of imports where band-iron used in the cooperage business, or which can be used in that business, is not separated from cotton-ties, you will find that it is still greater. But 67,000,000 or 68,000,000 pounds of cotton-ties is a quantity that will wrap every bale of cotton in America.

Now we know that two-thirds of our cotton crop is marketed abroad. This is not like a raw material that enters into a manufacture where a drawback can be obtained; but it is a finished product—a finished product which we propose to tax some 400 per cent. more than the present rate—a finished product, two-thirds of which must go abroad along

with our cotton, and which comes under the law of tare and is thrown upon the waste pile and becomes a dead loss. The planter, therefore, can get no drawback upon this, and if there is an article which above all others, even above tin-plate, should be put upon the free-list it is these ties for wrapping cotton. We now pay an unnecessary and vicious tax upon ties of nearly $300,000, and you propose to increase it to over $1,000,000.

The industries that use tin-plate and export their product can use it in their great factories, where, under the regulations of the Treasury Department, they can get drawbacks upon their cans. Such is true of the fruit-canning establishments; such is true of our great meat-packing establishments that send 100,000,000 pounds of canned beef over the world every year; such is true of the large establishments that export many million dollars' worth of petroleum or coal-oil all over the world. But, sir, the cotton bales are packed in the small gin-houses of the people, scattered over eleven or thirteen States of the Union. It is impossible to get any drawback upon them, and as we are importing now enough to wrap every bale in America there is no cotton-tie industry in our country to protect, just as there is no tin-plate industry.

Therefore, gentlemen should consider seriously (let them be protectionists as they may) whether under these circumstances they should lay any tax upon this article in the metal schedule.

But, sir, even granting that they should lay a tax, I ask gentlemen of the committee to state to this House by what process of reasoning, and upon what line of evidence they propose to increase this tax nearly 400 per cent. of the present rate? The chairman of the committee knows that until the last year or two about one-half of the cotton-ties were manufactured in this country. The long-maintained manufacture of this article in this country shows that 35 per cent. was close upon an adequate rate, and when this practical proof confronts the House that that is an adequate rate, or within a very small margin of it, I ask the gentlemen to state to the House and to the country why upon an article that must be exported, and upon which we can not get a drawback—an article that is consumed by the laboring poor all over the Southern country—why do you, in the face of the evidence of there being required, even according to your own theory, only a very small increase of the tax, propose to increase it some 400 per cent.?

Some gentlemen have stated that this is a sectional bill. I do not hold to that conclusion. I know that the duty imposed on the article of cotton-ties discriminates against those who produce cotton, but it discriminates against them no more than the increase in the duty on the clothing of the people discriminates against them all over the country. I am glad to say that this bill, whatever may be its character, strikes at least at the people of this country in their broadest and most national characteristics. It leaves on the tax-list wool, which is a product of the South, the production of which is increasing there, while it is decreasing in all the States of the North east of the Mississippi River.

This article, upon which you put an increased rate, is one which we are raising to sell to your own people. The people represented by the majority of the committee are those who buy it from us; they are the ones, in the main, who wear it. Strong as has been, on the part of gentlemen from the South, the advocacy for free wool, yet free wool is of greater benefit to the upper part of our country than the lower part. But all along the line we find great classes of people in all parts of our country who are discriminated against.

Cotton, it is true, is on the free-list; but a duty upon it would be as idle a mockery as the increased duty on wheat, as the duty on rye, the duty on beef, the duty on pork. Those duties are but dead letters. Those articles, like cotton, are not susceptible of protection. The great agricultural products of the South can not be made the recipients of tariff protection, nor can the great agricultural products of the North. Therefore, it is only a question of form and appearance when you put one of these articles upon the free-list and keep the others upon the tax-list.

Sir, while you are delivering this blow at an agricultural population, I ask you to remember that the wails of distress which are coming here are coming mostly from the agricultural people of the Northern States. According to the statistics, where are the farm mortgages? They are in Kansas; they are in your own State of Ohio, Mr. Chairman; they are in Illinois; they are in all the great States of the North and Northwest. There has not been presented on this floor a single column of statistics of mortgages in a State of the South.

From what other quarter do you find the clamor of distress coming? It is from the wage-worker; and in this connection I want to read to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means an authority which I think he will hold in high respect. Mr. Hamilton, in his communication No. 6 to The Continentalist, was speaking of repressing agricultural pursuits at a period when our people were being led into investments of their capital in land and the opening up of new lands, thereby increasing the wages of labor. Mr. Hamilton says:

> Particular caution ought at present to be observed in this country not to burden the soil itself—
>
> He was arguing that the only tax, as opposed to tariff duties, was a tax on land, though we have or can have taxes on tobacco and whisky and luxuries of various kinds as well as an income tax, which we can impose if we so decide—
>
> because the quantity of unimproved land will invite the husbandman to abandon old settlements for new, and the disproportion of our population for some time to come will necessarily make labor dear, to reduce which, and not to increase it, ought to be a capital object of our policy.

Mr. Hamilton here distinctly takes the position that one of the capital objects and effects of the tariff at that time, when the people were mostly land-owners, and those who hired for wages were few, and were not in sufficient numbers to be courted for their votes, was to reduce the wages of labor, as it is. He distinctly takes the position that the tariff should be adopted by these people because it lessened the wages of the people, and did not increase them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio in charge of this bill, reserving the balance of our time, to please indicate to the committee the reasons why he has made this increase of duty.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will take the floor at a later period in the discussion and try to give the reasons.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD].

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, during my service in this House I have witnessed three efforts, this being the third, to increase the rate of duty upon cotton-ties. In 1883, at the second session of the Forty-seventh Congress, an effort was made to increase the rate of duty upon cotton-ties from 35 per cent. ad valorem, the existing rate, to 81.64 per cent. ad valorem. It failed. In 1888 another effort was made to increase the duty, which also failed. And now this effort is made, and the present proposed increase is greater than any of the preceding ones.

The present duty upon cotton-ties is 35 per cent. ad valorem. If the proposition embodied in this bill shall become law it will increase that rate to nearly 104 per cent. ad valorem. But it changes also the character of the duty from an ad valorem basis and brings it to a specific basis, which makes it all the more a burdensome tax on the cotton-growers.

I appeal to our Northern Republican friends to aid us in opposition to this increased rate, because it is a direct blow at the cotton-growing industry of the Southern section of our country. Every single cotton-tie that is used in this country is sold south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers, and this burden growing out of this proposed increase will be altogether sectional in its operation and effect.

Under the present tariff of 35 per cent. ad valorem the tax upon cotton-ties used in the South amounts to about $470,000 a year. These figures may not be exact, but are approximately correct. I do not mean that that is the price of the cotton-ties to the planters, but it is the approximate increased price by reason of the tax imposed upon them by virtue of the existing tariff. If the proposition embodied in this bill be adopted this tax will be increased from $470,000 to about $1,400,000 a year, so that the burden upon the cotton producers of the South by the proposed increase is in the neighborhood of $1,000,000 per annum.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the cotton-growing districts of the South are not prosperous; we are not in a position to stand the imposition of this additional burden. Moreover, the life of a cotton-tie is but one year, and the duty upon cotton-ties therefore is paid annually; whereas with regard to nearly all other articles upon the dutiable list it is paid only once in years, since the life of such articles is longer than one year. Take the case, for instance, of a steel rail. Its life is ten years, and therefore the duty upon that article is paid only once in a decade.

I make this illustration in order to show the great disproportion between a tax on an article which pays duty every year and on one which pays the duty but once in ten years. The oftener it is paid the smaller it should be. The tie that the cotton producer of the country bales his cotton with is a dead loss to him—I mean its cost is. It is not true, as asserted in some quarters, that we buy cotton-ties at 3½ cents a pound and sell them as cotton at 10 or 11 cents a pound. That statement was made on this floor in former Congresses, but successfully refuted. It was announced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, himself, and I dare say he holds to-day the same opinion. But it is erroneous. There is no man in this country who has any familiarity with or experience in the cotton business who does not know that there is a tare of 27 pounds, or 6 per cent., deducted from the weight of each bale of cotton sold in Liverpool, and this tare, which is several pounds in excess of the actual weight of the bagging and ties, the cotton producers of the South must lose. Hence it is clear that what the cotton producer pays for ties is a loss to him, for the market of Liverpool fixes the price of cotton throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, in 1880 there were but six cotton-tie manufactories in the United States, and three of these were in Youngstown, Ohio, in the district represented by the gentleman from Ohio. In 1882 there were but ten all told; and they produced an aggregate product in value of $262,000 a year and did not employ in the aggregate more than two hundred and fifty men. Now, I say that this is too small a product and gives employment to too few laborers to justify this enormous increase from 35 per cent. to 104 per cent. ad valorem. I do not know

how many cotton-tie manufactories there may be now in the United States, but do not believe the number will exceed what it was in 1880 or 1882.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me it will be impossible to criticise this bill as it deserves. The main purpose I have in claiming the attention of the committee is this: I desire to call attention to two amendments which are now pending. The amendment to place cotton-ties on the free-list I think should commend itself to the favorable consideration of this House. The Committee on Ways and Means have increased the present duty, which is now 35 per cent., about 300 per cent., which will raise the duties about $600,000. This is a charge on one pacific industry, and from all sections of the country the news is being received that there is great depression in agriculture. The Government does not need this money, and why then should this heavy burden be imposed upon the people who are now struggling to obtain the necessaries of life?

Mr. Chairman, how inconsistent are the professions and conduct of the Republican party. They pose before the country as the friend of the laboring man and for the last twenty-five years they have professed great friendship for the colored man. Sir, it is a fact beyond controversy that this tax will impose a burden upon the colored people amounting to three or more hundred thousand dollars annually; as by their labor at least one-half of the cotton crop is produced. Now, if our Republican friends were sincere in their professions of friendship for the colored man, here is an opportunity to show their faith by their work, and I will assure them that if they impose this tax on the colored people I will do all within my power to expose their hollow pretensions so often made to these people.

Our friends on the other side are to-day confronted with a proposition which will test their sincerity. Gentlemen, will you vote to place cotton-ties on the free-list, so that I can return home and tell the colored man that you are his friends indeed, or will you vote to increase this tax and thereby more clearly demonstrate the truth that you love the colored man for his vote, and that only? Both on the stump and in your platforms you have declared and resolved that you were the colored man's best friend. Now, gentlemen, come to the front and verify your promises, for I greatly fear when this vote shall have been taken the old saying of holding out promises to the ear and breaking them to the hope can be applied to your conduct. Mr. Chairman, to be candid, I have but little faith in the assurances of our Republican neighbors that they are better friends to this peculiar race than those of us of the South who have from long association known them and appreciated their needs.

The conduct of the Republican party towards the colored man is well illustrated by a dream which I am told occurred during the political canvass of 1888 in the State of Virginia. It is related that a certain colored man in a dream imagined himself on the road to Paradise, and in his journey was greatly surprised to meet Hon. William Mahone returning, when the following colloquy occurred:

"Mass Mahone, where has you ben?"

Mahone: "I have been up to St. Peter's gate, and was denied admission because I was dismounted."

Colored citizen: "What will we do about it?"

Mahone: "I guess I had better get on your back and ride up to St. Peter, and we will both ask for admission, and I have no doubt that we will both be admitted."

The colored man agreed to this, and Mahone returned astride of the obliging darky. When they arrived at St. Peter's gate and demanded admission, said St. Peter:

"Who comes here? Whom have we here?"

Mahone: "It is Billy Mahone."

Replied St. Peter: "Are you mounted?"

Mahone: "I am, for a fact."

St. Peter: "Then 'light, and tie your critter, and walk right in."

Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor I beg to call attention to an amendment which I have introduced providing for a bounty of 1 cent per pound on cotton.

I have presented this amendment, not because I am in favor of the system of bounties, for I doubt if the system is either constitutional or dictated by a wise public policy; but as the party in power is determined to venture on this scheme I desire to test their sincerity. They propose a bounty to the sugar producers which is confined almost exclusively to three States.

The amendment which I propose offers a bounty to the producers of a product which is cultivated in eleven States, and in behalf of this industry it may be stated that it employs more wage-workers and a larger number of people are dependent on it than any other specific industry in the world. No other product contributes so largely to our import and export trade. We exported last year $237,775,270 worth of raw cotton which being exchanged for foreign products increased our import trade and thereby brought in millions of revenue.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there is an equity in this proposition, viewed from another standpoint. The South is now contributing $30,000,000 annually for the payment of pensions and receives only about $1,000,000 in pensions. This would, in some measure, equalize burdens, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say, sir, that a bounty of 1 cent per pound on 7,000,000 bales of cotton will amount to some $35,000,000, and if a bounty, as claimed, is calculated to stimulate an industry, why not experiment with this, and so stimulate the cultivation of a product in which millions of our working classes are directly interested, and in which, under existing circumstances, the profits to the laborer are meager and unsatisfactory?

Sir, before resuming my seat I desire to earnestly protest against the passage of the tariff bill. I denounce it as the most oppressive tariff measure ever formulated in an American Congress. It favors the rich against the poor. It is the most intense class measure it has ever been my province to consider. In my humble opinion it will increase our import duties from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 annually. In the name of the oppressed people of this country I warn those who are oppressing them that they will be arraigned before the bar of public opinion and receive the condemnation which they and their work justly deserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. I now yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE, of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this House has not general information as to the culture and production of cotton. It stands *sui generis*. I know of no production which has the same relation to labor that cotton does. But I say to you that the number of laborers engaged for wage in the production of cotton are very few. They are the only laborers in the Union that are interested and become part owners in the products themselves, so that when we refer to seven millions of laborers engaged in this production, the laborers themselves are joint owners of the product that they produce. That fact is not generally known. Whatever of injustice, therefore, or whatever of burden rests upon this production does not rest upon the aggregation of people as found in other products, but rests upon the laborer who produces the product, for he is part owner of this cotton.

There were produced last year nearly 7,000,000 bales of cotton, worth in the aggregate, according to the best statistics that I can get, $292,000,000 in round numbers. Only 104,000,000 pounds of that was consumed in our own country, and that embraces 8,000,000 pounds imported; so that two-thirds of all the cotton that we produce finds a market in Europe. Whatever the cost, therefore, by the legislation this House has imposed upon this product, it is practically an export tax. Cotton-ties already bear a tax of 35 per cent. It is now proposed to increase that nearly 400 per cent. For what purpose; to protect what laborers? These ties are not made here. There is no industry now in our country that produces them. They are imported. They do not enter into the business of manufactures as the 50,000,000 of imports do, and against which the protective rates are laid and for which drawbacks are allowed.

But this cotton, with its ties, is exported. No account whatever is taken of their value, and no drawback allowed. It becomes waste, and, as the gentleman from Louisiana very properly said, a tare is charged, 27 pounds is taken off every bale. I appeal to the gentleman from Ohio to make a statement to the House, with that clearness and precision for which he is remarkable, upon what principle and upon what hypothesis do you propose to impose an export tax practically amounting to more than a million dollars in excess of the present rate of duty upon ties?

What benefit do you propose to confer upon anybody? Is it to get money into your Treasury that you do not need? What laborers are protected? I say to you in sincerity you are imposing it upon the laborers of the country. In levying this tax upon the laborers of the South you are thereby placing upon the people of the United States a burden wholly unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say a single word in conclusion. This industry is declining. There is not a man engaged in the culture of cotton in the South who would not bear testimony that with the burdens of taxation increased to him as a consumer his business is not profitable, and the gentlemen representing other sections more prosperous can and will find the reason why in the South the laborers are not in a condition to bear the burdens now imposed upon them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, as I have only ten minutes remaining for this side, I think it would be but fair that we should hear from gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE].

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas and other gentlemen on that side, in speaking upon this matter make an appeal upon account of the colored men who are engaged at work in the production of cotton. It seems to me that the interest of the colored men who are engaged at work there and the interest of the workingmen throughout the country are involved in the imposition of such duties as will give employment to the people of this country, but not employment to the people of foreign countries for those things which we consume. The advantage which the protective system has given to this

country in the way of employment and supplying the home demand for our products that we make here is shown in this provision of the bill just as much as by any other in this entire bill.

We have the capacity to make all the cotton-ties that will be needed in this country. The cost to the consumer, when this bill shall have become a law, will be no greater, or but very little if any greater, than it is now. The fact that the proposed duty is calculated at 104 per cent. results primarily from one cause, which is admitted, and that is the very low rate at which cotton-ties have been selling during the last year. Another cause which enters into this calculation and which makes this ad valorem rate appear high is probably the undervalution put upon these goods when imported into this country. On account of the low rate of duty that is imposed none are now made in this country, and nobody takes an interest in watching the undervaluations——

Mr. SAYERS. Do you say that no cotton-ties are made here?

Mr. BAYNE. None of any account.

Mr. SAYERS. Why, two-thirds of those that were used to bale the cotton crop of last year were manufactured in this country, as I am informed.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. BAYNE. I am glad to know the fact, if it be so, but I do not so understand.

Mr. BLANCHARD. In 1882 there were ten mills engaged in manufacturing them.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BAYNE. With pleasure, in a moment. The fact is that the invoice prices have been put low in order to avoid paying even the existing rate of duty, and the low price of cotton-ties during the last year, coupled with the fact that they were put low to save duty, makes this ad valorem percentage appear high. In ordinary times, with cotton-ties at an ordinary price and with the full ad valorem duty collected, I venture to say that this proposed rate would not appear to be nearly so high as it does now.

Mr. HEARD. With the gentleman's permission I will ask him a question. The plea upon which this increase is proposed is that it is for the protection of American labor. Now, since there is no American labor engaged in the manufacture of these ties, according to the gentleman's own assertion, how does this bill protect American labor by putting a burden of a million dollars a year upon the American labor that is engaged in the raising of cotton?

Mr. BAYNE. There is now abundant capacity on the part of mills in this country, in the State of Ohio and in the State of Pennsylvania, to make all the cotton-ties that are needed in this country.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BAYNE. Not again. I am answering the gentleman's question. There is, I say, abundant capacity in this country to make all the cotton-ties that we need. There are mills in Pennsylvania and in Ohio, and elsewhere, that have all the appliances, all the machinery necessary, and they can manufacture all the ties that are needed by this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield three minutes further time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE].

Mr. BAYNE. There is no reason in the world, Mr. Chairman, why those mills are not manufacturing the cotton-ties for our people now or why American labor is not engaged in that business, except the simple fact that our manufacturers are unable to compete with the wages paid abroad for the same kind of work.

Mr. HEARD. Then the ties have to be made more expensive to the consumer.

Mr. BAYNE. One moment. Allusion has been made here to tin-plate and the statement has been made that this case is analogous to the tin-plate industry, because we are not making cotton-ties in this country. This simply illustrates the facts respecting the tin-plate industry. For a great many years we did make cotton-ties in this country and did supply the South with them. For some years we also made tin-plate in this country and supplied to a large extent the American demand. We have the capacity now to manufacture all the cotton-ties that are needed and to supply them to the consumer at reasonable prices.

We have also the capacity to manufacture, in part at least, the tin-plate that will be consumed in this country, and within a very short period after this bill shall have become a law and gone into effect there will be a capacity for the production of tin-plate equal to the demand. So that we shall supply the people of the South and the people of the West and the people of the whole country with both these articles.

One word more. There is not a line or a phrase in this bill that is sectional. It treats every part of these United States alike. There is not a sectional word or provision in it. It treats cotton-ties as it treats other kinds of hoop-iron. It gives the same rate of duty in proportion to the work, no more and no less. Throughout the lines of this bill gentlemen will search in vain to find a sectional word or provision, a sectional line of demarkation, or any evidence of an unkind disposition on the part of those who constructed this measure toward any section of this country.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLARKE].

[Mr. CLARKE, of Alabama, withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, we are informed by the majority of the committee, in the report which accompanies the bill under consideration, that they "seek by the increased duties recommended not only to maintain, but to enlarge our own manufacturing plants and check those supplies from abroad which can be profitably produced at home."

Whatever may be said as to the injustice of the measure in its every provision when applied to the general agricultural interests of the country, it must, however, be admitted that the majority of the committee, by whom exclusively it has been prepared and reported, have been entirely candid in their statement as to its manifest policy.

It is indeed a manufacturers' bill, for which those engaged in such industries should be exceedingly grateful. Never before in the history of Federal legislation has a measure of such far-reaching and permanent importance, yet so confined in the benefits proposed to be conferred, been presented to this House and to the country.

To the consumers at large, of whatever profession or avocation, and especially to those by whose toil, energy, and frugality the lives of 65,000,000 of home people are maintained in health and comfort, and by whom $532,141,490 in addition were contributed to the total values of our foreign exports during the past year, the bill not only affords no relief whatever, but is absolutely and unqualifiedly burdensome and oppressive—much more so than the law as it now is.

Among economists the bill is known, and will continue to be known, as a measure for protection, and not for revenue. But, sir, before proceeding to discuss certain of its more prominent features, I desire to call the attention of the committee to its minor or incidental object—that is, to raise revenue, its major or especial object being, as indicated in the report of the committee, to protect American manufacturers from foreign competition.

The report also informs us, Mr. Chairman—

That the proposed bill, if enacted into law, will certainly reduce the revenue from imports at least $60,936,536, and probably more, and from the internal revenue $10,327,878, or, in the aggregate, $71,264,414.

Again, its chairman [Mr. MCKINLEY], in his opening address, tells us that—

it is safe to assume that no increase of the revenues, taking the bill through, will arise from the articles upon which duties have been advanced.

His statement is but in accord with our past experience. As duties upon imports have been increased toward the prohibitory limit, the revenues have generally diminished, and where the duties have been reduced the revenues have correspondingly advanced.

I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, why the rule should not prevail under the operation of the pending measure.

But, sir, that we may reasonably and fairly approximate the condition of the Treasury, as it will be under the working of the bill, should it become law, at the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, we should bear in mind the amount of the annual revenues for each of the past six years, which were:

For the year ending June 30—

1884	$348, 519, 869. 92
1885	323, 690, 706. 38
1886	336, 439, 727. 06
1887	371, 403, 277. 66
1888	379, 266, 074. 76
1889	387, 050, 058. 84

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his report of December 2, 1889, to the Speaker of this House, informs us that the revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, actual and estimated, will be as follows:

REVENUES.

Source.	Quarter ended September 30, 1889 (actual).	Remaining three-fourths of the year (estimated).	Total.
Customs	$58, 274, 697. 04	$161, 725, 302. 96	$220, 000, 000. 00
Internal revenue	34, 733, 244. 96	100, 266, 755. 04	135, 000, 000. 00
Sales of public lands	1, 957, 706. 51	5, 042, 293. 49	7, 000, 000. 00
Profits on coinage, assays, etc	1, 473, 940. 83	7, 026, 059. 17	8, 500, 000. 00
Tax on national banks	661, 392. 98	838, 607. 02	1, 500, 000. 00
Fees—consular, letters-patent, and land	873, 920. 46	2, 126, 079. 54	3, 000, 000. 00
Interest and sinking-fund, Pacific railways	645, 876. 19	1, 354, 123. 81	2, 000, 000. 00
Customs fees, fines, penalties, etc	292, 323. 39	707, 676. 61	1, 000, 000. 00
Sales of Government property	40, 070. 41	209, 929. 59	250, 000. 00
Deposits for surveying public lands	33, 411. 13	216, 588. 87	250, 000. 00
Revenues of the District of Columbia	295, 145. 61	2, 204, 854. 39	2, 500, 000. 00
Miscellaneous	811, 599. 17	3, 188, 400. 83	4, 000, 000. 00
Total ordinary receipts	100, 093, 328. 68	284, 906, 671. 32	385, 000, 000. 00

EXPENDITURES.

Object.	Quarter ended September 30, 1889 (actual).	Remaining three-fourths of the year (estimated).	Total.
Civil and miscellaneous, including public buildings, lighthouses, and collecting the revenue	$19,593,943.32	$50,406,056.68	$70,000,000.00
Indians	2,024,876.03	4,975,123.97	7,000,000.00
Pensions	35,487,627.37	68,512,372.63	104,000,000.00
Military establishment, including fortifications, river and harbor improvements, and arsenals	14,762,047.51	33,237,952.49	48,000,000.00
Naval establishment, including vessels and machinery, and improvements at navy-yards	5,473,675.92	17,523,324.08	23,000,000.00
Expenditures for District of Columbia	1,849,727.00	3,150,273.00	5,000,000.00
Interest on the public debt	10,293,457.17	25,706,542.83	36,000,000.00
Total ordinary expenditures	89,488,354.32	203,511,645.68	293,000,000.00

Total receipts, actual and estimated	$385,000,000.00
Total expenditures, actual and estimated	293,000,000.00
Estimated surplus, applicable to the purchase of bonds	92,000,000.00
Estimated amount required for the sinking-fund	48,321,116.99
Leaving a net surplus for the year of	43,678,883.01

And for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891:

REVENUES, ESTIMATED.

From customs	$220,000,000.00
From internal revenue	135,000,000.00
From sales of public lands	7,000,000.00
From profits on coinage, assays, etc	8,500,000.00
From fees—consular, letters patent, and land	3,000,000.00
From interest and sinking fund, Pacific railways	2,000,000.00
From tax on national banks	1,500,000.00
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc	1,000,000.00
From sales of Government property	250,000.00
From deposits for surveying public lands	250,000.00
From revenues of the District of Columbia	2,500,000.00
From miscellaneous sources	4,000,000.00
Total estimated receipts	385,000,000.00

EXPENDITURES, ESTIMATED.

Legislative establishment		$3,399,152.15
Executive establishment—		
Executive proper	$153,644.00	
State Department	150,150.00	
Treasury Department	8,790,274.55	
War Department	2,188,750.00	
Navy Department	450,906.00	
Interior Department	4,791,794.00	
Post-Office Department	898,770.00	
Department of Agriculture	1,208,430.00	
Department of Labor	158,410.00	
Department of Justice	190,650.00	
		18,981,778.55
Judicial establishment		454,750.00
Foreign intercourse		1,807,285.00
Military establishment		25,403,148.86
Naval establishment		24,290,498.79
Indian affairs		5,804,399.77
Pensions		98,587,252.00
Public works—		
Legislative	$8,900.00	
Treasury Department	5,453,453.00	
War Department	12,020,134.74	
Navy Department	1,308,755.00	
Interior Department	212,400.00	
Department of Justice	3,800.00	
		19,007,442.74
Postal service		7,020,361.65
Miscellaneous—		
Legislative	$3,021,531.12	
Treasury Department	10,542,694.45	
War Department	5,551,040.35	
Interior Department	6,650,575.00	
Department of Justice	3,900,000.00	
District of Columbia	5,380,114.27	
		35,045,955.19
Permanent annual appropriations:		
Interest on the public debt	31,500,000.00	
Refunding—customs, internal revenue, lands, etc	10,393,680.00	
Collecting revenue from customs	5,500,000.00	
Miscellaneous	5,075,700.00	
		52,469,380.00
Total estimated expenditures, excluding sinking fund		292,271,404.70
Or an estimated surplus of		92,728,595.30
Estimated amount required for the sinking fund		49,159,073.00
Leaving a net surplus for the year of		43,569,522.30

It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that the estimates of receipts for the present and the coming year are based upon the revenue laws in force when the Secretary made his report, on the 2d day of December last.

Taking the statement of the majority of the Committee of Ways and Means to be true, there will be a reduction of revenue for the year 1891, if the bill under consideration be enacted into law, of $71,264,414, which would bring the sum total of the Secretary's estimated receipts for that year down to $313,735,586. What increases to the revenue will result from the bill are altogether problematical. They can but be very few and of small amounts, as the chairman [Mr. MCKINLEY] has advised us that no increase of revenues will arise from the articles upon which duties have been advanced, taking the bill through.

An inspection of the bill will show that there has been a greater number of increases than decreases of duty. So much, Mr. Chairman, as to the probable amount of revenue that will accrue to the Government.

One thing is certain, that as a measure to supply revenue adequate to the expenditures of the Government it is almost certain to prove an utter failure.

However, if it should fail in this particular, we ought not to complain, as it is not intended to be promotive of revenue. An increased protection to American manufactures against foreign competition appears to be its chief purpose, and if that be accomplished the intention of its authors and supporters will be gratified. There can be no doubt as to the intense satisfaction that such a result will afford its beneficiaries.

Having examined the credit side of the Government's ledger for 1891, let us take a glance at the debit column.

The first item which attracts attention is that of pensions, $98,587,252. Why, sir; there is not a member of this committee, be he Democrat or be he Republican, who has any acquaintance whatever with the present extreme and unwarranted activity of the Pension Office, and its reckless and extravagant methods in the allowance of pensions, but who feels entirely confident that this estimate will be too small by at least $10,000,000, without taking into consideration the pension legislation of the present Congress.

The present Commissioner has informed us that, during the six months preceding the 1st day of January last, he had paid on account of pensioners $53,207,604, and that, too, before his machinery for manufacturing pensions had been perfected into its present great efficiency. But, Mr. Chairman, when we recall the pension measures which have passed both Houses during the present session and become laws, and also the two bills which are pending in conference between the two Houses, and also the bills which are sure to be enacted into laws before this Congress expires, no one who hears me or has the slightest knowledge of public affairs, will entertain a doubt as to the inevitable increase of our expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, as the result of new pension legislation, to an amount not less than $75,000,000. So we are beyond question, if the bill before us should become law, to have a largely decreasing revenue with an increasing expenditure to provide for during the coming fiscal year.

I do not care to refer to other items in the Secretary's budget of expenditures, further than to say that as yet we have not been furnished with any practical evidence that the present Congress will be remarkable in history for its economy in the matter of appropriations or in its decrease of salaried officials. From the facts and figures, Mr. Chairman, which I have given, gentlemen can draw their own conclusions. My own opinion is that the revenues accruing during the fiscal year of 1891 will fail to reach the expenditures of the Government during the same period by fully $60,000,000, if not more—taking it for granted that the bill under consideration will be enacted into law and that the pension legislation to which I have alluded will be accomplished.

Ever since 1865 the annual receipts have largely exceeded the annual disbursements, and should this experience be reversed, as I firmly believe it will be during the next fiscal year under the proposed laws concerning pensions and taxation, other and additional means must be devised for the support of the Government.

After the manufacturers shall have enjoyed the many and great advantages which this bill has conferred upon them, think you that they will be willing to surrender them for the welfare of the Government and for the benefit of the people, and permit a decrease of duties so that imports may increase and additional revenues thus accrue to the Treasury?

If, sir, you or your political associates believe for a moment that you can persuade the beneficiaries of this bill to willingly yield up the great and substantial profits which it affords them, to the detriment of the consumers of the country, and at the same time retain their friendship, loyalty, and active support, you and they have lived and labored in vain. The manufacturers will not abate one farthing of their ill-gotten gains, except of necessity, no matter how great and pressing the requirements of the Government may be or how severely the people may be suffering under the burdens imposed for their benefit. They will go into the market, and in the market they will find and purchase men to do their bidding.

What then will it be within your power to do toward compensating a declining and a deficient revenue? It is folly, worse than folly, to talk

of purging the pension roll. This our Republican friends will not do, nor permit to be done. What then?

Sir, in order to meet the expenditures, you must either repeal the provisions of the acts of January 14, 1875, and of July 12, 1882, which have set apart $100,000,000 in gold for the redemption of the United States Treasury notes, now in circulation, or you must rescind the law of February 25, 1862, known as the sinking fund act, through which the redemption of the national bonds is, in part, being accomplished, or you must borrow money, and thus increase our bonded indebtedness; and from one, or two, or all of these sources you must derive funds with which to make up the deficiency of the annual receipts as compared with the annual expenditures.

As I have said, no such a deficiency has occurred since 1865. Subsequent to that year and till now the annual revenues have largely exceeded the annual demands upon the Treasury.

Sir, the people have borne many and grievous things from the Republican party during the past twenty-five years, but I can not believe that in a time of profound peace, when the Government may be economically yet efficiently administered, they will give their sanction to the enactment of such laws as produce such evil consequences. I believe that the greater portion of the $100,000,000 in gold should be used, not, however, to defray current expenses, but to pay our bonded debt, and for no other purpose.

To use the moneys accruing under the sinking-fund act, except solely and exclusively for the redemption of our interest-bearing indebtedness, would be an unspeakable outrage upon the tax-payers of the country. It would be a crime which should never be forgiven.

To borrow money predicated upon the issuance of new bonds would, if it were possible, be a greater crime, for which no plea in justification could be presented at the bar of public opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that the protection of the home manufacturer was the major object of the pending bill. In so saying, however, I had reference to its purpose as declared by its authors. To understand the measure fully and correctly, however, the policy of the Republican party in other directions must be taken into consideration.

Let me, Mr. Chairman, present to the committee the entire programme as I understand it to be, and in which the tariff bill is the opening act, and upon the success of which the others are sure to follow. The complete protection of the manufacturers and the diminution of the annual revenue so that it can not meet an increased annual expenditure, begotten by extravagant and unjustifiable legislation will create a necessity for more money, and to get hold of the needed funds the laws to which I have referred must be and will be repealed. The bill before us, if it should become law, will not be amended so as to procure more revenue, because it would require that the duties on imports should be diminished so as to let in foreign products. This, as we all know, would bring into the Treasury a sufficient supply; but the manufacturers would not permit the law to be touched. Therefore other sources for revenue must be sought after.

By using the sinking fund for the purpose of meeting annual expenditures, the gradual and certain extinction of the interest-bearing indebtedness will be prevented, so that when our bonds mature there will not be a dollar in the Treasury that can be applied to their payment.

This indebtedness must then be refunded at another rate of interest and to continue many years before maturity; and through this creation of new obligations, to take the place of the existing but unpaid bonds, the national-banking system will derive a new life, to continue so long as these new obligations shall remain unpaid. That this will be a necessary consequence, if this tariff bill be enacted into law, there can not possibly be a doubt.

Mr. Chairman, this measure, taken in connection with the pension legislation, means—

First. Complete protection to home manufactures against foreign competition.

Second. The refunding of the public debt.

Third. The indefinite continuance of the national-banking system with the character of currency as now exists under and by virtue of it.

To completely satisfy every doubt as to the truth of these propositions, if doubt should exist in the mind of any one, Mr. Chairman, we have but to consider, in addition to the increased duties as they appear in the bill and the declaration of the majority of the committee, the present condition of our bonded indebtedness.

On the 1st day of February last we had outstanding and drawing 4½ per cent. interest per annum and due September 1, 1891, bonds amounting to $117,969,400; and also outstanding and drawing 4 per cent. interest per annum and due July 1, 1907, bonds aggregating $622,248,400.

How are these obligations to be met, Mr. Chairman, when they fall due if our annual revenue is not to exceed our annual expenditure?

Sir, it is unnecessary to further discuss the revenue feature of this bill. The facts and the figures which I have given speak for themselves and are within the easy comprehension of any one who will give them his attention.

As to the policy involved there can not be a difference of opinion among those who are sincerely desirous of a reform in the economic and monetary administration of the Government, and I desire, here and now, to place upon record my opposition to a system of taxation which falls lightest upon the luxuries and heaviest upon the necessaries of life, and which operates for the protection of certain industries to the great disadvantage of all other interests and of the consumers generally; and, also, to the refunding of the public debt; and, also, to the perpetuation of the present banking system, with its method of distributing money among the people.

With duties imposed for revenue only and so ordered as to be least burdensome to the agricultural and laboring classes, with our bonded indebtedness completely discharged, and with the free and unlimited coinage as well of silver as of gold, supplemented by a sufficient supply of paper currency, emanating from the Government and going directly to the people and not through corporate agencies, I believe a happier and more prosperous era will dawn upon those great interests, which are not only so sadly neglected, but are so grievously oppressed by Federal legislation.

Until these things be accomplished, agriculture and labor can hope for no substantial relief.

Let us now, Mr. Chairman, examine certain provisions of the bill which directly affect the farming portion of our population. It is true that we find in the pending measure a duty of 30 cents per bushel placed upon all barley that may be imported, and of 15 cents per bushel upon all corn that may be imported, and of 15 cents per bushel upon all oats that may be imported, and of 10 cents per bushel upon all rye that may be imported, and of 25 cents per bushel upon all wheat that may be imported, and of $30 per head upon all mules and horses that may be imported, and of $1.50 per head upon all hogs that may be imported.

Sir, can it be possible that the framers of this bill have the slightest expectation that the duties which I have enumerated will be of the smallest value to those who grow cotton, corn, wheat, rye, oats, and barley, and that they will be caught by such chaff and accept them as full compensation for the extraordinary, unnecessary, and oppressive taxation that is levied upon the clothing which they wear, upon the household and kitchen utensils which they must use, upon the agricultural implements which are of prime necessity to them, and upon the almost thousand and one other articles which are essential to their health, comfort, and happiness?

Speaking for the constituency which I have the honor to represent upon this floor, I can safely affirm that it is one of too much intelligence to be so easily deceived.

To the farmers of Texas there is not one single clause in the bill, from its beginning to its end, that will help them in the least particular.

What farmer is so ignorant as to imagine for a moment that a duty of 15 cents per bushel on corn will be of any value to him?

Sir, 17,034,438,538 bushels of corn have been grown in this country and 568,765,729 bushels have been exported during the past ten years. During that time only 325,576 bushels have been imported, the importation for the past year being only 2,401 bushels.

Is it because of the foreign supply introduced into this country that corn has become so cheap in certain sections? In 1889 we exported 69,592,929 bushels and imported 2,401 bushels. How does the export and import of corn for that year compare in value? Export, $32,982,277; import, $1,216. The amount of injury done the corn-growers of the United States by the introduction during the year 1889 of $1,216 worth of foreign corn must have weighed very heavily upon the minds and consciences of the gentlemen who constitute the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means.

As to wheat, we find that 4,496,953,588 bushels were produced in this country from 1880 to 1889, both years inclusive, and that, during the same period, 932,413,176 bushels were exported and 4,188,933 bushels were imported. In other words, during those years the wheat-grower sold to the foreigner $977,886,989 worth of his wheat, and the foreigners sold to the consumers of this country $4,217,467 worth of the same product.

Can you hope, Mr. Chairman, that the wheat producers of the West, with these facts and figures staring them in the face, can be made to believe that their sufferings are because of the importation of wheat, and that a duty of 25 cents per bushel upon the foreign production will relieve them? If so, try it, and bring us their answer when Congress convenes in December next.

As to rye, my information is that from 1880 to 1888, inclusive, the production in the United States amounted to 227,257,398 bushels, of which 18,075,918 bushels were exported. Against this exportation there was an importation of 4,021,751 bushels, or in dollars and cents there were $13,734,978 received against $3,151,721 expended. If we take the exports and imports of the last year only the account will stand, export $158,917, import $24.

Mr. Chairman, the bosom of the rye-grower will, indeed, swell with exultation when he learns that the Committee on Ways and Means of the Federal House of Representatives have determined, once for all, that he shall no longer be forced to compete with the "blasted foreigner" in the sale of his product.

Of course, the majority of the committee expect him to henceforth

vote the Republican ticket as an evidence of his gratitude for their exceeding great kindness to him.

Notwithstanding the immense press of business upon them and the multitude of those who were seeking favor at their hands, they were not unmindful of his sad condition.

Will he be forgetful of them at the elections which are to come? We shall see.

Mr. Chairman, time will not permit me to continue the review of the production, exportation, and importation of the great agricultural products, upon which the people of our own and other countries depend for food.

The tables, which were prepared for me by the Government statistician, and which I now submit to the committee, will demonstrate with conclusiveness that the soil and those who cultivate it are the principal sources from which our national wealth in all its rich and surpassing abundance has been derived, and that, too, in spite of and in the face of the most unfriendly legislation for the past twenty-five years.

Statement showing quantity and home value of the products of the following cereals and cotton in the United States for the years ending December 31, 1880 *to* 1889, *inclusive.*

[From reports of the Department of Agriculture.]

Years.	Corn.		Wheat.		Rye.	
	Bushels.	Value.	Bushels.	Value.	Bushels.	Value.
1880	1,717,434,543	$679,714,499	498,549,868	$474,201,850	24,540,829	$18,564,560
1881	1,194,916,000	759,482,170	383,280,090	456,880,427	20,704,950	19,327,415
1882	1,617,025,100	783,867,175	504,185,470	445,602,125	29,960,037	18,439,194
1883	1,551,066,895	658,051,485	421,086,160	383,649,282	28,058,582	16,300,500
1884	1,795,528,000	640,735,560	512,765,000	330,862,260	28,640,000	14,857,048
1885	1,936,176,000	635,674,630	357,112,000	275,320,390	21,756,000	12,594,820
1886	1,665,441,000	610,311,000	457,218,000	314,226,020	24,489,000	13,181,330
1887	1,456,161,000	646,106,770	456,329,000	310,612,960	20,693,000	11,283,140
1888	1,987,790,000	677,561,580	415,868,000	385,248,030	28,415,000	16,721,869
1889	2,112,892,000	597,918,829	490,560,000	342,491,707	(a)	(a)
Total	17,034,438,538	6,689,423,698	4,496,953,588	3,719,095,051	227,257,398	141,269,871

Years.	Oats.		Barley.		Cotton.	
	Bushels.	Value.	Bushels.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
1880	417,885,380	$150,243,555	45,165,346	$30,090,742	2,771,797,156	$242,140,987
1881	416,481,000	193,198,970	41,161,330	33,862,513	3,199,822,682	280,266,242
1882	488,250,610	182,978,022	48,953,926	30,768,015	2,588,240,050	259,016,315
1883	571,302,400	187,040,264	50,136,097	29,420,423	3,405,070,410	309,696,500
1884	583,628,000	161,528,470	61,203,000	29,779,170	2,757,544,422	250,594,750
1885	629,409,000	179,631,860	58,360,000	32,867,696	2,742,966,011	253,993,385
1886	624,134,000	186,137,930	59,428,000	31,840,510	3,182,305,659	269,989,812
1887	659,618,000	200,699,790	56,812,000	29,464,390	3,157,378,443	257,295,327
1888	701,735,000	195,424,240	63,884,000	37,672,032	3,439,172,391	291,045,346
1889	751,515,000	171,781,008	(a)	(a)	3,437,408,499	292,139,209
Total	5,843,958,390	1,808,664,109	485,103,719	285,764,791	30,681,705,723	2,706,177,873

a No data.

Table showing the quantities of the domestic exports and imports of the following commodities from and into the United States during each year ending June 30, *from* 1880 *to* 1889.

DOMESTIC EXPORTS.

Years.	Corn.	Wheat.	Rye.	Oats.	Barley.	Cotton.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Hogs.
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Pounds.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
1880	98,169,877	153,252,795	2,912,754	766,366	1,128,923	1,822,061,114	182,756	209,137	83,434
1881	91,908,175	150,565,477	1,928,437	402,904	885,246	2,190,928,772	185,707	179,919	77,456
1832	43,184,915	95,271,802	973,921	625,690	205,930	1,739,975,961	108,110	139,676	36,368
1883	40,586,825	106,385,828	2,170,026	461,496	433,005	2,288,075,062	104,444	337,251	16,129
1884	45,247,490	70,349,012	6,220,206	1,760,376	724,955	1,862,572,530	190,518	273,874	46,382
1885	51,834,416	84,653,714	2,950,558	4,191,692	629,130	1,891,659,472	135,890	234,509	55,025
1886	63,655,433	57,759,209	196,725	5,672,694	252,183	2,058,037,444	119,065	177,594	74,187
1887	40,307,252	101,971,949	357,256	440,283	1,305,300	2,169,457,330	106,459	121,701	75,383
1888	24,278,417	65,789,261	78,783	332,564	550,884	2,264,120,826	140,208	143,817	23,755
1889	69,592,929	46,414,129	287,252	624,226	1,440,321	2,384,816,669	205,786	128,852	45,128
Total	568,765,729	932,413,176	18,075,918	15,278,291	7,555,877	20,671,705,180	1,478,943	1,946,330	533,247

IMPORTS.

1880	58,876	462,882	532,585	489,576	7,132,258	3,547,792	(a)	(a)	(a)
1881	75,155	200,620	473,925	64,412	9,528,616	4,449,866	(a)	(a)	(a)
1882	69,621	846,675	954,119	1,850,983	12,182,722	4,339,952	(a)	(a)	(a)
1883	25,989	1,075,725	973,677	815,017	10,050,687	4,081,945	(a)	(a)	(a)
1884	4,894	24,329	656,113	54,627	8,596,122	7,019,492	99,769	298,275	(a)
1885	4,507	206,556	239,014	34,397	9,986,507	5,115,680	105,138	336,609	(a)
1886	16,104	380,540	173,792	90,450	10,197,115	5,072,334	77,625	402,842	(a)
1887	30,536	277,842	18,469	87,389	10,355,594	3,924,531	87,030	479,800	(a)
1838	37,493	583,115	41	67,838	10,831,461	5,497,592	64,371	473,079	(a)
1889	2,401	130,649	16	22,310	11,368,414	7,973,039	61,991	404,817	(a)
Total	325,576	4,188,933	4,021,751	3,576,990	100,232,496	51,022,223	495,924	2,395,422	.....

a Not enumerated.

Table showing the values of domestic exports and imports of the following commodities from and into the United States during each year ending June 30, from 1880 to 1889.

DOMESTIC EXPORTS.

Years.	Total value of domestic exports.	Corn.	Wheat.	Rye.	Oats.	Barley.	Cotton.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Hogs.	Total.	Per cent. total of exports.
1880	$823,946,353	$53,298,247	$190,546,305	$2,362,765	$308,129	$784,819	$211,535,905	$13,344,195	$892,647	$421,089	$473,494,101	57.49
1881	883,925,947	50,702,669	167,698,485	1,885,813	186,899	549,245	247,695,746	14,304,103	762,932	572,138	484,358,030	54.87
1882	733,239,732	28,845,830	112,929,718	946,086	298,349	151,575	199,812,644	7,800,227	603,778	509,651	351,897,858	48.00
1883	804,223,632	27,756,082	119,879,341	1,657,998	233,843	299,137	247,328,721	8,341,431	1,154,856	272,516	406,923,925	50.50
1884	724,964,852	27,648,044	75,026,678	4,323,105	700,694	403,622	197,015,204	17,855,495	850,146	627,480	324,450,468	44.79
1885	726,682,946	28,003,863	72,933,097	2,000,294	1,589,640	346,302	201,962,458	12,906,690	512,568	579,183	320,834,095	44.15
1886	665,964,529	31,730,922	50,262,715	133,105	1,944,772	166,330	205,085,642	10,958,954	329,844	674,297	301,286,581	45.25
1887	703,022,923	19,347,361	90,716,481	216,190	179,634	853,405	206,222,057	9,172,136	254,725	564,753	327,526,742	46.54
1888	683,862,104	13,355,950	56,241,468	50,705	143,284	317,239	223,016,760	11,577,578	280,490	193,017	305,176,491	44.63
1889	730,282,609	32,982,277	41,652,701	158,917	245,562	853,490	237,775,270	16,616,917	366,181	356,764	331,008,079	45.33
Total	7,580,115,627	313,671,245	977,886,989	13,734,978	5,830,806	4,725,164	2,177,450,407	122,877,726	6,008,167	4,770,888	3,626,956,370	

IMPORTS.

Years.	Total values of imports.	Corn.	Wheat.	Rye.	Oats.	Barley.	Cotton.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Hogs.	Total.	Per cent. of total imports.
1880	$667,954,746	$65,364	$534,475	$373,558	$152,659	$4,537,921	$591,120	(a)	(a)	(a)	$6,955,097	0.94
1881	642,664,628	88,126	204,508	415,763	23,223	6,692,125	757,308	(a)	(a)	(a)	8,181,053	1.27
1882	724,639,574	59,895	1,077,795	889,189	784,118	10,866,628	789,844	(a)	(a)	(a)	14,467,469	1.99
1883	723,180,914	22,895	1,070,316	693,303	360,855	7,737,984	800,532	(a)	(a)	(a)	10,685,885	1.48
1884	667,697,693	4,839	23,920	459,015	22,904	5,922,144	1,379,850	$3,103,781	$891,390	(a)	11,807,843	1.77
1885	577,527,329	4,002	170,290	181,949	13,707	6,522,092	954,760	2,313,613	897,739	(a)	11,058,152	1.91
1886	635,436,136	8,785	331,393	128,180	30,792	7,177,887	672,508	1,281,765	1,006,785	(a)	10,638,085	1.67
1887	692,319,768	16,636	218,867	10,720	29,579	6,173,208	533,928	1,392,032	1,245,782	(a)	9,620,752	1.39
1888	723,957,114	20,507	466,886	20	23,655	8,076,082	744,800	875,998	1,366,320	(a)	11,574,268	1.60
1889	745,131,652	1,216	119,017	24	10,178	7,723,838	1,194,505	703,469	1,259,000	(a)	11,011,247	1.48
Total	6,800,599,554	292,265	4,217,467	3,151,721	1,451,670	71,429,909	8,419,155	9,670,658	6,667,016		105,299,851	

a Not enumerated.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *Washington. D. C., May* 10, 1890.

S. G. BROCK, *Chief of Bureau.*

And, sir, as additional evidence upon the subject of home production and exportation, I present to the committee another statement which shows, under appropriate classification, the value of the products so exported.

Year ending June 30—	Exports of domestic merchandise.							Exports of domestic gold and silver.
	Products of agriculture.		Products of manufacture.		Products of mining, forestry, fisheries, etc.		Total.	
	Value.	Per cent.	Value.	Per cent.	Value.	Per cent.		
1860	$256,560,972	81.14	$45,658,873	14.43	$14,022,578	4.43	$316,242,423	$56,946,851
1870	361,188,483	79.34	47,921,154	10.53	46,098,704	10.13	455,208,341	43,883,803
1875	430,305,570	76.95	75,755,432	13.55	63,175,636	9.50	559,237,638	83,857,129
1876	456,113,515	76.67	81,374,077	13.68	67,430,123	9.65	594,917,715	50,028,691
1877	459,734,148	72.63	88,007,773	13.91	85,238,933	13.46	632,980,854	43,134,738
1878	536,192,873	77.07	91,416,576	13.14	68,140,481	9.79	695,749,930	27,061,885
1879	546,476,703	78.12	89,117,215	12.74	63,944,824	9.14	699,538,742	17,555,035
1880	685,961,091	83.25	79,510,447	9.65	58,474,815	7.10	823,946,353	9,347,893
1881	730,394,943	82.63	89,219,380	10.10	64,311,624	7.27	883,925,947	14,226,944
1882	552,219,819	75.31	103,132,481	14.08	77,887,432	10.61	733,239,732	43,480,271
1883	619,269,449	77.00	111,890,001	13.91	73,064,182	9.09	804,223,632	21,623,181
1884	536,315,318	73.98	111,330,242	15.35	77,319,292	10.67	724,964,852	50,225,635
1885	530,172,966	72.96	117,259,810	16.14	79,250,170	10.90	726,682,946	24,376,110
1886	484,954,505	72.82	106,419,692	15.98	74,590,242	11.20	665,964,529	51,924,117
1887	523,073,798	74.41	136,735,105	19.45	43,214,020	6.14	703,022,923	22,710,340
1888	500,840,086	73.23	130,300,087	19.05	52,721,931	7.72	683,862,104	33,195,504
1889	532,141,490	72.87	138,676,507	18.99	59,466,612	8.14	730,282,609	80,214,994

This table, Mr. Chairman, suggests the query, Why have the non-aided industries so far outstripped the aided industries in the enhancement of our national wealth? No one will affirm that the great products of agriculture have ever received any substantial assistance from the Government, and no one will deny that the manufacturer has been fostered and cared for by the Government for more than a hundred years.

He has for a century been the petted and the spoiled favorite of Congress, and yet we find him far in the rear of the farmer in their respective contributions to swell the volume of our foreign trade.

Strange to say he dreads to face the foreigner at home or abroad. He is too cowardly and selfish to be depended upon in an open-field fight; nor is he willing to take his chances with his neighbors. He will not rely upon himself and is always appealing to the Government for help.

The showing, as made in this table, places him in a very awkward situation, indeed, before the country, while on the other hand it speaks volumes in praise of the farmer, who, depending upon himself alone and burdened with exactions levied upon him for the support of the manufacturer, enters the markets of the world and brings back as a trophy of his success $532,141,490 of foreign gold in a single year to enrich his own people, or leaves it there as payment for imports of equal value which were purchased by us.

Sir, during the course of this debate I have heard much said of the farmers along our Canadian border and of what great things this measure contemplates doing for them, but not a word have I heard fall from the lips of any gentleman upon the Republican side of this Chamber in behalf of the producer of cotton. Nor have I been able in all the provisions of this bill, after the most diligent search, to discover one single item which will be of the slightest benefit to this great industry—the greatest and most important of them all—giving employment to more labor—clothing the world with its fabrics—and constituting in value almost one-third of all our foreign exports.

To illustrate, Mr. Chairman, the exceeding great importance of cotton as a factor, not only in our internal, but also in our foreign commerce, let us recur briefly to the tables which I have already presented to the committee.

Taking the year 1889 as an instance, we find that during that period there was produced in this country cotton to the extent of $292,139,209 in value, and of this $237,775,270, or, rather, its representative, 2,384,816,669 pounds, were exported, the remainder of the crop being used at home. We also find that the total value of all the domestic products of agriculture exported during that year amounted to $532,141,490 in value, and that the value of our manufactured exports was $138,676,507.

From this it will be seen that, in value, our cotton exports were almost equal to all other agricultural exports combined and exceeded all our manufactured exports by $99,098,763.

Notwithstanding this enormous yield, Mr. Chairman, the cultivation of cotton is a most hazardous industry. From the very day the planter puts his seed in the ground until the moment of its sale, after it has been cultivated, picked, ginned, and prepared for market, it is attended with the greatest danger.

Cold, heat, rain, drought, worms, and fire, with continued expense, all are to be dreaded, and too often are experienced, to the great and sometimes to the total loss of the product.

Its cultivation is not confined to any particular class of our farmers. The laborer himself is interested in the quantity and quality of the cotton which he produces, as he most generally is joint owner with the proprietor of the soil of the crop which is realized. But should the cotton-grower escape all of the evils to which I have alluded and be rewarded with a satisfactory yield, yet at the end of the year he may find, as he often does, that the value of his product does not compensate him for the expense which he has incurred in its cultivation and preparation for market.

The price of cotton in every town and city in the United States is regulated by the Liverpool quotations, and, as has been too often the case, speculation, corners, and rings depress its mercantile value until after it has passed from the farmer's hands.

I make these observations, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen upon the opposite side of this Hall, many of whom have never seen a growing crop of cotton and know nothing practically about its cultivation, may understand and appreciate to their full extent the dangers which attend the growing of this great American production.

But, sir, how have the Committee on Ways and Means treated the cotton-grower of the South? Have they evinced the slightest disposition to assist him while they have been conferring so many and such substantial benefits upon other industries? They say that it is impossible to protect him. This I deny with the greatest emphasis. The cotton-grower can and should be protected, not by imposing a duty upon that which may be imported, nor by giving to him a bounty, but by relieving him from the weight of taxation.

This was the thing which ought to have been done by the committee, and this they would not do. On the contrary, they have increased his burdens all along the line, wherever and whenever they could.

I have already spoken, in the course of this debate, as to the increase of the duty upon the ties that must be used to bind his cotton into bales from 35 per cent., which is the existing law, to 103.71 per cent.

This increase I regard as wholly inexcusable. It is unconscionable. It is oppressive in the extreme.

Sir, did time permit I might name to this committee more than a hundred items of taxation in this bill which fall with peculiar and pressing hardship upon the cotton-planter. I will only designate a few. From the different schedules I have selected the following as fair indications of the full text of the bill, so far as it affects those in whose behalf I am now speaking:

	Per cent.
Lowest grades of woolen yarn	112.00
Highest grades of woolen yarn	72.00
Coarse cheap blankets	106.00
Finest cheap blankets	72.00
Coarse cheap woolen hats	111.00
Finest cheap woolen hats	66.00
Women's and children's cheapest dress goods, with cotton warp	106.00
Finest dress goods, with cotton warp	73.00
Lowest grade of woolen cloths	125.00
Highest grade of woolen cloths	86.00
Cheapest qualities of knit goods for underwear	112.00-138.00
Finest and most expensive qualities of knit goods for underwear	78.00
Woolen shawls of the coarsest and lowest grades, used by the poorest people	135.00
Worsted goods of the lowest grade	130.00
Highest-grade worsted goods	90.00
Common window-glass, 16 x 24	123.10
Common window-glass, 24 x 30	135.34
Common window glass above those sizes	138.04
Cotton-ties	103.71
Tin-plate	74.00
Wire-fence rods, No. 6	54.00
Table cutlery	50.00
Tobacco	200.00
Plushes	100.00
Hosiery	60.00
Shirts and drawers	65.00
Burlaps	50.00
Brown and bleached linens	50.00
Yarns	100.00

Who so bold as to deny that these exorbitant and unnecessary duties must in the end be paid by the consumer?

But the answer has been made that to compensate him for these enormous burdens he is furnished with a home market. This doctrine, as well as the one that the duty is not a tax and that it is paid by the importer and does not enter into the cost of the product when it reaches the consumer, the farmer has realized by long and sad experience to be absolutely false. If the pretense of a home market ever deceived him, it will deceive him no longer. Nor will he believe that the manufacturer will fail to increase the price of his product to the consumer in consequence of the increased rates of duty allowed him by this bill, and in order to prevent overproduction will form trusts and combinations with his brother manufacturers. He has done so in the past, he is now doing so, and he will continue to do so as long as he is thus protected.

Mr. Chairman, every cotton planter of any intelligence whatever knows that the price of the product at his county town or at the nearest railroad depot is its value at Liverpool, less the cost of transportation and other charges. The New England manufacturer, the Georgia manufacturer, and, if you please, the Texas manufacturer, adjust their prices to those of the foreign market.

No wonder it is that our towns and cities are becoming overcrowded with increasing population, and that the farms of the East are being abandoned, and that those homes, around which the sunshine of prosperity once played in continual brightness, are standing tenantless and desolate. For this sad condition of agriculture in that section Federal legislation is in a great measure responsible.

Mr. Chairman, the committee provide bounties to be paid out of the Treasury for the sugar grower and the silk producer, and also drawbacks for the highly protected manufacturer, so as to enable him to compete with his foreign competitor. Why could they not have given some relief to the planter of cotton? The provisions of this bill contain nothing but burdens and exactions for him, and of these it is full to the overflowing.

In the course of his remarks upon the bill, delivered a few days since in this House, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] said:

> Now, Mr. Chairman, this tariff bill is the best ever presented to the House of Representatives. It is protection all along the line. It reaches every industry. It reaches the rich manufacturer; it reaches the workingman in his mill; it reaches the farmer on his farm; it reaches the sewing girl in the garret. There is not a hand manipulation made by a human being in this country that is not protected by this bill.

The gentleman compliments himself and his committee highly. It is but natural that the parent should be pleased with his own offspring, even though it be lamentably hideous and deformed. I find no fault with the gentleman or with his committee for the fondness which they manifest for the child of their own creation.

But when he says that it is protection all along the line, I must take issue with him. This is a bill in the interest of the manufacturer, and of the manufacturer only, except that it may be of some slight advantage to the farmer who lives along the eastern extension of the Canadian border. To the farmers everywhere else, East and West, North and South, it carries no relief whatever. To them it is extremely hurtful in whatever light it may be viewed.

It does, however, reach the manufacturer, and in a manner eminently satisfactory to him. He has gotten that for which he has been during so many years praying and laboring: complete protection against his foreign rival.

It approaches him bearing rich and extraordinary gifts, making no condition save only that once in every two years he must respond in a proper way—freely, willingly, and liberally—to the demands of the grand old party.

It reaches the workingman in his mill; but oh, how different is the manner of its address to him! The bill says to him: "Workman, before you can wear or use the products of your own hands you must pay to your employer an average of not less than 50 per cent. of their value more than you can purchase similar products for in foreign markets. The employer needs this money in order to compensate him for the wages he is paying you, and he must be repaid. Therefore, return them unto him with usury."

It reaches the farmer also, but as a tax-gatherer, and, reading to him the long list of heavy duties imposed upon everything which he must have in order to make life comfortable and to grow his crops, he demands of him a strict compliance with the terms of the law.

The sewing girl in the garret is also reached, not with a blessing, but with a curse. It lays hold upon her poverty and her dependence and robs her of the largest portion of the earnings which accrue to her from fourteen hours of daily toil.

Who would not be an American manufacturer under a Republican Administration and the party in full control of both Houses of Congress?

[Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama, withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now yield so much time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I do not now remember that we had any testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means bearing directly, or elaborately at least, upon this particular industry. For myself I was governed very largely in making this increase by the testimony taken before the Senate committee in the last Congress, and by the reasons then urged in the debate on the floor of the Senate for increasing the duty upon cotton-ties. It is one of those industries that might be established in the United States in a short time if sufficiently protected; and to impose this increased taxation, as it is called, in my judgment will not increase the cost of the product in the end to the consumer, but will result eventually in establishing a very great, important, and valuable industry in the United States.

Mr. SAYERS. Will my friend allow me to ask him one question which is entirely pertinent to the course of his remarks?

Mr. BURROWS. I have but a minute or two.

Mr. SAYERS. I will try to get you an extension of time if it be necessary; I only want to ask a single question. Will the gentleman be kind enough to state how long a time, how many years, in his judgment, will lapse before you can bring this industry down to the cheap basis of which you speak?

Mr. BURROWS. Oh, I do not know exactly. As a rule, in these matters the price falls immediately; from the moment the product begins to increase in the home market competition is felt, and it decreases the price of the foreign as well as the domestic product.

Mr. SAYERS. In the mean time the cotton producer is forced to suffer.

Mr. BURROWS. If the increased rate should even increase the price, as the gentleman indicates, it will continue only for a short time.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to allude to the debate which took place in the last Congress upon this subject; and I presume I will not transgress the rules of parliamentary law by citing some of the arguments used in the other branch of Congress upon this important question. During the debate in the Senate in December, 1888, when this question was under consideration, Mr. ALLISON, in reply to inquiry if we were producing ties in the United States, said:

A good many cotton-ties were made in the United States some years ago, but it is now impossible to make them in competition with Belgium and Germany with the rate of duty imposed by law.

That was in response to a question as to whether cotton-ties were made in the United States. Then follows this statement by a Senator from Arkansas:

Mr. BERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island why this increase was made from 35 per cent. to 108 per cent. ad valorem.

The same question is asked here to-day.

What necessity is there for it? If this article is not manufactured in the United States and no protection is thereby afforded to any industry now in operation, why is this increase from 35 per cent., by the present law, made to 108 per cent. ad valorem, unless it is for the very reason that the principal amount of it is used in the South, and it was the intention of gentlemen to discriminate against that section of the country?

Mr. ALLISON was favoring the very thing that we want to do under the present bill, namely, the establishment of the industry in this country. Then Mr. ALDRICH replied:

Mr. ALDRICH. I will now answer the question of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY]. He asks, why increase the duty upon the article of cotton-ties, especially as it can not be made in this country? The present duty of 35 per cent. upon cotton-ties is one of those anomalies and inequalities which it is the object of this bill to remedy. The decision of the Treasury Department which placed the duty on cotton-ties originally at 35 per cent. was undoubtedly an erroneous decision, that is, erroneous in the fact that it did not carry out the intention of Congress.

The intention was that cotton-ties should pay the same duty as other hoop-iron. The rate of 35 per cent. has been continued for the reason that there has been no power that could remedy it. This is the first opportunity that we have had to remedy that defect. It is a defect. I think every Senator here will understand that a tie for one use ought not to pay a less rate of duty than a tie for another use; that it certainly is not the purpose of tariff legislation to discriminate against one part of the country or in favor of one class of people, however deserving they may be, as against another class of people.

As to the fact of the ties not being made in this country, they can not be made in this country for the reason that the duty is 35 per cent.

Mr. DAWES. They used to be made in this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. They used to be made in this country when they were protected the same as other hoop-iron was protected, and they can be made in this country, as every one of them will be made in this country, three months or six months after this bill becomes a law.

There is not a single article in the iron and steel schedules but that its production would cease in this country if we should reduce the duty out of proportion to the article from which it is made. Take pig-iron, for instance; if we should put down the duty on pig-iron to $3 per ton, leaving other grades the same; or take steel rails, if we should put the duty on steel rails at half the sum that we put the duty on pig-iron and other products of iron and steel, within six months the production in this country would cease, for the reason that the duty would not be adequate, and would not bear the proper relation to the other duties in the bill. That is the simple story of cotton-ties. There is nothing about them difficult to make. They can be made here, and they will be made here if the duty is made ample.

That is, Mr. Chairman, the whole story. The duty is so low under the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury that, while formerly we made cotton-ties in this country, under that decision we have been driven absolutely out of the business by the cheap labor of Belgium. Now, it is proposed to do by this bill just what was proposed to be done in the Senate bill of last year: to put such a duty on the foreign product as will enable us to revive the industry and establish it in the United States. If this bill passes it will be established, and it will result in this case as in every other, the statement of our friends on the other side to the contrary notwithstanding; it will result in demonstrating beyond question that the time is not far distant when this article will be purchased by the Southern planter much cheaper than he can purchase it to-day, and it will be purchased from our own people.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLARKE] aright, he stated that in the Senate hearings, in the letter of J. Painter & Son, they only asked for a retention of the then existing rate of duty. Am I right about that?

Mr. CLARKE, of Alabama. That is my understanding of the letter.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I thought that was the understanding of the gentleman. I have before me a letter from J. Painter & Son & Co., which may be or not the same letter. I do not know.

Mr. CLARKE, of Alabama. Is it on page 686, volume 2?

Mr. MCKINLEY. It is on page 872, part 3.

Mr. CLARKE, of Alabama. I do not see that.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I find in that letter, dated December 6, 1888, a request for an additional duty of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound added to the rate of duty upon hoop-iron.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a single word. What is a cotton-tie? It is a piece of hoop-iron cut into a length sufficient to go around a bale of cotton. It may have a buckle upon it; it may have some other fastening upon it, and it is called a cotton-tie. Now, I have never been able to find any reason why hoop-iron used for baling cotton should be dutiable at any other rate than hoop-iron used for any other purpose.

Mr. SAYERS. Do you not propose to increase the duty now?

Mr. MCKINLEY. We do put an increase of duty on cotton-ties of one-fifth of 1 cent per pound. We provide for a duty upon hoop-iron as much as we have always done, and then in addition to that, for the additional cost of manufacturing, we put on an additional duty of one-fifth of 1 cent per pound. Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk of our manufacturing them in the United States, and some allusion has been made to the fact that there are in my district two or three establishments that manufacture hoop-iron.

I believe that to be true; and I congratulate myself that I have a district where there are very successful manufacturing industries built up all over the district. We used to manufacture these cotton-ties, and continued to do so until there was a decision reducing them from the same duty as was placed on hoop-iron to an ad valorem duty in the basket clause of the statute, which were held to be "manufactured of hoop-iron not otherwise provided for."

While we were manufacturing hoop-iron and cotton-ties in the United States, and successfully manufacturing them, under the hoop-iron duty, the price of cotton-ties was reduced to the producers of cotton in every one of the cotton States, every one of them. The very instant that our establishments were broken down, because of the interpretation of the Secretary of the Treasury, that very instant the price of the cotton-tie went up.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Then, as a result of that, you should manufacture them more easily.

Mr. MCKINLEY. On the contrary, they destroyed the manfacturers and did not benefit the producers of cotton in the South. Now, what does the proposed amendment do as to cotton-ties?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I can not, as I have but a moment, and there are two or three things I want to say.

We propose to put the cotton-tie in this bill precisely as it was when made of hoop-iron. It is a manufacture of hoop-iron. For ten years the duty on the cotton-tie made of hoop-iron has been less than the duty on hoop-iron itself. Now, we propose to equalize the duty and then to put an additional duty of one-fifth of 1 cent a pound and give it for the difference of cost in the manufacture on the other side and the manufacture on this side; and if this duty shall be put upon cotton-ties as recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means gentlemen will not only be buying cotton-ties made in the North, but they will be buying cotton-ties made in the South. There are already in the State of Alabama and also in the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., establishments ready to manufacture these cotton-ties. Indeed, in Chattanooga they undertook it, but because of this diminished rate of duty they have had to quit the business.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SAYERS. I said a few moments ago, on the authority of the Farmers' Alliance, that there were imported into this country in 1889 one-third of the cotton-ties used. I understand the gentleman denied the correctness of the assertion?

Mr. MCKINLEY. For what year?

Mr. SAYERS. For 1889.

Mr. MCKINLEY. One-third?

Mr. SAYERS. One-third of the amount imported. I understand the gentleman to say that the manufacturers of this country have gone out of the business. If that is the case I would like to know how many we annually import?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will tell the gentleman. In 1889 there were imported 7,573,062 pounds, at a value of $847,012.61. Now, my understanding to-day is—I have not the exact proportion used in the domestic and foreign uses—but my understanding is that there is a very great excess in the foreign tie over the domestic tie used in the United States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. I give the information on the authority of the representatives of the Farmers' Alliance.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask for a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I would like the gentleman to give his figures in regard to cotton-ties, and let them be inserted with his remarks.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I would like to do that.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. I offer the following amendment to the amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 20, page 21, strike out the word "fifty" and insert the word "twenty." Also, page 25, line 18, strike out the words "shall pay two-tenths of one" and insert the words "35 per cent;" and strike out lines 19 and 20.

The question was put; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was put; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. SAYERS. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 93, noes 121.

Mr. SAYERS. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 96, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, can no more amendments be offered on the cotton-tie paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from California to offer amendments to the bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Will the gentleman from California allow an amendment which I desire to offer to come in on this paragraph before we take up another? There will be no debate upon it.

Mr. MCKENNA. I have no objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from California will be read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Before we leave this paragraph I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] to allow my amendment to be voted upon. There will be no debate.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Very well.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend section 144 by striking out all after the word "pay," in line 18, and adding in lieu thereof the following: "45 per cent. ad valorem."

The amendment was rejected—ayes 82, noes 109.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for another amendment.

Mr. MCKENNA. I can not yield.

The amendment offered by Mr. MCKENNA was read, as follows:

Strike out Schedule E down to section 236, and insert the following:

"SCHEDULE E.

"All sugars not above No. 13 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 polariscope not above 75 degrees, shall pay a duty of ninety-four-hundredths cent 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 sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely:

"All sugars above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard, 1.79 cents per pound.

"All sugars above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard, 1.99 cents per pound.

"All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.19 cents per pound.

"Molasses testing not above 56 degrees by the polariscope shall pay a duty of 2 cents per gallon; molasses testing above 56 degrees shall pay a duty of 4 cents per gallon."

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will ask the gentleman from California how much time he desires for the discussion of this amendment.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from California. I will put the amendment in writing.

Mr. MCKENNA. Mr. Chairman, of course there are other gentlemen who desire to debate this amendment besides myself. As for myself, I would like to occupy continuously on the amendment twenty or twenty-five minutes, certainly not to exceed half an hour. Other gentlemen, however, will want time, and they, perhaps, can say how much time they desire.

Mr. WILKINSON. This is a very important amendment, and we shall require a reasonable time for debate upon it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have from fifteen to twenty minutes.

Mr. FLOWER. I want about five minutes' time now before this debate begins.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the sugar schedule and amendments thereto be limited to two hours and thirty minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. How will that time be divided?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I was just going to ask that question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. There are four or five different propositions. There is the proposition of the bill itself; there is the proposition of the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA]; there is the proposition for free sugar; and there are certain other propositions.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I am quite content that gentlemen who are opposed to the provisions of the bill upon the subject of sugar shall have control of one-half of the time, the distribution of that half to be arranged amongst them.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I submit to the gentleman that that is hardly fair, because the differences between the gentlemen opposed to the provisions of the bill are greater in some instances than the differences between the propositions they favor and the proposition in the bill.

Mr. WILKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the time suggested by the gentleman from Ohio is not at all sufficient. This is the most important schedule in the bill, involving more money and affecting the revenue more largely than any other schedule; and I think that we ought to have at least one hour in addition to the time asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA].

Mr. MCKINLEY. I am willing to yield to the other side of the House, to be controlled by any gentleman they may determine, one hour of the two hours and a half.

Mr. BLAND. I shall object. I prefer to let the debate go on in regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] make a motion to limit debate?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I think we can have unanimous consent. My proposition will give the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] thirty minutes, and it will give the gentlemen on the other side an hour, leaving to the friends of the bill one hour.

Mr. COLEMAN. Where does the gentleman from Louisiana come in? [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. COLEMAN] will come in in the time of the other side, of course. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent——

Mr. COLEMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman, unless the Republican member from the State of Louisiana can get some show. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the Chair making a statement of the question? [Laughter.]

Mr. COLEMAN. This matter affects Louisiana as much as any provision of the bill affects any other portion of the country, and I object.

The CHAIRMAN. To what does the gentleman object?

Mr. COLEMAN. I object to any unanimous consent that cuts me out of time to discuss this question. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair has not yet put the question for unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLEMAN. Then I object to an arrangement which requires me to get my time from the Democratic party. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will give the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. COLEMAN] twenty minutes of the hour which I shall control if my suggestion shall be adopted.

Mr. COLEMAN. I am content with that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] asks unanimous consent that debate upon this schedule and amendments be limited to two hours and a half.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Not on all amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair trusts he may be allowed to complete his statement. The proposition is that one hour be controlled upon the Democratic side of the House, half an hour by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA], and that there be one hour in favor of the bill, with the understanding that twenty minutes of that time is to be accorded to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. COLEMAN]. Is there objection?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Who is to control the time on this side?

Mr. BLANCHARD. We want an understanding on that point. I suggest that my colleague [Mr. WILKINSON] control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection to that so far as the Chair is concerned.

Mr. SWENEY. This proposition, if adopted, practically consumes upon this subject the entire time now at the disposal of the House. I desire that, before this bill shall be voted on, a matter which is as important or very nearly so to the State of Iowa as this is to any State shall be considered. I refer to the matter of hides, which this bill places upon the free-list. I do not want the entire time consumed on the sugar schedule, but desire that some time be left for the consideration of this other matter. If even half an hour be conceded to this subject before a vote is taken, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. It seems impossible to reach an agreement; and

therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am willing that the debate proceed for some time. Later on I may make some suggestion.

Mr. McCOMAS. I desire to offer an amendment—other gentlemen may wish to present the same proposition—to include the maple-sugar industry in the provisions of this bill with respect to bounty. I wish an opportunity to have a vote on that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can offer that amendment.

Mr. McCOMAS. If I can offer the amendment and have five minutes upon it, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the debate proceeds the Chair desires to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLOWER], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, desires unanimous consent to address the Committee of the Whole on the pending subject. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENNA. I am to be recognized next?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN. Before the gentleman from New York proceeds, I wish to inquire when it will be in order to offer an amendment to this schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLOWER] has occupied his five minutes the gentleman can send up an amendment to this schedule.

Mr. FLOWER. Mr. Chairman, I have published in the RECORD two amendments to this bill and hoped to have an opportunity to bring them to a vote; but according to my information from the chairman of the committee and from what I can very plainly see from the method in which we are proceeding a great many amendments which gentlemen desire to offer and debate will have a very small chance within the time to which we are limited by the majority.

In the first place, under this bill it is proposed that all effervescent mineral waters be taxed 70 per cent., instead of the present duty of 30 per cent. (the tax being merely on the bottle), while champagne is allowed to come in at 50 per cent. My constituents think this is wrong. While 10,000,000 gallons of mineral water are produced in this country and 2,000,000 gallons come in from Europe for the accommodation of the tastes and habits of the people, being used as temperance beverages, my people think the present rate of duty, 30 per cent., should not be increased. Therefore I desire to submit an amendment to that effect.

I shall print with my remarks a petition from physicians of the country asking that effervescent mineral waters be allowed to come in at the present rate of duty. The reasons, as we understand, why physicians join in such a petition is that when a person is suffering with fever or other sickness it is necessary that the water he drinks should be pure, and physicians are in the habit of prescribing in such cases these effervescent mineral waters. If members of the Republican party desire to avoid a vote on this question and pass this bill imposing a tax of 4 cents a bottle on Apollinaris and these other imported mineral waters, the people of the country who use them will know who is responsible for it.

The next amendment on which I would be glad to have a vote relates to the duty on oranges and other fruits. A large number of my constituents, together with dealers of fruit in New Orleans and the produce exchanges of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York, have intrusted to me petitions asking that the present duty on oranges and other fruits be continued. Under the schedule as now arranged in this bill we shall practically be deprived, as they believe, of oranges and lemons for five months in the year, and for three months each year we shall be deprived of grapes. Our country does not produce anything comparing with the Malaga grape, and under this bill you practically destroy the importation of that product.

As I have had occasion to remark before, the taxes as imposed in this bill from one end to the other seem to be fixed upon the Scriptural principle that "Unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." [Laughter and applause.] You have in every instance increased the taxes on the poor man to the advantage of the rich. I admit there are two notable exceptions. In the first place, you have put sugar on the free-list; and from the tone on the other side of the House I know you are sorry about it; and upon tobacco you have made a reduction of duty. But as to all other articles embraced in this bill you have so arranged your duties that the poor man pays the taxes, while the rich man gets the benefit. I intended to amend the bill in several schedules, but am debarred by the majority. However, I will print in the RECORD several protests which I have received from my constituents. Thanking gentlemen for their attention, I will not occupy further time. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

NEW YORK, *May* 3, 1890.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, importers of grapes in this market, beg you to use your influence, when the tariff bill comes up for discussion, in having a change made in the duty proposed by the McKinley bill.

The present duty on grapes is 20 per cent. ad valorem on the value of the fruit, while the new duty proposed is 2 cents per pound.

We object to any duty requiring the grapes to be weighed and tared, because by doing so the fruit will be ruined, and it would very seriously injure the entire business.

While we make no suggestion as to what rate of duty shall be placed on grapes, we earnestly ask you to aid us by having it fixed at a rate per barrel of not exceeding 3 cubic feet capacity. The barrels are about all of the same size, and we have given above the measure of one of them. The duty during several years past has averaged a little under 30 cents per barrel.

Respectfully yours,

SGOBEL & DAY,
OTTO G. MAYER & CO.,
W. H. WESTERVELT & CO.,
T. FESCARICIO,
E. L. GOODSELL,
Per J. C. MACNUCHEN,
FREDERICK S. ROBINSON & CO.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK, *May* 8, 1890.

DEAR SIR: I will limit my arguments to commodities on which the McKinley bill proposes to levy a prohibitory duty, such as oranges and lemons. Importers have declared that for the past four years they have made an average profit of between 5 cents and 10 cents per box. The McKinley bill proposes to increase the duty on oranges 25 cents per box and on lemons 20 cents per box.

Lemons. Nobody has asked for a raise in the duty, and the increase is therefore uncalled for.

Oranges. All the dealers and jobbers in domestic and foreign oranges of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans have signed memorials declaring that the foreign do not compete with the domestic, and, as they handle and sell both, they are the only real unbiased judges. The only opposition comes from Florida and California growers, who believe that the foreign hurt the domestic production, but have submitted no facts.

Dealers and jobbers affirm that bananas and pineapples, the former particularly, affect the sale of our domestic oranges, as well as apples, and both bananas and pineapples are left on the free-list.

Doctors recommend the free use of oranges, and said fruit should therefore be within the reach of the masses, who have the right to some comfort, particularly when said fruit is conducive to health and temperance. In a word, the proposed increase will ruin importers, dealers, jobbers, and peddlers, and will deprive the masses of cheap fruit. It would be detrimental to all and will benefit none.

I have the honor to remain, yours respectfully,

L. CONTENTIN.

JAMES M. CONSTABLE, Esq.,
Chairman Importers' Meeting.

ITALIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN NEW YORK,
24 State Street, Room 313, New York, April 4, 1880.

DEAR SIR: My impression is that the strongest point the House will consider is the fact that all the importers, dealers, and jobbers in domestic and foreign fruits of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New Orleans have signed petitions in your possession against any increase in the duty on imported oranges and lemons. They are unbiased and therefore the only and best judges, as they sell both domestic and foreign; and when they say that the foreign don't interfere with the domestic they should be believed. They are not Italians in the sense that Mr. Hartridge, of Florida, insinuated. A few, as you will notice from the signatures, are Italians, excepting New Orleans, where the most of the traffic is managed by Italians, but they are American citizens, known to me for from twenty to thirty years, some owning steamers sailing under the American flag.

You must have found out from all my writings to you that I have been truthful and consistent, while if you look at my remarks on the Florida memorial you will notice that the exaggerations therein contained are clearly seen, and made in order to gain their point and destroy our business.

Myself and the majority have been working hard for the past forty years, and have earned every cent with the sweat of our faces, and, comparatively speaking, we are poor people, the business being so precarious and risky. Any further obstacle in the way, such as a higher duty, would completely ruin us.

Now permit me to call your attention to a most palpable inconsistency and injustice.

Bananas and pine-apples are also raised in Florida, but the same have been left on the free-list by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means in their tariff bill, while the duty on oranges and lemons has been doubled, when it is a positive fact that bananas, in particular, affect the price of oranges, and I will explain it.

While Florida oranges are plentiful you can go from one end to the other of New York City, or any other city, and you will find that all the grocery stores, the fruit stores, and even the fruit stands in the street, have for sale Florida oranges and bananas, and no Mediterranean oranges, the latter being only sold by peddlers in the cities' tenement districts, manufacturing and mining districts, or are shipped to the far West, where Floridas can not reach sound, and therefore do not interfere with Floridas; but bananas being cheaper than oranges, and to be had almost the year round, naturally many of our people will go for the cheapest and others prefer to make a change, which is demonstrated by the fact that about 10,000,000 bunches are received yearly in the United States, and importations are rapidly increasing.

California oranges are equally affected by bananas in Chicago and west of Chicago where said fruit is consumed, and for the very identical reason.

Mediterranean oranges are also affected by bananas, and in fact more than our domestic oranges, because longer in the market. Nevertheless, we are not selfish, and do not ask for duty on bananas, as we do not wish to deprive the masses of cheap fruit of any kind, fruit being healthy and recommended by all doctors. We simply demonstrate the injustice of doubling the duty on oranges, particularly when they do not interfere with Florida and California oranges, and as for lemons, when neither Florida nor California have insisted for higher duty, as shown by the statement made by the delegates before the Committee on Ways and Means, and so ably combated by you, to double the duty is an outrageous, inexcusable injustice, particularly when we produce hardly enough for one week's consumption. Therefore to increase the duty on oranges and lemons is as demonstrated above a palpable and uncalled-for injustice which must act to the detriment of all and the benefit of none.

Now, permit me to make remarks on some of the statements made by the Florida delegates before your committee.

Damage allowance, page 1074, no rebate is made on what Mr. Hartridge terms trash; the rebate is only made on the fruit actually decayed, which amounts on an average between 5 and 10 per cent., and which can easily be seen from the returns at the custom-house. We are not frauds, as Mr. Hartridge seemed to intimate, and this is why I touch the damage question.

Mr. McKibben, page 1075, claims that Mediterranean oranges can be imported for $1.20 per box, and make a profit. See my memorial, page 7, where I state that the fruit can not be profitably imported and sold for less than $2.25 to $2.50 per box, and which can be easily verified from invoices at the custom-house. I state facts, and defy Mr. McKibben to disprove what I say.

Mr. Welsh, page 1079, did not give the reason why Florida oranges in January sold at $1.38 to $2.35 per box. Because the fruit arrived out of condition he should have stated.

Mr. Wilson, page 1079, says that 38,797 boxes of Mediterranean oranges were received in October, 1887, which is erroneous, as none were received, and which can also be verified at the custom-house. Italian oranges, or rather Mediterranean oranges, do not commence to come before December in any quantity, and even then in small proportions. See their own statement, pages 1088 and 1089.

Mr. Mabry, page 1080, says Florida produces 4,000,000 boxes. The present season the production in Florida has been a little over 2,000,000 boxes, and which is the highest ever known. For the next two or three years, on account of the heavy frost last month, the crop will be one-half, which means high prices for Florida oranges. See the article I sent you, written by Mr. Prime, of the Journal of Commerce of New York.

Statement of Hon. W. VANDEVER, page 1090: He says the freight is 25 cents per box from the Mediterranean, while as a matter of fact the freight is about 42 cents on an average. Sometimes it has been for a short time on account of competition as low as 1 shilling, say 25 cents. No steamer can carry fruit at such a low rate.

Should the minority of the Ways and Means Committee submit a tariff of their own, kindly recommend either the schedule of 10 cents, 20 cents, and 40 cents, respectively, or 13, 25, and 50 cents, respectively, as in the wisdom of the committee they may think best. See page 5 of my memorial, and in justice to our laboring classes have the duty on shelled walnuts and filberts made higher, also page 5.

The bill of the majority has the duty on shelled almonds, peanuts, etc., higher than in the shell, but not on walnuts or filberts, which is an inconsistency and perhaps an oversight.

I have the honor to remain yours, respectfully,

LOUIS CONTENCIN, *President.*

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER,
1735 *I Street, Washington, D. C.*

[A. Minaldi & Co. importers, Nos. 22 and 24 State street. Branch offices: Boston, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Baltimore.]

NEW YORK, *March* 4, 1890.

SIR: We are apprised by a private telegram that your Committee on Ways and Means contemplate reporting that the duty on oranges and lemons shall be imposed at the rate of 25 cents per cubic foot per box. On this subject we take the liberty of addressing you, our honored Representative, protesting against such advance from the present rate and advocating that if any change is made it shall be at a lesser rate, and for the following reasons herein noted, namely:

First. The imported oranges and lemons do not interfere with our domestic production, as the season for the imported fruit begins when the domestic ends, which is, for the latter, from November to February, and for the former from March to July. The receipts from both sources which come to hand in other months are but small as compared to the demand, and therefore prices of either do not interfere with the other. As to lemons, the domestic production is but meager, and in any case does not equal the demand by millions of boxes; therefore, it can not be claimed that protection is demanded for that important and necessary article of commerce.

Second. To further increase the cost of green fruit would burden the consumer to an extent that would place it beyond the reach of the masses, desirable as it has become, owing to the present ruling prices. That oranges and lemons are healthful can not be gainsaid. The former are luxurious and palatable, and the latter, possessing abundant medicinal properties, have elicited the encomiums and recommendations of the best physicians of the land. The question then becomes an ethical one. We should cheapen their cost and foster their general distribution, thereby augmenting the prosperity and extending the happiness of the nation.

Third. The importations of fruit into this country have attained such proportion that the cost has been reduced to a minimum point that places it within the reach of the masses, the prices of oranges at the last auction sale being from 75 cents to $1.75 per box and for lemons from $1.25 to $2.50 per box. It is no longer considered a luxury, as formerly, but a necessity, and recognized as such by the medical world as well as others. By imposing a duty of 25 cents per cubic foot per box, amounting to 62½ cents per box instead of 25 cents per box, the present rate, would add to the cost so much that but few importers would dare to add to the many risks they already have to assume and would take it out of the reach of many who now enjoy the privilege of its benefiting influences. The consumption of oranges and lemons assists good morals and aids digestion. It is expedient therefore to encourage the extensive use of such wholesome food and nothing will be more effective in that direction than reducing its cost.

Fourth. By imposing the proposed additional rate of duty as noted, your committee will ruin the business of many of our old houses and take employment from 300,000 of our citizens of this country, in various walks of life, many of whom are now dependent for their daily livelihood from this heretofore established trade. We believe that the interests of the Government are identical with those of the people, that to deprive the people of their labor, and, in this particular, the fruits of their labor, is working a double hardship upon a very large and deserving class of our population who have rights which should be respected in its nation's councils even though they are unheard. We admit the hypothesis that legislation should be devoted to the end of serving the masses, and it can not be denied that any system which will have the effect of reducing the cost of healthful commodities commends itself as one to be put into immediate operation.

Fifth. In view of the perishable nature of the fruit in question and also in view of the pending action of the Senate in dealing with the "McKinley administrative bill," which is now before that honorable body, and which, in section 22, repeals section 2927 of the Revised Statutes, which provides for a rebate of duties on damaged goods, it will be seen that in the event of the Senate passing the McKinley bill and your committee recommending the duty of 25 cents per cubic foot per box, you will advocate a rate of duty which will amount to a tax more burdensome than we can bear, and which we can not contemplate is considered by your committee. Trade competition is lively, margin of profit correspondingly close, prices subject altogether to the demand of an auction trade (all importations of fruit are sold by auction to the highest bidder). So, were the duty higher we could not realize any more on that account than at present, as the matter of cost is not entered into the calculation of a buyer at auction sales. The goods are sold at auction on account of their perishable nature. Not to dispose of them at once and as quickly as landed would be suicidal.

Sixth. The surplus of the Treasury is such that there can be no urgent demand for a further increase in that direction as such an increased tax would represent, even taking into consideration the natural falling off of imports that would follow if the proposed rate were adopted.

Seventh. And in the matter of protection to a home industry in the States of Florida and California which is in its infancy as yet, we do not come into competition with these States, as the product of the Mediterranean reaches our shores after the bulk of the domestic crop is disposed of. Then why increase the cost of this article? Why place further incumbrances on the importer, whose business is venturesome and dangerous and whose profits are hardly commensurate with the risks involved? No obstacle should be permitted to impede its progress. Its expansion would be productive of greater revenue than its contraction, and legislation should be for the many, and not for the few, particularly in the case of an article of national demand, such as oranges and lemons.

We request you will give this matter your serious consideration, the benefit of your influence, and so impress your committee with the beneficial importance of the requirements of the people at large for this truly desirable article of commerce that we will not be disturbed in its importation, as an increase of duty would certainly do.

Kindly favor us with an early reply as possible under the circumstances.

Respectfully,

A. MINALDI & CO.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER, *Washington, D. C.*

NEW ORLEANS, *March* 21, 1890.

To the honorable Committee on Ways and Means, Washington:

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned, importers, dealers, and jobbers in domestic and foreign fruits, hereby certify that Mediterranean oranges and lemons do not affect the value of our domestic production, the bulk of which is marketed in December, January, and February, when the Mediterranean oranges are tart and are peddled out in our manufacturing districts and in the cities' tenement districts, and are shipped to some extent to the far West, wherever Florida can not reach sound.

A higher duty would either stop importation or restrict it to such an extent as to make us lose our business and at the same time deprive our manufacturing and cities' tenement districts, representing hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children, of cheap fruit, without benefiting Florida; and as for lemons, so few are raised in this country that to advance the duty is also entirely uncalled for and will enhance the price to the detriment of all and benefit of none.

We therefore most earnestly pray your honorable committee that no advance in the duty be countenanced.

We have the honor to remain yours, respectfully,

Chas. H. Schenck, Arthur Caron, jr., Machean Bros., C. A. Fish & Co., R. R. Rice & Co., A. Garnard & Co., D. Canute & Co., Memphis, Tenn.; T. E. Corvaja & Bro., Santo di Traponi, R. di Cristina Hule, G. Cuccio di B., Cusimano Bros., M. J. Mulvihill, Nagele & Manguno, D'Armiro & Sidali, Jac. Bokenfohr, J. W. Demorest & Co., O. R. Angelovich, Emanuel & Zorre, Andrew Anderson, Jas. Williamson, S. Oteri.

BOSTON, *March* 21, 1890.

To the honorable Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned, jobbers and retailers of green fruit in Boston, desire to express to your honorable committee and to our Representatives in Congress our convictions that the imposition of any higher duty on oranges and lemons is unwise and detrimental to our interests, and will seriously curtail the supply of these fruits, which have now become to the consumer almost as much of a necessity as tea or coffee.

Lemons should not be touched at all; in our judgment they are a sanitary necessity, and no visible or probable supply is available to replace a restricted importation of this fruit from the Mediterranean, either in quantity or quality.

This is less true of oranges, but the same facts exist and the same arguments remain to a degree, which leads us to protest against any advance in the duty.

We have the honor to remain, very respectfully,

A. S. and J. Brown & Co., Alexander Bros. & Co., W. L. Hoope & Co., B. F. Southwick & Co., Spear & Co., Hanson & Ricker, Chas. Lawrence & Co., L. W. Sherman & Co., Cyrus Thacher & Co., Geo. O. Eustis, Eaton & Eustis, Gillette & Hennigan, W. C. Royer & Co., L. H. Daggett, Byram Bros., Foster, Weeks & Co., Hinds & Wyman, George N. Emery & Co., J. M. York, J. Bond & Co., Snow & Co., Geo. E. Richardson & Co., Conant & Bean, Sawtell & Pratt, Hill & Gowen, J. R. Conant, Harris, Caldwell & Co., Lowell Bros. & Co., W. Gleason & Co., C. E. Morrison & Co., Davis, Chopin & Co., E. J. Morrison & Co., Winn, Ricker & Co., Isaac Locke & Co., Curtis & Co., Simmons, Amsden & Co., Howard W. Spun & Co., John B. Baker & Co., A. Hayden & Co., Henry Currier & Co., Seaovins & Co., W. W. & C. R. Noyes, Patch & Roberts, Bennett, Rand & Co.

NEW YORK, *March* 19, 1890.

To the honorable Committee on Ways and Means, Washington:

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned, dealers and jobbers in domestic and foreign fruits, hereby certify that Mediterranean oranges and lemons do not affect the value of our domestic production, the bulk of which is marketed in December, January, and February, when the Mediterranean oranges are tart and are peddled out in our manufacturing districts and in city tenement districts, and are shipped to some extent to the far West, wherever Florida can not reach sound.

A higher duty would either stop importation or restrict it to such an extent as to make us lose our business and at same time deprive our manufacturing and city tenement districts, representing hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children, of cheap fruit without benefiting Florida; and as for lemons, so few are raised in this country that to advance the duty is also entirely uncalled for and will enhance the price to the detriment of all and benefit of none.

We therefore most earnestly pray your honorable committee that no advance in the duty be countenanced.

We have the honor to remain yours, respectfully,

D. Wegman, 79 Barclay street; Hien Bros., 79 Park Place; D. M. Durell, 186 Reade street; William E. Stagg, 184 Reade street; Edw. C. Leake, 184 Reade street; R. A. Tucker & Son, 188 Reade street; Robert Ciurtis, 190 Reade street; A. N. Philbrick, 6 Harrison street; H. C. Vogel, 192 Reade street; H. S. Worth & Co., 194 Reade street; Charles W. Maxfield, 182 Reade street; C. E. Maxfield, 182 Reade street; Schott & Franke, 262 Washington street; Voorhes & Vreeland, 258 Washington street; G. W. Mulcot, 112 Warren street; J. B. Greason, 110 Murray street; C. L. Armstrong & Co., 110 Murray street; Covert, Ris & Suydam, 244 Washington street; Clarence E. Winterton, 95 Park Place; Blackwell & Bros., 99 Park Place; John Punng, 105 Park Place; Robert Werderman, 25 Wallabout Market; Levi Pawling, 24 State street; James Williamson, 24 State street; Millard F. Prince, 100 Wall street; James Dodd, 141 Reade street; Seggermann Bros., 121 Front street; Henry Rolkes, 59 and 61 Park Place; Samuel Brush, 27 Harrison street; James Saitto, Son & Co., 16 State street; Frederick S. Robinson & Co., 126 Pearl street; Lawrence, Giles & Co., 11 South William street, G. Villari, 55 Beaver street; Arquimbau & Rainel, 4 Bridge street; Arquimbau & Walliset, 24 State street; W. H. Westervelt & Co., 24 State street; Dameneus Cunis, 24 State street; Frank Lanhanna, 24 State street; W. Minaldily, 24 State street; U. H. Dudley & Co., 4 Bridge street; Otto G. Mayer & Co., 14-20 Whitehall street; Hisel Feltmann & Co., 55 Beaver street; D. Bonanno, 24 State street; Emil Zutta, 2 Bridge street; William T. Clarke; R. A. Tucker, 248 Washington street; Gills & Hills, 84 Park Place; Peter J. Thomas, 2 Bridge street;

P. J. Miller; John Haesloop; F. S. Maynard; E. B. Renaud; Lyon & Co.; P. Hulton; P. Fescalzi; George Lester & Co.; William B. Mason & Co., 232 Greenwich street; N. Cunes, 315 Greenwich street; H. E. Sanford, 14 South Twelfth street; John F. Matthews, 24 State street; Mills & Everett; A. Zurce; Charles S. Haynes; T. J. Curry; J. W. McSimson; C. F. Foster, 54 Broad street.

[T. J. Stewart & Co., sales agents, factors, commission merchants, and ship-brokers, Railroad block, Exchange street.]

BANGOR, ME., *April* 21, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Believing that an increase of duties upon the oranges and lemons imported into the United States from the Mediterranean will work harm to the interests of this State and be of no advantage to any section of the country, we deem it our duty, in behalf of ourselves and the manufacturers of orange and lemon box-shooks for export, to protest against any such increase of duty.

The provision in the tariff bill reported to the House for a slight rebate of 2 cents per box will be of small benefit to the manufacturers of boxes in this State for the reason that the proposed increase of duty will be almost prohibitory. Even with the present duty it is difficult to maintain a trade of Mediterranean fruit, and when the importation of such fruit ceases the demand for boxes of the American manufacturers from Italian and other Mediterranean ports will cease.

As the Mediterranean fruit does not come into competition to any great extent with home productions, an increase of duty upon Mediterranean fruit will either increase the cost to the consumer of all that is imported or restrict or prohibit the importation entirely. In either case it will work injuriously to the consumer of what, in this country, has come to be considered a necessary article of food.

In this section of the State quite a large trade has been built up in boxes manufactured for exportation to Italy and Sicily and quite a large amount of capital is invested in mills. If these mills are obliged to lie idle in consequence of the lack of the demand for shooks for export it will work a serious injury to the parties having capital invested and to the laborers engaged in the manufacture of these shooks.

We can not believe it is good policy to prohibit, by an excessive duty, the importation of oranges and lemons from Italy.

Hoping you will use your best endeavors to prevent this proposed increase of duty, we remain,

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. STEWART & CO.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER,

NEW YORK, *May* 14, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We beg to call your attention to sections Nos. 696 and 731 in the new tariff bill relating to sago, sago flour, and tapioca.

These articles have been admitted free of duty, and in the new bill they appear on the free-list, but conditions have been attached evidently for the purpose of making them dutiable at the rate of 2 cents per pound as starch.

Section 696, relating to sago and sago flour, reads, "not in condition suitable for use as starch."

Section 731, relating to tapioca, reads, "provided the same is not fit for use as starch."

Sago is an article of food. Sago flour is used chiefly by manufacturers of cotton fabrics. Tapioca is an article of food.

None of these articles are produced in this country, and all of them have for years past been admitted free of duty unconditionally. Sago, sago flour, and tapioca are exported to this country almost entirely from Singapore, Straits Settlements, and East Indies.

It is difficult to understand why it is now sought to make these articles dutiable even under the theory of "protection," and, owing to the vague and deceptive manner in which the clauses relating to them were framed in the new bill, it is only recently that dealers and consumers realized that a duty of 2 cents per pound was intended to be placed upon them. It is owing entirely to this fact that dealers in East India produce did not enter a protest while the bill was being framed.

The normal value of sago flour is 2 cents per pound landed in the United States, and of tapioca 4 cents per pound landed in the United States. A duty of 2 cents per pound would therefore be 100 per cent. on sago flour, which is prohibitory, and 50 per cent. on tapioca. It is believed that an association of starch manufacturers were instrumental in getting the clauses referred to herein inserted in the new bill, but it does not appear probable that the Committee on Ways and Means intended legislation in favor of a so-called starch trust to the injury of a large class of dealers in and consumers of sago, sago flour, and tapioca. Protests have been signed by a large number of merchants in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia against placing any duty whatever upon sago, sago flour, and tapioca, and we beg to ask in behalf of New York merchants your kind assistance toward keeping these articles free of duty unconditionally as they stand upon the tariff now in force.

We inclose herewith a form of protest signed by a number of New York and Philadelphia merchants, and we may add for your information that Mr. HENRY CABOT LODGE has been addressed upon the subject by Boston merchants; also we believe that Mr. REYBURN, M. C., has been made acquainted with the views of Philadelphia merchants.

Any further information that we can give you upon the subject referred to herein we shall be happy to furnish you at any time.

Yours faithfully,

BIDWELL & FRENCH.

APOLLINARIS WATER.

Petition of eminent medical men (including Drs. Fordyce Barker, Lewis A. Sayre, Allan McLane Hamilton, F. N. Otis, and others, of New York; Professor Bowditch and others, of Boston, Mass.; Dr. Van Bibber and others, of Baltimore, Md.), protesting against changes proposed in the tariff bill on mineral waters containing carbonic-acid gas and other mineral waters, and praying that the provisions now in force relating to same and to the bottles in which they are imported, be re-enacted.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, members of the medical profession in various cities of this country, respectfully present this their petition and pray that the same may be considered at an early day.

The provisions of the tariff bill now under the consideration of your honorable Houses are designed to inflict duties upon natural mineral waters which will prevent their importation.

The proposed tariff provisions are such that all natural mineral waters which contain free carbonic-acid gas, and which therefore may be described in popular language as "effervescent" in various degrees, will be subject to prohibitive duties.

Under present enactments all such waters are, for reasons of public utility and because of their great value to public health as beverages and as medicines, expressly admitted free, except in respect to a reasonable duty on the bottles in which they are inclosed.

The carbonic-acid gas which such natural mineral waters contain, and in virtue of which they are necessarily more or less effervescent, is one of the main elements in their constitution; it has the effect of preserving their valuable natural ingredients in solution, and without such free carbonic-acid gas they would inevitably suffer change and deterioration which would alter their constitution and destroy their properties and good effects; they would undergo decomposition and become undrinkable and useless.

We respectfully submit that it would be contrary to public policy to deprive the many thousands of persons of the benefits which they now derive from these natural mineral waters, whether as dietetic beverages or as medicines.

Such deprivation would take out of the hands of the medical profession these important resources of hygiene and of medicine and would be a serious injury to the people.

The combined effects of the heavy and prohibitive tax which it is now proposed to levy on bottles containing mineral water, and the yet heavier prohibitive impost proposed on effervescent natural mineral waters, would altogether rob the public and the medical profession of the inestimable boon which under the present and all preceding tariffs they have enjoyed by the provisions expressly inserted in such tariffs in favor of these waters on the grounds of health and public utility, and we submit that, on these grounds, the provisions now in force relating to foreign natural mineral waters and to the bottles in which they are imported should be re-enacted in any tariff which is sanctioned by your honorable Houses.

We respectfully and earnestly pray that our petition may be considered at an early date.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Fordyce Barker, M. D.; Lewis A. Sayre, M. D.; W. H. Thomson, M. D.; T. Gaillard Thomas, M. D.; A. Jacobi, M. D.; Valentine Mott, M. D.; Charles Slover Allen, Chas. Carroll Lee, W. Oiner Moore, M. D.; Wendell C. Phillips, Chas. B. Hyland, M. D.; William T. Lusk, M. D.; George Tucker Harrison, M. D.; Francis Delafield, M. D.; Edward G. Juneway, M. D.; I. R. Seawing, M. D.; Arnatt R. Gulick, M. D.; C. E. Lockwood, M. D.; Chas. Stedman Bull, M. D.; Charles T. Buffum, P. Brynbig Porter, M. D.; Geo. L. Mason, D. M. D.; C. J. Wood, M. L. Healey, M. D.; C. W. Pfeiffer, M. D.; Agn. A. Mango, M. D.; O. B. Douglas, M. D.; Thomas Bradley, D. M. D.; Lewis R. Morris, M. D.; J. J. A. Sinsabaugh, M. D.; Chas. J. Kane, M. D.; Everett Herrick, M. D.; F. N. Otis, M. D.; W. E. Bullard, M. D.; Edward Blackwell, M. D.; Jno. A. M. Creery, M. D.; Arpad G. Gerster, M. D.; W. W. Van Valzah, M. D.; J. E. Kinney, M. D.; Edw. H. Peaslee, Allan McLain Hamilton, Thos. R. Parley, Thomas Asch, F. M. Markoe, Francis H. Markoe, Geo. A. Peters, Nathan G. Bozeman, Nathan Bozeman, Geo. Thos. Jackson, Charles C. Branson, Wm. A. Valentine, J. E. Janorin, E. W. Keuyon, James R. Goffe, George L. Peabody, S. Baruch, Jean F. Chaureau, John McKew, M. D.; W. H. Katzenbach, W. H. Draper, A. B. Ball, M. D.; F. Currier, M. D.; Francis Volk, M. D.

BOSTON, MASS.

Albert W. Blodgett, Vincent Y. Bowditch, Thomas Amory De Blois, Saml. Delano, S. C. Thayer, Martin Prince, Charles M. Green, S. Breck, H. S. Dearing, Frederick L. Jack, Edwin E. Jack, Charles B. Putnam, John W. Farlon, Edwin H. Brigham, Otis K. Newell, Francis S. Wakar, Henry Q. Bowditch, Joseph P. Oliver, James J. Putnam, J. Foster Bush, Geo. A. Leland, Robert W. Lovett, A. Coolidge, jr., John P. Reynolds, A. K. Stone.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Christopher Johnston, M. D.; Arlan P. Swink, F. Donaldson, M. D.; Russell Murdoch, M. D.; F. T. Miles, M. D.; G. W. Mittenberger, M. D.; L. E. Neale, M. D.; James J. Mills, M. D. I am in accord with the general tenor of this petition, Jas. Casey Thomas, M. D.; Geo. Van Bibber, W. B. Perry, M. D.; George H. Rohé, F. P. Murphy, John R. Winslow, M. D.

DUTY ON CORKS.

DEAR SIR: In view of the approaching debate in the House of Representatives on the various items of the McKinley tariff bill, we desire to call your attention to the proposed new duty on corks.

Now, they pay 25 per cent. ad valorem; the new bill proposes 15 cents per pound, which is simply prohibitory.

If the bill becomes a law the effect will be to ruin the business of importers of corks, and to enrich a few already wealthy manufacturers here, who have now the most ample protection, as the cork bark from which corks are manufactured in this country is admitted free of duty. Importers have endeavored respectfully to present their protest against the proposed prohibitory duty, and for that purpose sent a committee to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means, and lay before them a mercantile and carefully arranged table showing the exact state of the cork-importing business, and the ample protection the home manufacturers already have; and to propose 5 cents per pound as a fair duty instead of 15 cents. Our committee had a hearing it is true, but it was apparent that the excessive rate had been established unalterably, largely out of deference to a member of the honorable committee, who represents a locality in which one of the four cork manufactories is established.

Therefore, we now appeal to you and to your honorable body for a just consideration of so much of the pending bill as relates to manufactured and partially manufactured corks. We claim that 15 cents per pound is a prohibitory and absurd proposition. It has but the one object in view, to enrich three or four (no more) cork manufacturers. There is no consideration for the people—none whatever! Corks are used in every American home, by every one, every day. They must be made from imported corkwood which is not grown here, but enters free of duty. This now gives to the beforementioned few manufacturers the exclusive privilege of making and selling more than three-fourths of all the corks consumed in this country; and 15 cents per pound duty would give them the absolute monopoly of the trade and absolutely prevent importation—the goal they aim for.

We repeat again that 5 cents per pound is full and more than full duty, and it is by far more than any other country imposes, as can be seen by the following table:

In England, corks are free.

Corks pay—		Cents.
In France	large sizes, per pound	1⅘
Do	other sizes, per pound	1.1
In Holland	all sizes, per pound	1.9
In Switzerland	do	⅗
In Norway and Sweden	do	1
In Denmark	do	1⅗
In Germany	do	1⅘
In Austria	do	2.5
In Italy	do	1½
In Russia	do	4.5
		Per cent.
In Belgium	ad valorem	10

We trust, therefore, that when the subject comes before your honorable body for debate you will take the necessary steps to thwart the mercenary object that these few persons have in view, and give your vote for justice and the interests of the masses of the people.

Your obedient servants,

THE IMPORTERS OF CORKS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER, *M. C.*

CUTLERY AND GUNS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May* 7, 1890.

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr.,

Chairman Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned, wholesale dealers in hardware, cutlery, and guns in the West, have come to Washington in person to protest as vigorously as possible against any increase in the duties on cutlery and guns, as is now proposed by bill H. R. 9416.

We represent houses that distribute fully 75 per cent. of all the cutlery sold west of the Alleghany Mountains and 80 per cent. of all guns sold in same section of country. Among our number is the largest gun dealer in the world and the largest purchaser of cutlery in America. We are importers as well as wholesale dealers.

Being thoroughly familiar, as we are, with the conditions of the manufacture of these goods, both in this country and abroad, we unhesitatingly say that such legislation is not a necessity for protection, is unwise, is impolitic, and almost prohibitory;

That much of the information and testimony from the manufacturers is distinctly misleading and does not present the facts as they exist;

That from our personal knowledge the enactment of a law of the kind proposed is universally and with scarcely an exception opposed by the dealers in these goods in the West, Northwest, and Southwest, and unpopular to a degree that is not realized here at th e seat of Government;

That we most earnestly hope and pray, for the good of the country at large, the trade in general, and the welfare of the party in power, the bill may be defeated.

Very respectfully,

E. C. Simmons, president Simmons Hardware Company, St. Louis, Mo.; John Alling, of Markley, Alling & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Charles H. Shultz, of Shultz & Hosea, St. Joseph, Mo.; Walton N. Moore, treasurer Kansas City Hardware Company, Kansas City, Mo.; Charles J. Schmelzer, of J. T. Schmelzer & Sons, Kansas City, Mo., Leavenworth, Kans.; E. B. Sears, secretary and treasurer of the Henry Sears Company, Chicago, Ill.; Frank Shapleigh, vice-president of The A. F. Shapleigh Hardware Company, St. Louis, Mo.; Richards & Conover Hardware Company, J. Conover, treasurer, Kansas City, Mo.; E. C. Meacham, president E. C. Meacham Arms Company, St. Louis, Mo.; Charles D. Seeberger, of A. F. Seeberger & Co., Chicago, Ill.

POTATO STARCH.

[Chas. Morningstar & Co. Philadelphia office, 48 North Delaware avenue; Boston office, 165 Milk street.]

NEW YORK, *March* 6, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We addressed you a short time ago relative to the proposed increase in the tariff on dextrine (a potato-starch product), which was desired for the benefit of a monopoly to be established. To-day we call your attention to the fact that a combine on starch and starch products has been formed, protected by the high tariff on these articles. The inclosed clipping from to-day's New York Herald gives particulars of the starch trust. We defer burdening you with any details in refutation of the gross misstatements given in the prospectus of Mr. Chapin (which we hope you will carefully read). We confine ourselves to stating the facts, that starch has not in twenty years sold above 5 cents per pound, and that the value of the nineteen starch factories, estimated at $10,200,000, has been enormously exaggerated, the extreme worth of these plants not exceeding $5,000,000. The promoters of the starch trust contemplate, therefore, a watering of values of about 100 per cent, evidently intending to float this bogus stock on a confiding and innocent public.

The tariff at present protects the starch industry by duties ranging from 95 per cent. to 120 per cent., to the detriment of the numerous consumers of this necessity in our country.

We trust when this question is before the Ways and Means Committee you will, as you have always done in the past, protect the consumers in this country against trusts and monopolies, which are now being organized in starch products, dextrine, etc.

The duty on starch should be reduced to 1 cent per pound, equivalent to 40 per cent. of the present market price.

We hope these lines will have your earnest attention, and beg to remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

CHAS. MORNINGSTAR & CO.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Copy of petition from electrical manufacturers and stove manufacturers in all parts of the country. Business interests affected which employ tens of thousands of workingmen and over $100,000,000 capital.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition your honorable bodies to retain the article mica on the free-list, where it now is, on the ground that the imposition of a duty would be a burden upon the manufacturing interests using this article.

MANUFACTURERS OF ELECTRICAL MACHINERY, ETC.

Edison Machine Works, Schenectady, N. Y.; Thompson-Houston Electric Company, Lynn, Mass.; Westinghouse Electric Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; United States Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Arnoux-Hochhausen Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; A B C Motor Company, New York, N. Y.; H. E. & C. Baxter, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Bergmann & Co., New York, N. Y.; The Bryant Electrical Company, Bridgeport, Conn.; S. W. Baird, St. Louis, Mo.; Geo. E. Bowers, Fitchburg, Mass.; C. & C. Motor Company, New York, N. Y.; Cleveland Motor Company, New York, N. Y.; Geo. F. Card Manufacturing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio; Connecticut Motor Company, Plantsville, Conn.; Continental Dynamo Company, New York, N. Y.; Detroit Electrical Works, Detroit, Mich.; Detroit Motor Company, Detroit, Mich.; Julian F. Dennison, New Haven, Conn.

Denver Light and Heat and Power Company, Denver, Colo.; Des Moines Street Railway Company, Des Moines, Iowa; Davenport Electrical Street Railway Company, Davenport, Iowa; Thomas H. Dallett, Philadelphia, Pa.; Excelsior Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Empire City Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Eddy Electric Manufacturing Company, Windsor, Conn.; Electric Construction and Supply Company, New York, N. Y.; Elektron Manufacturing Company, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Eureka Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Easton Electrical Company, New York, N. Y.; Electrical Light, Heat, and Power Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Electrical Light, Heat, and Power Company, Carbondale, Pa.; Erie Motor Company, Erie, Pa.; Federal Street and Pleasant Valley Railroad Company, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Fisher Electric Company, Detroit, Mich.; Fort Wayne Electric Company, Fort Wayne, Ind.; T. W. Gleason & Co., Boston, Mass.; C. M. Griffen, Kansas City, Mo.; The E. S. Greeley Company, New York, N. Y.; Gilliland Electric Company, Adrian, Mich.; Heisler Electric Light Company, St. Louis, Mo.; Hawkeye Electric Manufacturing Company, Davenport, Iowa; Hess Electrical Works, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Honesdale Iron Works, Honesdale, Pa.; Holland & Thompson Manufacturing Company, St. Paul, Minn.; Hiram M. Howard & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; Hobart Electrical Company, Middletown, Ohio; Jenney Electric Company, Indianapolis, Ind.; The Jones Brothers Electric Company, Cincinnati, Ohio; Leib Machine Works, New York, N. Y.; Mather Electric Company, Manchester, Conn.; Midland Electric Manufacturing Company, Omaha, Nebr.; Manhattan Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Morris McGraw, New Orleans, La.; Augustus Noll & Co., New York, N. Y.; New Century Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Northwestern Electric Supply Company, Seattle, Wash.; Roland T. Oakes & Co., Holyoke, Mass.; A. Pecoux, New Orleans, La.; Queen City Electric Company, Cincinnati, Ohio; Quicker & Graybill, York, Pa.; J. W. Queen & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; D. Rosseau, New York, N. Y.; River and Rail Electric Company, New York, N. Y.

Richmond Light, Heat and Power Company, Staten Island, N. Y.; Charles M. Rumrill, New York, N. Y.; A. J. Sweeney & Son, Wheeling, W. Va.; Shaw Electric Crane Company, Milwaukee, Wis.; St. Louis Electric Company, St. Louis, Mo.; The Electric Appliance Manufacturing Company, Waterbury, Conn.; United States Illuminating Company, New York, N. Y.; Western Electric Company, Chicago, Ill.; Weston Electric Instrument Company, Newark, N. J.; Webster, Camp & Lane Machine Company, Akron, Ohio; York Electric Company, York, Pa.; The Knapp Electrical Works, Chicago, Ill.; Foree Bain, Chicago, Ill.; Belding Motor and Manufacturing Company, Chicago, Ill.; Sperry Electric Company, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago Edison Company, Chicago, Ill.; The Clark Electric Company, New York, N. Y.; Bell Electric Light Company, New York, N. Y.; E. L. Tunis, Baltimore, Md.; Inman Manufacturing Company, Amsterdam, N. Y.; The Crocker-Wheeler Electric Motor Company, New York, N. Y.

MANUFACTURERS OF STOVES, ETC.

Richardson & Boynton Company, New York, N. Y.; Abendroth Bros., New York, N. Y.; J. L. Mott Iron Works, New York, N. Y.; Union Stove Works, New York, N. Y.; Manhattan Stove Works, New York, N. Y.; Ely & Ramsey Stove Company, New York, N. Y.; Southard, Robertson & Co., New York, N. Y.; Albany Stove Company, Albany, N. Y.; Art Stove Company, Detroit, Mich.; Armstrong & Co., Perryville, Md.; Baldwin & Graham, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Bissel & Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Buckwalter Stove Company, Royersford, Pa.; Blemker Stove Company, Evansville, Ind.; Bonnett & Nance, Quincy, Ill.; Burdett, Smith & Co., Troy, N. Y.; Bussey & McLeod Stove Company, Troy, N. Y.; Boyer & McMaster, Dayton, Ohio; Bloomington Stove Company, Bloomington, Ill.; E. Bement & Son, Lansing, Mich.

Bridgeford & Co., Louisville, Ky.; Brand Stove Company, Milwaukee, Wis.; Bridge Beach Manufacturing Company, St. Louis, Mo.; Buck Stove and Range Company, St. Louis, Mo.; Barstow Stove Company, Providence, R. I.; Bartlett-Hayward Company, Baltimore, Md.; B. C. Bibb & Co., Baltimore, Md.; L. C. Beardsley, Cleveland, Ohio; Cleveland Co-operative Stove Company, Cleveland, Ohio; Chicago Stove Works, Chicago, Ill.; Cribben, Sexton & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Cutler & Proctor Stove Company, Peoria, Ill.; Co-operative Fidelity Company, Rochester, N. Y.; Co-operative Stove Works, Buffalo, N. Y.; Co-operative Stove Works, Troy, N. Y.; Chicago and Erie Stove Works, Erie, Pa.; Abram Cox Stove Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; Cobb Stove and Machine Company, Taunton, Mass.; Dighton Furnace Company, Dighton, Mass.; Detroit Stove Works, Detroit, Mich.; R. E. Deitz Company, New York, N. Y.; Enterprise Stove Company, Vincennes, Ind.

C. Emrich, Columbus, Ohio; Eagle Stove Foundry Company, Fall River, Mass.; Fuller-Warren Company, Troy, N. Y.; Fisher, Leaf & Co., Louisville, Ky.; Fisher, Pfingst & Co., Louisville, Ky.; Foster Stove Company, Ironton, Ohio; W. P. Ford & Co., Concord, N. H.; M. L. Filley, Saugatuck, Conn.; Floyd, Weil & Co., Royersford, Pa.; Finch & Co., New York, N. Y.; A. B. Fales, Troy, N. Y.; Favorite Stove Works, Piqua, Ohio; Gem City Stove Manufacturing Company, Quincy, Ill.; Great Western Stove Company, Leavenworth, Kans.; Grander & Co., Royersford, Pa.; Gibson-Lee Manufacturing Company, Chattanooga, Tenn.; E. P. Gleason Manufacturing Company, New York, N. Y.; Hess, Snyder & Co., Massillon, Ohio; Z. Hunt, Hudson, N. Y.

Hoyt & Wyncoop, Troy, N. Y.; Hammond & Co., Geneseo, Ill.; Cortland Howe Ventilating Stove Company, Cortland, N. Y.; Indianapolis Stove Company, Indianapolis, Ind.; Charles Kibler, jr. & Co., Denver, Colo.; Keeley Stove Company, Columbia, Pa.; Keokuk Stove Works, Keokuk, Iowa; F. and L. Kahn & Bro., Hamilton, Ohio; F. A. Klaine, Cincinnati, Ohio; Leibrandt & McDowell Stove Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lithgow Manufacturing Company, Louisville, Ky.; Lord & Stone, Otter River, Mass.; Lebanon Stove Company, Lebanon, Pa.; A. Lotze & Son, Cincinnati, Ohio; Littlefield Stove Company, Albany, N. Y.; Lapham Foundry Company, North Plymouth, Mass.; Myers Manufacturing Company, Cleveland, Ohio; Merion, Hertenstein & Co., Columbus, Ohio; March, Brownback & Co., Linfield, Pa.; Michigan Stove Company, Detroit, Mich.; Mount Penn Stove Works, Reading, Pa.

Moser & Werhle, Newark, Ohio; Madison Stove Company, Madison, Ind.; Ohio Stove Company, Tiffin, Ohio; Bellaire Stove Company, Bellaire, Ohio; Pittston Stove Company, Pittston, Pa.; Plymouth Foundry Company, Plymouth, Mass.; Phillips & Clark, Geneva, N. Y.; Phillipsburgh Stove Works, Phillipsburgh, N. J.; Perry & Co., Albany, N. Y.; Peninsular Stove Company, Detroit, Mich.; Portland Stove Foundry Company, Portland, Me.; D. E. Paris & Co., Troy, N. Y.; V. Quarre & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Rathbone, Sard & Co., Albany, N. Y.; William Resor & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio; James Reed & Sons, Warren, Ohio; J. H. Rolliker & Co., Evansville, Ind.; Raymond & Campbell, Middletown, Pa.; Richmond Stove Company, Norwich, Ct.; Roberts, Scypes & Co., Quakertown, Pa.

W. L. Sharp & Son, Steubenville, Ohio; South Erie Iron Works, Erie, Pa.; Scanlon & Co., Louisville, Ky.; Stratton, Terstegge & Co., Louisville, Ky.; Somerset Co-operative Foundry Company, Somerset, Mass.; S. B. Sexton & Co., Baltimore, Md.; Swinton, Shimer & Co., Port Jervis, N. Y.; Taplin, Rice & Co., Akron, Ohio; Thomas Roberts Stevenson Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; Terstegge, Gohman & Co., New Albany, Ind.; O. G. Thomas, Taunton, Mass.; J. Van Wormer & Co., Albany, N. Y.; Victor Stove Company, Salem, Ohio; Van Bergen & Co., Carbondale, Pa.; John Van Range Company, Cincinnati, Ohio; Wood, Bishop & Co., Bangor, Me.; Western Stove Works, Peoria, Ill.; Weiskettle & Son, Baltimore, Md.; Yeager & Hunter, Spring City, Pa.

NEW YORK, *April* 12, 1890.

GENTLEMEN: It is difficult to account for the reasons that have induced you to include in the proposed tariff bill all nursery products in the way of trees and plants that have for a number of years past been admitted free. Some ten or a dozen years ago there was this duty of 20 per cent., which it was found did great injustice to the great mass of producers in this country, and was therefore taken off in the previous tariff revision. With a large acquaintance and correspondence all over the country, I am able to speak with some authority and understanding upon this question, and in behalf of this interest wish to protest against such duty again being levied.

The number of persons or the percentage in value that are in any way protected by any tariff upon products of this class is infinitesimal and in no way commensurate with the injury done to the thousands of persons engaged directly and indirectly, in the nursery and plant business. The product of nearly all nurseries, from Maine to California and from Canada to Texas, is largely dependent upon small seedling stocks, that are of necessity imported, and must, with or without a tariff, continue to come from that source in the future, as the growing of these stocks here is prohibited by climatic and other conditions over which Congress or the people have no control. This being the fact, for every one that is protected or benefited by any tariff, be it more or less, there are nine hundred and ninety-nine burdened with just that additional amount; besides this, every dollar added to the cost of these small seedling stocks which comprise a very large percentage in value and amount of all the importations of this kind, tends to make the competition in the great producing sections of the country all the closer and to demoralize a business conducted now upon very close margins, and one in no condition to stand any additional burdens. It is therefore to be hoped that you may see your way clear to amend this portion of the proposed bill, so as to allow all nursery or plant products to be admitted free as under the present law.

This return of conditions that were found impracticable and largely injurious years ago would be not only retrograding instead of advancing, but would certainly produce a reaction of sentiment among the thousands of intelligent business men and laborers now engaged in this business, even among those whose sympathies and sentiments would otherwise be with your committee in its laborious efforts to equitably adjust this important tariff matter.

If there are any points upon which information is desired relating to the above statement of facts or of the subject generally, I should be most happy in behalf of this interest to explain them or present additional facts in person or by letter, as most agreeable to your committee.

I remain, gentlemen, very truly yours,

FRED. W. KELSEY.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, *Chairman.*

OPPOSED TO THE TARIFF—A NUMEROUSLY SIGNED MEMORIAL SENT TO WASHINGTON—THE CIGAR MANUFACTURERS, MAKERS, AND CITIZENS UNITE IN PETITIONING CONGRESS TO AMEND THE TOBACCO TARIFF SCHEDULE OF THE M'KINLEY BILL.

The following memorial was forwarded to Washington to-day:

"BINGHAMTON, *April* 11, 1890.

"MY DEAR SIR: We, the cigar manufacturers of Binghamton, N. Y., feeling confident that if that part of the tariff bill contained in the tobacco schedule under Section F becomes a law the cigar-manufacturing interests of the country will be most injuriously affected, we, as cigar manufacturers, most earnestly recommend that the same be amended. As the bill now reads the proposed duty on the raw material will be considerably advanced, while the proposed increase in the duty on imported cigars is comparatively small; the result of such a change would be that the consumption of the latter would become far greater than now, while the production of cigars in this country would be greatly reduced. Another objection is that, although from the tenor of the tobacco clause it is evidently intended that the duty on unstemmed fillers shall remain at 35 cents, the greater part of the latter should be made liable to a duty of $2, from the fact that almost every bale of so-called fillers contains 'some leaves fit for wrapping purposes.'

"We recommend that a duty of 50 cents per pound be put upon all imported tobacco, whether fillers or wrappers, as the consumption of the American product in the form of fillers would thereby be considerably increased, and that a specific duty of $5 per pound be imposed on imported cigars, in order to give the home manufacturer sufficient protection.

"We must also protest against a continuance of the use of the import stamp on cigars made in other countries. It is unjust to the American manufacturer that this distinguishing mark should appear on the foreign article. The sentiment among our employés is the same as our own. We employ —— hands.

"Yours very truly,

"Reynolds, Rogers & Co.; Binghamton Cigar Company, Pratt, Imhoff & Co., proprietors; F. Schubmehl; Carter & Darrow; Geo. A. Kent & Co.; Lyman Clock, Son & Co.; Smith & Champion; VanWormer, Gumberg & Co.; Charles Butler; C. B. Smith, jr., & Co.; the Rossville Manufacturing Company; Hull, Grummond & Co.; Ostrom, Barnes & Co.; Wm. H. Ogden & Co.; Cox & Sears; Wright, O'Connor & Co.; Dewilegar & Hollister; Isaac Hanchett; F. R. Keyes & Co.; F. B. Richards & Co.; Cooke & Strickland.

"Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
"*Care of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*"

The following, signed by several thousand cigar makers and packers, has also been forwarded to Washington:

"We, the undersigned cigar makers and packers of the city of Binghamton, do most respectfully protest against the passage of that part of the tariff bill embodied in section F, under the head of 'Tobacco,' as it would ruin the cigar industry of the country. We would request that the import stamp now put on all boxes containing imported cigars by the Government be abolished, that the duty on imported cigars be $5 a pound, and that a uniform duty of 50 cents a pound be put on imported tobacco, irrespective of grade."

The following, signed by citizens of all classes and conditions, was also sent to Washington:

"The undersigned, residents of the city of Binghamton, in the State of New York, respectfully protest against placing a duty of $2 per pound upon Sumatra tobacco, and respectfully petition that a uniform duty of 50 cents per pound be placed thereon."

LINENS.

Whereas the bill known as the "McKinley tariff bill," now pending, proposes to raise the duty on linen goods counting less than seventy-five or in some instances one hundred threads to the square inch from 35 per cent., as at present, to 50 per cent. ad valorem and 3 cents per pound; and

Whereas said advanced rate of duty is equivalent to 62 to 116 per cent. ad valorem, according to the grade of material, the cheaper goods being thereby taxed the highest; and

Whereas the stated purposes of said bill are "to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports," and yet it in reality increases the rate of duty on a large proportion of linen goods consumed in the United States from 100 to 200 per cent.:

Be it resolved by the Linen Trade Association of New York in public meeting assembled, That we earnestly protest against the proposed increase of duty for the following reasons:

First. The proposed measure would largely increase the revenue, instead of diminishing it.

Second. Because there are no linen goods manufactured in this country of any importance, and also because the establishment of any such industry would be attended by almost insurmountable difficulties, owing to climatic and other adverse conditions well known to all practical men in the trade. In proof of which we would cite the fact that several attempts that have been made in this direction have been unsuccessful.

Third. Because the introduction of mixed rates of duty will lead to endless confusion in the trade and place upon the already crowded water front of New York additional difficulties, owing to the time required in weighing the importations as they arrive, which would practically result in an embargo on the commerce of the port.

Fourth. The inequality and injustice of the proposed rates are apparent from the fact that fine linens (counting over seventy-five or one hundred threads) are admitted at 35 per cent., while common household linens and canvases, which are required in every American home, are taxed at the excessively high rates already stated. Thus the luxuries of the rich pay a duty of 35 per cent., while the necessities of every workingman are oppressively taxed, in some cases as high as 116 per cent.: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Linen Trade Association respectfully request that no advance be made on the existing rate of duty for the reasons already set forth, and also because the proposed charge would seriously disorganize an important branch of business in which is invested in this country many millions of dollars in capital, and in which are interested a large number of citizens of the United States, both as employers and employed.

We, Richard H. Ewart, president, and Robert McBratney, secretary, of the Linen Trade Association of the city of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, complete, and correct copy of the resolutions adopted by the committee appointed by said association with full power to act in the matter.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands at the city of New York this 22d day of April, 1890.

RICHARD H. EWART, *President.*
ROBERT MCBRATNEY, *Secretary.*

CITY, COUNTY, AND STATE OF NEW YORK, *ss:*

On this 22d day of April, A. D. 1890, before me personally came Richard H. Ewart, president, and Robert McBratney, secretary of the Linen Trade Association of the city of New York, to me personally known, and known to me to be the individuals described in and who executed the foregoing certificate, and they severally acknowledged that they executed the same.

[SEAL.] CHARLES E. SIMMS, JR.,
Notary Public, New York County.

FLAX AND JUTE GOODS.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

The undersigned, importers and dealers in flax and jute goods, would respectfully make the following statement:

The present rate of duty on brown and bleached linens, ducks, canvas, paddings, diapers, table damasks, napkins, towels, crash, huckabacks, handkerchiefs, lawns, and other manufactures of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp is the component material of chief value, not otherwise provided for, is 35 per cent. ad valorem.

This rate of duty, as your petitioners believe and most respectfully aver, is a burden upon the commerce of the country and a needless tax upon the people, and that all concerned will be greatly advantaged by a reduction in such rate, so that the class of merchandise above named (the same being more particularly specified in Schedule J of the act approved March 3, 1883, known as chapter 121 of the laws of the United States, passed during the second session of the Forty-seventh Congress of the United States), may pay a rate of duty not in excess of 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Your petitioners are informed through the public press that in the proposed tariff bill now before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Schedule J, in items 364 and 364A, provides for an increase of duty of more than 100 per cent. in the form of a specific and ad valorem tax.

The reasons why your petitioners entertain the belief that this rate of duty should not be increased, but should be reduced to or below 20 per cent. ad valorem, are as follows:

First. None of these goods are manufactured in the United States, excepting a few coarse fabrics, almost the entire consumption of this country being imported from abroad and largely used as a raw material for remanufacture.

Second. Your petitioners are of the belief that it is impossible for most of such goods to be manufactured here, because, first, while the raw material of an inferior quality and suitable to the production of certain kinds of merchandise is grown in this country, climatic conditions prevent the successful cultivation and treatment of such a quality of the raw material as is required for the manufacture of most of said linen fabrics; and, second, one of the processes in the manufacture of such goods, to wit, the process known as bleaching, can not be successfully performed, owing to the like absence of moisture and certain other climatic elements, without which such process can not be carried on.

Third. Large quantities of linen fabrics are cut up and manufactured in the United States into various articles of domestic consumption, the most important of which are white linen for shirts, collars, and cuffs; elastics, ducks, paddings, and hollands for use in manufacturing woolen clothing for men's wear; brown linens, drills, etc., for men's wear; printed lawns, etc., for ladies' suits, besides similar materials for trunk, sachel, and shoe linings. If the linen used in the manufacture of the above-enumerated articles (for which purposes it is practically raw material) could be imported at a lower rate of duty, a large export trade could be done, especially in collars and shirts, thereby giving a very large outlet for cotton goods, which are the component of chief value in this manufacture. A large industry, notwithstanding the existing excessive rate of duty, as above named, has already grown up within the United States, and your petitioners are convinced that if such rate of duty should be lowered, so that these articles of wearing apparel, etc., could be produced at a reduced cost, this industry would immediately assume much larger proportions, and would enable the various manufacturers of the United States not only to increase the

present domestic consumption, but also to largely supply the markets of the Dominion of Canada, of Mexico, and of the various States of South America.

We therefore respectfully recommend and request that the rate of duty on all manufactures of flax and on all articles of which flax is the component material of chief value now paying 35 per cent. may not be increased, but reduced so as not to exceed 20 per cent. ad valorem.

E. S. Jaffray & Co., dry-goods jobbers, 350 Broadway, New York, N. Y; Lee, Tweedy & Co., dry-goods jobbers, 86 and 88 Worth street, New York, N. Y.; Rice, Stix & Co., dry-goods jobbers, 361 Broadway street, St. Louis, Mo.; John Dougan & Co, tailors' trimmings, 364 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Sylvester Bell & Co., dry goods jobbers, 503 and 505 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Richard H. Ewart, importer, 115 and 117 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; J. W. Goddard & Sons, tailors' trimmings, 516 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Lesher, Whitman & Co., tailors' trimmings, 502 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Fechheimer, Goodkind, & Co., clothing manufacturers, 746 and 750 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; E. J. Denning & Co., dry goods, retail, Broadway and Tenth street, New York, N. Y.; Hilton, Hughes & Denning, dry-goods jobbers, Broadway and Ninth street, New York, N. Y.; James McCutcheon & Co, dry goods, retail, 64 W. Twenty-third street, New York, N. Y.; Alfred Benjamin & Co., clothing manufacturers, 104 Bleecker street, New York, N. Y.; Hammerslough, Sachs & Co., clothing manufacturers, 98 Bleecker street, New York, N. Y.; Hammerslough Bros., clothing manufacturers, 478 and 482 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

James McCreery & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, 805 Broadway, corner Eleventh street, New York, N. Y.; Keep Manufacturing Company, shirt, cuff, and collar manufacturers, 809–811 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Sweetser, Pembrook & Co., dry-goods jobbers, 374 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Butler, Clapp & Co., dry-goods jobbers, 365 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Tefft, Weller & Co., dry-goods jobbers, 328 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; S. W. Richardson, importer, 84 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; D. Carlisle, importer, 100 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; R. McBratney, importer, 120 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; J. B. Locke & Potts, importers, 81–83 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; Douglass, Berry & Co., importers, 82 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; Lamb & Griesbach, importers, 85 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; Ferguson, Weiler & Co., importers, 103 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; V. Henry Rothschild & Co., shirt manufacturers, 43 Leonard street, New York, N. Y.; J. Galt Smith & Co., importers, 44 White street, New York, N. Y.; Henry Matier & Co., importers, 17–19 White street, New York, N. Y.

H. Bernheim & Co., shirt manufacturers, 15 White street, New York, N. Y.; Tim & Co., collar and cuff manufacturers, 87 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; Tim, Wallerstein & Co., shirt manufacturers, 87 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; D. A. Lindsay, importer, 38 White street, New York, N. Y.; Donald Macleod, & Co., importers, 293 Church street, New York, N. Y.; E. N. & W. H. Tailer & Co., importers, 43 and 45 White street, New York, N. Y.; Wilmerding & Bisset, importers, 76 Leonard street, New York, N. Y.; James Thompson & Co., importers, 112 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; Acheson, Harden & Co., importers, 107 and 109 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.; James Scott & Sons, per E. R. Biddle, attorney, importers, 73 Leonard street, New York, N. Y.; Anderson, Churchill & Co., importers, 84 Leonard street, New York, N. Y.; James F. White & Co., importers, 54 and 56 Worth street, New York, N. Y.; I. Frank & Co., shirt manufacturers, 47 and 49 White street, New York, N. Y.; Remy, Schmidt & Pleissner, importers, 43 and 45 White street, New York, N. Y.; Charles Brown & Co., importers, 292 Church street, New York, N. Y.; John Graham & Co., importers, 87 Franklin street, New York, N. Y.

Marshall Field & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, Chicago, Ill.; James H. Walker & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, Chicago, Ill.; Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., dry goods jobbers, Chicago, Ill.; Storm & Hill, dry goods jobbers, Chicago, Ill.; C. F. Hovey & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, Boston, Mass.; Shepard, Norwell & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, Boston, Mass.; R. H. White & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, Boston, Mass.; Jordan, Marsh & Co., dry goods, wholesale and retail, Boston, Mass.; Beal, Higgins & Henderson, dry goods, wholesale and retail, Boston, Mass.; Jackson, Mandell & Daniell, dry goods jobbers, Boston, Mass.; Farley, Harvey & Co., dry goods jobbers, Boston, Mass.; Wilson, Larrabee & Co., dry goods jobbers, Boston, Mass.; Bradford, Thomas & Co, dry goods jobbers, Boston, Mass.; Wheeler, Blodgett & Co., dry goods jobbers, Boston, Mass.; Chandler & Co., dry goods, retail, Boston, Mass.; R. & R. Gilchrist, dry goods, retail, Boston, Mass.; T. D. Whitney & Co., dry goods, retail, Boston, Mass.; R. H. Stearns & Co., dry goods, retail, Boston, Mass.; Houghton & Dutton, dry goods, retail, Boston, Mass.; William S. Butler & Co., dry goods, retail, Boston, Mass.

PROTEST OF DEALERS IN HOSIERY AND UNDERWEAR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April* 29, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is especially called to the accompanying papers, which are copies of a protest against any change in the present rate of tariff on hosiery and underwear, filed to-day with the Ways and Means Committee by a committee representing the combined interests of dealers in foreign hosiery in the United States.

This protest is signed by all the leading houses in this branch of business in the country, without regard to party affiliations, representing an aggregate capital of over $600,000,000, who believe the proposed change in the tariff would result in serious injury to the commercial interests of the country.

You are respectfully requested to use your influence and vote to prevent any change in the hosiery and underwear schedules from the present law.

Respectfully,

OTTO HEINZE.
B. F. LARRABEE.
THOMAS BAINS.
J. H. EMERY.
E. N. TAILER.
H. N. PALMER.
THOMAS FIELD.

We, the undersigned, importers and dealers in hosiery and underwear, beg to call your attention to the proposed changed in the tariff, as per Schedule J, sections 350 and 351, which, if enacted, will destroy a business in which thousands of our citizens are directly interested, and by which many more are personally benefited.

If the present rate of duty were not amply sufficient for the protection of the domestic manufacturer, as loyal citizens we would not object to the proposed advance; but, knowing that the domestic industry is now fully protected, we offer our protest against any change in the existing rates, and would respectfully petition that the tariff on cotton hosiery and underwear remain as it is at present.

Respectfully submitted.

NEW YORK.

Tefft, Weller & Co., Dunham, Buckley & Co., Sweetser, Pembrook & Co., Butler, Clapp & Co., Heinze, Lowry & Co., O. K. Krause & Co., E. S. Jaffray & Co., Mills & Gibb, James McCreary & Co., Lord & Taylor, Stern Brothers, Simpson, Crawford & Simpson, R. H. Macy & Co., Hilton, Hughes & Denning, Arnold, Constable & Co., Seward & Tourtellot, Passavant & Co., Henry N. Palmer, Klein, Harriman & Co., Abegg, Daeniker & Co., Schafer, Schramm & Vogel, Schiff & Bodenheimer, Wesendonck, Lorenz & Co., Spielmann & Co., H. B. Claflin & Co., Syndicate Trading Company, A. Swan Brown, president; A. N. Loeb & Co., Fred. Vietor & Achelis, Edward Scheitlin & Co., Lee, Tweedy & Co., O. Jaffe & Pinkus, E. N. & W. H. Tailer & Co., Alex. D. Napier & Co., Robert Reis & Co., J. S. Lowrey & Co., Couturat & Co., Edw. Creutznachs, successor Verdier & Schultz, Renwick & Keenen, W. H. Riley & Co., Sylvester, Bell & Co., Weld, Colburn & Wilkens, Charles Goodman's Son, Weil, Haskell & Co., Gutman Bros., J. & M. Lehman, M. & C. Mayer, J. A. Schmidt, E. Stern.

BOSTON.

Claflin, Larrabee & Co., Walker, Stetson, Sawyer Company, Davis, Pitts & Co., Simons, Hatch & Whitten, Weil, Dreyfus & Co., Wheeler, Blodgett & Co., C. F. Hovey & Co., Russ, Cobb & Co., R. H. White & Co., Wilson, Larrabee & Co., William S. Butler & Co., Brown, Durrell & Co., Coleman, Mead & Co., Hawley, Folsom & Ronimus, Jordan, Marsh & Co., Beal, Higgins & Henderson, Shepard, Norwell & Co., Chandler & Co., Gross & Strauss, R. H. Sterns & Co., Simpson & Co., Houghton & Dutton.

PHILADELPHIA.

Young, Smyth, Field & Co., Joel J. Baily & Co., Pearce Brothers, A. R. McCowan & Co., Granville B. Haines & Co., Sharpless Brothers, Sullivan, Harker & Co., Skinner & Test, Cook & Brothers, Strawbridge & Clothier, Jacob Reed's Sons, Thomas Lalor & Co., Perkins & Co.

CHICAGO.

Marshall Field & Co., Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., James H. Walker & Co., Wilson Brothers, Edson, Keith & Co., Storm & Hill.

MILWAUKEE.

Gall & Frank Company, H. Stein, jr., & Brothers, Laudauer & Co.

DETROIT.

Edson, Moore & Co., Burnham, Stœpel & Co., Strong, Lee & Co., Stanton, Sampson & Co., Schloss Brothers & Co., Lyon Brothers & Co., Monroe, Rosenfield & Co., Jacob Brown & Co., S. Simon & Co., George Hadzsits & Co.

SUGAR OF MILK.

NEW YORK, *May* 3, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Many thanks for your kind favor of the 1st instant, in reply to our petition forwarded through you to the Ways and Means Committee, protesting against the imposition of a duty upon sugar of milk.

We beg to advise that this is not a new industry. Chemists of ability and with capital have tried to make it here for years, but owing to the peculiar conditions of its manufacture on the other side they have never been able to compete and never will be able to compete. Farmers' sons and help in Holland, Southern Germany, and Switzerland make a little crude sugar of milk which they have as a perquisite for tobacco, etc., and traveling buyers go about the country and buy it up in a crude state, a little at a time, and take it to large mills, where it is refined and put on the market. In this way it can be produced at a very low figure.

We purchase from abroad 50,000 pounds of milk sugar at a time, and we think it most unfair and unjust that from six to ten thousand dollars per year should be taken out of our pockets and placed in the hands of one or two manufacturers who will never be able to compete either in quality or price with the milk sugar obtained from abroad. We bought a thousand pounds of milk sugar once from this manufacturer in New Jersey and found it discolored and a very poor article of sugar. Even if this duty were imposed we do not believe there are any manufacturers in this country who would be willing to so increase their facilities as to fill the demand, when perhaps next year or the year after the duty might be taken off. Milk sugar is used in medicinal preparations, and it would be a serious tax upon poor people if the price were increased. The way in which sugar of milk is mentioned in the McKinley bill looks to us as if it had designedly been put where it would not be easily seen.

Sulphate of morphia is made from the poppy, but it is not classed as a food product, but as a chemical product, and and so with sugar of milk; it is not a dairy product in any sense of the word.

We hope that through your kind assistance we may prevail upon the committee to leave this article free. The list which was forwarded to you is signed by every large wholesale jobbing and importing druggist in this city, and the list which was forwarded by a retail house up town embraced all the principal retail and dispensing chemists in New York City.

We are yours, very respectfully,

FAIRCHILD BROS. & FOSTER.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER,
Congressman of the Ninth Congressional District of New York.

NEW YORK, *April* 14, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Feeling confident that if that part of the tariff bill contained in the tobacco schedule under section F becomes a law the cigar-manufacturing interests of the country will be most injuriously affected, we, as cigar manufacturers, most earnestly recommend that the same be amended. As the bill now reads the proposed duty on the raw material will be considerably advanced, while the proposed increase in the duty on imported cigars is comparatively small; the result of such a change would be that the consumption of the latter would become far greater than now, while the production of cigars in this country would be greatly reduced. Another objection is that, although from the tenor of the tobacco clause it is evidently intended that the duty on unstemmed fillers shall remain at 35 cents, the greater part of the latter would be made liable to a duty of $2 from the fact that almost every bale of so-called fillers contains "some leaves fit for wrapper purposes."

We recommend that a duty of 50 cents per pound be put on all imported tobacco, whether fillers or wrappers, as the consumption of the American product in the form of fillers would thereby be considerably increased, and that a specific duty of $5 be imposed on imported cigars in order to give the home manufacturer sufficient protection.

We must also protest against a continuance of the use of the import stamp on cigars made in other countries. It is unjust to the American manufacturer that

this distinguishing mark should appear on the foreign article. The sentiment among our employés is the same as our own. We employ about one hundred hands.

Yours very truly,

SAM'L I. DAVIS & CO.

Hon. ROSWELL P. FLOWER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

PEARL BUTTONS.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

The undersigned, importers and dealers in pearl buttons, having been informed through the public press that in the proposed tariff bill now before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Schedule N, clause 422, provides for an increase of duty on pearl or shell buttons of 4 cents a line, or from 103 to 358 per cent. average increase on the great bulk of pearl buttons used in and imported into this country, as shown by the following scale of the four chief grades used by the masses:

SCALE.

Line.	Quality No. 1.		Quality No. 2.		Quality No. 3.		Quality No. 4.	
	Present cost per gross.	Proposed cost per gross.	Present cost per gross.	Proposed cost per gross.	Present cost per gross.	Proposed cost per gross.	Present cost per gross.	Proposed cost per gross.
18	$0.58	$1.30	$0.30	$1.02	$0.19	$0.91	$0.14	$0.86
20	.65	1.45	.35	1.15	.22	1.02	.16	.96
22	.76	1.64	.40	1.28	.28	1.16	.21	1.09
24	.87	1.83	.47	1.43	.33	1.29	.24	1.20
26	1.02	2.06	.56	1.60	.39	1.43	.30	1.34
28	1.20	2.32	.68	1.80	.50	1.62	.38	1.50
30	1.39	2.59	.83	2.03	.55	1.75	.45	1.65
Proposed increase	103 per cent.		187 per cent.		273 per cent.		358 per cent.	

The scale above shows the proposed increase to be disproportionate, and we, the subscribers, respectfully beg to recommend and request that no change be made on the present tariff rate.

It is evidently to the interest of the general public that any industry which may require protection by such enormous rates as shown above had better be abandoned altogether for the general good, and a tariff for revenue only be applied.

A tariff per line is a prohibitory and unreasonable tariff, and the poorer classes of citizens would suffer most from its enforcement.

For example: Take a twenty line now costing 16 cents per gross, used by the poorer classes, and a button of same size now costing 65 cents per gross, used by the wealthier classes, the specific or line duty as proposed would make the poor man pay 80 cents per gross more than it now costs him, or 500 per cent., whereas the wealthy man pays only the same specific duty of 80 cents per gross, or 123 per cent.

This example alone shows the absurdity of specific duty; but specific duty would also place disproportionate profits in the hands of a few domestic button-makers, to the disadvantage of the public. We pray, therefore, that the tariff by line or specific duty be struck from the proposed bill and only an ad valorem one be enforced, unless the articles be placed upon the free-list.

John Dougan & Co., 356 Broadway; John Thornton & Co., 345-347 Broadway; Pratt & Farmer, 353 Broadway; Dunham, Buckley & Co.; Sweetser, Pembrook & Co.; Calhoun, Robbins & Co.; Weiller, Strauss & Co.; Siegman Brothers, 370 Broadway; E. S. Jaffray & Co., 350 Broadway; Mills & Gibb, Broadway and Grand street; Aitkin, Son & Co., 873 Broadway; Fisk, Clark & Flagg, 686 Broadway; Hilton, Hughes & Denning, Broadway and Tenth street; E. J. Denning & Co., Broadway and Tenth street; R. H. Macy & Co., Sixth avenue, Thirteenth to Fourteenth streets.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that if the gentleman from New York insists upon having a vote upon his amendment in reference to oranges the Representatives of my State, my colleague and myself, will necessarily ask the privilege of being heard upon the amendment. But as there seems to be some doubt of his getting a vote upon it I will not at this time ask the attention of the committee, because I am aware of the fact that the sugar schedule is now under consideration.

Mr. MCKENNA addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. MCKENNA. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with my remarks I desire to ask unanimous consent to be permitted to continue for not exceeding a half an hour without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MCKENNA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered proposes a reduction of the rate in the existing law of duty on sugar of about 33 per cent. It retains the dividing line at 13 instead of at 16, and thereby secures to American refiners the refining of all sugars between those numbers which the pending bill, with, I think, unpatriotic purpose, sends to foreign refiners.

The amendment makes a greater reduction than the Mills bill did, and restores to sugar protection as understood and practiced by the Republican party, and therefore is not a case of raising rates or of lowering rates or a case where deference to the committee should obtain and prevail.

The bill, except in the sugar schedule, is brave and strong—strong because it is brave. It avows and executes Republican principles. In the sugar schedule it is timid, time-serving, and weak—weak because it is timid and time-serving. It denies and refuses to one great industry Republican principles. I offer the amendment, therefore, in the interest of the protective system, the interest every system must have in fair and clear consistency. I offer the amendment in the interest of the Republican party, the interest every party must have in fair and clear consistency.

In the report, sir, that I had the honor to submit to this House I said that the sugar schedule could not be justified on the principles upon which the bill was based and that it was not Republican. Both assertions can be established. I am not simple enough, Mr. Chairman, to suppose that a majority can be staid or retarded by a reference to its pledges. Power usually has not either conscience or compunction. But it may be well, sir, for us to know what the practical and political, if not the moral, effect will be.

The Chicago platform, which was framed by a convention which knew our economical and financial conditions and the relation of sugar to them, explicitly enumerated the ways and the means of reducing the revenue, and declared that the internal-revenue system should be destroyed "rather than to surrender any part of the protective system."

The sugar industry is a part of the protective system. It is surrendered by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, is not sugar an article "produced by our people"—I quote the platform—and capable of being produced by them, as capable as tin-plate is, as linen is, as cotton goods are, as capable as any other article is which requires the tilling of the soil and the exertion of labor and capital for its production? The apologies which have been pronounced on this floor for a bounty concede this; the report of the Committee on Ways and Means grudgingly concedes it, but accompanies the concession with the intimation that with bitter distinctness and in some mysterious way the duty on sugar is more of a tax than is the duty on any other article "not produced to the extent of our own wants." I quote the report.

This is confusing and deceptive. Why, sir, some of the most important articles in the bill are not produced to the extent of our wants, and no prophecy can say when they will be; articles which, if the condition is enforced, will go on the free-list and stay there and be there when sugar has fulfilled the utmost rigor of the condition and been restored to the dutiable list.

What is meant, anyhow, by "production to the extent of our wants," in the connection in which it is used? I do not mean as to sugar alone, but as to other things, for the inquiry stretches beyond sugar, and the answer may approve or disapprove the protective system itself. Is quantity alone meant—tons, yards, pounds of things? If so, at what price produced? The question is radical and important. At what price produced—at a foreign price? No, Mr. Chairman, but at an American price, a price which the bill concedes, which the system concedes, ay, boasts is higher than a foreign price, and better because it is higher. For in being higher there are in it life and hope and happiness for American workingmen. It is that higher price which means higher wages; which we say, in the eloquent language of Wendell Phillips, "lifts the workingman from the deadening level of mere toil, which means education, independence, self-respect, manhood."

This, sir, is the boast of the system, and the report of the committee shouts with very joy over it, and shall we now, sir, shiver and shake and whimper about its effects on sugar?

If we are not seeking the cheap for cheap's sake, the canting condition of "production to the extent of our wants" is foolish. It is worse; it is vicious. It points as distinctly as ever free-trader has pointed to the benefit of buying in the cheapest market. If we are seeking the cheap for cheap's sake, the protective system itself is condemned, for what is the use of "production to the extent of our wants" if it is not cheap production—cheaper tons, yards, and pounds of things than we can get anywhere else? So the condition of the committee falls utterly, therefore, as a principle.

Why, sir, wool is not "produced to the extent of our wants," and no one can predict when it will be. It is to-day a declining industry [applause on the Democratic side], and because it is a declining industry it is given increased protection by the pending bill; and yet, sir, in metaphor and proud distinction, it is called the keystone of the arch of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the committee is right the duty on it is a charge on the consumer [applause on the Democratic side]; and because it is a charge on the consumer it is repeated to the protection of the yarn, and the cloth, and the carpet manufacturers, to fall at last, if the committee is right, with unmitigated blow and burden on the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Paint an inch thick, and to this complexion must you come if you paint on the principles of the committee's report.

No, Mr. Chairman, we can not make sugar the scapegoat of the surplus without involving other things, without involving the protective system itself; and, believe me, sir, we have struck it a harder blow than any tariff-reformer or free-trader has ever struck or can strike, unless he strike on our principles; and, sir, will it not be odd if future Democratic Congresses shall quote a Republican Congress and put wool on the free-list on protection principles? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And why not?

They want to do it on their own principles; they may justify themselves on ours; the process is as easy in wool as it is in sugar. Belief and disbelief have no tests; either may be assumed, and where there is some evidence naturally entertained; and we know, sir, that it is disputed strongly and seriously disputed whether wool ever will attain to the eminence of "production to the extent of our wants." We see, Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] calls a "new departure" has its embarrassments. You can get no good guidance or good policies from makeshifts and shufflings. Our old-time policy, the policy of the platform, broad and national, will protect wool even if it does not increase in production a single pound.

It concerns too many people not to be a proper object of the most beneficent governmental policies. The same policy, broad and national, will protect sugar; it touches too many homes and can be made to touch too many homes to prosperity to be whistled down the wind by any such cant as "production to the extent of our wants."

I do not mean to say, Mr. Chairman, that the price of an article is never to be regarded by a protectionist, but I do say, and I repeat every protectionist when I say, that a reasonable price is the maximum of American cheapness, even if not as cheap as in England. Sugar to-day is at a reasonable price and yields this country immense and magnificent revenues without sensible burden [applause], revenues that it needs and that may be profitably employed. Sugar is cheaper in the United States to-day than it is in any country in the world but one. Of how many articles of all the thousands that this bill deals with can that be said? I repeat, sir, that sugar is cheaper in the United States to-day than it is in any country in the world but one, and that one is England. I had almost said, with the usual reproach of the protectionist, free-trade England; but, sir, I pause and refrain. Things are changing somewhat, and in this debate English example is set before us and English cheapness is displayed before us by voices that used to be eloquent and fierce against British influence and Cobden clubs.

But, sir, things are changing somewhat. Where will the stop be? What article next must be put on the free-list that we may get it as cheap as we can in England? But gentlemen say: "We give sugar a bounty, and is not a bounty protection?" Well, yes, of a certain kind it is, but it is an odious discrimination as well. In a sense it makes sugar contraband in the protective system. In the language of Mr. Cox, "it pauperizes the industry," points it out as a parasite on the Treasury and a beggar on the law. It puts the sugar business under police inspection as criminal and thrusts into its affairs the spies of the revenue department.

No person solicitous of his honor will accept such espionage under the name of protection or endure for a moment the suspicion that such situations always attract and, unfortunately, sometimes deserve. A bounty protection the disease of protection, rather a cancerous growth on it, with its discriminations and licenses and suspicions and spies and frauds! But, sir, if it be as good as gentlemen say it is, if it have the double virtue of encouraging home production and relieving from taxation, why not apply it to other things? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why not apply it to tin-plate [applause and cries of "Good!" on the Democratic side] and save at once, if the committee is right? You see I am only repeating its reasons; I am not indorsing them. [Laughter.] If the committee is right we will save at once $7,000,000 of revenue and taxation and many millions more before the bounty shall be paid to the full extent, and will give us always cheaper tin to go with cheaper sugar. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why not apply it to linen goods, which we do not produce, and save that revenue and taxation and give us always cheap linen to go with cheap tin and cheap sugar? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Why not apply it to wool until it, too, is "produced to the extent of our wants?" A bounty will work in these industries with as much beneficence as in sugar, shine with as much luster in them as in sugar. And think, sir, of the splendid political effect when the Republican party can point with pride—as parties always do point—when the Republican party can point with pride to the workingman and the farmer sitting down to a cheap breakfast in a cheap suit of clothes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Guardians of the party as we are, let us seize the opportunity and give her this brilliant record. [Laughter.] It may, it is true, spoil some eloquent denunciations that have been uttered on the floor of this House in the name of protection against cheapness, but after all they are only oratory, which, flexible and protean to any use, can turn its light and sweetness on the new glory of the Republican party and cheap things. [Laughter and applause.]

But, in sober earnest, why not apply a bounty to wool if the committee is right? I hope gentlemen observe my qualification every time: if the committee is right. [Laughter.] We produced, according to the report of the committee, 245,000,000 pounds of wool last year, about one-half of the home consumption if we consider all forms of wool. The duties reduced to a specific rate, the average would be about 9 cents a pound. That gives us $22,000,000 in round numbers as the tax on the consumer and increase of price for the wool-grower. The report also says that there were imported under all forms 350,000,000 pounds of unwashed wool. At the average duty of 9 cents a pound this will give us $31,000,000 in round numbers.

Now, sir, by paying a bounty of $22,000,000 to the wool-growers, which we have to pay anyhow if the committee is right [laughter], we save $31,000,000 to the consumers and the country and encourage home production as well—if the committee is right. [Laughter.] Thirty-one millions of dollars is a great deal of money, Mr. Chairman, and if we are in the saving business, and that alone, that money is well worth saving.

But, sir, I cut loose now from the committee. [Laughter.] All this talk about the charge and price to the consumers as individuals is nonsense from any thoughtful aspect of tariffs of any kind.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. They do not applaud that on the other side.

Mr. MCKENNA. No. I thought I would reach a place where they would not applaud. The important matter to the country, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is energy of production, implying in that diversity of industry and full and varied employment of the people and all the good, moral, social, and political, that comes from them. The important thing is not one-eighth of a cent on a dinner-pail, or a dollar per capita on sugar, or 80 cents per capita on wool. It is not, sir, that the tariff is a burden on the individual. It is not a burden on him; not because it is indirect, but because he does not feel it, or, if so, he feels it as the horse feels his rider, not burdened by him, but encouraged by him and animated to swifter flight and to victory in the race. [Applause.]

It is not, I repeat, an eighth of a cent saved or lost on a wretched dinner pail or a wretched pound of sugar, but it is that energy of production is gathered by the protective system from the people as the sun gathers moisture from the sea to fructify and gladden the earth, albeit sometimes in excess, sometimes in deficiency, but nevertheless giving us all the life we have and all the happiness we enjoy. This is the protective system. If it is not this, the sooner we are rid of it the better. If it is this, we belittle it and condemn ourselves when we pick out this or that article to howl about or this or that consumer to wail over and try to convince that he is burdened and wretched beyond all others. After you have succeeded in convincing him, do you think he will be satisfied with cheap sugar? After you have tossed that tub to discontent it will want other tubs. It will want every article in the protective system.

Mr. Chairman, I illustrated in my report the advantages of beet sugar to the country; I showed that in a beet-sugar factory in Alvarado, Cal., out of $105,000 of expenditure there were $41,000 paid to farmers and $27,000 paid directly as wages for labor in the factory. Similar factories can be multiplied.

For the next year the Alvarado factory has contracts with farmers for $150,000 worth of beets, and refused more. Is not this an industry worth preserving? Is it not too great to be odiously discriminated against? Why, sir, the beet-sugar industry is the splendidest industry in France to-day; it is the splendidest industry in Germany to-day; and it can be made just as splendid in the United States if we impartially and without odious discrimination give it the protection which we give to other industries.

I have no desire to dwell on this matter longer. I have gone over what I consider the important parts of the question. I think I have shown that the provision of the bill on this subject is a mistake.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I believe the gentleman has not indicated the precise character of the amendment he proposes.

Mr. MCKENNA. I thought I had done so. In my opening remarks I stated that my amendment reduced the existing duty 33 per cent. This is lower than the Mills bill proposed to reduce it. It gives a fair differential duty to the refiners.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. What per cent. ad valorem would that be?

Mr. MCKENNA. I can not answer that because the ad valorem percentages shift so much on account of the varying value of the sugar.

A MEMBER. About what?

Mr. MCKENNA. About 45 per cent.

Now, I say to the Republicans that I think the matter is worthy of serious consideration. I think the Committee on Ways and Means has made a mistake. It appears to have acted under the influence of a scare about the surplus, and has cast to the pursuit of the tariff reformer the most precious thing we have, as the Russian woman tossed her children to the pursuing wolves. Thanking the Committee of the Whole for its kind indulgence, I will yield the floor.

Mr. BLAND. Does the gentleman's amendment make a corresponding reduction on refined sugar?

Mr. MCKENNA. Yes, sir; I make a relative and proportionate reduction all the way through. I give to the refiners only that to which from the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee they are entitled. I myself heard a refiner say to the gentleman who sits before me [Mr. GEAR] that he would give him a thousand dollars a day to stand his—the refiner's—losses. So I say the condition of the sugar-producing industry requires this protection; the condition of the refining interest requires it, and I hope it will be given.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Does the amendment of my friend look to the protection of the refiners or is its prime object the encouragement of the industry of this country in the production of sugar, both beet and cane?

Mr. MCKENNA. I have had both objects in view. I have in this amendment sought to discriminate against neither the one nor the other. According to the views I entertain, every man and every firm engaged in industry is entitled to protection.

Mr. CANNON obtained the floor and said: Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan). The gentleman, as the Chair understands, has unanimous consent to address the Committee of the Whole for ten minutes.

Mr. GEAR. He has ten minutes from the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA], who controls the time on this side.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not understand that there has been any arrangement in regard to the time.

Mr. WILKINSON. I suggest that we now adopt an arrangement giving one hour to each side of the question.

Mr. GEAR. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MCKINLEY] stated that he would permit the debate on this question to run along for awhile until some limit of time might be agreed upon on both sides.

Mr. HOLMAN. It seems to be assumed that some agreement as to the amount of time that shall be occupied on this proposition has been reached. I understand there is no agreement except that the gentleman from California was accorded twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands now that the five-minute rule is in operation, that the proposition made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] was withdrawn by him, and that debate is now running on without any arrangement. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent——

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now ask consent that debate on this question be confined to two hours, one hour on each side.

Mr. HEARD. Does the gentleman mean two hours in addition to the time already occupied?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEARD. I object to that.

Mr. BLAND. That would make the whole time two hours and a half.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Does the arrangement which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] now suggests include the giving of thirty minutes to my colleague [Mr. COLEMAN]?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Can we not agree on a night session?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Let us agree on this matter first.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. We want to know before disposing of this question whether we can have some further time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. That depends of course on the pleasure of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I suggest that in the allotment of the time gentlemen coming from the region where most of this product is made should be allowed proper opportunity to present their views. There are some of those gentlemen who had no opportunity to be heard in the general debate.

Mr. OATES. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio the propriety of settling that question now as to a night session, because some gentlemen would take very brief time here if they had any assurance of getting more time hereafter.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the sugar schedule and all amendments thereto be limited to two hours from this time.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to amend it by making it three hours.

Mr. HEARD. That will leave no time for any of the other amendments.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I will modify it by saying two hours and a half.

Mr. MCMILLIN. And the time to be equally divided between the two sides on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana as modified.

The question was taken, and the committee proceeded to divide.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will ask my friend from Indiana if he will not consent to two hours and fifteen minutes, to be equally divided?

Mr. HOLMAN. That would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Then I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the sugar schedule and all amendments thereto, be limited to two hours and fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. To be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. MCMILLIN. And exclusive of the time used.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio as controlling the time in favor of the committee's bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. And I would suggest that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILKINSON] control the time on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence and attention of the committee for the fifteen minutes that I have upon this schedule. I believe, with the exception of five minutes, I have not addressed the House upon this bill. I want to be heard in reply for a few minutes to the fallacious position taken in regard to this schedule by the gentleman from California, specious and misleading unless understood, and give the reasons which are sufficient to me why now, as heretofore, I am in favor of placing sugar upon the free-list, and if I can not give the reasons in harmony with the platform of the Republican party and with the principles of protection, then I am willing to forsake my position.

What is the position of the Republican party touching a protective system? I hold in my hand the platform of the party upon that subject:

> The Republican party favors such revision of the tariff law as will tend to check the importation of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production, except luxuries, the like of which can not be produced at home.

Is sugar a foreign production and a necessity that is not now and can not fairly be produced in the United States in sufficient quantities, or nearly sufficient quantities, in the reasonable future to supply our people or to regulate the world's cost of sugar? That is the question for us to consider. When that question is answered, the policy of the Republican party upon this item is outlined, in my opinion.

Now, what are the facts? Words are one thing, facts quite another. Last year the imports of sugar into the United States amounted to $93,000,000, $12,000,000 of which was free from the Sandwich Islands under the reciprocity treaty. The duties upon the sugar so imported amounted to $56,000,000. The production of sugar in the United States was but one-eighth of the consumption.

Mr. GEAR. And that was better than an average crop?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, better than an average crop, as I believe.

Now, $93,000,000 worth of sugar were imported, $12,000,000 of which were imported free of duty, upon which the duty was $56,000,000, and then we made in the United States one-eighth of the amount we consumed.

Yet it is claimed we have not had a fair chance to establish the sugar industry in the United States. My friend from Iowa, Governor GEAR, answered that proposition the other day when he said that for one hundred years no article has been protected like sugar. In that time we have collected, in round numbers, $1,500,000,000 of duty upon sugar and all the time the tariff was high enough for ample protection.

Mr. COLEMAN. Did the money go into the Treasury?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; it went into the Treasury, yielding a revenue duty—a revenue tariff—which in one hundred years has not enabled our people in the United States to establish the sugar industry to any sufficient degree to compete in the production of this article with the foreign producers, and thereby bring the price down at home or affect the price in foreign countries.

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

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield; I must decline; I do not mean, of course, to be discourteous, but I have but a few minutes.

Listen! Fact number 2: Less sugar is produced in this country now than there was thirty years ago. Think of that, gentlemen!

Now, then, I say that our friends upon the other side are consistent when they stand for a sugar duty, and the only defense they have ever given for standing for it is that it is a duty that yields pure, clean revenue; and therefore, it being a revenue duty, it is in harmony with the principles and the policy of the Democratic party. There is the whole story.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from California was not happy when he said that wool stood upon all fours with sugar, for the reason that when I see the production of wool last year in the United States under the present tariff amounted to 250,000,000 pounds, whereas the importation of wool last year was but one hundred and twenty-odd millions of pounds, showing that twice as much was produced at home as was imported, and home production was sufficient to control the price at home and help regulate the world's price of wool; I say that he has selected an unfortunate subject for his comparison. So you see it is not on all fours again.

Take iron, take steel, take hardware, take woolens, take cotton goods. In all of these cases they have not been protected one-third as much as sugar, but these industries have been established, the price has been cheapened, and we produce far more of all these articles than we import, and protection has protected. Therefore, because I am a Republican I am for removing this sugar duty, this revenue leech upon the protective system, and placing sugar upon the free-list, where it properly belongs.

Mr. PRICE. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. CANNON. I must decline because of the short time allotted to me; otherwise my friend knows that I would with pleasure.

Now, then, I see another thing. This sugar schedule, partly by accident—by accident I believe so far as Congress was concerned, but by intention so far as the selfish interests were concerned—the sugar schedule, as it now stands under the law, and as it would have stood

under the Mills bill, as it would stand under the amendment of the gentleman from California, is so arranged, not only as to charge the duty, every cent of it, upon the consumer in this country, but so arranged as to yield a profit of over 1 cent a pound in addition to the refiner as a pure bonus after every dollar of the cost has been paid for refining, including the placing of it in packages, amounting to nearly $30,000,000 per annum bonus to the refiners.

Mr. Chairman, the placing of sugar on the free-list will relieve each inhabitant, rich and poor, of $1 per annum of tax and of at least 50 cents of extortion levied by the sugar refiners.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California says we ought to keep this duty, reducing it one-fifth, but keep up the same discriminating juggling schedule; and he says that we ought to do that in the interest of beet-sugar production in the United States. Now, let me tell the gentleman from California where the shoe pinches him. Nearly twenty years ago we made a reciprocity treaty with the Sandwich Islands under which sugar produced there comes into this country free, and it has been coming every year since that time. Now, it is an open secret that Californians bought up the Sandwich Island plantations and own them to-day.

I am reliably informed that less than four men on the Pacific coast own the Sandwich Islands plantations and own the sugar product, and it comes into the United States without paying any duty. Last year there were 243,000,000 pounds of sugar came into the United States free from the Sandwich Islands, while 2,700,000,000 pounds of sugar imported paid over 2 cents a pound duty. The result was that every pound of the Sandwich Islands sugar the moment it landed in the United States had 2 cents added to its value. This amounted to $5,000,000 of profit last year to owners of the Sandwich Islands plantations.

Now, then, when you put sugar on the free-list, good by to the $5,000,000 of profit per annum to these four men. We have already contributed to them over $50,000,000 by that treaty, and in God's name, I ask my friend from California, are you going to stand forever and cry, "More, more?" My Democratic friends say your demand shall be granted. This bill denies your demand and puts that denial into law.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California asks, why give a bounty to the producers of sugar in the United States? Well, I answer my friend, I am not anxious to give a bounty, if you do not want it. My principal anxiety is to place sugar on the free-list and relieve the people from this great burden of taxation. This is good policy, and when I see an opportunity to reduce taxation which is levied upon all the people of the country, rich and poor alike, and which means taxation and exaction to the amount of nearly $90,000,000 a year, I will take that burden off, even if I have to do it at the expense of paying a bounty of 2 cents a pound for all the sugar produced in this country. That would only amount to $7,000,000 upon the amount of sugar now produced. We can well afford to pay it if at the same time we get rid of the $90,000,000 burden.

There is, perhaps, an equity in favor of the payment of a bounty to producers of sugar in the United States. For a hundred years they have been protected at the enormous cost before referred to. A bounty of 2 cents a pound will give them all the protection they have had heretofore. In addition to that, it is claimed that in the Dakotas, in Nebraska, in Kansas, and on the Pacific coast the sugar beet will grow as well and will produce as much sugar as it produces in Germany, and that protection or bounty of 2 cents a pound will in time so encourage the production of sugar from the sorghum, the cane, and the beet that we can largely produce in the United States the sugar that we consume.

And under the circumstances I am willing to try the experiment; for it is true that we import nearly $100,000,000 worth of sugar every year from foreign countries. It is also true that under a system of bounties in Germany, where they did not produce any considerable amount of sugar at all when the bounty was given, the production of sugar from the beet has so increased that nearly one-half of the sugar of the world is now produced there.

I am not in favor of bounties, as a rule. But I think, under all the circumstances, this is a proper exception. Nor are we without precedents in this matter, for we have given bounties for the promotion of the fisheries for many, many years, bounties for the establishment of the salt industry in Michigan, bounties for the construction of railways and canals, bounties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine, bounties for the promotion of agriculture, and for many other purposes. But if the voting of bounty for the production of sugar in the United States is a stumbling-block in the way of gentlemen, while I am willing to vote for it, yet we are for free sugar, with or without a bounty.

But gentlemen ask, Why not pay those who raise corn, or oats, or wheat a bounty? I answer, because those industries are established, and they do not need a bounty. What the agriculture of this country needs at this time more than ever before is a diversification of products.

Mr. Chairman, one word further. This is the third time since I served in this House that those who or rather whose constituents are interested in the duty upon sugar imported have appealed for a continuance of that duty for the purpose of developing the sugar industries from sorghum and from the beet. We are willing to give a bounty for the sorghum and the beet, and give it large enough to furnish all the protection that producers of sugar in the United States now receive. But I say to gentlemen, we will not, under the pretense of developing our sugar industry in this country, continue the duty upon sugar for the interest of those who make an extortionate profit from the duty.

And if anybody believes that we can produce beet sugar, as perhaps in the fullness of time we can, we will give them a chance.

Mr. GEAR. They produce it in Germany.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; they produce it in Germany and they produce it in France; that is true. But, Mr. Chairman, let us post books a moment——

Mr. GEAR. If we paid that bounty to whom would it go—to the producer of the beet or to the refiner?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, it would go to the man that raised the beet.

Mr. HEARD. It would not go into the Treasury.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. We can spare this money from the Treasury, which you now levy upon the rich and the poor alike, and it is the Republican policy——

Mr. HEARD. You mean that you levy upon them? You made the tariff laws of to-day, not we.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but you were standing opposing the tariff law when we made it and when it was necessary to have the revenue, and now, when it is not necessary and we want to roll a dollar a head off every inhabitant, you take your stand and say no.

Mr. HEARD. No; I am not with you in that. I am ready to roll; but I do not want to roll it all off the rich and put it upon the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, fifteen minutes is quite as long as I ought to have, as this debate is limited. There are other things that I would have been glad to say, and, in conclusion, I want to say just one thing more. I shall vote for this bounty if the people of Louisiana and the people who believe that we can make sugar from beets desire it, because we can give them this bounty and pay the bill with $7,000,000, and relieve ourselves of $56,000,000 of taxation. But when you come, gentlemen, and demand not only that you shall be protected, but insist that we shall further sustain this sugar-trust anaconda by a continuance of the present schedule, you ask too much; we draw the line there. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. VANDEVER. I want to make one suggestion to the gentleman from Illinois to which I ask his attention. He speaks of the California men who own the sugar plantations in the Sandwich Islands. I only want to say that those are the same gentlemen who are now engaged in California in promoting beet culture. They are paying out some $100,000 to $150,000 a year for that purpose, and now the gentleman wants to give them 2 cents a pound on that sugar in addition to what they get already.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; but they get $5,000,000 every year, out of which they can afford to pay under this arrangement of the sugar schedule $150,000 for the culture of the beet or any other purpose.

Mr. VANDEVER. To which you want to add 2 cents a pound on their beet sugar.

Mr. WILKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have read the sugar schedule as proposed in the tariff bill passed by the Democratic House two years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman take the floor for the purpose of addressing the committee and ask to have that read in his time?

Mr. WILKINSON. Yes, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

All sugars not above number 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic test as follows, namely:

All sugars not above number 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 polariscope not above 75 degrees, shall pay a duty of one and fifteen-hundredths cents per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay thirty-two thousandths of a cent per pound additional.

All sugars above number 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely:

All sugars above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard, 2.20 cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.40 cents per pound.

All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.80 cents per pound.

Molasses testing not above 56 degrees by the polariscope shall pay a duty of 2½ cents per gallon; molasses testing above 56 degrees shall pay a duty of 6 cents per gallon: *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.

Mr. WILKINSON. Mr. Chairman, that was the sugar schedule in the Mills bill, so called. In that schedule a reduction was made on the existing tariff of about 20 per cent. That, our people in Louisiana felt, was as far as they could go and their industries still prosper. Now, in this House, the Committee on Ways and Means has brought in a bill to put sugar on the free-list, and the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA], while changing that schedule, still imposes a duty on sugar far less than was imposed by the Mills bill passed by the Democratic House two years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield nineteen minutes of my time to my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, before entering into a discussion of this question I desire to call attention to a part of an article that was

read by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] in closing his remarks on the sugar schedule a few days since, which article was from The Crusader, of New Orleans, of the date of March 29, 1890, a paper which he said was recognized as the organ of the colored people of Louisiana. Knowing the gentleman from Iowa as well as I do and having for him the most profound regard and respect, I know that when he made that statement he certainly believed it was true. At the end of that article are these words:

A deep cut in the tariff would free the laborers from the thralldom of their overbearing taskmasters and the citizens of the said Congressional district from the autocratic rule of an oligarchy of a few large landed proprietors.

Mr. GEAR. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment? I understand him to state that that paper is not the organ of the colored people of Louisiana?

Mr. PRICE. I have not yet finished my statement.

Mr. GEAR. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PRICE. Immediately after the gentleman from Iowa made that speech I telegraphed to Louisiana to ascertain whether or not The Crusader represented the sentiments of the colored people of the sugar district.

From a large number of telegrams and petitions which I have received I desire to read one or two and publish the balance in the RECORD. I read first a telegram from Hon. John F. Patty, an appointee of President Harrison to the second most important Federal office in the State of Louisiana, a colored man of far more than ordinary intelligence and a man who, I believe, is as thoroughly wedded to his political party as any man possibly can be. Along with his signature is that of Douglass Burrell, another very prominent colored politician. They wire me as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May* 12, 1890.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, *Washington, D. C.:*

The position taken by The Crusader does not reflect the sentiments of the masses of the colored people living, as we do, in the sugar belt. We can safely say that a cut in sugar will seriously damage the laboring people. The Crusader does not represent the colored people.

J. F. PATTY.
DOUGLASS BURRELL.

I have also the following telegram:

DONALDSONVILLE, LA., *May* 12, 1890.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest against the Crusader article. The laborers of the sugar district need to have sugar protected. No other industry can pay them as good wages. A numerously signed petition will follow by mail.

P. A. JONES.
OVIDE JOHNSON.
RUBEN JOHNSON.
P. MASON.
AUGUST SKINNER.
B. OSIGIER.
FRANK BROWN.
JESSE CHASE.
S. S. LAWRS.

I have also a telegram from Charles A. Roxborough, a prominent colored lawyer in the parish of Iberville:

PLAQUEMINE, LA., *May* 12, 1890.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE:

Jones and myself wired Coleman, regarding article in Crusader. See him; will do more if necessary.

CHAS. A. ROXBOROUGH.

He sent me also the following telegram:

PLAQUEMINE, LA., *May* 15, 1890.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, *Washington:*

I trust you will use your best endeavors to defeat sugar clause in McKinley bill. If adopted, it will be ruinous to over 250,000 colored laborers employed on sugar plantations. Those friendly relations which now and have always existed between planter and laborer will necessarily be ruptured, because with this cut planter can not posibly pay present wages. I appeal to you in the name of a majority of the colored race and our whole delegation in Congress. Use every means honorable to secure the defeat of the contemplated cut in sugar. Command me if I can serve you in any way. How would a committee, say three young colored men, do to appear before Senate Finance Committee?

CHAS. H. ROXBOROUGH.

I simply read these in order to show that my friend on the other side was mistaken in assuming that the paper from which he read represents the sentiments of the colored people of the sugar section of the country.

I also submit petitions of similar tenor which I have received:

ASCENSION, *May* 13, 1890.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, M. C., *Washington, D. C.:*

We, the undersigned laborers and representatives of the laboring class, protest against The Crusader article for a deep cut in the tariff on sugar. We, the laborers of the sugar district, as well as the planters, need to have the sugar protected. It is the only industry from which we can get as good wages. Any deep cut in the duty on sugar means starvation to ourselves and families. The above is truly the sentiment of the laborers.

H. C. JOHNSON and 85 others.

STATE OF LOUISIANA, PARISH OF ASSUMPTION,
First Ward, May 15, 1890.

We, the undersigned, colored people, hear that The Crusader, a so-called organ of our race, is advocating free sugar as a means of ruining the planters who are styled the "overbearing task-masters of the laborers," do hereby enter our emphatic and solemn protest against any such advocacy, and avail ourselves of this opportunity to pray for the maintenance of the import duties on sugar.

With sugar on the free-list the industry would be so crippled here that our principal means of livelihood would cease to exist.

H. C. COTTON and 32 others.

ASCENSION, *May* 12, 1890.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, M. C., *Washington, D. C.:*

We, the undersigned, protest against the Crusader article. The laborers of the sugar districts need to have sugar protected; no other industry can pay them as good wages.

EDWARD BUTLER and 117 others.

ASCENSION, *May* 12, 1890.

We, the undersigned laborers and representatives of the laboring class, protest against The Crusader article for a "deeper cut" in the tariff on sugar. We, the laborers of the sugar district, as well as the planters, need to have sugar protected. It is the only industry from which we can get as good wages, and any deeper cut in the duty on sugar means starvation to thousands of us who depend entirely on that industry for our support.

CHAS. J. BUSH and fifty-five others.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

ASCENSION, *May* 12, 1890.

We, the undersigned laborers and representatives of the laboring class, protest against The Crusader article for a deep cut in the tariff on sugar. We, the laborers of the sugar district, as well as the planters, need to have sugar protected. It is the only industry from which we can get as good wages, and any deep cut in the duty on sugar means starvation to thousands of us who depend entirely on that industry for our living.

VICTOR LANDRY and 345 others.

Hon. ANDREW PRICE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, as the Ways and Means Committee profess that they desire their bill to be a measure which will carefully guard and protect every industry that can produce or gives promise of producing what is needed by the consumers of the United States, and as the distinguished member of the committee [Mr. GEAR], who seems to have had special charge of the sugar schedule, in his speech of the 9th inst. said:

I am frank to say that if we could produce a large portion of the sugar we use, I should earnestly desire to foster it by a fair protection.

and his colleague from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], speaking of sugar on July 7, 1888, said:

If it can be demonstrated that it will meet the wants of our people, then it comes within the range of our protective policy, and should have that recognition—

I shall, therefore, endeavor to show that the sugar industry of this country as clearly comes within the scope of the committee's protective theory as any interest which is protected by their bill.

Sugar-cane was introduced into Louisiana by the Jesuit Fathers from San Domingo, and was planted on ground now occupied by many of the principal banks and commercial houses of New Orleans. No attempt to make sugar from it was successful until 1795. Six miles above New Orleans, on the land now covered by the park where was held the exposition of 1884-'85 and 1885-'86, Étienne de Boré, in 1794, planted a small crop of cane and in 1795 made a crop of sugar that sold for $12,000. No official record was kept of the sugar production of Louisiana until 1823.

The following table is a statement of the sugar crop from 1823 to 1887:

Year.	Crop.	Year.	Crop.
	Hhds.		*Hhds.*
1887	285,158	1855	231,429
1886	145,968	1854	346,635
1885	231,290	1853	449,324
1884	170,431	1852	321,947
1883	221,515	1851	238,201
1882	241,220	1850	211,923
1881	122,982	1849	247,023
1880	218,314	1848	220,000
1879	169,972	1847	240,000
1878	213,221	1846	140,000
1877	127,753	1845	186,000
1876	169,331	1844	200,000
1875	144,146	1843	109,000
1874	116,867	1842	140,000
1873	89,498	1841	90,000
1872	108,520	1840	87,000
1871	128,461	1839	115,000
1870	144,881	1838	70,000
1869	87,090	1837	65,000
1868	84,250	1836	70,000
1867	37,647	1835	30,000
1866	41,000	1834	100,000
1865	18,070	1833	75,000
1864	10,387	1832	70,000
1863	76,800	1829	48,000
1862	No data.	1828	88,000
1861	459,419	1827	71,000
1860	228,753	1826	45,000
1859	221,840	1825	30,000
1858	262,296	1824	23,000
1857	279,697	1823	30,000
1856	73,296		

It will be seen that from 1823 to 1843 the production of sugar increased 233 per cent.; from 1843 to 1861, 359 per cent., and from 1823 to 1861, 1431 per cent. At this rate of increase we should now be producing, had it not been for the war, the enormous sum of 4,961,713,200 pounds, over a billion pounds in excess of the present consumption of the United States.

Yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] who occupied the

floor a few moments ago stated that though we had been protected for one hundred years we are still producing only an infinitesimal part of the sugar needed for consumption in the United States. And why? Simply because the war, which found that industry flourishing, which found us producing, in 1861, 459,000 hogsheads of sugar, left that industry, after four short years, reduced to a production of only 10,000 hogsheads, within 3 per cent. of absolute obliteration. That is why the sugar industry of Louisiana and the cane industry of the United States have not made that rapid progress which gentlemen on the other side seem to think should have been made within the time this industry has been protected.

However, notwithstanding the destruction that the war entailed upon the industry and those engaged in it; notwithstanding the fields were devastated, the sugar-houses burned, the labor demoralized, and the credit of the individuals and the State destroyed, the people, with a determination and an energy that would have reflected credit upon any people upon the face of the earth, heroically undertook to build up their wasted fortunes and their destroyed industry, and the result shows how successful they have been in their efforts. Notwithstanding from time to time their fertile fields have been overflowed by the unbridled Mississippi River and notwithstanding the tariff has been greatly reduced, the production has increased from 10,387 hogsheads in 1864 to 285,158 hogsheads in 1887; and this increase has been brought about under difficulties unparalleled in the history of almost any industry and under disadvantages which would have demoralized and discouraged a less brave and less enterprising people. During this time the price of sugar has fallen off more than two-thirds—from 17 cents in 1864 to 5 cents in 1888, as will be seen from the following table:

[Currency prices in black figures.]

Year.	89 test.	Year.	89 test.
	Per lb.		*Per lb.*
1825	$0.093	1861	$0.076
1826	.082	1862	.090
1827	.085		**.102**
1828	.086	1863	.072
1829	.076		**.105**
1830	.070	1864	.086
1831	.058		**.175**
1832	.065	1865	.091
1833	.072		**.143**
1834	.071	1866	.074
1835	.078		**.105**
1836	.090	1867	.076
1837	.067		**.106**
	.070	1868	.078
1838	.068		**.110**
	.069	1869	.083
1839	.068		**.111**
1840	.058	1870	.079
1841	.060		**.091**
1842	.046	1871	.078
1843	.057		**.088**
1844	.062	1872	.074
1845	.059		**.084**
1846	.085	1873	.070
1847	.077		**.080**
1848	.067	1874	.070
1849	.069		**.078**
1850	.074	1875	.070
1851	.075		**.081**
1852	.070	1876	.082
1853	.072		**.092**
1854	.067	1877	.085
1855	.072		**.089**
1856	.098	1878	.072
1857	.118		**.073**
1858	.087	1879	.076
1859	.088	1880	.070
1860	.085	1881	.077

Year.	89 test.	Year.	89 test.
	Per lb.		*Per lb.*
1882	$0.073	1886	$0.048
1883	.068	1887	.047
1884	.053	1888	.051
1885	.053		

Mr. GEAR. That price in 1864 was based on currency at 38 to 42 cents on the dollar.

Mr. PRICE. Then I will take the year 1869 or 1870. From the year 1869 the price has been reduced from 9.1 cents a pound to 5 cents a pound.

Mr. GEAR. Currency in 1869 was worth about 68 cents,

Mr. PRICE. Sugar is cheaper in the United States than in any of the great nations of the world excepting England.

As a nation the United States consumes more sugar than any other, and we consume more per capita than any country except England.

In this connection the following table is of interest:

The total consumption in the United States for the past twelve years has been as follows:

	Tons.		Tons.
1888	1,469,997	1882	1,070,920
1887	1,397,356	1881	1,008,932
1886	1,389,079	1880	997,109
1885	1,245,574	1879	831,896
1884	1,265,283	1878	773,472
1883	1,164.391	1877	745,250

Approximate consumption of raw sugar in Europe and the United States for each of the following years:

Countries.	1888.	1887.	1886.	1885.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
United States	1,469,997	1,397,356	1,389,079	1,245,574
Germany	425,000	386,000	418,000	409,000
Austria	282,774	260,000	255,000	250,000
France	471,325	452,000	445,000	439,000
Russia	353,550	360,000	348,000	330,000
Holland and Belgium	98,437	80,000	78,000	76,000
England	1,206,224	1,125,000	1,107,000	1,150,000
Other Europe	298,678	315,000	302,000	290,000
Total	4,551,985	4,375,356	4,342,079	4,189,574

The relative per capita consumption in this and a few European countries is as follows:

Years.	United States.	Great Britain and Ireland.	Germany.	France.	Switzerland.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
1878	35.7	60.4	14.6	16.1	20.2
1879	37.4	67.6	14.7	16.5	20.9
1880	39.9	65.0	13.8	19.0	21.3
1881	42.5	68.6	13.7	21.6	23.4
1882	45.3	71.6	14.1	22.9	24.3
1883	47.4	73.2	17.9	23.6	25.4
1884	49.7	74.1	17.0	24.5	31.3
1885	48.9	.....	.....	.....	.....
1886	51.8	.....	.....	.....	.....
1887	52.2	.....	.....	.....	.....
1888	53.1	73.0	20.7	28.0	23.5

In addition to other obstacles, Louisiana has been confronted with great reductions in the sugar duties, as will be seen by the following table giving the sugar schedules in all tariff legislation from 1789 to 1883:

Sugar.	Act of July 4, 1789.	Acts of Aug. 10, 1790; Mar. 2 and 3, 1791.	Act of May 2, 1792.	Acts of June 5 and 7, 1794; Jan. 29, 1795.	Acts of Mar. 3, 1797; July 8, 1797; May 13, 1800.	Acts of Mar. 26, and 27, 1804; Mar. 3, 1807; Mar. 4, 1808.	Acts of July 1, 1812; Feb. 25, 1812; July 29, 1813; Mar. 3, 1815; Feb. 5, 1816.
Brown, raw, or clayed	Pound...1 ct.	Pound...1½ cts.	Pound...1½ cts.	Pound..2½ and 1½c	Pound..2 and 2½c.	Pound....2½ cts.	Pound.... 5 cts.
Loaf or candy, refined	Pound....3 cts.	Pound....5 cts.	Pound...5 cts.	Pound.... 9 cts.	Pound.....9 cts.	Pound....9 cts.	Pound....18 cts.
White, clayed, or powdered	.....	.....	.....	Pound.... 3 cts.	Pound.....3 cts.	Pound....3 cts.	Pound.... 6 cts.
Other	Pound...1½ cts.	Pound...2½ cts.	Pound...2½ cts.	Pound....2½ cts.	Pound ...2½ cts.	Pound....2½ cts.	Pound.... 5 cts.

Sugars.	Acts of Apr. 27, 1816; Apr. 20, 1818; Mar. 3, 1819.	Acts of May 22, 1824; Feb. 11, 1825.	Acts of May 19, 1828; May 24, 1828; May 20, 1830; May 29, 1830.	Acts of July 13, 1832; July 14, 1832.	Under operation of act of Mar. 2, 1833.			Act of Aug. 30, 1842.
					Act of July 4, 1836.	Act of Sept. 11, 1841.	As in force June 30, 1842.	
Brown raw or brown clayed	Pound.. 3 cts.	Pound.. 3 cts.	Pound.. 3 cts.	Pound..2½ cts.	Pound..2½ cts.	Pound..2½ cts.	Pound..2½ cts.	Pound..2½ cts.
Loaf or candy, refined	Pound..12 cts.	Pound..12 cts.	Pound..12 cts.	Pound..12 cts.	Pound..12 cts.	Pound..12 cts.	Pound..12 cts.	Pound...6 cts.
Lump	Pound..10 cts.	Pound..10 cts.	Pound..10 cts.	Pound..10 cts.	Pound..10 cts.	Pound..10 cts.	Pound..10 cts.	Pound...6 cts.
White, clayed or powdered	Pound.. 4 cts.	Pound.. 4 cts.	Pound.. 4 cts.	Pound..3½ cts.	Pound..3½ cts.	Pound..3½ cts.	Pound..3½ cts	Pound...6 cts.
All other advanced beyond the raw state	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Pound...4 cts.

Articles.	Act of July 30, 1846.	Act of Mar. 3, 1857.	Act of Mar. 2, 1861.	Acts of Aug. 5, 1861; Dec. 24, 1861.	Acts of July 14, 1862; Mar. 3, 1863.	Acts of June 30, 1864; Mar. 3, 1865; Mar. 16, 1866; May 16, 1866; June 1, 1866.	Acts of July 28, 1866; Mar. 2, 1867; Mar. 22, 1867.	Acts of Mar. 25, 26, 29, 1867; Feb. 3, 1868; July, 20, 1868; Feb. 19, 24, 1869.	Acts of July 14, 1870; Dec. 22, 1870.	Acts of May 1, 1872; June 6, 1872.
Sugar	30 per cent.	24 per cent.								
raw, muscovado or brown			Pound, ¾ ct.							
not above No. 12 Dutch standard				Pound, 2c., 2½ cents.	Pound, 2½c.	Pound, 3cts.	Pound, 3cts.	Pound, 3 cts.		
White and clayed (not refined) above No. 12 (No. 12, not above No. 15, 1862)			Pound, ¾ ct.							
above No. 15, not above No. 20, not stove-dried				Pound, 2½ cts., 3cts.	Pound, 3c.	Pound, 3½ cts	Pound, 3½cts.	Pound, 3½ c.		
all (raw or muscovado, repealed December 22, 1870), not above No. 7 Dutch standard					Pound, 3½c.	Pound, 4 cts.	Pound, 4 cts.	Pound, 4 cts.		
ditto, above No. 7, not above No. 10									Pound, 1¾ c.	Pound, 1¼c.
ditto, above No. 10, not above No. 13									Pound, 2c.	Pound, 2c.
ditto, above No. 13, not above No. 16									Pound, 2¼c.	Pound, 2¼c.
ditto, above No. 16, not above No. 20									Pound, 2¾c.	Pound, 2¾c.
all (raw or muscovado, repealed. December 22, 1870), above No. 20									Pound, 3½c.	Pound, 3½c.
all refined loaf, lump, crushed, powdered, granulated (and all stove-dried or other sugar above No. 20, 1862)			Pound, 2cts	Lb. ,4c., 5c	Pound, 4 cts.	Pound, 5cts.	Pound, 5 cts.	Pound, 5 cts.	Pound, 4c.	Pound, 4c.
all, after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or adulterated, etc			Pound, 4 cts.	Lb., 6c., 8c	Pound, 10 cts.					
ditto, value less than 30 cents per pound						Pound, 15 cts.	Pound, 15 cts.	Pound, 15 cts	Pound, 15c.	Pound, 15c.
ditto, value above 30 cents per pound, or sold by box, package, or otherwise. (See Candy)						50 per cent..	50 per cent..	50 per cent..	50 per cent.	50 per cent.

Articles.	Rev. Stat. of June 22, 1874; Acts of Feb. 8, 1875; Mar. 3, 1875; July 1, 1879; June 14, 1880; May 6, 1882; Dec. 23, 1882.	Act of Mar. 3, 1883.
Sugars:		
All not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic test as follows, viz:		
(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 polariscope not above 75 degrees, shall pay a duty of)		Pound, $1\frac{4}{100}$ cents.
(And for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay additional)		Pound, $\frac{1}{100}$ additional.
Not above No. 7 Dutch standard in color	Pound, 2.1875 cts.	
Above No. 7 and not above No. 10 Dutch standard in color	Pound, 2.5 cents.	
Above No. 10 and not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color	Pound, 2.8125 cts.	
[*a. Provided*, That concentrated melada, or concrete, shall hereafter be classed as sugar * * * and melada shall be known and defined as an article made in the process of sugar-making, being the cane-juice boiled down to the sugar point and containing all the sugar and molasses resulting from the boiling process and without any process of purging or clarification, and any and all products of the sugar-cane imported in bags, mats, baskets, or other than tight packages shall be considered sugar and dutible as such;		
And provided further, That of the drawback on refined sugars exported allowed by section 3019 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, only 1 per cent. of the amount so allowed shall be retained by the United States. [Act of March 3, 1875, sec. 3.]		
All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely:		
All sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard	Pound, 3.4375 cts..	Pound, $2\frac{75}{100}$ cents.
All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard	Pound, 4.0625 cts..	Pound, 3 cents.
All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard, and all refined loaf, lump, crushed, powdered, and granulated sugar	Pound, 5 cents....	Pound, $3\frac{85}{100}$ cents.

Articles.	Rev. Stat. of June 22, 1874. Acts of Feb. 8, 1875; Mar. 3, 1875; July 1, 1879; June 14, 1880; May 6, 1882; Dec. 23, 1882.	Act of Mar. 3, 1883.
Sugars—Continued.		
All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely—Continued.		
But sirup of sugar, sirup of sugar-cane juice, melada or concentrated melada, or concentrated molasses entered under the name of molasses shall be forfeited to the United States.		
Molasses testing not above 56 degrees by the polariscope shall pay a duty of	Gallon, 6¼ cents..	Gallon, 4 cents.
Molasses testing above 56 degrees shall pay a duty of		Gallon, 8 cents.
Candy, not colored	Pound, 10 cents...	Pound, 5 cents.
All other confectionery not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, made wholly or in part of sugar, and on sugars after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or in any way adulterated, valued at 30 cents per pound or less. (See Confectionery)	Pound, 15 cents...	Pound, 10 cents.
Beet seed	Free	Free.
Grape. (See Glucose)		20 per cent.
Of milk	Free	Free.

Mr. PRICE. In spite of all these disadvantages it will be seen from the following table, giving the world's sugar production, that Louisiana now stands fifth in a list of twenty-two cane-sugar-producing countries, being surpassed only by Cuba, Java, Brazil, and the Philippine Islands.

The world's sugar production.

Countries.	1888–'89. Estimated.	1887–'88. Actual.
CANE SUGAR.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
Cuba	550,000	647,860
Porto Rico	65,000	62,506
Trinidad	65,000	63,867
Barbadoes	70,000	66,108
Jamaica	30,000	30,000
Antigua	25,000	25,000
Martinique	42,000	40,000
Guadaloupe	54,000	50,094
Lesser Antilles	26,000	26,000
Demerara	120,000	97,244
Reunion	27,000	32,031

The world's sugar production—Continued.

Countries,	1888–'89. Estimated.	1887–'88. Actual.
CANE SUGAR—continued.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
Mauritius	125,000	121,508
Java	360,000	432,675
Brazil	230,000	282,418
Philippines	210,000	169,526
Natal	8,000	7,000
Peru	30,000	30,000
India	52,000	55,000
Egypt	50,000	50,000
Fiji	22,000	20,000
Sandwich Islands	125,000	110,000
Louisiana	162,264	166,928
Total	2,448,264	2,605,268
BEET SUGAR.		
Germany	980,000	959,166
Austria	525,000	428,616
France	470,000	392,824
Russia	510,000	441,342
Belgium	140,000	140,742
Holland	45,000	39,200
Other countries	55,000	49,980
Total	2,725,000	2,451,950
Add to this cane sugar	2,448,264	2,605,268
Grand total	5,173,264	5,057,218

From a table found on page 30 of Culture of the Sugar Beet, being Special Report No. 28 of the United States Agricultural Department, it is found that the quantity of sugar produced in France increased from 1864 to 1887 from 149,074 tons to 392,824 tons, 163 per cent., while during the same period the production of sugar in Louisiana increased 2635 per cent., increasing from 10,387 hogsheads in 1864 to 285,158 hogsheads in 1887. And yet in the face of these figures gentlemen on the other side persist in asserting upon the floor of this House that the sugar industry in Louisiana is in a rapidly decaying condition.

From statistics furnished by the Agricultural Department it is shown that the Cuba crop in 1875 was 700,000 tons, and from the table showing the world's sugar production, referred to above, it is found that in 1888–'89 the Cuba crop amounted only to 550,000 tons, showing a decline from 1875 to 1889 of 150,000 tons, or a decrease of 21 per cent.; while in Louisiana the crop increased from 144,146 hogsheads in 1875 to 285,000 hogsheads in 1887, an increase of nearly 100 per cent. And still the gentlemen cry that the sugar industry is not and can not be made a success in Louisiana.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] in his effort to show that sugar-cane was not a success in Louisiana, said—

That cane-sugar should not come within the list of protected articles is clearly shown by the following table, which shows the production and imports for twenty-one years. It shows that in twenty-one years they have produced only about 10 per cent. of what we consume:

Years.	Sugar imported.	Growth of Louisiana.	Per cent. of home growth to imports.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	
1869	1,247,833,430	95,051,223	.07617+
1870	1,196,773,569	99,452,940	.08310+
1871	1,277,479,653	168,878,952	.13220+
1872	1,509,185,674	146,906,125	.09733+
1873	1,568,304,592	125,146,343	.07980+
1874	1,701,297,869	103,241,110	.06068
1875	1,797,509,990	134,504,691	.07482+
1876	1,493,977,442	163,418,670	.10938+
1877	1,654,556,834	190,672,570	.11524
1878	1,537,451,834	147,101,941	.09568+
1879	1,834,365,836	239,478,753	.13055+
1880	1,829,291,684	198,932,278	.10875
1881	1,946,745,205	272,982,899	.14023
1882	1,990,152,374	159,874,950	.08033
1883	2,137,667,865	303,060,258	.14177
1884	2,756,416,230	287,712,230	.10438
1885	2,717,884,663	211,402,963	.07778+
1886	2,689,881,765	286,626,486	.10656
1887	3,136,443,240	181,123,872	.05775—
1888	2,700,284,282	353,855,877	.13105+
1889	2,692,502,670	350,000,000	.12997—
Average per cent			.10160

I wish to show him from his own table that from 1869 to 1889 the sugar crop in the United States increased from 95,051,233 pounds to 350,000,000 pounds, an increase of 254,948,767 pounds.

In further attempting to show that Louisiana was not adapted to sugar culture, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] also said:

Another reason is that the climate is not warm enough, as is shown by the reports of General Greely, of the Signal Service, which I will read:

"SIGNAL OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT,
"*Washington City, January* 20, 1890.

"SIR: Replying to your favor of the 18th instant, I beg leave to inform you that the mean annual temperature for the northern portion of Louisiana is 65.6°; for the southern portion, 69°; mean for the State, 67.3°.

"Very respectfully,

"A. W. GREELY,
"*Chief Signal Officer.*

"Hon. JOHN H. GEAR,
"*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*"

It will also be readily seen that the mean temperature of Cuba, San Domingo, and Hayti is the natural climate for sugar-cane, as is shown by the following letter in regard to that climate:

"SIGNAL OFFICE, *January* 27, 1890.

"Hon. J. H. GEAR:

"The mean annual temperature of Cuba varies from 75° in some localities to 78°, and possibly 79°. In other localities the averages for Hayti and San Domingo are not so well established, but may be safely put at figures ranging from 76° to 79°, and possibly 80°, according to localities.

"A. W. GREELY."

From these reports it is seen that there is only from six to seven degrees difference between the mean annual temperature of Cuba and Louisiana, and the cane has long since adapted itself to this difference and has become thoroughly acclimated. We all know that wheat, corn, cotton, and other crops are raised with equal profit in different sections of the United States, and that the temperature of these sections varies more than it does between Cuba and Louisiana.

As the gentleman has quoted quite freely from Bouchereau's Report to show that that authority considered Louisiana a very undesirable locality in which to produce sugar, I beg to refer him to the following language, which I find upon the 84th page of Bouchereau's Report for 1888–'89, to wit:

We have said in previous issue s of this work, and we repeat it, that Louisiana has the requisites of soil and climate to produce all the sugar needed by the whole people of the United States, and every dollar of the nearly $100,000,000 now paid for foreign sugar could and would thus be left at home to enrich our own countrymen, east, west, north, and south. What a tidal wave of prosperity the adequate development of this great industry in Louisiana, Florida, Texas, etc., would send all over the United States.

Dr. William C. Stubbs, of New Orleans, La., in charge of the experimental station, a gentleman of the highest character and most extensive information, said before the Committee on Ways and Means:

I have never found any plant that was more thoroughly at home than sugar-cane is in South Louisiana. As a proof, on the 19th day of August, at Baton Rouge, I had over forty crops growing in the field. We had a tornado and the cane crop was the only one that resisted the storm. The cotton was torn out by the roots, but the cane resisted the storm, and I made a most excellent crop of sugar.

I would next call attention to the subjoined letter, dated Havana, April 23, 1890, published in the Louisiana Planter, in order to show that although Louisiana sometimes suffers from bad seasons, cane-even in Cuba is not exempt from all dangers:

CROP PROSPECTS.

The drought continues unabated, and its effects are more severely felt all over the island on account of strong winds blowing from the east and southeast for several days past, which have done away with whatever had been spared by the drought.

Fires in the cane fields, that seemed to have terminated this year, are again reported with increased violence, and unless it rains soon it is likely that the cane unground as yet will be totally destroyed in a very short time, as well as the scorched pasture of all the breeding farms, whose cattle are fast disappearing from want of water and food.

In some localities not a drop of water has fallen in eight or ten months, and it may be said that there is not one estate in the central and western parts of the island that has not suffered more or less on account of fire, with a heavy decrease in its production.

Up to the present only the cane fields and few buildings had been pasture to the flames; but lately they have extended their ravages to the grazing of cattle-breeding farms; and from Sagua to Puerto Principe two destructive fires took place in the woods, and a large number of trees were burned to the ground as if they were dry straw.

At Cienfuegos most of the ponds and brooks have been dried up, and the water in the largest rivers has considerably decreased.

The tropics may be better adapted to the culture of sugar than Louisiana; still we would not fear to be put upon an equal basis of competition were it not for the fact that the labor of those countries is so much cheaper than ours. We can, by our superior skill and enterprise, overcome the advantages they have over us in climate, but we can not vie with them in the cheapness of human labor, as will be seen from the following statement from the consular reports:

Consul Pierce, at Mantanzas, Cuba, reports, March 5, 1886: "By law, as now in force, highest wages payable to a slave in servitude is $3 in gold per month; Negroes, free and at liberty to control their labor, can be readily obtained at $1.25, gold."

The same class of labor in Louisiana costs from 75 cents to $1.50 a day, as shown by the testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means, averaging $1 per day.

Mr. Chairman, that sugar-cane is an exotic in Louisiana and that the climatic influences are not suited to its successful production, is a statement that one would scarcely imagine needed contradiction; and yet there are gentlemen, intelligent and well informed on all other subjects, who seem to seriously believe that sugar-cane is grown in that State as a sort of hot-house plant. I wish here to say, as a practical farmer, not only in Louisiana, but in a State where the cereals are produced, that the sugar-cane of Louisiana is as certain a crop

in that State as the corn crop is in Illinois or the wheat crop is in the Northwestern States. The sugar-cane as successfully withstands all the climatic conditions of Louisiana as the various field crops grown in the other States withstand the climate of those localities.

In addition to the progress that has been made in Louisiana, Texas and Florida have also come into the field and give assurances of producing not only more sugar than Louisiana now does, but in sufficient quantity to supply the entire demands of the United States.

In 1879 there were produced in Texas only 3,000,000 pounds of sugar, while in 1889 18,000,000 pounds were produced on only a limited area of the 20,000,000 acres of land that can be devoted in that State to the culture of sugar-cane. In the ten years there has been an increase in the sugar production of Texas alone of 500 per cent.

Then comes the State of Florida with 500,000 acres of land suitable to the production of cane and a climate so well adapted to the sugar plant that even Cuba can boast little advantage over it.

During the last season there was produced in Florida 6,000 pounds of sugar per acre from a large area of land. Those who are familiar with the sugar lands of that State say neither Cuba nor the Hawaiian Islands have lands any better adapted to the production of sugar-cane.

The following letter from Mr. Hamilton Disston, a prominent gentleman of Philadelphia, well known to many gentlemen upon this floor, explains itself:

PHILADELPHIA, *January* 4, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Owing to illness I am unable to appear before the Ways and Means Committee on Monday, the 6th instant, and therefore take this method of saying a few words regarding the sugar industry in the State of Florida.

We have successfully demonstrated that the rich muck lands of the State are capable of producing a large amount of sugar per acre, probably exceeding 2 tons, and the number of acres that are susceptible of reclamation and cultivation can be placed at not less than 500,000, which would give about 1,000,000 tons of sugar.

In addition to this there are other lands in Florida which can be made to produce a fair yield of sugar by the use of fertilizers.

You will see from this statement, which can be verified by an actual examination, that Florida is about to become a very important factor in the sugar business, provided, of course, there is to be sufficient protection given by Congress to enable us to compete successfully against foreign sugars.

As to the amount of protection required, I would prefer to have those who are more conversant with the business give the figures, but my judgment is against a bounty, from the fact that it would be an unpopular measure, and the outcry might become so great against it as to cause its repeal, thus leaving the sugar industry without sufficient tariff protection and no bounty to aid the producers.

I shall be glad to furnish the Committee on Ways and Means with further information if it should be required.

Yours, truly,

HAMILTON DISSTON.

Hon. THOMAS M. BAYNE.

Sugar-cane is grown in the following States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas.

There are sufficient lands within the Southern States suited to the production of sugar-cane to supply the entire domestic market. In Louisiana the area devoted to sugar has not greatly increased within the last few years. The disastrous overflows of 1882 and 1884 have been one of the chief causes why the area of sugar-cane has not been extended more rapidly in the southern portion of the States. However, the sugar belt is increasing in the more northern parishes of Louisiana, where the lands are higher and free from overflow, as will be seen from the last report of Bouchereau, page 87, to wit:

It will be noticed that we have included the sugar and rice crops of the northern parishes, a fact which we have more or less omitted in the past, but, owing to the yearly increase of the sugar made in said parishes, we shall hereafter report their crops in the bulk.

The effort has not been to extend cultivable area, but rather by a system of intensified agriculture and improved methods of manufacture to double the product from present acreage. In the factories there have been most decided improvements, and we consequently find that upon the same area we are making more sugar than we did ten years ago. Improved machinery has been adopted by the planters as rapidly as their financial circumstances would permit, and to-day by the most improved mills and by diffusion—which has been introduced extensively within the past two years—we are producing from a ton of cane from 200 to 220 pounds of sugar, while by the old methods we were enabled to secure only from 100 to 125 pounds.

The introduction of diffusion in Europe, less than twenty-five years ago, caused other means of extracting sugar from the beet to disappear as if by magic and was one of the principal causes of the tremendous increase in the beet industry. Now that we have successfully adopted diffusion in this country we will soon be securing double the quantity of sugar that we now obtain from a ton of cane.

The central factory system is being adopted, and will, before a great while, be universal. It will cause the industry to develop most rapidly. Under this system cane is bought by the ton, as beets are in Europe. These new establishments are being erected to do several times as much work as is being done by the average sugar-house of to-day. The average annual production of each sugar-house in Louisiana is about 300,000 or 400,000 pounds; while the new establishments are being erected to turn out from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 pounds each.

As a result of the public spirit of a distinguished citizen of Louisiana (Hon. Donelson Caffery), capitalists are erecting in St. Mary's Parish a mammoth central factory, to contain all the modern improvements and appliances, and when it is completed and ready for work this fall it will have a capacity of making 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 pounds of sugar within the space of ninety days, thus doing ten or twelve times as much as can be done by the average sugar-house of the country.

By improved methods of cultivation we are producing an average of from 18 to 20 tons of cane to the acre, while in former years we only produced from 12 to 15. Are these not evidences of thrift and progress and development? Would such improvements be made by those engaged in an industry which has been represented to be in a declining and dying condition? Does this not show that the planters of Louisiana are making progress and using every energy to keep abreast with the most modern appliances and improvements of the age? And if their industry is not destroyed by this bill they will make a showing that will bring conviction to the doubting Thomases on the other side of the Chamber.

It is entirely within the range of almost immediate accomplishment to produce all the sugar we require in this country from cane alone. From about 200,000 acres of land there is produced in Louisiana about one-tenth of the sugar required in the United States. Thus we only need 2,000,000 acres in cane to supply the demands of the nation. In the twenty-five parishes in which sugar-cane is now successfully grown in Louisiana the Tenth Census shows that there are over 7,000,000 acres of land, of which only about 1,000,000 is at present tilled; and of this 7,000,000 acres there would be no difficulty in securing for the cultivation of cane the 2,000,000 acres necessary to supply the whole country with sugar.

I have thus gone into details and figures to show that the sugar industry of Louisiana is a success, and that unless it is crippled by adverse legislation that State alone will be able to produce all the sugar required for consumption in this country.

BEET SUGAR.

In addition to the production of sugar-cane it is now conceded by all who have taken the pains to investigate the matter that the sugar beet has been successfully grown and sugar successfully made from it in large quantities within the United States, and that the production of beet sugar is destined to meet with that success here that it has met with in almost every country in Europe.

Experiments have shown that the beets grown in the United States are richer in saccharine matter than those grown in Germany, a country which to-day produces more sugar than any other in the world, all of which is produced from beets. When Professor Harvey W. Wiley, chief chemist in the United States Agricultural Department, whose investigations have been made under the direction of that Department, was before the Ways and Means Committee he said, in substance, "that all that was necessary to develop the beet-sugar industry of this country to the extent of supplying the country with sugar was for the farmers to grow beets and the capitalists to erect factories." The farmers are growing the beets and the capitalists of the United States are erecting the factories, not only for the manufacture of beets and sugar-cane, but also for the manufacture of sorghum.

Mr. Oxnard, in a most interesting address upon the culture of beets, delivered before the Ways and Means Committee, said:

There are at present two beet-sugar factories in the United States: First, the Alameda Beet Sugar Company, situated at Alvarado, Cal., with a capacity of working 150 tons a day, which would be increased to 250 tons next year; second, the Western Beet Sugar Company, situated at Watsonville, Cal., with a capacity of 300 tons. Another factory, with a similar capacity, would be put up by the same company next year if tariff legislation does not prevent; and, third, the Oxnard Beet Sugar Company, at Grand Island, Nebr., now building, and which will be ready to start in the fall of 1890.

In view of the facts that beet sugar is now being successfully manufactured and upon a large scale in this country, and that the producers of beet sugar are in a position to avail themselves of all that patience, investigation, science, and capital have accomplished in Europe, it does seem that it is foolish in the extreme, at this particular time, to enact such legislation as will retard the development of the sugar industry in this country.

It has only been within the last few years that the beet-sugar crop of the world was a factor of any importance. A few years ago the planter of Louisiana asked with anxiety and solicitude as to what would be the crop of Cuba. To-day he asks with greater anxiety as to what will be the crop of Europe, because it is to-day the greatest sugar-producing country in the world.

Within the last ten years the improvement in the manufacture of beets has been the principal cause of this wonderful increase in the production of beet sugar; and the same methods of manufacture that are now being used in the most successful establishments of Europe are the methods that will be adopted in the great central beet factories that are being erected in the United States. The beet-producer of the United States begins at the point at which Europe has arrived after long years of labor and expense; and there is no reason to believe that the American, who, with equal advantages, has surpassed every other nation of the earth both as farmer and as manufacturer, will not also surpass the Germans as the producers of beet sugar.

Although the section from which I come is not adapted to beets and we have to confine ourselves to the production of sugar-cane, I do not hesitate to say that the beet is the best sugar-producing plant

of the world, and those who embark in its growth will eventually become the principal sugar-producers in the United States.

Professor Wiley, in writing me on the subject, says:

The possibilities of beet sugar in the United States are most flattering. In California, the coast valleys, where the temperature in summer remains low, are peculiarly suited to the growth of the sugar beet. For eight years a factory has been in successful operation in Alvarado and for two years a large factory at Watsonville. The content of sugar in the beet growth in that locality is fully up to the best standard of Europe. Large areas in California, Oregon, and Washington are suited to beet culture.

In the Platte Valley in Nebraska, large areas have also been discovered suitable to the culture of a sugar-beet containing a high percentage of sucrose. A beet-sugar factory costing nearly $300,000 is now in process of erection at Grand Island, Nebr. In addition to this it is believed that large areas in the northern portion of the Central and Eastern States may be found suitable to the production of beet sugar. Northern Indiana, Ohio, and New York, especially those parts bordering on the lakes, it is thought will be found peculiarly adapted to this form of agriculture. A cool summer, not too moist, and a dry autumn make climatic conditions favorable to the sugar-beet.

Progress in the development of the beet industry has been marvelous, and the long waiting, patient investigation, and heavy expense incurred in the development of the industry are now reaping a full reward in unparalleled success; but still, in the face of the experience in Europe, our legislators grow impatient because within the twenty-five years intervening since the war Louisiana has not succeeded in producing from cane all the sugar that is required by the people of these United States, and, having grown impatient at Louisiana, they are disposed, not only to crush out her industry, but to place a blighting hand upon the new beet industry that gives promise of a success here that will equal that which has been attained in Europe.

When you allow the mind to dwell upon the immensity of this country and to reflect that within the confines of these United States can be found every variety of soil and climate that can be found beneath the sun, does it not seem ridiculous to suppose that we can not succeed in selecting the paltry quantity of 2,000,000 acres of land upon which to grow sugar to supply the wants of our people? Allowing the production of only 10 tons of beets to the acre and a yield of sugar of only 150 pounds to the ton, or an output of 1,500 pounds of sugar to the acre, we would only require 2,000,000 acres planted in beets to supply all the sugar that is now needed by the United States.

Let the Congress of these United States but give the people of the country to understand that the sugar industry will not receive adverse legislation, and I assure you that it will not be long before the home market is supplied and the farmers' distress greatly relieved by the production of $100,000,000 worth of sugar within this country. It would only require 1,000 factories, with an output of 3,000,000 pounds each, to produce all the sugar that the United States requires, and there are now within Louisiana several factories that are producing each season between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 pounds each, and there is one factory in Texas which produces at least 4,000,000 pounds.

It is not a dream that possesses us, but a firm conviction that it is entirely within the range of almost immediate accomplishment to produce all of the sugar that this country needs.

In 1747, Margraff, a member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, experimented and found the beet to be rich in sugar, and yet it was not till 1797 that Franz Archard, one of Margraff's pupils, succeeded in extracting sugar from the beet in any large quantity. The first sugar works were not established until 1805. In 1811 Napoleon issued a decree providing for direct encouragement of the industry. Again in 1812 Napoleon issued a decree giving aid to the industry. In 1812 thirty-nine or forty factories were established, but the industry subsequently declined, and we find that in 1826 only 1,500 tons of sugar were being produced, and if the statesmen of France had listened to the criticisms and croakings of the doubtful ones, and had lost all faith in the possible development of the sugar industry, France to-day would have been buying its sugars from some foreign market. The first beet factory was not established until 1805, which was fifty-eight years after Margraff made the discovery that the beet was a valuable sugar-producing plant, and it was still not until fifty years later that as much sugar was being made in France as is now being made in the State of Louisiana.

We have heard a great deal said in the course of this debate about the importance of preserving the home market.

In order to preserve it a tariff has been placed upon many agricultural products, horses and mules, cattle, hogs, sheep, barley, corn, oats, butter, milk, beans, cabbages, eggs, potatoes, etc., and yet this committee, by destroying the sugar industry of Louisiana, will, first, deprive the producers of these various farm products of a home market and, second having obliterated the sugar industry, it will force those who are now engaged in it to embark in the production of crops which will come directly into competition with the farmers whom they say they are so anxious to legislate in favor of.

Mr. Chairman, the honorable gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL] in his recent speech, said:

This is the beginning of an era of progress in this Republic; an effort to build up a new and profitable industry which shall increase as the years go on, the outcome of which will be to make us independent of the world for our supply of sugar.

We have in him another believer in the future of the sugar industry of the country; but, strange to say, he and many others on his side of the House, while believing and professing their belief, are about to enact a policy that will not only obliterate the industry, but relegate to a night of oblivion the bright prospects of a future sugar industry in this country.

Mr. O'DONNELL goes on to tell us how, by cultivation of the sugar-beet we will diversify our crops, enrich our soil, reclaim our worn-out acres, give employment to thousands of hands that now are idle and food to thousands of mouths that are now hungry, and yet, with all his professions and all his faith, he still insists upon enacting such legislation as will bring disappointment to every heart in which his words have enkindled the slightest hope. He tells us that we are sending abroad $83,000,000 a year for an article of food which should be produced upon our own farms and that the time has arrived for a change; that we should follow in the steps of other nations; that the opportunity has arrived, and that he believes that the representatives of the people will try to promote the interests of the people, and yet he persists in advocating the absolute repeal of the sugar tariff and the giving of a bounty in its stead. And the bounty is paid only for sugar polarizing 80°; and thus a large amount of sugar that is made will receive none of the benefit of the bounty.

In the beginning of this speech, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] attempted to show that the sugar industry of the United States had not made sufficient progress to show itself worthy of protection, and that therefore sugar should be placed upon the free-list, and yet, with strange inconsistency, at the close of his speech, he paints in the most glowing manner the great possibilities of the American sugar industry under the stimulus of the proposed bounty.

How can he say, in one breath, that the industry does not deserve protection and, in the next, draw a picture of its mammoth development within the near future? The proposed bounty will not give the sugar-producer as great advantage as he derives from the present tariff, and if the gentleman believes that the sugar industry is destined to blossom as the rose and that the stimulating influence of a bounty "will cause the erection of sugar-factories in every hamlet," I ask him why he should not also believe that the industry will thrive and prosper under the beneficial influence of the present tariff. No American sugar-producer that I know of, whether he be beet, sorghum, or cane grower, asks a bounty in preference to the present tariff, but all unite in opposing the bounty and give assurances that under the present tariff they will be enabled to develop their industries.

We are told that the consumers of the country are clamoring for free sugar, that it is a prime necessity of life, and that the farmers of the West especially demand that they shall have it free upon their breakfast tables. Is it any more of a necessity than the farmer's plow? Is it any more of a necessity than the farmer's cooking-stove, or his woolen shirt, or his woolen hat? Is it not a fact that a farmer can more readily dispense with sugar than with any of the articles that are absolutely necessary for the carrying on of his vocation and conducting his domestic life? A plow is certainly more of a necessity than sugar and a woolen shirt is a more necessary part of a farmer's wardrobe than is a lump of sugar a necessary part of his breakfast.

It is not just to ruin those engaged in the sugar industry under the cry that sugar is a prime necessity of life, while you protect those engaged in the manufacture of other articles which are still greater necessities to the consumers of this country.

Why sacrifice any one industry by making it bear the entire burden of tariff reduction and by one stroke of the pen bring ruin and disaster to any class of citizens, who, relying upon the faith of the Government, have invested their all in that industry?

I would commend to the committee the advice of President Cleveland, who, while advocating a reduction of the revenue, said:

These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our workingmen need, and with benefit to them and all our people by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

I would also refer them to the platform of the Democratic party, which says:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by a reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation.

I would also commend to them the language of the late Senator Beck, who, in commenting on the Mills bill, said:

The Democrats seek cautiously and prudently to reduce all taxation, * * at the same time taking care that no injury is done to any domestic industry, even though unduly stimulated by protection, on whose success the employment of any considerable portion of our people depends.

The course that is proposed by this bill must indeed be very acceptable to the highly protected industries of this country. They see by the removal of the sugar duty that the surplus revenue is obliterated.

They see also that the demands which would be made upon the Treasury to pay the bounty to the sugar-producer would be so large in a few years that there would be a necessity for increasing the revenues of the country, and they hope when this demand for additional revenue arises that the increase will be made by raising the tariff rates upon the articles which they produce.

While not objecting to such assistance as the various industries of this country may receive, while the Government is raising revenue with which to pay its expenses, I do most earnestly protest against a plan which proposes to sacrifice the industry in which the people I represent are engaged in order that all the other protected industries of the country may feel secure in the protection which they now enjoy.

We are willing to bear our proportion of the reduction, but most solemnly protest against being led as a lamb to the sacrificial altar and offered up in order that all other protected industries may be saved. While the tax-payers demand an offering in the way of reduced taxation, all should contribute their proper share toward bringing about the reduction.

If the sugar revenue is lost to the Government the tax-payer must meet the demands of the Government by paying a duty on some other article, and there is no other article upon which he pays a duty which puts so large a proportion of the amount paid into the tax-payers' Treasury.

Notwithstanding the fact that the tin-plate industry, while receiving protection under the present tariff law, has absolutely failed to succeed, the committee gives that industry increased protection for the purpose of enabling it to spring into life, and, with singular inconsistency, places sugar upon the free-list, although it is established and vigorous. We are told that the tax-payer saves $5 to his family per year by being relieved of the sugar tax, but we are not told that in order to make good this loss to his Treasury he has to pay far more than $5 per year in increased taxes on wool, tin-plate, and other necessaries of life, and that of the taxes paid on these last-named articles only a small proportion is in the nature of a tax going to the support of his Government.

"But," say these gentlemen, "we do not propose to destroy your industry; we propose, instead of the duty which we are removing, to give you on every pound of sugar produced in the United States a bounty of 2 cents, and this bounty will stimulate your industry as it has never been stimulated before."

"And why," say they, "are you opposed to it?" Because it is contrary to all American ideas of tariff legislation; in fact, it is un-American in the extreme. I am also opposed to it because I believe it is unstable, and that it is but a temporary relief and assistance to those who have their money invested in the sugar industry of this country.

The sugar planter is not asking that the burdens of the tax-payer of this country be increased upon his account; but, recognizing that this great Government must, from some source, be supplied with sufficient revenue with which to pay its expenses, he feels that he is as justly entitled to that protection which comes from the raising of that revenue as are those who are engaged in any of the other industries of this country, and he believes that it has been demonstated, to any one who desires to be convinced, that sugar can be produced in this country in sufficient quantity to supply the needs of all its consumers. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. I sent to the Clerk's desk yesterday an amendment designed to put maple sugar under the operation of the bounty clause contained in this bill. I desire now to offer as a substitute for that amendment one which has been prepared by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend Schedule E (sugar) as follows:
On page 47, line 15, after "cane" insert "or maple trees, producing sugar testing not less than 75 degrees by the polariscope."
On page 48, line 8, before "or sugar cane" insert "maple trees."
On the same page, in line 18, insert "maple trees" after "beets."
In line 22, same page, after "beets" insert "maple trees."

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. I do not propose to discuss the question of bounty. My individual opinion, however, is that no industry of this country should receive any bounty. The only bounty which I would favor would be a bounty, or what is sometimes called a subsidy, to the shipping of the country; and the only justification for it in that case is the policy of foreign nations on that subject. I think that would be a sufficient justification for the people of this country to encourage shipping by corresponding bounties so as to match the great commercial nations of the world which are getting ahead of us as maritime nations by their bounties.

But if the bounty system is to be extended to the sugar industry, it seems to me it ought not to be confined to sorghum and beet sugar. I do not suppose that gentlemen of this committee know the amount of maple sugar produced in this country. In my own State, according to the census of 1880, there were produced in a single year over 11,000,000 pounds of maple sugar; in the seven States, Vermont, Massachusetts, Maine, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, over 30,000,000 pounds of maple sugar were produced, and 1,162,497 gallons of molasses.

I observe by the report I have received that in 1886 there were 600 tons of beet sugar produced in the United States, and 25,000 tons of maple sugar. In the State of Kansas there were less than 100,000 pounds of sorghum sugar produced, against 11,000,000 pounds of maple sugar produced in my own State.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the bounty system is to be extended to the sugar industry, I beg my friends here not to leave out the good State of Vermont. We claim a share in the benefit, if there is to be any bonus on this subject. This is all I have to say upon the matter.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I would like my friend, the gentleman from Vermont, to answer as a lawyer this question: Whether in his opinion the insertion of this bounty clause in the proposed tariff bill would constitute such a contract as could be enforced in an action at law against the Government by the raiser of sugar?

Mr. ANDREW (to Mr. STEWART, of Vermont). Tell him you want a retainer. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. I accept the suggestion. I would like a retainer before answering the gentleman's question.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I have asked the question because I do not believe that either branch of a Democratic Congress would ever make an appropriation to pay this bounty.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. So it would expire in the next Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. GEAR. We will cross that bridge when we get to it. We have not a Democratic Congress yet.

Mr. WILKINSON. I yield now five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DORSEY].

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a few practical questions of this committee in connection with the pending bill. By the proposed tariff bill we reduce the revenues of the Government $56,000,000 received heretofore from duties on sugar. Then we propose by the bounty paid to the sugar-growers of the country to expend $7,000,000 more, adding this much to the expenses of the Government. If this committee will remember, we but recently passed a pension bill that carries fifty millions annually, increasing our annual pension-list to $150,000,000, and we will probably pass a river and harbor bill carrying $22,000,000 more, with several millions for public buildings in addition to the ordinary expenses of the Government; and in my judgment, if this tariff bill shall become a law and we reduce the revenues $56,000,000 from sugar and pay a bounty of seven millions besides to the sugar-growers of Louisiana and to the beet-growers of other parts of the country, there will be a deficit in the Treasury on the 30th day of June, 1891.

I think we should encourage the beet-sugar industry that is attracting so much attention at this time. Germany did that and does it now and also the Republic of France. Germany not only lays a duty upon sugar, but pays a bounty upon the domestic product from beets. France does the same, and if gentlemen on this committee will take the time and will carefully read the report made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and notice what is said by the Agricultural Department regarding the capabilities of this country, I am sure they will agree with me that in fifteen years, if we do not strike down the protective system and put sugar upon the free-list, the States of Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, California, and South Dakota can produce all the sugar consumed in the United States.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. And North Dakota.

Mr. DORSEY. And North Dakota. These States can furnish all of it. North Dakota has already offered a bounty of 2 cents, and Nebraska pays 1 cent per pound for all sugar produced in those States; and, Mr. Chairman, the farmers of my district will ask, if I vote for this bounty, which I may have to do—— [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Why do you feel obliged to?

Mr. DORSEY. I say, while I may have to vote for this bill, they will ask why have you not given us a bounty upon corn?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes; of course they will, and very properly.

Mr. DORSEY. Corn is not profitable in Nebraska, and has not been for years; and they may ask why we do not put a bounty upon honey and protect the little busy bee. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But you put beeswax on the free-list.

Mr. DORSEY. Well, I am opposed to that. I think the bee ought to be protected.

I offered an amendment, Mr. Chairman, reducing the present tariff bill 25 per cent. as far as the sugar schedule is concerned; but I do not intend to press that amendment, but will, on the contrary, support the amendment of the gentleman from California, which I regard as covering mainly the grounds that ought to be covered by such legislation. I think the report he made is unanswerable, and that no more logical, clear, and comprehensive statement with regard to the protective system was ever made on the floor of the House than that which fell from the lips of the gentleman from California to-day.

I am a protectionist and a Republican; and I think if the Republican party puts sugar on the free-list and strikes down the protective system they make an argument stronger than any that may be made by an advocate of free trade on the floor of the House.

I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from California. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have offered a substitute for

the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California, which is exactly the same as the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maine in the last Congress to the schedule proposed by the majority of the committee, an amendment providing for the reduction of the duty on sugar one-half of what it is at the present time. As it was figured at that time, that would make a reduction from 83 to 42 per cent., which was what was proposed as the average duties in the bill presented by the committee in that Congress.

I then said, in the remarks made by me a day or two before the introduction of the amendment by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], that I believe in a fair protective tariff. I do not believe in discriminating against any American interest. They ought to be all treated fairly, and as an industry is created in any particular section of the country there is no reason why it should not be entitled to the benefits of the system of protection.

This amendment was then sustained by a unanimous Republican vote.

I desire, in this connection, to renew an objection I have made heretofore to this proposed bounty scheme. I said the other day that in the whole history of this Government, except a small bounty on fish with a view to develop our shipping, no bounty had ever been proposed for the production of any American article.

It is a new departure in the history of the Government, which, in my opinion, the American people will never justify. If it were carried out in good faith, and would result in securing the development of this sugar industry as proposed, it would cost this Government, if successful, as anticipated, $66,000,000 per year, even if the consumption were not increased, in fifteen years. With the average increase of our population it would amount to nearly one hundred millions per year in fifteen years, if it resulted, as is claimed, in the production of our own sugar at home. The bill proposes to give a bounty of 2 cents per pound for all sugar produced in this country from beets, cane, and sorghum.

Under this provision alone the sugar planters of Louisiana would draw annually from the Treasury on their present crop $7,500,000. If we were sure the price of sugar would be decreased, there might be some compensation, but of this there is no certainty, for experience has proven that. The advantage of such measures chiefly accrues to the producers of sugar in other countries, as has been the case under the reciprocity treaty with the Sandwich Islands. And the country, in addition to the loss to the Treasury by the continually increasing bounty, will lose the money we now receive from the duty, which last year amounted to fifty-six millions. And the danger will be very great that, considering the probable appropriations for pensions and other necessary purposes, there may be a deficiency.

The very large increase of the production of sugar in Louisiana in the last few years, together with the prospects of the production of sugar from beets, sorghum, corn, and maple sap, warrants the belief that with a continuation of a moderate degree of protection we would before many years produce the greater part of our own sugar without any such dangerous sacrifice of revenue.

The proposition confining bounty to sugar produced from cane, sorghum, and beets illustrates the danger of this new experiment as well as its injustice. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STEWART] has justly complained that the maple-sugar industry of his State and others has been neglected. The great Northwest may with equal reason complain that glucose sugar, the product of the corn of the Northwest, has been discriminated against and entirely neglected by the proposed new departure, although if properly protected it might ultimately be of vast benefit to the farmers and corn-raisers of the Northwest.

I call attention in this connection to an extract from a letter from S. D. Phelps to WILLIAM MCKINLEY, jr., which will illustrate the injustice of this discrimination. He says:

> The evident purpose of proposing a bounty on sugar, as in the bill, is to protect the planters and farmers who now raise sugar-cane, beets, and sorghum, and at the same time to encourage other farmers and planters to enter upon the same pursuits. The bounty feature, if it becomes a law, will undoubtedly widely diversify and rapidly increase the production of beets and sorghum, and to a more limited extent that of sugar-cane. The same rule will apply to the production of corn.
>
> While a bounty on domestic glucose and corn-sugar, as proposed, may have little immediate or apparent effect upon the total area planted to corn, yet it will tend to render prices of that cereal more stable, and ultimately to advance the price by enabling manufacturers of glucose and corn-sugar from home-grown corn to export more largely and thus increase the home consumption of corn. But, conversely, the farmer who raises the corn which the glucose manufacturers consume would inevitably suffer. The consumption of corn in the glucose factories of the United States for several years has nearly or quite equaled one-half of our total exports of corn. If producers of glucose and corn-sugar are denied a bounty and producers of sugar from sorghum, beets, and sugar-cane are granted a bounty, the glucose factories will have to largely curtail or entirely abandon operations, and the farmers who now supply them with corn will have to find other markets for that which they now consume.
>
> From any point of view, there does not seem to be a sufficient reason why the grower of sugar-cane, sorghum, and beets should be favored at the expense of the grower of corn. But this is what the bill, as reported, proposes, and such must be its ultimate effect. The grower of corn is not only to be deprived of a large home market for his product, which he now enjoys, but he is to pay a bounty to the growers of beets, sorghum, and sugar-cane besides. Surely this can not be the intent of the bill.
>
> The following figures regarding the glucose and corn-sugar industry in the United States, although partially estimated, may be taken as approximately correct:

Number of glucose factories	17
Capital invested	$11,000,000
Daily capacity, bushels of corn	61,000
Annual capacity, bushels of corn	19,032,000
Acres of land required to raise corn, at 26 bushels to the acre	732,000
Farmers required to raise corn, three men per 100 acres	21,960
Annual capacity, pounds of glucose	570,960,000
Value of glucose produced annually	$17,128,800
Laborers employed in factories	4,575
Amount of wages paid annually	$2,058,570
Average daily rate of wages	$1.50

> The factories are located in the States of Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, and New York.
>
> I am, very respectfully yours,
>
> S. D. PHELPS.

The letter above quoted shows that corn sugar has at least 70 per cent. of the sweetness of sugar from cane, and to offer no bounty is a discrimination against an industry in my district that furnishes a market for a large part of our surplus corn. But, as I said before, this plan of giving bounties is a new and invidious process that will result, if begun, in more scrambles for favor, more struggles for advantage, than have ever been witnessed in this country, and I very gravely question if it will be sustained by the courts as a legitimate exercise of the taxing power. Mr. MCKENNA, one of the majority of the committee, states his dissenting views with much force, and I print the following extract from his dissenting report:

> I dissent from the sugar schedule of the bill. I do it with regret, regret to dissent from colleagues, greater regret that principles which should be universally and impartially applied are partially and discriminatingly applied.
>
> The bill in its sugar schedule makes an arbitrary and invidious distinction between the sugar industry and other industries, a distinction inconsistent with the principle upon which the bill is framed and upon which it can only be justified.
>
> Protection, as understood politically, is the clear right of all industries or of none. The means of it is a tariff, not largess from the Treasury. The distinction is not one of words. It is a distinction firm and clear in substance and effect.
>
> A tariff may be a tax. A bounty is certainly one, fixed and unavoidable, and increases with the production it encourages. A tariff tax lessens with the production it encourages and finally vanishes in the competition of home producers.
>
> A bounty abandons the home market to the foreign product; a tariff secured the home market to the home product. A bounty, therefore, is as useless as it is burdensome and as odious as it is useless.
>
> It is not Republican. It has no justification in either the practice, the principles, or the professions of the Republican party. The platform of the party, and which it was elected to execute, proclaimed that before protection—tariff protection—should be sacrificed the internal-revenue system should be destroyed.
>
> If a bounty is useful for sugar, why not for other things? In all the range of articles with which the bill deals are none fit for a bounty but sugar? What relief does it give consumers of sugar that it can not give to consumers of other things? The bill protects even the hope of a production of some articles. Sugar is an established industry in four States, and yet is denied protection.
>
> Great principles should not be played with this way. They are not so flexible to men's passing interests.
>
> If a bounty is a tax of less burden than is a tariff, why are sugar consumers selected for favor?
>
> Is sugar the only article used in this country that is higher in price than in the markets of the world? Make this the test. Contemplate the citizen as a consumer only (and at a special time), and there is an end of a protective tariff. The Republican House of Representatives should not set this example. Who can say where the contagion of it will stop?

These views will strike any one very forcibly who has given the subject attention and who has observed how the system of bounties has been always urged by the friends of free trade as so much preferable to what they have always been pleased to term indirect bounties. If a sugar bounty is preferable to a sugar tariff why is not a bounty on tin-plates, a bounty on salt, a bounty on wool, a bounty on any article whose production we wish to encourage preferable to a tariff on such articles? The National Government was not created for any such purpose; if it had been, the statesmen who have honored the nation in the last century would surely furnish us with a single example as a precedent for this new departure from the uniform practice of the last hundred years. I append as a part of my remarks an extract from a leading paper of my State:

[From the Algona Upper Des Moines (Republican).]

> If Major Holmes has done nothing else of credit in Congress, he covered the Tenth district with glory when in a five-minute speech he repudiated the scheme to subsidize private business with bounties. If the McKinley tariff bill were perfect in all else its provisions to give 2 cents a pound to sugar-producers would condemn it. Even with the small amount of sugar now produced the tax would mount into the millions, and should it operate to increase the product, as is claimed, it would, before fifteen years were up, be a burden hardly to be borne. And why should sugar-producers be fattened out of the United States Treasury with money wrung from the sweat of other labor? What great service do they render that entitles them to public pension any more than the butter-makers and corn-raisers of Iowa? They have the richest stretch of land in the United States. They can produce anything they want on those overflowed valleys of the Mississippi.
>
> Even with one crop in three years they can amass wealth, and they are to-day the millionaires of the Southern States. Why should they get a public benefit at the expense of men who raise oats on raw prairie for 15 cents a bushel and burn corn because they can not sell it at any price? Who proposed a bounty on wheat when Northern Iowa was starving out in that industry and the grasshoppers operated the harvesting machines? Who suggested any other remedy than after the people had failed long enough they would go at something they could make a living at? Why is not the medicine that was applied to Northern homesteaders good medicine for the lords of sugar plantations? If the Southerners can not make a living at raising sugar-cane let them devote their

ingenuity to finding out what they can make a living at, and even be forced to work as a final resort. If the beet industry seems likely to languish without a bonus from the public Treasury, let the prairies of Kansas be planted to carrots, turnips, or even be left sage brush, if thereby the people can earn the same honest livelihood their neighbors are doing.

In any event, if the public Treasury is to be opened to a raid let Iowa Congressmen see to it that the first and heaviest bounties are put on the things Iowa has to sell. Let wild hay come in, and butter and cheese and pork and beef. It is time we took a stand somewhere, and the place to stand is for an even divide of the booty. A bounty duty is pure State socialism. It is taxing one class for the direct benefit of the private interests of another. It is an attempt of Government to take the earnings of one man's industry to patch up another man's failure of gratifying his avarice. It is putting a bonus on beggary and lying and political corruption. When the door is opened there will be no limit to the demand that will be made, and where now sugar-cane will wither and beets fade away without Treasury notes wrapped about their roots within one generation good healthy pigweeds will have their pleaders before the Ways and Means Committee appealing for aid. There may be an apology for the tariff on sugar, for the tax is primarily for the Government, and not for the private aid; but for a bounty system there is no excuse except the corrupt desires of those who want to fatten by plundering the public Treasury.

Mr. WILKINSON. I now yield one minute to the gentlemen from West Virginia [Mr. ALDERSON].

Mr. ALDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I understood the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] to state, when he occupied the floor to-day, that we produce but about one-eighth of the sugar consumed in this country and that our sugar indnstry was not in a flourishing condition, and to argue therefrom that sugar should be placed on the free list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that, from a good, consistent, Republican protection-standpoint, the industries which are in the most unsatisfactory condition should have the highest protection. I understand this to be the Republican doctrine on this subject.

Some of the people whom I represent do not use sugar, some from choice, a few from their inability to purchase it, and others because their maple sugar, abundant in some sections, furnishes them a substitute for the kind of sugar named in this bill. And yet it is proposed to tax all my people upon the necessaries of life to pay to the sugar-producer a bounty of 2 cents per pound upon the sugar he produces, and this to come directly out of the Treasury after the money is collected from the people.

I am unwilling to support this enormous tax on the masses; but I can see no justice in the demand of the Republicans that sugar shall be stricken down entirely, when it is the only agricultural product substantially benefited by the tariff, and the planters and laborers who produce it are heavily taxed for the benefit of others on everything they consume.

If free sugar is a good thing now, so it was years ago. The present tariff law is the handiwork of the Republicans, and they are responsible for its defects and errors, if any there be in it. The Republican party has had opportunity to correct any mistakes and wrongs which have existed; but so far from correcting them we have seen that party arrayed in solid phalanx and standing in the way of every effort made by the Democracy to make lighter the burdens of the people. The Democratic party is on record in favor of a reduction of the tariff tax on sugar.

The Mills bill reduced the rate of duty more than is proposed by the present bill, if we count the bounty to be paid from the Treasury to the producer. It has been suggested that Louisiana does not vote right; that she is Democratic. Considerations of this kind may or may not enter into this matter.

The duty on wool is increased to some extent in this bill, under the pretense that the producer will be benefited thereby, while the tariff on woolen goods is increased in a much larger ratio. This shows beyond dispute that the real purpose of the framers of this bill is to benefit the manufacturers, and not the producer or consumer. It has been estimated on this floor to-day by a Republican that we produce one-half enough wool for our own clothing. We produce no tin-plate at all, and this bill more than doubles the tax to be paid upon its importation.

These, Mr. Chairman, are a few of the inconsistencies of this bill. To enumerate all of them would consume more time than our Republican brethren have doled out to us in which to discuss this most important measure. In fact, sir, there would seem to be no consistency and fairness in it, except that consistency which would be found always in the efforts of the zealous inferior to carry out and promote the interests of an exacting master. Certainly, the favored few who will be benefited by the provisions of this bill should it become a law are happy and fortunate in the fact that the Republican party is for the time being in the ascendency in our National Legislature.

This bill is not even fair in its terms in respect to the measure of protection it gives to the various industries of the country. Some are to be stricken down that others may flourish and prosper.

I desire to read and to have printed with my remarks a protest I have received from constituents of mine in respect to the effect this bill will have upon industries in which they are engaged, and which will be crippled, if not destroyed, should this bill become a law. The canning industries of this country have grown to large and almost wonderful proportions, and it is a conceded fact that if the rate of duty on tin-plate is increased they will suffer very much and the people who purchase and consume their products must pay higher for them. The protest reads as follows:

OFFICE OF GREENBRIER CANNING COMPANY,
Lewisburg, W. Va., May 12, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We wish to say through you that we earnestly protest against any additional duty on tin-plate, and would be gratified to have the present duty removed, and if a higher rate is put on it we feel confident it will greatly damage, if not entirely destroy, the canning industry of the country.

Yours, very respectfully, etc.,

GREENBRIER CANNING COMPANY,
Per D. R. THOMAS, *Treasurer.*
GREENBRIER CREAMERY COMPANY,
Per H. T. BELL, *Treasurer.*

Hon. JOHN D. ALDERSON,
Congressman Third District West Virginia, Washington, D. C.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I personally know that the Greenbrier Canning Company and the Greenbrier Creamery Company are new industries, with fair prospects of success even under the existing law, which is not favorable to them, giving employment to a number of laborers, purchasing directly from farmers the products of their farms, and thereby benefiting the people of the agricultural communities in which they do business by furnishing to the agriculturists a "home market." The gentlemen composing these firms are entitled to as much consideration as are the persons who make up any combination, syndicate, or trust interested in a tariff on tin-plate. I also know that this is not a partisan petition. This protest recites that "if a higher rate is put on it" (tin-plate) "we feel confident it will greatly damage if not entirely destroy the canning industry of the country."

Protest after protest has come up here against the increase of the duty on tin-plate, but without avail. "Joined to their idols" at one moment; in the next breath arguing that a tariff reduces the price to consumers; claiming now that competition controls and reduces prices, and in the next instant that it is necessary to increase duties in order to protect "infant industries," the majority has been and is deaf to the entreaties and petitions of the people.

"Infant industries," indeed!

It is an admitted fact that no tin-plate is produced in this country. Why, then, a duty upon tin-plate at all? Why an increase of duty? Is it proposed to protect an industry which does not exist? The pretext for an increase of duty is found in the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, wherein it is stated:

We make sheet-iron and sheet-steel, and it is confidently believed that we have in the Dakotas pig-tin in sufficient quantities for use in making all of the tin required for this market.

The majority "confidently believe" that pig-tin may be found in the Dakotas, and upon that presumption more than double the duty on tin-plate.

Upon quite as good and reliable evidence we might suppose that there is no tin in America, and as far as known it is a fact that no commercial tin exists. But, Mr. Chairman, let us look at the weakness and unreasonableness of the position assumed by the majority. They not only clothe in princely and gorgeous habiliments the "infant industries" now in existence, but they attempt by this bill to beget new and bastard offspring, and prepare in advance the swaddling clothes and raiment of fine linen for a child which they themselves admit may never be born, and all at the expense of the great masses of the people, the farmers, the artisans, the laborers of the country, the consumers.

With an overflowing Treasury what excuse existed for taxing the people of the country in 1889 more than $7,000,000 upon the importation of tin-plates? What good reason is there now for more than doubling this tax, as is proposed by this bill? These are questions which will be asked by what they call the "middle class" and by the poor people of the land, who almost exclusively purchase and use and consume the articles and wares manufactured from tin-plate, and the meats, vegetables, and fruits put up by the canning establishments of the country.

Mr. Chairman, it has been conceded in all the controversies and disputes of this debate that no tin is produced in America. I have made this statement before and I make it again. Tin, if ever we produced it, is a lost art in our Republic; we have no tin; we produce no tin. The claim that a duty on tin is to protect and promote American industries and production is a subterfuge and a sham by which the manufacturers of sheet-iron propose to make the people abandon tin and pay a double price for sheet-iron as a substitute for all the uses to which tin is applied, thereby to increase the profits of sheet-iron manufacturers.

This is plain English, but it is a fact. This substitution would begin with sheet-iron roofs and end with sheet-iron spoons, if there would be any end. And this brings us to the real issue involved in this proposition, to increase the duty and multiply the tax on tin-plate. Where does it lead? This bill increases the tax from 1 cent to more than 2 cents; we leave out the fraction and simply say that the tax is more than doubled.

Now, let us for a moment pause and see who is affected by the imposition of this fresh burden and increased tax. The millionaire uses gold and silver, and ivory and pearls, and the things that are precious of this earth. It makes no difference to him what they cost. He buys them because they cost. He is able to do so. He is the "infant in-

dustry" who is protected by this bill. He would spurn a tin cup or a tin spoon and kick it from his dining-room as he would kick a burglar from his mansion, and he does this all, it is claimed, for the sake of "American labor" and "home market." The truth is the great American people need and use and must have tin-plate.

Tin is a necessity. It constitutes for the people their buckets, their dish-pans, their plates, their spoons, their fruit-cans, their wash-basins, their wash-boards, their coffee-pots, their tea-pots, their cups (half-gallons, quarts, pints, and half-pints), the miners' lamps, and the roofs which cover their homes. Genius could not enumerate the uses to which tin is applied in this great and glorious country of ours. The whole subject is covered by the statement, plain and simple as it is, that tin is an article of universal consumption, of universal necessity, except, possibly, for the rich. And yet no tin-plate is produced in this country.

It seems to me that argument is superfluous. No theory could inspire or justify an increase of tax on tin except the inspiration that the rich man is made to ride and the poor man to pull in the traces. The proposition is made to this Congress that certain gentlemen should be allowed to experiment at public expense and ascertain whether they may be able to produce at a profit this prime necessity. There is no claim that the revenue to be derived will be necessary for the support of Government. The position is not assumed that any industry now in existence will be benefited by the imposition of this burdensome and unnecessary tax, but the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means pretend that a new industry may possibly be created and set on foot in this country, and another leech is placed on the body politic.

This whole bill is builded upon this same false and indefensible doctrine, the doctrine that, regardless of the question of revenue, the masses should be taxed to increase the profits of a few persons engaged in manufacturing, who themselves make the specious plea that they can not continue their business unless the tariff tax is increased, and in the opinion of the great body of the favored few "they can not continue their business" unless their neighbors are taxed for their benefit, whereby they may amass great fortunes in hot haste at the expense of the public.

We believe, and with the assurance that we are right, that there should be some gauge, some limit, to the taxes imposed upon the people; that where such a vast sum is necessary annually for the payment of pensions and the current expenses of the Government, which sum must in the main be collected by an indirect system of taxation—by a tariff system—the industries of this country will be sufficiently protected when the rates of duty are high enough to realize this immense amount. And thus the issue is presented.

It is not a question of "free trade." It is a question whether the people shall be taxed more in amount than is necessary for this Government. The politician or statesman who wastes his time in charging it upon us that we are "free-traders," as the Republicans busy themselves to do, is not worthy of consideration. Free trade is impracticable under our system of government; freer trade is not impracticable.

If time permitted I would be glad to go through the schedules of this bill and show where they discriminate in favor of the few against the many, where the masses, the great body of consumers, are unnecessarily and unreasonably taxed to benefit the manufacturers, the privileged classes, and not the laboring people, as has been so often assumed.

I desire also briefly to refer to the enormous increase proposed by this bill in the tax on lamp-chimneys. Mr. Chairman, a lamp-chimney is apparently so insignificant a thing that it may be presumed that nobody cares what you tax it or how you do it. But it happens, in the providences of nature, that my district affords a peculiar demonstration of the enormity and injustice of this tax. I represent a homogeneous and a good people, but in large part they live in the mountains, and, while they earn all they enjoy, the lack of railroad and other facilities for transportation has necessitated largely the continuance of primitive methods.

In my whole district, filled as it is with coal and salt, primeval forests, and all the elements which are so rapidly producing wealth in the country, it is a fact, and I frankly admit it, that outside the great resort known as "the White Sulphur Springs" there is only one town in the whole district lighted by gas. Now, in the face of this fact what can you expect of me when you propose by this bill and its arbitrary increase of duties to double the cost of lamp-chimneys to every household in my mountain district and send its members to bed in the dark?

"Large sales and small profits" is a maxim in commercial law, and so I presume it is calculated by the promoters of this bill that it is a simple thing to make the school children of West Virginia or their parents put away the lights and the little ones go to sleep with lessons unlearned or pay a tax of 5 cents each or more to enrich the coffers of the manufacturers whose half-paid laborers blow or press the glass. Take off your tax from the light that guides the footsteps of the people in the dark hour. As God Almighty would paralyze the arm that would hinder the sunshine, His own free gift that guides them by day, so will the people strike down the party which favors this iniquitous tax. Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to know that Republicans have arisen on this floor to protest against this enormity. But they represent the great agricultural regions of the far West, and it is painful to see that they, like their Democratic brethren, are disregarded in every appeal for justice for the people against the beneficiaries of this Republican bill.

The subjects which I have named are not exceptional cases in which the people are to be imposed upon by this bill. They simply represent the theory, practical effect, and policy of the entire bill with reference to every article consumed by the people and manufactured by a special class. The farmer, the artisan, and the laborer have not had their influence felt here, but the mainspring of the Committee on Ways and Means has been touched by every monopolist in the land, and the simple suggestion of what it requires to make him rich has met with response.

I am sorry this debate is so limited. I would be glad to speak further upon this bill.

While you, my Republican brethren, may cut off debate here—and I do not blame you for this course, for besides the hard raps it has received from this side I am of opinion that if one or two more good Republicans should rise above party for the time being and "speak out in meeting" the life of this monstrosity of a bill would be "of few days and full of trouble"—I want to say to you that there is a forum before which debate will not be limited, the forum of the people, before which we will strip from this measure the last vestige of hollowness, deceit, and unmeaningness, and expose its rottenness and hypocrisy.

It is to this feast we invite you.

It has been wonderful to me to see in this day and generation so many friends of the "dear farmers" and "laboring men" stand up and proclaim their devotion to these classes. Has it dawned upon the country at last that the men who have been fulfilling the scriptural requirement, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," have torn asunder their fetters, have awaked from their lethargy, and have determined to exercise the power they possess, a power long unexercised and left dormant?

And the people are not to be deceived and cajoled by false promises and false pretenses. Is it believed that the farmer is so lacking in intelligence that he can be satisfied by a proposed increase of the rates of duty on farm products when he knows that he sells his corn and wheat in a free-trade market and purchases his necessaries of life in a market highly protected, and the agricultural interests from one end of the land to the other are in a declining and prostrated condition?

Is it supposed that the laboring man is to be satisfied with the specious plea that high rates of duties increase his wages, when he has an every-day experience that his labor goes into a free market governed by the law of supply and demand, and his wife and children are suffering for the necessaries of life under the very shadow of the princely home of his employer?

Mr. Chairman, the "leaven is working," and "by their fruits ye shall know them."

You can not deceive the people by a measure of this kind. Even Republican Representatives see "the handwriting on the wall." In the remarks made by Mr. BUTTERWORTH, the distinguished member from Ohio, on the 10th instant, when discussing this bill, this language is found:

> I sound this note of warning, and whatever this House may decide, and although it may resound with plaudits of utterances that a Chinese wall is the security of our people, yet I assert that there never was a time in the history of the Republican party when it was in more danger of defeat than upon this one suggested idea that it is permissible to levy tribute upon all the people of this country of 65,000,000 to confer a benefit upon a few hundreds by going beyond the imposition of a protective tariff necessary to remove inequalities and impart to competition the quality of fairness. Equalizing opportunities is not exacting tribute. Creating inequalities is producing the very evil the protective system was intended to remove.
>
> Now, sir, I read with sadness the attempt to satisfy the farmers and other laborers and producers, and to induce them to believe they will find quicker prosperity, lighter burdens, and greater strength to bear them in the clause of this bill which imposes increased duties on agricultural products; that they will derive a benefit from a duty on Canada eggs; a duty on potatoes and barley; a duty on rye, corn, etc., and the like imported from Canada. In other words, that the hens will lay during the winter when eggs are high if we only rule out the fruit of the Canadian hen. We are exporters of wheat, and not importers, and yet they would build a dam to keep the water from running up the hill. We are exporters of corn, but would request the Canadians to shut their doors and thus close the highway to that great market for our corn. Is the fact overlooked that all along our northern border there would be immense establishments, employing thousands of workmen, built up to utilize Canadian lumber, Canadian minerals, but for the useless and absurd notion that we must levy a tax upon all the people of this country, which has no other effect than to bestow exclusive advantages upon a few who have already become possessed of the wealth of Crœsus?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH is one of the ablest Representatives on this floor and a Republican of national reputation. The note of warning sounded by Mr. BUTTERWORTH will not be heeded by his associates here. They will pass this bill, and when the time of retribution comes the people at the polls will mete out to the party and the men who favor this iniquitous measure the reward they deserve. This satisfaction and its certain coming is worth more than mere temporary ascendency or success.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is to strike out paragraph 727, page 120. In other words, strike sugar from the free-list.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any cut on sugar. The shibboleth of my political campaign in the fall of 1888 was "protection to sugar." Protection to American industries as a principle was considered the doctrine of the Republican party and the political issue was plainly stated to be American protected labor *versus* pauper, slave, cooly, peon, or free-trade labor. A Republican member of Congress was elected from the wealthiest district in the State of Louisiana, the district having the largest white majority in the State and which had been represented in Congress by a Democrat for thirteen consecutive years, excepting one year, from March, 1885, to March, 1886, when Hon. Michael Hahn, Republican, was the Representative. The personal popularity of Hon. Michael Hahn and his well known views in regard to protection, labor, and the rights of the workingman secured for him a number of independent votes which were of great importance towards his election.

The workingmen and laborers in the city of New Orleans and the plantation hands in the sugar parishes of Jefferson, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, and St. James were told that the Republican party was the party of protection to American labor and that protection to sugar would surely follow the election of a Republican President and enough Republican members of Congress to control the House of Representatives. The Republican national platform adopted in Chicago in June, 1888, states in unmistakable language:

> We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against the destruction as proposed by the President [Cleveland] and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff.

After the election in November, 1888, the Louisiana Republican member of Congress elect visited the Republican President-elect at Indianapolis and was there told by the President-elect that there would be no conflict between the Republican party and the question of "protection to sugar."

The death of Hon. Edward J. Gay, of Louisiana, caused an election for member of Congress in the Third Congressional district of Louisiana in the summer of 1889, and in that campaign Hon. J. C. BURROWS, member of Congress from Michigan; Hon. J. H. ROWELL, member of Congress from Illinois, and Hon. S. R. PETERS, member of Congress from Kansas, were sent to this sugar district of Louisiana by the national Republican campaign committee to assist in electing a Republican member of Congress to succeed Hon. E. J. Gay. In that campaign both the Republican and the Democratic candidates were sugar-planters.

I heard the speeches of Hon. J. C. BURROWS at Bayou Goula and at Plaquemine, La., and I am informed that all the speeches delivered by these gentlemen promised that the Republican party was the party of protection to American industries as a principle, and none of their speeches implied that sugar was to be protected by bounty.

The duty received by the Government last year on those grades of sugar which it is proposed to put on the free-list amounted to $54,894,181, and the production of sugar by foreign Governments will be stimulated by the fact that foreign sugar will have an open and free market in this country. At present each person in the United States pays into the United States Treasury less than $1 per annum to protect the sugar industry against competition from foreign sugar; and the cultivation of sugar is entitled as an American industry to protection as much as the growing of flax, wool, or hops, the development of tin-plate manufacturing, the salt industry, the lime industry, and the other articles and industries in the long list which are protected by the proposed tariff bill.

The people understand that money paid into the United States Treasury by the citizens of this country is not lost to the people, but remains a valuable asset, in which all have an undivided interest or share. If the pension bill which has passed this House becomes a law and other appropriations known to be urgent and necessary are made, the operations of the sinking fund must be suspended if the revenues of the country are to be reduced. The protection afforded sugar by the existing tariff yields an important and valuable revenue. The country can not abolish this revenue from sugar and reduce the national debt at the same time. This is a plain arithmetical fact. The Republican Administration is pledged to pass a dependent pension bill, and justice to the soldiers by whose acts and devotion this Union was preserved demands a liberal policy towards the veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I was a Confederate soldier, a private in Lee's army of Northern Virginia for nearly four years. During the month of May, twenty-seven years ago, I was a prisoner of war at Fort Delaware. When the Confederate battle-flag, endeared to me by the blood of kindred and comrades went down forever, twenty-five years ago, the war ended and the beautiful star representing fair Louisiana, my native State, was reset in that victorious union of the Stars and Stripes, that glorious emblem of our reunited country. [Applause.] I am loyal to Louisiana and I am loyal to that flag, and I consider it a proud privilege to assist in securing with my vote and my voice liberal recognition in the matter of pensions to Union soldiers (or their widows) [applause] for their heroic acts and patriotic devotion [applause], which have preserved to us and to generations following the glorious Union of these United States.

In a few days a nation's love and respect will be manifested by the beautiful ceremony of decorating the graves of the Union dead, expressing a beautiful sentiment in recognition of devotion. Many of these Union soldiers' graves are in Louisiana, and flowers will be tendered then and there by those who wore the gray, and will be accepted by those who wore the blue, and be placed with sentiments of love and kindness on the graves of our nation's dead. Shall this Republican Administration forget the widows of those whose graves we decorate?

Mr. Chairman, the Philadelphia Press, which is recognized in this country as an influential paper and strong in the Republican faith, states in its issue of the 2d of this month as follows:

> With pensions increased and the revenue reduced there can be no sinking-fund payments, no river and harbor appropriations, no new public buildings, and no expansion of the regular appropriation bills. Congress is inclined to do all these things. It can not without a deficit. A deficit for the fiscal year 1891 will be reported on the eve of the next Presidential election. It will call for explanation of a kind which no party in this country has had to make since 1860, when the Democrats had to report a deficit.
>
> This is not argument. It is fact. Congress has to appropriate for next year a margin of $92,728,000 after paying out what the Government must have for ordinary expenditures. The dependent pension bill takes $40,000,000. The sinking fund calls for $49,159,073. This takes practically all there is. Bills already passed will absorb the rest. But the McKinley tariff bill will take from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 more by reducing the revenue. The caucus silver bill will take $10,000,000 more profit on coinage. For public improvements $12,000,000 is provided in the estimate. Congress proposes to add $12,000,000 more. Public buildings and other additions to the estimates stand for another $10,000,000. This is a deficit of $72,000,000, if Congress carries out its present plans and the payment of pensions and the debt both go on. If the payment of the debt is stopped the reduction of the revenue will take the rest, and the silver bill and public works, buildings, and so on will still leave a deficit of over $30,000,000.

Even if there was not a deficit there are claims against the Government which are just and should have been paid long since, claims that grew out of the operations of the war known as war claims. The justness of these claims is based on four facts: The property was taken; the valuation is correct and fair; the loyalty of the claimants proven beyond dispute; and the claims have not been paid. The French spoliation claims are recognized to be just by all who have investigated them, and should be paid by a just and honorable Government which assumed their payment and thus relieved the French Government of these obligations.

I believe that the depositors in that Government institution, the Freedman's Savings-Bank, should be paid the balance that is due them on their hard-earned deposits, placed by them in confidence and good faith in that national institution. I believe that the amounts justly due to these Freedman's Bank depositors, most of whom are colored people working long hours in daily toil, should be paid. I believe that, rather than enrich the pockets of those who produce sugar by slave, cooly, and peon labor, it is far better to increase the amount in the United States Treasury, from which could be drawn appropriations for the education, by the National Government, of the ignorant masses of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the payment of a bounty of 2 cents a pound to the producer of sugar from the soil is seductive and if it was possible to secure it for the time specified in this bill—fifteen years—would carry convincing influence of its stimulating effect. If the production of sugar is stimulated by this bounty, the amount of $7,500,000 to be paid to the sugar-producer to-day will grow until it reaches such large proportions that it will be considered a burden and become a conspicuous target for political "reformers."

There are some plantations in Louisiana which produce 3,000,000 or more pounds of sugar per annum, and the payment of a bounty of 2 cents per pound means the payment of checks of the United States Government for amounts from $60,000 upwards directly from the Treasury into the pockets of individuals. Fancy a stump speaker displaying a copy of one of these checks to his audience in sections of this country where sugar is not produced; hear him harangue the multitude in some such strain as this: "Fellow-citizens, look upon this check of the United States Treasury which calls for the payment of $60,000 for one year's crop of sugar to Mr. X. Y. Z., a sugar plantation lord of Louisiana, who receives from the Government $60,000 cash; and in addition to this cash he gets the market price for his crop. What do you receive, fellow-citizens, from the United States Government for the production of your maple sugar, your wheat, your corn, your hay, your vegetables, etc., etc., etc., etc., etc.?" [Laughter and applause.]

The strength of this argument will be intensified if, by any chain of circumstances or events, accidental or otherwise, the price of sugar happens to be then about what it was before the bounty enactment; then the argument would carry weight and influence that could not be opposed; and you gentlemen who sit here now representing the people of this country, if you are re-elected, would be compelled to repeal before five years the very law which this Republican House is trying now to enact.

The stability of this bounty, I fear, is not to be trusted. The Republican voters who have sent me to Congress to represent their interest have no confidence that this bounty will last, believing that it

is simply a step towards free sugar, pure and simple. They believe that you realize the merciless cruelty of making free sugar at one swoop, and you attempt to mitigate this evil by reaching the result by gradual approaches, by providing a bounty to-day to be taken off to-morrow.

Mr. Chairman, I am here as a Republican elected on the platform of protection to American industries. I am here to protect the industries of the American people all along the line. From the lime in Maine to the sugar and rice in Louisiana; from the glass lamp-chimneys of New York and Pennsylvania to the wool of Ohio and Iowa and borax of California; also Michigan lumber and Wisconsin beer. [Laughter and applause.] And now, fair play demands that you do not forsake the sugar interests of Louisiana, from which State I was elected a Republican member of Congress. [Loud applause.]

I submit herewith a telegram dated Baton Rouge, La., May 12, 1890, from Hon. Charles A. Bourgeois, member of the Louisiana Legislature, secretary, and Hon. Richard Simms, State senator, president, both of whom are prominent leaders of the colored people in Louisiana:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *May* 12, 1890.

To Hon. H. D. COLEMAN:

At a meeting held by the Republican members of the General Assembly of Louisiana we were directed to transmit to you the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That a majority of the colored people are opposed to the schedule of the McKinley tariff bill placing sugar on the free-list or any deep cut thereof."

Respectfully,

C. A. BOURGEOIS, *Secretary.*
RICHARD SIMMS, *Chairman.*

I submit another telegram of same date from Mr. Charles A. Roxborough and Mr. J. L. Jones, prominent colored citizens of the parish of Iberville:

PLAQUEMINE, LA., *May* 12, 1890.

Hon. H. DUDLEY COLEMAN, *Washington:*

As colored citizens of Iberville we desire to protest against the article in the New Orleans Crusader read by Governor GEAR advising a deep cut in the tariff on sugar. This paper is not the recognized organ of the colored people of Iberville. If sugar cut in the McKinley bill is adopted it will be the means of putting the laborers on the sugar plantations in a thralldom of overbearing taskmasters. Nay, it will ruin the garden spot of Louisiana, and bring ruin and starvation to the thousands of laborers who rely upon the cultivation of sugar for a livelihood. We believe in a tariff for protection, and not one for revenue only. We desire you to read this to Congress.

CHAS. A. ROXBOROUGH,
J. L. JONES.

I also submit an editorial, published last Saturday, May 17, in The Standard-Pelican, the official organ of the Republican party in New Orleans, La., published by Hon. T. B. Stamps, ex-State senator:

THE CONTEST FOR SUGAR.

In behalf of our colored people we protest against the proposed reduction in the sugar tariff or the placing of this home production on the free-list. This industry is the source of living of nearly one-half of our people in this State, and we must say they enjoy a freer expression of their franchise and far better in the sugar district of Louisiana than in any other portion of the State; therefore we ask that sugar be protected. The colored laborers do not desire in asking this protection to be considered as paupers upon the bounty of the nation; they only desire the privilege of earning their living equal with that of citizens of other sections of the country. As it is they are driven about from one section of the South to another by political oppression, seeking some place where political freedom actually exists.

The Republicans of the nation have always expressed solicitude for our welfare, and we believe sincerely so. We wish to call attention to the fact that the extinction of the sugar industry of this State will be a blow to the welfare of that class of our people for whom they have expressed so much solicitude. After failing to furnish educational aid, so long promised and hoped for, to be deprived of means of livelihood is a severe trial to our people.

The proposed bounty on sugar is a delusion and a snare. It establishes an undesirable precedent and will be so regarded. Congress can not justly bind or attempt to establish the future tariff sentiment of the country. New conditions are constantly arising and the voice of the people expresses these changed conditions at each succeeding Congressional election.

I submit also a set of resolutions:

At a mass meeting held by the colored farmers and laborers at the court-house of the parish of West Baton Rouge, the 15th day of March, 1890, the meeting was called to order by Mr. Frank Delany, who stated the object of the meeting.

On motion of Mr. C. B. Landry, Mr. Alexander Banes was elected president, and on motion of Mr. Davis, Mr. Frank Delany was elected secretary.

On motion of Mr. Delany that a committee of three be appointed on resolutions, the chair appointed the following-named gentlemen on resolutions: Delany, Landry, and Davis.

And on motion of Mr. Delany, the meeting took a recess for five minutes to allow the committee time to report.

Whereas an article published in the New Orleans Crusader containing the following language: "A deep cut on the tariff would free the laborers from the thralldom of their overbearing taskmasters," is being quoted by members of the Ways and Means Committee of Congress with possibly damaging effect against the sugar industry of this State:

Be it resolved, That we declare that the New Orleans Crusader on this subject does not express the opinion of an overwhelming majority of the colored population of this State.

Be it further resolved, That on the successful continuation of the sugar industry depends the welfare of the masses of our population, and any blow aimed against it will cause great suffering and distress with all classes of our citizens.

Be it further resolved, That we urge upon our Representatives and Senators in Congress to use all honorable means to defeat the present tariff bill now under consideration.

On motion of Mr. C. B. Landry, the proceedings be published in the Times, Democrat, Pelican, and New Orleans Picayune.

On motion of Mr. Landry, the secretary be authorized to take the proper steps to transmit the proceedings of this meeting to our Representatives in Congress.

On motion of Mr. Landry, the meeting adjourned.

ALEX. BANES, *President.*
FRANK DELANY, *Secretary.*

These show very clearly the views of the colored people in Louisiana on this important question of "protection to sugar."

Mr. WILKINSON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress I voted to put tinned plate, wool, salt and lumber on the free-list and to retain the duty upon sugar up to about 68 per cent. If the opportunity should occur to me during this Congress—but I do not expect it, as I have waited in vain for a chance to offer such amendments—I would again vote to put lumber, salt, and wool upon the free-list; but I am not willing to put sugar on the free-list with or without a bounty [applause on the Democratic side]; and it is because of a principle—because the duty upon sugar is simply a revenue tariff.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has spoken of this duty as one of the revenue leeches, as if a revenue tariff was something to be sneered at as a wicked device of evil. A revenue tariff is a tariff that goes from one pocket of the American citizen into another pocket. It comes from the people at large into the Treasury of the United States to be there held as the property of the United States, each individual having still his interest and share in that money to pay out again to the citizens and for the citizens of the United States. No one can tell where the increase in price which is caused by a protective tariff goes. The owners of the protected industry manage that.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me I said leech on the protective system.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Better be a leech upon the protective system than a leech upon the pockets of the many for the use of the few, as the protective system itself can be made to be and is being made to be in many parts of this bill. When I pay an increase of 2 cents a pound on sugar because of the duty I can trace it into the Treasury of the United States to bear part of my share of the various expenses of the people's Government. Upon more than one occasion I have traced the increased price of articles caused by protective duties into the pockets of the manufacturers who produced the article. You say the law made me pay that tax to the manufacturer for the benefit of the labor. I question whether the labor ever gets its share.

But I must make some other statements about this duty on sugar. I wish it understood that I would support the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILKINSON] to retain the duty at what it was retained in the Mills bill. If we can not retain it at that point, I would then vote for the proposition of the gentleman from California, to retain it at 45 per cent., and that without a bounty.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I think, was misinformed in regard to the sugar interests in the Sandwich Islands. I have no time to discuss the reciprocity treaty, which was made by the Republican party, but give all of its virtues to their credit and all of its vices, if any, to their discredit. As a matter of fact, the sugar plantations in the Sandwich Islands are owned by a large number of American citizens spread all over this country, and not by a few individuals. When we speak upon this subject there arises in the mind of almost every American citizen the image of the gentleman who is known as the sugar king. I am credibly informed that that gentleman appeared here in Washington and stated before the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that they would be satisfied to have the duty taken off of sugar if a bounty were put on.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I want to state to the gentleman from Ohio, for I know he does not want to make a misstatement, that no such statement was made to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have just been so informed.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I think it is due for me to say that, because I know you do not want to make a misrepresentation.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly not, but just now I was so informed, and I thought I was credibly informed, having confidence in the gentleman who stated it to me for use in this debate.

I have here Statistical Abstract No. 12, and from it I wish to show how unfairly gentlemen deal with the sugar industry in speaking about the want of growth of that industry. Now, I am not a protectionist and I would not keep this duty for the sake of protecting the sugar industry; but let me show you the result of incidental protection according to your own claims of results from tariffs. Taking this Statistical Abstract on page 169, and we have the amount of sugar produced in 1851. It was over 231,000,000 pounds. The amount produced in 1862—eleven years afterwards, before the war had devastated the sugar industry—was over 528,000,000 pounds, about 130 per cent. increase in ten years. Then the industry was wiped out, obliterated almost, swept from the face of the earth; so that from 528,000,000 pounds, in 1862, it went down to only 10,800,000 pounds, in 1865. Now, this book shows an increase from that 10,800,000 pounds, in 1865, at the close of the war; starting afresh, the production in 1888 had reached 353,855,877 pounds; the increase has been 3,400 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Does the gentleman contend that that is on account of protection?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; I do not make any such contention. It is such an argument as you make for other industries. Protection does

increase this product more than it does in any other industry, where it is in spite of protection.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Then I do not see the relevancy of your argument.

Mr. McKINLEY. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS].

Mr. McCOMAS. I will yield two minutes of that to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER], and in the three minutes remaining I desire to call the attention of the committee to the amendment of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STEWART] and myself, in the same terms, upon offering a bounty for maple sugar.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will you not let glucose sugar made from starch come in under the same provision?

Mr. McCOMAS. No; I would not go that far. If my friend desires it he can offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I will offer one. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCOMAS. Now, we demand if this is put upon the free-list that a compensatory duty should follow. This sugar can be raised in this country and it can be raised to a large extent by farmers in portions of the country where it is not now raised, on poor soils; and according to some information which has been given on that subject, there is every reason to say, as Professor Wiley says, "that a race of maples yielding a large percentage of sugar can be developed as easily as a race of cows from which a large quantity of butter can be made, and among maples there may be a race of Jerseys."

Now, when you put the bounty on sorghum and on the beet sugar you ought to put an equivalent bounty on maple trees and maple groves for the farmers of this country. Last year there were 22,000 tons of maple sugar produced in this country, and from Canada there came 404,000 pounds. Now that the tariff is off there will be a large influx of it into this country. I favor free sugar. I favor a bounty on sugar. I am glad the committee have had the courage to face the sugar trust and raise the test to 16. I shall vote for the provision as it is, but I hope the committee will make it consistent and encourage the maple-sugar industry along with the rest. That sugar is produced in eleven States; it is raised in my own State; it is growing in importance; it is growing in production; and we ought to do what we can to foster and increase the development of this industry, so important to the farmers of this country.

The two minutes that I have remaining I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CANDLER].

[Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts, addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILKINSON. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW].

[Mr. MORROW addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McKINLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN].

[Mr. HERMANN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILKINSON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM].

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to a bounty on sugar or a bounty on any other article, because I believe that under the Constitution no power exists to pay a bounty to any industry. I am in favor of a reduction of the duties upon sugar to a revenue basis. The reason I am opposed to placing sugar on the free-list is that it is a revenue article. We received some $56,000,000 of duty on sugar last year, and I am opposed to removing this tax, which goes into the Treasury of the United States, in order that the wool-growers of Ohio, the tin-plate manufacturers of Pennsylvania, the lime manufacturers of Maine, and the lumber manufacturers of New England shall put this amount of money into their pocket. I prefer a tax which when collected from the people goes into the Treasury to a tax that goes into the pockets of the manufacturers.

I shall therefore vote for an amendment which makes a reduction in the duties upon sugar, but which does not recognize the power of this Government to pay a bounty, to levy a tax upon one man in order to put the money into the pocket of another. Such a principle is a recognition of the doctrine of the communist, who would take the property of one man and give it to another. The only difference is that the communist would take from the rich and give to the poor, while this committee would take from the poor to give to the rich. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. The debate is not entirely closed, I believe?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has not expired, but no gentleman seemed desirous of occupying the floor.

Mr. WILKINSON. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON].

[Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McKINLEY. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McCORD].

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to add anything new to the subject under discussion, nor do I intend to discuss the schedules of this bill.

The economic question of protection, more than any other with which our Government has had to deal, has received the careful attention and best thought of our scholars and statesmen, and the system in connection with administering the Government is as old as the Government itself; in fact, the principle was among the first recognized by law by the young Republic, as a tariff bill, a bill designed not more for revenue than to protect what few infant industries we then had and to encourage others to build up, was among its early enactments.

The bill under discussion I believe is the best, if not the only genuine, tariff bill ever presented to the American people. It aims to formulate a system of assessing and collecting the revenues needed for the support of the Government and at the same time guard and protect our established industries and encourage and build up others which we hope to get. It seeks to protect our labor against competition with the cheap labor of Europe and elsewhere, to protect the great agricultural interests against the damaging effects of foreign importations, and at the same time reduce the revenue to the lowest possible amount consistent with providing the means of administering the Government.

As stated, it is not my purpose at this time to review the schedules of this bill. That would take too much time were I capable of doing it intelligently and instructively, which I confess I am not. I simply want to call attention to a few items in the bill and then discuss briefly the principle of protection itself.

First let me say that the bill under consideration is the only measure ever brought before Congress that distinctly recognized and protected the great agricultural interests of this country. Up to this time the tillers of the soil have been lost sight of in the legislation upon this subject. True their interests in some particulars have been guarded, but not so much but that over $60,000,000 worth of farm produce has been permitted to be imported into this country in one year comparatively free of duty. This bill, in my judgment, goes a long way towards preventing a recurrence of such transactions. It gives sufficient protection to the products of the farm to prevent articles of foreign raising that are sometimes brought here at a nominal freight—sometimes as ballast—from taking the place of the products of our own farms. And why should not this be so? Everything the farmer uses in the way of tools and machinery in carrying on his farm or consumes or wears, if imported, is protected, and I ask again why not his products? [Applause].

But, Mr. Chairman, before I proceed with my argument I want to dig up root and branch that great fraud and scarecrow which has been flaunted in our faces ever since this discussion began. I allude to that great bugaboo, farm mortgages.

It is said that the West is plastered with mortgages. Alarming statistics have been read here to show that the entire farm product of the West for years would be insufficient to satisfy the mortgages that are already upon the farms; that this generation or the next will not see these mortgages taken up and satisfied. And the cause of this terrible state of affairs in the minds of our friends over there is the protective policy that has obtained for the last thirty years. In the first place, let me say that this picture is highly overdrawn. No such state of affairs exists.

True, many farms are mortgaged, and times with the farmers are hard, and the price of produce is low; but there are causes for this. One is the want of protection or the low duty which allows foreign produce to be brought here and sold to the extent of $60,000,000 a year; another is that 46 per cent. of the entire population of the country is engaged in agriculture in its various branches, while 37 per cent. of the population, with the improved machinery now in use, is sufficient to produce all that our home consumption requires, even if we could have the entire home market to ourselves.

I said the statement of the amount of mortgages upon the farms of the West was greatly overstated. The statistics, it is true, show a large amount in the aggregate, but let me tell you how a large amount of this is made up. I cut out of a newspaper published in my district the following item:

The largest mortgage ever recorded in Chippewa County was received by Register of Deeds Dalton yesterday. It was given by the Wisconsin Iron Company to the Massachusetts Loan and Trust Company for $1,500,000. The mortgage covers 5,336 acres in Ashland County, 206 acres in Chippewa County, 4,991 acres in St. Croix County, 9,384 acres in Price County, 13,200 acres in Taylor County, a right of way through St. Croix County; also lands in Pierce and Dunn Counties, together with machinery, minerals, saw-mills, etc., on such lands. It is a voluminous document, consisting of thirty-five closely printed pages.

Not one acre of this land is a farm or any part of a farm, yet it goes to make up the aggregate amount. But a little while ago a railway company whose headquarters are in my State executed a mortgage for $15,000,000, covering lands in every county through which the road passes. This mortgage, like other mortgages, must be recorded in every county in which lands mentioned in the mortgage are located, and the full amount of the mortgage is reckoned as many times as the

mortgage is recorded, which frequently is in a dozen or more different counties.

Frequently large mining enterprises are started mainly on borrowed capital, and a mortgage on lands in different counties is given to secure some Eastern loan and trust company, and the aggregate of the several recordings is charged up and figured into the grand aggregate and all charged to the account of mortgages on farms, so that it is a fact that indebtedness represented by mortgages of record is not anything like a correct indication of money actually due and unpaid, because millions of this *prima facie* indebtedness has been paid. For instance, a mortgage securing an indebtedness of $5,000 may be partially or even wholly paid, although not canceled of record. So true is this that the instances are few where the face of the indebtedness as appears from the record is a correct index to the amount actually due. Again, many mortgages are taken to secure a contingent liability, and many others represent no actual indebtedness whatever, but are fraudulent and given to cover up property to hinder or defraud creditors.

It is true, however, that the actual amount of real, genuine unpaid farm mortgages is enough, far more than I wish it were; but the statistics which have been paraded here upon this subject are wholly unreliable and deceptive. I do not believe the actual unpaid, genuine farm mortages are one-tenth of the amount represented, and I know that the farmers of my State are well fed, well clothed, well educated, and not greatly in debt; and, while they are not making money as fast as they ought to for the capital, energy, and labor invested, yet they are a long way from the poor-house and are contented and comparatively prosperous and happy. If they can have the protection they are entitled to, the protection that this bill gives, then they will prosper as they never have before.

I have been astonished to learn what great, what ardent, what unyielding friends the farmers and the soldiers have in members on the other side of this House. Their hearts are continually bleeding with sympathy for the poor farmers, the poor soldiers, and the poor men. Did they bleed for them or any of them when they were in the majority? Not a bit of it; there was no heart-bleeding then. Even the Mills bill did not pretend to give any adequate protection to the farmers, and the record of that party on the subject of pensions is well illustrated by the acts of their late President. [Applause.]

Now, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is one in the interests of protection, protection to all, and the rate of duty as low in the main as it can well be made and furnish the necessary protection to our home institutions and interests and the necessary revenues to carry on the Government; and while I doubt the wisdom of some of the schedules—for instance, the one fixing a higher duty on tin-plate, inserted with a good motive, it is true, but which I fear will be an expensive and unsatisfactory experiment, and which I would prefer not to have tried—I also doubt the wisdom of so large a reduction of the revenue derived from the sale of tobacco, and I would not pay a farthing of bounty to encourage the sugar industry, but would take off every cent of the duty on sugar; yet, as a whole and as the best thing we are liable to get, I shall vote for the whole bill from the first to the last section, and every schedule in it, believing as I do that it is a bill in the interest of both the Government and the people. Having said this much in favor of the bill under consideration, I wish to discuss briefly the principles of protection and give a few reasons for the faith that is in me.

The principle of protection has never in this country until since the beginning of the late war had a fair trial. Its existence prior to that period upon our statutes has been during brief intervals and continually menaced by hostile legislation, attempted legislation, or sentiment; so that neither the Government nor the people have had the continuous and uninterrupted benefits of its workings. Still, during the most of the time of the existence of the Government, we have been going along under a sort of a protective system.

Just why a system not fairly tried that has engendered a growth that is the amazement of the world should be declared a failure is beyond my comprehension. Yet nothing is surer than that the Democratic idea of tariff for revenue or revenue reform is surely tending to that end and is but another method and a very gauzy one for free trade. They dare not come out openly and boldly for free trade, because they know that such a policy would consign them to that oblivion they, as a party, are so well qualified to adorn. So they shout themselves hoarse for revenue reform.

George Washington, as President, signed a protective law; I think it was the first public act he signed. This was the beginning and foundation of the protective system of this Government, and in a greater or less degree we have enjoyed its beneficent results since. What is this protective system? Simply a mode of accomplishing two things at once: supplying the revenue with which to carry on the Government and protecting our home labor, home industries, and home markets by imposing a duty upon all articles of foreign manufacture that are brought to our shores to be sold in competition with articles manufactured or produced by our own people.

The doctrine of protection, so ably advocated by Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Quincy Adams, and their compeers, has been indorsed and reiterated by Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and many other distinguished characters in history. As before remarked, it has been the established policy of the Government down to the present time, and under that policy, and directly through the influence of that policy, this country has prospered and flourished as no other Government under the sun ever did. And so firmly grounded is the belief of the people in the wisdom of this policy that I firmly believe if it could be submitted to them separated from politics and the influence of parties it would receive the approval of three-fourths, if not more, of the people.

The Democratic party, however, within the last decade have been gradually drifting towards free trade; drifting in opposition to the protective policy, until now we find them up to the very brink of free trade, riding their pet hobby of "tariff reform," and just on the outskirts of the camp of the free-traders. If there had ever been doubts upon this question their conduct and votes in this House for the past ten days must have dispelled them. Here we have seen them day after day rising in their places and voting in favor of every amendment to hits bill looking to reduction of the revenue below the protection point and voting for every proposition, by whomsoever offered, to put every article on the free-list. Upon no section, schedule, or paragraph of this bill has the voice of any Democrat upon this floor been heard in favor of protecting any article produced or manufactured in this country. [Applause.]

If the votes of the representatives of the Democratic party upon this floor had been potent to enact laws, every manufacturing interest in this country would have been left without the least protection and our labor left to compete with the pauper labor of Europe. I say if the Democratic party had the power to enact laws and should enact them in accordance with the way they have voted upon amendments offered to this bill and the way they will vote on the bill itself when it comes up before the House for final passage, not the least protection would have been left to any industry in this country.

The issue in the campaign in 1888 was plainly and unmistakably an issue between protection and free trade practically, though the Democrats sought to dodge it by the very thin disguise of crying revenue reform. The verdict was for protection, and gave to the nation a Republican House to originate a measure for protection and revenue—a Senate we already had—and a President to sign and execute the law. We are going to heed the voice of the people; we are going to pass a revenue measure, at once designed to protect our labor and industries and to furnish a sufficient revenue to defray the expenses of the Government, honestly administered, as is now being done. We are not only going to pass a bill that will protect our manufacturing interests, our laboring people, our home market, but we are going to do something that never was done before: we are going to protect our agricultural industries. [Applause.]

It is true, Mr. Chairman, as has been so often stated by gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, that our agricultural interests are depressed, but I have no hesitation in saying that protection is in no way responsible for it, as they would have us believe, but on the contrary it is the want, the absence of protection that is responsible for it. It is because foreign importations of farm products have been allowed to come in almost free, and thus take the place that our own products should have had, that, in a great measure, has caused this depression. That the farmers may know just what this bill seeks to do for their interests I append the schedule upon that subject:

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

Animals, live:
Horses and mules, $30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at $150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Cattle, more than one year old, $10 per head; less than one year old, $2 per head.
Hogs, $1.50 per head.
Sheep, $1.50 per head.
All other live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Breadstuffs and farinaceous substances:
Barley, 30 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Barley-malt, 45 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.
Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 2 cents per pound.
Buckwheat, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel.
Corn-meal, 20 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 2 cents per pound.
Oats, 15 cents per bushel.
Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound.
Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound; uncleaned rice and rice flour and meal, 1¼ cents per pound; paddy, three-quarters of 1 cent per pound; rice broken, which will pass through a sieve, known commercially as No. 12 wire sieve, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
Rye, 10 cents per bushel.
Rye-flour, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
Wheat, 25 cents per bushel.
Wheat-flour, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Dairy products:
Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.
Cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Milk, fresh, 5 cents per gallon.
Milk, preserved or condensed, including weight of packages, 3 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 10 cents per pound: *Provided*, That there shall be allowed a drawback on the sugar used in the manufacture of condensed milk equal to the duty paid on such sugar, less 1 per cent. for expenses; but such drawback shall be paid only to the manufacturer of the condensed milk, subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Farm and field products:
Beans, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Beans, pease, and mushrooms, prepared or preserved in tins, jars, bottles, or otherwise, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
Broom corn, $8 per ton.
Cabbages, 3 cents each.
Cider, 5 cents per gallon.
Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
Eggs, yolk of, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Hay, $4 per ton.
Honey, 20 cents per gallon.
Hops, 15 cents per pound.
Onions, 40 cents per bushel.
Pease, green or dried, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; split pease, 50 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, 1 cent per pound.
Plants, trees, shrubs, and vines of all kinds, commonly known as nursery stock, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Seeds:
Castor beans or seeds, 32 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.
Flaxseed or linseed, poppy seed, and other oil seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 30 cents per bushel of 56 pounds, but no drawback shall be allowed on oil-cake made from imported seed.
Garden-seeds, agricultural seeds, and other seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
Vegetables of all kinds, prepared or preserved, including pickles and sauces of all kinds, not specially provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem.
Vegetables in their natural state, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Straw, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Teasels, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Meat products:
Bacon and hams, 5 cents per pound.
Beef, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.
Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Extract of meat, all not specially provided for in this act, 35 cents per pound; fluid extract of meat, 15 cents per pound; but the dutiable weight shall include the extract and the tins, jars, bottles, or other articles containing the same, and no separate or additional duty shall be collected on such coverings unless as such they are suitable and apparently designed for use other than in the importation of meat extracts.
Lard, 2 cents per pound.
Poultry, live, 3 cents per pound; dressed, 5 cents per pound.
Tallow, 1 cent per pound.

That, Mr. Chairman, is what this bill proposes to do for the great agricultural interests of this country; that is what the Republican party proposes to do for the farmers, and against that schedule I have no doubt every Democrat in this House will vote. I have not the time and it would take too much space to elucidate the workings to the advantage of the farmers of these schedules if the bill becomes a law, as I hope and expect it will. But let us take the one item of potatoes. And let me say right here that two counties in my district produce more potatoes than any other two counties in the United States, and of a very superior quality.

The total number of acres in potatoes in 1888 was 2,500,000. Since the decrease in the duty on potatoes from 25 to 15 cents per bushel, the importations have increased from less than 200,000 bushels a year for the five years before the decrease of duty to an average of more than 2,500,000 bushels per year for the last five years. Foreign potatoes are sold every year in every great city in this country. They were raised cheaply enough abroad to send 8,262,458 bushels into this country in 1888, paying the freight charges and a duty of 15 cents a bushel and then underselling our farmers at their own doors.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what else does this bill do? It abolishes the special taxes heretofore imposed upon producers and dealers in tobacco and enables the farmer who raises tobacco to sell it without any statutory restrictions. It forbids the free importation of articles for the use of the United States, and hereafter if this bill becomes a law the Government can not go abroad to buy English blankets for our Army and Navy, as was done under the late Democratic Administration, nor can foreign material be used in the construction of Government buildings. What else does it do? It places sugar, that prime necessity, that article that the wage-worker, the farmer, and every man must use, that article upon which the people have been paying an annual duty of nearly $60,000,000, on the free-list.

This one feature of the bill alone, if it contained no other commendable one, is sufficient to entitle the Republican party to the thanks of the people of the nation. There is another important feature in this bill that a large number of people of my district are especially interested in. It is the lumber schedule. The present duty on white-pine sawed lumber in the rough is $2 per thousand feet, board measure. The present bill reduces that duty 25 per cent., or to $1.50. This is the amount agreed upon by the committee; it was done against my earnest protest, but, like many other schedules, was agreed upon in a spirit of compromise, and I accept it with the best grace I can, because I can get nothing better.

I represent on this floor, Mr. Chairman, the largest producing district of white-pine lumber in the United States. More than 1,500,000,000 feet of that commodity is annually produced in that Congressional district. The money value of that product is not less than $20,000,000, and not less than twenty thousand men are annually employed, and not less than seventy-five thousand people are dependent upon this industry for a living. Not less than $75,000,000 in capital is employed in the industry in that district.

Now, why should not this great and important industry be protected? Why should not the labor employed in this industry be protected? Why should the men engaged in the manufacture of this product, the men who work in the woods, on the river, in the mills and factories, and in the yards be protected from the cheap labor. If lumber is put on the free-list, as our Democratic friends want to do and as they did in the Mills bill, it will do one of two things: either it will reduce the price of lumber or it will reduce the price of stumpage. If it reduces the price of lumber the reduction will in the end come out of the laborer. The man who owns the pine stumpage will not reduce his price, for he can afford to hold it. It therefore follows that if there is a reduction the manufacturer must first stand that reduction, but ultimately it will fall on the laborer.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that if the tariff was entirely removed from lumber it would bring that commodity a penny cheaper to the consumer. The wholesale dealer might, and probably would, derive a temporary benefit and profit because of that reduction of duty, but eventually, and very soon, I think the ultimate result would be only to add to the value of pine stumpage in the Dominion of Canada. In Canada, the pine-timbered lands are held by the Government; the lands are not sold and pay no taxes. They sell the right to cut the timber, and this duty only serves to equalize the price of stumpage between this country and that.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think this provision of the bill is very commendable, and I hope all amendments to put lumber on the free-list or to reduce the duty below the amount named in the bill will be voted down.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, there are some features of this bill that I do not approve, some that I would change, if I had the power; but as any measure of this kind, to be successful and command a majority of the party (for we can get no votes for protection from the Democratic side of the House), must of necessity be a compromise measure, therefore, and for that reason, we must stand by the whole bill, and for the further reason that I believe it a wise and beneficent measure, a measure in the interests of protection, a measure especially in the interests of the great agricultural and manufacturing interests of the country, a measure that will encourage and build up diversified industries all over the country, a measure that in my humble judgment will bring to us a reign of prosperity such as we have not enjoyed for many years.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I shall most cheerfully and heartily give my cordial support to and vote for this bill. [Applause.]

But they tell us they are burning corn in Republican and protection Kansas; they have none to eat or burn in free-trade England. Our farmers of the Republican West are groaning under the burdens of mortgages they say. No tales reach us from them of evictions and starvation such as are of almost daily occurrence in free-trade Ireland. But we are told we have no export market for our product because Republican high protection shuts out an interchange of commodities.

How, then, did we export for the year ending June 30, 1889, commodities to the value of $742,401,375? Why is it, if we are in the state of great depression our friends on that side picture us to be, that our facilities at the seaboard for receiving and handling and our railroads for transporting are taxed to their utmost capacity to handle the immense tide of immigration that annually come to our shores? Why is it that nearly 500,000 people annually come to America, are assimilated among our people, and become good American citizens? From every part of the Old World they come and are welcomed by friends with hospitable hands. Why do they leave their homes in other lands to rear their firesides and families beneath the folds of that starry banner? For what do they come? Is it that they may help to share the great burdens that protection has heaped upon our people? Is it to help the struggling, starving mass of humanity that is here?

Shame upon such slanderers, such maligning of our fair name and fame. No; they come to become citizens of the greatest and best Government upon the face of the earth, to become citizens of the freest Government, administered by the best laws ever devised by the wisdom of man. Let no one be deceived by the croaking and wailing we have recently heard upon this floor; they are but the idle vaporings of demagogues to deceive and confuse. Our country is not in the slough of despond; our enterprises are not languishing; our farmers are not paupers, and our Government is not unwisely managed, nor is the Republican party, which has never been found wanting, wrong upon any of the great economic questions, but, on the contrary, the reverse is essentially and emphatically true. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WALLACE, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no gentleman on this side of the House in my adherence to the protection policy of the Republican party. It is because I am a protectionist that I am opposed to the proposed schedule on leaf-tobacco. It is not apparent that this proposed increase of duty will benefit the farmer, and it is apparent that it will seriously interfere with the business of the cigar manufacturer.

In the city of Brooklyn there are twelve hundred cigar manufacturers, employing many hands. They are entitled to the same measure of consideration as the tobacco growers of Connecticut or Wisconsin.

The benefits of protective legislation should not be confined to the

agriculturist or the workman in the shop of foundry. They should extend to every producer in the country.

This bill provides for a duty of $2 per pound on leaf-tobacco suitable for cigar wrappers. The duty on leaf-tobacco under existing laws is 75 cents on wrapper tobacco, 35 cents on other leaf-tobacco. The average rate collected last year was 43 cents. The bill provides for a lower rate, 35 cents per pound on tobacco other than wrapper tobacco, but the schedule is so worded that practically all leaf-tobacco will be subject to $2 per pound duty. There has not been given and I believe there does not exist any valid reason for this enormous increase, or for any increase, in the duty on leaf-tobacco. There has been no decrease in the consumption of the domestic leaf-tobacco and no reduction in the price received by the farmer. The statistics of the Department of Agriculture bear me out in this statement.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIMONDS] in his remarks favoring this change of duty on leaf-tobacco has made a statement which the statistical facts do not verify. He has drawn deductions and arguments therefrom which I believe to be unsound when viewed in the light of facts.

The gentleman, from the authority of a newspaper clipping, states that one of his constituents sold a crop of tobacco at 1½ cents per pound which twenty years ago would have brought 50 cents per pound. Now, an investigation of the reports will show that no farmer in Connecticut ever did receive 50 cents per pound for his crop of tobacco in any year. The Agricultural Reports show that the tobacco raised in the valley of Connecticut in 1889 was the poorest crop of years, owing to incessant rains during the whole growing season. All the plants, except those on the hillsides, stood in water for more than a month, and were nearly all ruined for cigar or smoking purposes.

The gentleman further states that "we export substantially no cigar-leaf," while the Treasury reports show that annually from 10,000 to 30,000 cases, weighing 300 pounds each, of cigar-leaf are exported, and Germany takes as much cigar-leaf for filler purposes from us as she does from Cuba.

It is an undoubted fact that the tobacco-growers in the cigar-leaf-growing States have for four years last past suffered terribly in price and yield per acre by drought, frost, and rain, but instead of ascribing their injury and loss to the proper cause they seek to benefit themselves by a new tariff schedule on tobacco.

The price of tobacco in the Eastern States, where, as the farmers claim, it costs 12 cents per pound for fertilizers and labor to raise tobacco, can not advance while the farmers of Wisconsin, on inexhaustible prairie lands, can do better raising tobacco without fertilizers at 6 cents per pound than on any other crop. There has been a substantial increase in the production of cigar tobacco from year to year since the introduction of Sumatra tobacco, except when crops have been destroyed. That the consumption of domestic leaf must have increased very materially since 1881, when Sumatra tobacco was first introduced, is clearly shown by the following facts:

In the eight years following the introduction of the Sumatra leaf, the output of cigar factories increased from 2,682,629,979 in 1881 to 3,867,385,640 in 1889, or nearly 1,200,000,000. It is safe to assume that this increase would have been much more but for the increase in cigarette smoking, which caused an increase in the number of cigarettes manufactured from 567,386,893 in 1881 to over 2,000,000,000 in 1889, over 1,400,000,000 increase. Some cigar leaf was used in the production of cigarettes, but waiving that we find that 30,000,000 pounds (25 pounds per thousand) more tobacco was required to make these 1,200,000,000 cigars. Importations of leaf-tobacco increased by less than 13,000,000 pounds during these years, hence 17,000,000 pounds more of domestic leaf must have been consumed.

The Department of Agriculture shows in its report that the average price has been the same. Good crops brought good prices and poor crops brought low prices. Wrapper-leaf fell in value; filler-leaf increased in price. With these facts before us, I am unable to see where the farmer has been injured by the present tariff duty.

I insert tables furnished by the Department of Agriculture, showing the production of cigar leaf-tobacco in the large tobacco-growing States.

CONNECTICUT.

Year.	Acres.	Quantity.	Price per pound.	Result per acre.	Total result.	Remarks.
		Pounds.	*Cents.*			
1879	6,900	9,660,000	12½	$168	$1,159,200	
1880	10,070	15,487,660	15	231	2,323,149	
1881	8,753	13,763,759	16	254	2,202,201	The finest crop in many years.
1882	8,665	9,772,269	13¾	141	1,270,396	Poor crop.
1883	8,145	9,576,824	13½	146	1,292,871	
1884	8,064	9,481,000	12½	158	1,175,644	
1885	7,661	12,066,000	12½	195	1,496,193	
1886	7,292	11,667,000	13⅞	228	1,633,380	
1887	6,198	9,173,000	14½	210	1,311,745	Crop injured by rain causing loss, but fine quality.
1888	6,136	9,602,840	13	234	1,248,369	Poor crop, seed leaf.

WISCONSIN.

Year.	Acres.	Quantity.	Price per pound.	Result per acre.	Total result.	Remarks.
		Pounds.	*Cents.*			
1879	5,300	5,474,900	12	$123	$656,988	
1880	9,168	11,395,824	12	149	1,367,499	
1881	10,045	8,702,770	12½	108	1,087,846	
1882	11,250	10,443,324	12	111	1,253,199	
1883	12,750	5,743,828	12	53	681,821	Destruction by frost.
1884	14,663	14,360,000	12	91	1,464,720	
1885	27,127	31,196,000	8½	109	2,963,625	Largest crop ever raised.
1886	24,229	27,714,000	10	98	2,374,400	Poor crop.
1887	11,050	11,271,000	11	110	1,235,810	Large loss by drought.
1888	13,813	12,846,090	9	92	1,220,379	Destroyed and injured by frost so as to injure price and yield.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Year.	Acres.	Quantity.	Price per pound.	Result per acre.	Total result.	Remarks.
1879	2,900	4,350,000	11	165	478,500	
1880	3,442	4,927,840	15	228	739,176	
1881	3,291	5,000,964	15	228	750,144	Fine crop.
1882	2,962	4,250,819	12½	179	531,352	Poor crop.
1883	2,814	4,038,278	13½	190	533,053	
1884	2,730	3,715,000	12½	184	532,300	
1885	2,594	3,798,000	12	171	455,714	
1886	2,594	4,231,000	14	225	592,340	
1887	2,464	3,511,000	13	240	596,904	
1888	2,464	3,893,120	12½	197	486,640	

OHIO.

Year.	Acres.	Quantity.	Price per pound.	Result per acre.	Total result.	Remarks.
1879	21,000	14,091,000	6	40	845,460	
1880	35,489	38,434,587	6	65	2,306,075	
1881	36,760	35,419,913	8	77	2,883,593	
1882	33,819	33,648,917	7	59	2,335,424	
1883	32,128	29,947,536	8½	74	2,395,805	
1884	35,983	29,349,000	7	59	2,113,128	
1885	36,703	33,767,000	6½	58	2,127,306	
1886	36,805	35,333,000	7	67	2,473,310	
1887	31,284	19,240,000	9	55	1,731,569	Large loss, injured by drought.
1888	39,105	35,194,500	7½	70	2,745,171	Large loss.

NEW YORK.

Year.	Acres.	Quantity.	Price per pound.	Result per acre.	Total result.	Remarks.
1879	1,850	2,432,750	12	158	291,930	
1880	5,135	6,072,800	12	153	788,736	
1881	5,037	6,291,217	12½	174	880,770	
1882	8,059	9,751,386	12	145	1,170,166	
1883	5,140	9,068,789	13	139	1,178,943	
1884	5,386	8,162,000	12	161	974,440	
1885	6,733	10,234,000	10	152	1,023,416	Poor crop.
1886	5,833	7,583,000	11½	148	872,045	Wisconsin displaced New York.
1887	5,775	7,623,000	11½	153	876,645	Pennsylvania was preferred.
1888	6,179	6,487,950	12	126	778,554	Crop injured by frost; much of it destroyed.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Year.	Acres.	Quantity.	Price per pound.	Result per acre.	Total result.	Remarks.
1879	20,300	29,617,700	9	130	2,665,593	
1880	29,739	34,854,108	10	117	3,485,411	Poor crop, fly-bitten.
1881	33,080	38,805,661	13	140	5,044,735	
1882	29,773	31,044,529	12	124	3,725,343	
1883	28,879	36,322,000	12	150	4,358,652	
1884	25,991	23,143,000	15½	134	3,585,015	Began to raise Havana seed leaf.
1885	23,392	23,392,000	15	104	2,456,160	Bad crop.
1886	28,659	34,951,000	11½	143	4,124,218	Bad crop all through.
1887	28,121	40,213,000	15	214	6,031,955	Part very fine, part very poor.
1888	19,500	24,180,000	10½	132	2,587,260	Very poor crop.

The total production of the cigar-leaf-growing States and of the United States for the years from 1879 to 1888, inclusive, was:

Year.	Total acreage of cigar-leaf tobacco States.	Total pounds cigar-leaf States.	Total acreage of United States leaf-tobacco.	Total pounds of United States
1879	58,250	65,566,230	592,100	391,278,350
1880	98,843	111,672,819	602,516	446,296,889
1881	96,669	105,684,084	646,239	449,880,014
1882	94,527	98,911,044	671,522	513,077,558
1883	90,156	94,697,275	638,739	451,445,641
1884	92,817	88,210,000	724,668	541,504,000
1885	104,210	114,453,000	752,520	562,736,000
1886	102,412	117,509,000	750,210	532,537,000
1887	84,892	91,031,000	598,620	586,240,000
1888	87,197	92,244,500	747,326	565,794,264

In this discussion on the tobacco schedule much has been said about Sumatra tobacco and it has been repeatedly claimed that the American grower can produce as good a wrapper tobacco. The American manu-

facturer to-day can buy the American wrapper for one-tenth of what he pays for the Sumatra wrapper. The following table shows the price of Sumatra tobacco, duty paid, from 1881 to 1889:

Year.	Price per pound.	Year.	Price per pound.
1881	$1.15	1886	$1.50
1882	1.25	1887	1.60
1883	1.35	1888	1.65
1884	1.40	1889	1.80
1885	1.45		

Can any one believe that for an article of the same quality a manufacturer will pay ten times as much for the imported as for the domestic production? The fact is that the imported wrapper has become a necessity to the cigar manufacturer and the American leaf is a necessity for use as a filler. Raise the duty to an average of 50 cents per pound and we thereby give the tobacco-grower all needed protection and give the manufacturer an opportunity to meet the demands of the tobacco consumers of the country.

I am glad to give my support to the main features of this bill. It is an American bill, framed to protect American industries. It is a redemption of the pledge of the Republican party to preserve the American market to the American workman. I believe that its passage will add new life to our American industries and that from farm and the factory will come the voice of approval to the party and the men who place this bill upon the statute-book.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now yield four minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWENEY].

Mr. SWENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist, and I believe that the general features of this bill are exceptionally good. I believe that the principle of protection is in this bill extended to the industry of sugar production. I am in favor of the encouragement of any such interest as we may have in this country, but I do not believe that it ought to be continued indefinitely if the case were hopeless or if it were not believed that protection might ultimately so increase the production as to supply or nearly supply all of the requirements of the country.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I desire to illustrate my meaning a little further. I believe that the agricultural interests of the country have received generally kind attention from this committee and that much good will be done to them. But there is one thing to which I desire to ask your attention and wherein I think another large part of the agriculturists of the country have greater cause of complaint than have the sugar-producers. In the State of Iowa about $73,000,000 are invested in cattle. In the United States $1,000,000,000 are invested in stock, in cattle.

We find that hides were put at one time by the committee on the protected list. That fact was published to the country. Not protection to the extent of 2 cents per pound, as sugar would receive under the provisions of this bill, but protected by 15 per cent. duty. Afterwards they were taken off the dutiable list and placed upon the free-list absolutely. If the bounty and the duty were removed from sugar at once sugar would be placed in no worse condition any way than the production of hides by the present bill in this country, when it becomes a law.

There are members on the floor of the House who know that along certain lines of railroad in the Western part of the country hides are allowed to lie rotting because of the fact that they will not bear the cost of transportation. In the evidence taken and printed by the Ways and Means Committee it is claimed that in some parts of the country they have been used for fuel. The price has become so low that they could not be otherwise disposed of. I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, why leather manufactured east of the Alleghany Mountains should be protected to the extent of 10 to 30 per cent. while the hides raised between the Alleghany and the Rocky Mountains are placed upon the free-list.

Yesterday I presented and had printed in the RECORD an amendment to this bill, taking hides from the free-list and putting a duty of 15 per cent. on them. Let us have a chance to consider and vote upon that proposition.

Why should the people all over the United States engaged in cattle-raising be compelled to compete with Central and South American cattle-raisers, with the Indian herders there, without receiving the benefit of protective duty, while the Eastern tanners and shoe-makers are protected against European competitors by a duty of from 10 to 30 per cent.?

The European workmen receive higher wages than the Central and South American herders, who are our farmers' competitors. It is said that hides have been on the free-list for eighteen years already. Yes; and in this is an illustration of the ruin brought to a great industry by unrestricted competition of this kind.

Of the 4,000,000 of cattle in Iowa, representing a value of about $73,000,000, as shown by the report of the Secretary of Agriculture in January, 1890, about one-third are annually slaughtered, making about one and a third millions of hides annually marketed from that State. In the whole country the number would not be less than 18,000,000. Is not such an industry well worthy of careful consideration and of protection?

The cattle industry has suffered great depression, not only from this cause, but from others. The country furnishes public domain for ranchmen on which to raise, untaxed and without rent, cattle in competition with the farmer who pays for his land and contributes by taxation to the support of society and government.

That I hope to see corrected, and to see the bill for this purpose, introduced by myself, now with the Committee on Agriculture, favorably reported.

No class of people have a right to the use of public domain without taxation or other expense, with which to compete with farms owned and paid for by our citizens.

The prices of beef and pork never separate very widely. One follows the other in market fluctuations.

Bogus lard has fraudulently destroyed to a great extent the demand for hogs. It has brought American hog products into disrepute and suspicion at home and abroad and destroyed largely their legitimate value. The beef combine has had its grip on the cattle of the whole country and has mercilessly robbed cattle-raisers of a large part of the value which all other adverse conditions left. After all this comes the bucket-shop option, gambling in farm products, destroying all basis of value and leaving in the market practically very little relation between supply and demand.

That these commercial frauds and oppressive combinations will be broken up by this Congress I believe and sincerely hope. I know that on this side of the House the disposition to do so prevails.

I insert here a table showing the number and value of cattle in each of the States and Territories in January, 1890, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture:

Estimated number of animals on farms and ranches and total value of cattle, with average price, January, 1890.

States and Territories.	Milch cows.			Oxen and other cattle.		
	Number.	Average price.	Value.	Number.	Average price.	Value.
Maine	175,949	$25.00	$4,398,725	157,386	$23.76	$3,739,024
New Hampshire	103,011	27.63	2,846,194	116,169	23.87	2,772,447
Vermont	234,642	23.75	5,572,748	169,053	22.68	3,834,563
Massachusetts	174,729	32.50	5,678,693	98,774	25.24	2,492,663
Rhode Island	24,041	31.00	745,271	12,194	27.25	332,257
Connecticut	134,897	31.08	4,192,599	102,143	27.20	2,778,071
New York	1,552,373	28.11	43,637,205	783,634	28.12	22,034,214
New Jersey	183,493	34.47	6,325,004	67,856	28.92	1,962,417
Pennsylvania	938,665	28.06	26,338,940	852,267	23.67	20,175,387
Delaware	29,543	27.50	812,433	26,866	24.78	665,614
Maryland	141,826	24.36	3,454,881	127,335	18.53	2,358,908
Virginia	272,036	19.28	5,244,854	419,523	15.66	6,569,393
North Carolina	272,155	16.04	4,365,366	398,414	10.47	4,170,321
South Carolina	156,575	21.40	3,350,705	210,396	13.15	2,767,004
Georgia	354,618	17.24	6,113,614	580,816	11.03	6,408,205
Florida	54,951	16.40	901,196	565,201	8.88	5,016,334
Alabama	311,805	15.80	4,926,519	454,042	8.94	4,060,682
Mississippi	309,234	15.38	4,756,019	441,862	9.34	4,126,898
Louisiana	177,613	16.32	2,898,644	295,731	9.76	2,884,941
Texas	843,342	14.15	11,933,289	7,167,853	8.83	63,294,293
Arkansas	329,121	13.62	4,482,628	587,212	8.64	5,072,101
Tennessee	877,740	16.98	6,414,025	484,578	11.68	5,660,645
West Virginia	179,939	21.52	3,872,287	286,538	18.00	5,156,882
Kentucky	317,093	21.69	6,877,747	523,728	17.69	9,263,546
Ohio	791,316	24.80	19,624,637	986,601	22.62	22,317,518
Michigan	454,926	26.24	11,937,258	547,716	21.38	11,710,832
Indiana	602,354	21.48	12,938,564	957,843	18.82	18,027,577
Illinois	1,072,473	22.62	24,259,339	1,713,966	18.71	32,076,531
Wisconsin	674,588	24.29	16,385,743	805,170	17.10	13,772,432
Minnesota	492,117	20.79	10,231,112	617,256	16.49	10,188,617
Iowa	1,331,888	19.79	26,358,064	2,577,161	18.03	46,455,399
Missouri	774,122	18.53	14,344,481	1,515,935	15.98	24,221,922
Kansas	750,815	18.69	14,032,732	1,829,422	16.71	30,563,967
Nebraska	420,069	20.15	8,464,390	1,306,372	17.03	22,242,548
California	268,628	27.75	7,454,427	697,805	16.80	11,719,707
Oregon	88,730	27.31	2,423,216	762,728	17.15	13,079,341
Nevada	18,399	30.00	551,970	373,527	14.53	5,426,224
Colorado	65,563	30.40	1,993,115	1,048,933	16.77	17,595,648
Arizona	16,790	20.00	335,800	604,170	15.00	9,062,550
Dakota	248,619	19.32	4,803,319	822,017	15.79	12,980,535
Idaho	31,750	30.00	952,500	374,247	16.50	6,175,076
Montana	33,015	29.75	982,196	981,786	17.24	16,925,993
New Mexico	20,375	21.25	432,969	1,383,357	11.25	15,560,693
Utah	52,910	22.10	1,169,311	426,170	14.08	5,999,615
Washington	83,641	35.89	3,001,875	369,381	23.51	8,684,635
Wyoming	10,404	32.25	335,529	1,217,890	14.98	18,240,947
Total	15,952,883	22.14	353,152,133	36,849,024	15.21	560,625,137
				15,952,883		353,152,133
Grand total				52,801,807		913,777,270

I appeal to you to think of the number of our people dependent upon this industry of which the production of hides constitutes so important a part. Do not forget nor neglect them. They are as industrious, as intelligent, good, and deserving as any citizens of this country. You

hear but little from them except as spoken from this floor. They never engage in riots. They never strike. Neither eight, nor any other fixed number, measures the hours of their daily toil. Around their hearthstones the strength of the nation is found. In their homes christianity, patriotism, and the christian virtues prevail.

You have in this bill, gentlemen of the committee, given them needed protection on many of their farm products and propose by the amendment to cheapen sugar to them and all our people. On sugar, owing to the disparity between production and consumption in this country, "the tariff is a tax" indeed. It is the most oppressive instance possible to name, and yet our Democratic friends are found to-day unanimously working to retain it. With them protection is indeed "a local issue," without regard to the necessities of the Government or burdens imposed on the citizen. It is to the Republican party that the people must look for legislation bettering their condition and to secure for them legitimate returns for their labor.

I believe in protection thoroughly, but I believe in reciprocity as well. There should be uniformity in the treatment of the different sections, between the people of the country and between the different States. It is for this reason that I desired to say a word with reference to this question, hides, and to say to the House that while I believe that great industry, in which so much capital and energy are invested and in which my people are so deeply interested, has not yet received that which I believe under the general principle of protection it ought to receive, yet, notwithstanding that fact, I believe in granting to the industry of sugar production all that is carried in this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. HOLMAN withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. DUNNELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the gentleman from Iowa who has just spoken in relation to hides. I think hides should be taken from the free-list and placed upon the dutiable list.

I have been given five minutes in which to speak upon the pending item. I have for a long time believed that we should have cheaper sugar. When the tariff act of 1883 was passed, I pleaded for a larger reduction of the duty upon this article of prime necessity.

I am glad, heartily glad, that in this pending bill we have sugar placed upon the free-list, and am satisfied that the people of the country, to whom the purchase of the necessaries of life constitutes more or less a burden, will deem this provision a great benefaction. To a farmer who has six, seven, or eight children, and his wife and hired man on a farm, the purchase of sugar at the present rates for the year is not a very inconsiderable element of family expenses. The cost of sugar in this country has very, very largely lessened its consumption.

In 1882 the consumption per capita in the United States was 38 pounds, while in England at the same time it was 69 pounds per capita. I hope the time is near at hand when there shall be as much consumption of sugar in this country as in England. It is not only needed by the farmer, but it is needed by the laboring men of all classes. Men who support families on farms know that sugar is one of the heaviest bills of the year—I mean those bills that are expended to supply the table.

I am glad we have this bill, and I thank the Committee on Ways and Means that we have it.

Mr. Chairman, my attention, within a day or two, has been called to the large canning interests of the country. I have been amazed, as I have read through the hearings of this committee upon tin-plate and the tin-canning interests, at their magnitude. They have become simply enormous, and our exports have been very largely increased, even with the present price of sugar. If we could have cheap sugar here in this country, our canning interests would be multiplied fourfold, not simply for home consumption, but for exportation.

I regard this item, therefore, as one of exceeding interest and of exceeding importance. I predict, Mr. Chairman, that under the bounty system, which goes along with this free sugar, there will spring up in this country a production of sugar; and I hope to live to see the time when the people of the United States shall produce their own sugar; and when that time comes, there will come along with it a period of general prosperity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I will add to these remarks a short extract from the hearings to which I have referred:

With sugar at the same cost to the American preserver as to the English, we could not only supply this country with all the preserved fruits needed, but could export directly into England and Germany these goods in very large quantities; besides we would be able to successfully compete for the trade of all other foreign countries for these articles, which trade is of very large proportions. It seems to us a pity that for the one obstacle of high cost of sugar our American fruit-growers should not be allowed to furnish the fruits for all these different markets.

American fruit canners, on account of the superior quality of our fruits, are able to export largely to Great Britain our heavily siruped fresh fruits in tin cans, but with being able to reduce the cost 5 or 10 per cent., a very much larger business could be done, as our fruits are acceptable to the best communities wherever they are introduced, with a rapidly growing demand for them, which demand could be largely and quickly increased if they could be offered as above noted at a slight reduction below present prices; and the only thing that stands in the way of this necessary reduction is the cost of sugar. This pertains to only the higher grades of canned fruits in which large quantities of sugar are used in the manufacture of sirups for them.

Right here, too, is a strong argument why we should have no increased tariff on tin-plates, but rather free tin-plates. One company here at Rochester consumes the products of upwards of 1,000 acres each year, of such items as tomatoes, corn, and pease, and by producing only high grade in these articles canned, we are building up a trade in many different foreign markets, which markets the fruit and vegetable packers of this country should control, and would in a very short time, if we were able to meet a competitive lower price with other countries that enjoy free tin-plate and free sugar, and so utilize a large amount of territory in the production of these articles for their use.

Mr. WILKINSON. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend from Minnesota had announced that he was in favor of free tin-plate I could understand his argument for the reduction of the duty on sugar and the increased exportation of canned goods.

Mr. DUNNELL. I am in favor of the present duty on tin-plate. I have part of a speech formed here on my table, which I hope to print in the RECORD on that subject.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am glad that my friend has made a step in the right direction, and I hope before the debate is over he will see the error of his ways entirely and come over and join the church of the righteous. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of such a reduction of the duty on sugar as will make it a fairly revenue duty, but I am in favor of stopping at that point, because it is very nearly the only article upon which we put a tariff which furnishes the peculiarities that ought to be in a tax. The tax is impartial; it is universal; it is voluntary. It is distributed over all the country; it is impartially distributed, and is on consumption, and not upon production, and therefore so far that is possible this is a tax that is equal and impartial. It is not a good tax. All taxes are evil. I do not defend it as good, for taxes, like sorrow, sickness, and death, are evils and burdens; but so far as it can be good it is the best tax we have in our tariff schedules.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amount of sugar used in America per capita as shown by the report of the majority of the committee was, in 1888, 53 pounds. That is about $2.50 or $3 per head. The reduction of the duty will make a difference of about 85 cents per capita, so that in a family of five the saving will not be $5. As a mere object-lesson, in contrast to this saving, I have had a friend make a calculation of what is the duty upon the building materials necessary to build a house in this country, and I will make that table a part of my remarks. Under this tariff only four houses can be built, where, if it were not for the existing duties, five houses could be built; so that the rent which would be paid by five tenants is now divided among four. That is, where a man builds $10,000 worth of houses he now makes four tenants pay him the income which otherwise five tenants would pay, and it is fair to say that the difference is probably $50 a year.

In other words under the pretense of my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and other gentlemen of taking the burdens off the poor man, they pass a bill which makes his rent $50 a year more than it ought to be, while they profess to reduce the price of his sugar $5 a year, and they call that legislation in the interest of the workingman. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But in fact this bill adds to the burdens connected with sugar; for it keeps out of the Treasury $56,000,000 in the shape of duties that would go into it, which must be made up by some other taxation, necessarily more onerous, and actually takes out of the Treasury $7,500,000 to pay the bounty this year, which must be paid by the tax-payers. This fifty-six millions of revenue and seven and a half millions of bounty must be paid by the very persons who use the sugar, and that under tariff duties which require the consumer to pay enormous indirect tributes to the beneficiaries of this bill. It is therefore wholly inaccurate to say that to put sugar on the free-list gives any relief to any tax-payer.

This does not relieve a single laboring industry, add one cent to the wage of a single workman in any section of the country, nor give hope to any depressed interest.

It is in the interest of those who are benefited by high protective tariff rates.

It is a tax paid into the public Treasury, and not into the pockets of those who crowd our corridors, and therefore obnoxious to those who urge prohibitory duties.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW] is probably correct that the Treasury can not do without these revenues; that the expenditures required under the present Administration will be such that without this revenue there may be a deficit. Indeed, if one-half of the promises made during the late canvass are redeemed, there will be a deficit, whether this revenue is preserved or given up.

But this is only half of the burden imposed by this schedule. The bounty of 2 cents a pound on our present production amounts to about $7,500,000, but this is only the beginning. My friend and colleague [Mr. PAYNTER] has kindly furnished me with his calculations as to the sums which will be needed to meet the bounties under this proposed plan.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] predicts that the production of sugar will gradually increase, so as to supply the wants of the American people; if so, the bounty will be, in 1895, $25,519,000; for 1900 it will be $43,000,522; and for 1905 it will be $61,000,000;

and the aggregate sum needed for the next fifteen years will be over $600,000,000. Of course we are not going to do that. If we pass this bounty we will stimulate this production in Kansas, in California, in Louisiana, and elsewhere, and then the bounty will be taken off and the industry will instantly collapse. The people of this country are not going to pay that bounty on the one hand and take the duty off on the other.

If the Republican party has determined to admit sugar free of duty, then we ought to make use of our sugar imports to secure profitable reciprocity treaties with the sugar-producing countries, so that we could thus extend our commerce and find better markets for our products. Our trade with the Hawaiian Islands demonstrates what might be accomplished under such a policy. With wise statesmanship we might build up a most profitable trade with those who desire to sell to us sugar, coffee, tea, wool, hides, etc. There are objections to reciprocity treaties, but these are better than our present system—much better than this prohibitive bill, which makes the Pan-American Conference a farce.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILKINSON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I vote reluctantly for the amendment offered by my friend from California [Mr. MCKENNA], for this reason: he proposes to give a differential duty in favor of the refiner of four-tenths, six-tenths, and eight-tenths. Four-tenths is what is given by the bill under consideration. If you turn to the testimony taken by the Committee on Manufactures in the Fiftieth Congress, you will find that one-fourth of a cent is all the difference between the cost of refining here and the cost of refining in England, and the freight equals this and gives to our refiners all this duty, and one-sixteenth of a cent profit on the pound of refined sugar makes to Mr. Havemeyer a net profit of $1,500 a day. I do not think that either this bill or the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] ought to be adopted and so great an advantage be given to this particular industry. But the amendment is so much better than the bill that, as between these two propositions, I can not refuse to vote for a proposition that reduces the duty about 33 per cent., secures a revenue of about $37,000,000, and repudiates the un-American plan of a bounty.

I protest against the adoption of this new policy of bounties, by which certain industries are taxed for the benefit of other industries. Why should the producers of wheat, corn, tobacco, and cotton be taxed to pay bounties to the growers of sugar or those who cultivate cocoons to make raw silk? Bounty is a grace from a sovereign to a subject; it has no place in the economic system of a free people, where there ought not to be any favored classes. In a republic, bounties are anomalous and can not be permanently maintained. It is misleading and will end in disappointment, loss, and disaster.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL] will not succeed in his effort to preserve the present duty on tin-plate, nor will we who desire to put it on the free-list be given fair opportunity to urge this change.

Free tin-plate would greatly enlarge our exports. The inventions by which we are enabled to preserve in comparative purity and freshness every kind of edible product were of immense advantage. We have it in our power thus to supply an enormous demand for our vegetables, fruits, fish, and meat. With free tin-plate and the power to buy in the markets where we sell there would be found foreign markets for many millions of dollars in value of products which now rot. There is scarcely any limit to the demand for condensed milk, for canned vegetables, fruit, fish, and meat; and this would give relief to the farmers.

There also will be no fair opportunity to discuss the wool schedule, nor the flax, hemp, and jute schedule.

As to the hemp schedule, I content myself with a single remark. There is an apparent protective duty thrown around American hemp, when in fact the admission of jute free of duty stabs it in the back.

Free jute is accompanied with increased protection on binding-twine, and the trust which controls twine will reap the entire benefit of this remission. The farmers in my district are thus smitten on each cheek. Hemp is smitten by the remission of duty on jute and wheat burdened by the increased protection donated to the binding-twine trust.

Free wool is necessary to the manufacturer and to the wool-grower. Nothing can be more certain than that the only purchaser of American wool is the American manufacturer; that he must also purchase foreign wool to mix with American wool; that the less he pays for foreign wool the more he will be able to pay for American wool; that the duty put on foreign wool is that much added to the cost of the foreign wool and to that extent renders the manufacturers less able to pay full price for American wool. It has followed that American wool has gone down in price, and under this bill it will continue to decrease.

This duty also burdens the manufacturer and prevents him from entering into competition in the foreign markets with the foreign manufacturer; and our woolen factories have not been profitable, and yet those who have to use woolen fabrics have been compelled to pay onerous prices for the articles they must use. In 1860, 7 bushels of wheat would pay for a suit of real woolen at $10; now over 14 bushels are needed to buy a $10 suit of shoddy clothes. And as we refused to purchase wool from the Argentine Republic, her people are growing wheat, and so we turn a profitable customer into a dangerous competitor.

The largest purchaser of our breadstuffs is Great Britain. We are forcing her to construct railroads through India to transport the wheat and rice, which, produced in great quantities, are inaccessible to the seaboard, so that she may become independent of America. We are protecting South America and India into becoming the successful competitors of our farmers.

Our exports preserve us from bankruptcy. As we increase them we grow richer. We must sell those exports for those products which our purchasers have produced beyond their needs. This commerce is necessary to agricultural prosperity in this country.

There can be no relief from the depression which is so distressing until the present system is set aside and in its stead are enacted revenue laws which are in truth for the purpose of raising the public revenue for public purposes; when private greed does not dictate the tax enactments of a free people; when the only trammel on the freeman's right to sell his product where he lists and buy with his own earnings what he pleases where he desires, will be the necessities of his Government.

This bill is in the direction of isolation, of prohibition of trade. This is not protection; it is prohibition. It will aggravate every evil, it will magnify every grievance, it will increase every difficulty. Under its operation depression will continue, distress will deepen, bankruptcies will be numerous, sheriffs will be the vendors of the farms of the debtors. But out of this will come enlightenment, inquiry will be universal, relief will follow enlightenment and inquiry crystallize into wise statutes.

Building materials.

Materials.	Now.	This bill.	Change.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Lumber	21.37	21.37	.....
Lumber, dressed	29.98	29.98	.....
Brick:			
Fire	20	45	+25
Plain	20	25	+ 5
Lime	10	35	+25
Cement	20	29.13	+ 9.13
Paints (white lead)	58	58	.....
Glass	{ 67.61 / 132.29	73.72 / 138.04	+ say 5
Tin	34.67	74.51	+39.84
Hardware	45	45	.....
Plumbing	45	45	.....
Slate	25	25	.....
Laths	12.65	12.65	.....
Building-stone	20	50	+30
Shingles	35	35	.....

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to discuss the remarks made by my distinguished friend from California [Mr. MCKENNA]; they were amply and fully replied to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]; but I want to show this House and the country what that amendment of the gentleman from California means and what would be its effect if it were enacted into law. If you adopt that amendment you force us to continue the present system of putting every pound of sugar that comes to this country through the melting kettles of the sugar refiners, thereby continuing the hold that the refining trust has upon the American people.

Under the provisions of that amendment you make common sugar cost 22 cents a hundred more than the price for which you can import the best granulated sugar that is made anywhere. What will this Congress give to the American people? Will it any longer give the right to this refining trust to exact money from the people under the present system or will it put an end to that here and now? Let me say to my friends from the South who are afraid of a bounty that a bounty provided for under this bill will be in the nature of a contract between the citizen and his Government, and, sir, in my judgment, no Congress before the end of the time provided would dare to violate the contract implied and entered into by the provisions of this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the Republican party pledged itself honestly at Chicago two years ago to relieve the people of these taxes, and in my judgment it is our duty as Republicans to pass this bill, giving the people relief by the amount of this duty, $56,000,000. If you continue the present system you will, it strikes me, continue it to our great disadvantage. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] says that this bounty in 1905 will amount to $61,000,000 a year. What warrant has he or anybody else to say that in a given number of years it will amount to any such sum?

The beet-sugar industry is one of which we expect much, but it is yet in its infancy, still undeveloped. No man can say from his own knowledge and experience that the beet-sugar industry to-day has reached perfection or can be perfected.

I want to say a word in reply to a question asked me by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] the other day when I was speaking on this subject. He claimed that this bill protected the sugar trust, as shown by the fact that their certificates had advanced.

Did the gentleman examine the market reports of that day? And, if so, did he observe that while the certificates went up four points, sugar itself went down that day from one-eighth to three-sixteenths in the markets, showing that the sugar certificates are controlled by a syndicate that can put them up or down at its pleasure, while sugar itself is not so controlled?

Mr. MCMILLIN. It showed that this bill did not hurt the refiners, even if the price of sugar did go down.

Mr. GEAR. The bill only gives them a fair protection and will give the American people cheaper sugar than they have ever had.

Mr. WILKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time allowed is so short that a number of gentlemen, including myself, who were desirous of speaking on this question must forego that privilege. I now yield my remaining time, four minutes, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

Mr. CRAIN. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means are inconsistent in their treatment of sugar. In their report and in the statements made by them in the discussion of this schedule, they have stated that they want to take sugar out of the dutiable list and place it on the free-list, because, although it has been protected, according to their statement, by the duty imposed upon the foreign importation, it has been a languishing industry; and at the same time they propose to place a bounty upon its production, in the hope and expectation that it will no longer be a languishing industry, but will in the course of time furnish enough sugar for all the consumers of the entire country. This to me seems an illogical and contradictory statement.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the majority of this committee have selected sugar as a target. They propose to pick it out and make it obnoxious to the people of this country, by compelling the consumer to pay a bounty upon its production. It is not true that it is a languishing industry. Take the district in Texas which I represent and which produces nearly all the sugar that is used there to-day. You will find that the production has increased in the last ten years from 3,000,000 pounds to 18,000,000 pounds; and there are acres enough in the State of Texas to produce all the sugar that can be consumed by all the people of the United States—yes, ten times as much as is consumed to-day. The sugar territory of Texas covers more acres than are embraced in the province of Ireland. Why not single out wheat or cotton, or corn, or tobacco, or hay, and impose upon the tax-payers of this country a bounty of 2 cents a bushel or 2 cents a pound for those articles. Why single out sugar? Why make it obnoxious to the people of the country.

So far as the sugar-planters are concerned this bounty is as acceptable to them as the tax; but it is the insecurity of this bounty, the instability of this law of which they complain, because while it may be true that, as long as the Republican party controls both branches of the legislative department and at the same time has its representative in the White House, this bounty upon sugar will be continued or rather may be continued. I do not say "will be continued," because the time may come when the tax will be so great that even a Republican Congress would be called upon to repeal it; but, on the other hand, if the Democrats get control of the Government the friends of the bounty tax may rest assured that a Democratic Congress will wipe it out, will repeal the law. Hence the insecurity, the instability of which the planters complain.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. In other words, our party will observe good faith and your party will not. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAIN. I decline to be interrupted. [Laughter.]

Mr. ABBOTT. Mr. Chairman, if that part of Schedule E which I propose to strike out should become a law, it will be in my opinion one of the greatest outrages ever perpetrated on the people, and the inauguration of a new system of taxing one class for the benefit of another. Sir, the Democratic party, recognizing the fact that only about one-eighth of the sugar consumed in this country is raised at home, has contended that it is better to lay a revenue duty on this article rather than lay a burdensome tax upon the necessaries of life, which the poor are bound to have as well as the rich.

But, sir, it appears the Republican party, acting on a different principle and in the interests of manufacturing trusts and combines, is not willing to let the people have anything cheap. By this bill your party says to the people, in effect, "We will give you free sugar from abroad and we will pay you 2 cents a pound on all the sugar you raise from beets, sorghum, and sugar-cane, and by this means we will reduce the revenues of the Government about $55,000,000, the amount now annually collected by the Government on the importation of sugar; but as our party has been so generous as to give you free sugar from abroad and pay you 2 cents a pound on what you produce, in consideration of this munificent gift and for the purpose of encouraging our 'infant' manufacturing industries and protecting our laboring classes from coming in competition with the 'pauper labor of Europe' we will have to lay some additional burdens on your cutlery, table and glass ware, and upon your tin-plates, pans, and buckets, and upon the window-glass that lets the light of heaven into your humble cottages as well as into the palaces of the rich, and upon your carpenter and blacksmith tools and farm implements, and although the duty on many of these articles has been increased over 100 per cent. we think the Government and the manufacturing industries of the country have not been fully compensated for the concessions made to you on sugar, and therefore we will tax you on wool hats, blankets, women's and children's dress goods, and woolen cloth from 75 to 130 per cent."

These, Mr. Chairman, are the logical inferences to be drawn from the provisions of this bill and the arguments made in its favor by its advocates.

I find in the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics that during the year ending June 30, 1889, there were imported into this country 2,700,421,343 pounds of sugar below the standard No. 16, which under the provisions of this bill would have been admitted free of duty, and 126,384 pounds above No. 16, which would have been dutiable at four-tenths of 1 cent per pound according to this bill.

The average price of this sugar was 2.9 cents per pound, and the average ad valorem rate of duty was 69.8 per cent., or a fraction more than 2 cents per pound, making the cost of the sugar to the importer after the duty was paid 4.9 cents per pound. The theory of existing law under which this sugar was imported is that, as the importer of foreign sugar had to pay 2 cents per pound as duty to the Government, it was equivalent to giving the sugar-planter a bounty of 2 cents a pound on all the sugar he raised, and this theory is correct.

Now, the theory of this bill is that, as the importers are relieved from paying any duty to the Government, to compensate the sugar producer in this country for the loss he will sustain by admitting free of duty foreign sugar, the Government will pay him 2 cents a pound for all the sugar he produces. Now, let us stop and reflect a moment and see what is going to be the result of this change of the law.

Suppose the importers and refiners of sugar who combine to form the sugar trust, and who now sell sugar at nearly double the cost and duty added, conclude that as the Government gives a bonus of 2 cents a pound to the Louisiana and Texas sugar-planter for all he raises they will take unto themselves the same bonus, in which evnt t he price of sugar will remain about as it is and, instead of the Government deriving a revenue of nearly fifty-five millions, as it now does, this immense sum will go into the coffers of the sugar trust.

But some one may answer that we passed the other day a bill to suppress trusts. Such is a fact, and here I take occasion to say that I had intended to make some remarks on that bill, but the Committee on Rules brought it in without previous notice and railroaded it through on such quick time I had no opportunity to do so. While it is a fact that the bill has passed this House and may become a law, its ablest advocates freely admit that without the co-operation of the States it can accomplish but little. Be that as it may, we know from past experience that great moneyed corporations are not suppressed in a day and that they rarely yield such a hold upon the purse-strings of the people as the sugar trust has to-day without a struggle.

Under the tariff law of 1883, which is still the law, the sugar planter is indirectly given 2 cents a pound on his sugar, while the importer is bound to pay, including purchase price and duty, 4.9 cents per pound for foreign sugar, and whatever profit he adds to this cost enhances the value of sugar and becomes profit also to the producer. But suppose, Mr. Chairman, that those who compose the sugar trust should be moved by pity and compassion to hearken unto the voice of the poor and tax-oppressed multitude and should say among themselves—

> Then must we, those who groan beneath the weight
> Of want and poverty, commiserate;

therefore we will reduce our profits to one-half of 1 cent per pound on the purchase price of imported sugar, which will reduce our profits to the insignificant sum of thirteen and one-half millions of dollars annually; yet to show our magnanimity we will make this sacrifice, and sell the people sugar at 3.4 or 3.5 cents, at most, per pound."

Now, Mr. Chairman, if such generous impulses should actuate the sugar trust, what would become of the sugar industries throughout this country? The sugar-grower under existing tariff law receives as much bounty on the sugar he produces as he will receive under the proposed legislation of this bill, while the Government surrenders its revenue to the trust.

How it is going to help the producer of sugar is more than I can comprehend, but I can readily see how it can be made to add millions to the already overgrown fortunes of those engaged in the sugar trust, and unless some law is enacted for the suppression of trusts more certain and definite in its terms than any with which I am acquainted, I fear the passage of this bill will not have the effect to give the people sugar much cheaper.

Another feature of this schedule, if not obnoxious to the Constitution, and I believe it is, is certainly contrary to public policy and the spirit of our free institutions. Before the producer of sugar can get the benefit of the 2 cents per pound bounty for which this bill provides he must make application to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for a license or permission to raise sugar, and he must accompany his application with a statement of the place where he proposes to make it, a description of the machinery he proposes to use, and an estimate of the amount he proposes to produce, and he must further accompany his application for a license with a bond and good security conditioned

that he will faithfully obey all the rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the manufacture and production of sugar.

The provisions of this schedule necessarily imply that the Internal-Revenue Department of the Government is to practically take charge of this great agricultural industry, appoint overseers, inspectors, etc., how many the Lord only knows, and to make the citizen the slave of the Government, and compel him by bond to do whatever the Commissioner prescribes, under penalty that the favor of the Government will be withdrawn if he is disobedient.

Thus the freedom of the citizen is destroyed; no longer can he do with his own as he wills; his knowledge and skill derived from experience are no longer of value to him, but he must obey the dictates of some one who probably never saw a stalk of sugar-cane grow.

And after all this is done and the sugar has been made and inspected, etc., there is still another obnoxious feature about this system, and that is, the growers of corn, cotton, wheat, and all other agricultural products, as well as the raisers of horses, cattle, and hogs, must be taxed to pay the bounty to the sugar-producer; but how the "dearly beloved darky" is to get any part of this bounty is more than I can foresee.

For the year 1888 the sugar product of this country was about 376,000,000 pounds, a bounty of 2 cents on which would give to the sugar-producers $7,520,000, and how much more the other industries would have to be taxed to pay for salaries of overseers, inspectors, stealage, etc., no living man can say.

Mr. Chairman, no member on this floor is more anxious to give the people cheap sugar than I am, but I believe in the doctrine that taxation should be equal and uniform and that no class of citizens should be taxed to support another class of citizens. I believe in raising a sufficient revenue to support the Government "economically administered" by a duty on imports; but the duties should be so adjusted as to throw the burden of taxation as equally as possible on all alike. I believe the present duty on sugar ought to be reduced one-half; and rather than favor the bounty system I would put it on the free-list, as I propose by this amendment. But, in any event, I am unalterably opposed to the theory of taxing one class of people to raise money to pay bounties to another class.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I would have preferred, Mr. Chairman, if the article of sugar could have been left in the tariff schedule upon the dutiable list. This, however, was not practical in the presence of an almost universal sentiment in favor of the removal of the entire duties upon this article of universal family use. On the one hand there were those who favored the entire abolition of the duty without any bounty; on the other hand there were those who favored the maintenance of existing rates, and there were still others in favor of making a cut on sugar of from 50 to 75 per cent. To have made such a cut on sugar would have been absolutely destructive to the sugar industry of the United States. To have made a cut of even 50 per cent. would have compelled the sugar-producers, as they themselves declared, to quit business.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means, looking to the average sentiment of the country, wishing on the one hand to give the people free and cheap sugar and desiring on the other hand to do no harm to this great industry in our midst, have recommended an entire abolition of all duties upon sugar, and then, mindful as we have ever been of our own industries, we turn about and give to this industry 2 cents upon every pound of sugar produced in the United States, a sum equal to the duties now imposed upon foreign sugar imported into this country. We have thus given the people free and cheap sugar and at the same time we have given to our producers, with their invested capital, absolute and complete protection against the cheaper sugar produced by cheaper labor of other countries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what have we accomplished by this? We pay annually $55,000,000 upon the sugar we import. The gentlemen on the other side claim rightfully that this is revenue duty. It is a revenue duty; it is a democratic duty; and being a democratic revenue duty every dollar of it is paid by the American consumer. Last year we paid $55,000,000 out of our own pockets to protect whom? To protect the men in the United States who were producing just one-eighth of the amount of our consumption of sugar. Now we wipe that out, and it will cost us to pay the bounty just $7,000,000 every twelve months which furnishes the same protection at very much less cost to the consumer. So we save $48,000,000 every year and leave them in the pockets of our people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] talks about the number of houses that could be built if we would only remove the tariff upon cotton and woolen goods. Sir, when we lift from the American people this vast sum of $48,000,000 of taxes they can put up every twelve months 48,000 houses, costing a thousand dollars apiece.

"Ah, but," they say, "this appropriation will not last." Some gentleman on the other side says that if we should pass this bill a Democratic Congress would refuse to make the appropriation.

Fearing that, fearing that the Democratic party would do such a gross injustice to a great American industry, we have provided in the bill that the sum required for bounties shall be a permanent appropriation. [Applause on the Republican side.] But my time is almost consumed, and I must hurry on.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] said the other day that the bill that we had reported to the House gave more duties and protection to the sugar refiners than the bill which he brought into the House in the last Congress. I think he must have by inadvertence made that statement.

Let me tell you what his bill did for the refiners of the United States. His bill placed sugar of 75 degrees at $1.15; sugar of 90 degrees at $1.63; sugar from No. 13 to No. 16 at $2.20; sugar from No. 16 to No. 20 at $2.40, and above No. 20 he gave a duty of $2.81. He gave as a differential duty, commencing at No. 13 and running up to No. 16, .57 of 1 per cent. to the sugar refiners of the United States. We give no duty to the sugar refiners up to No. 16. Above 16 and up to 20, he gave them .77; we give them .40, just .37 less than was given by the Mills bill. Above 20 he gave 1.17, and we give .40, just .77 less than the Mills bill gave to the refiners of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The refiners should have whatever duty will protect them against their foreign rivals in the difference of the labor cost. But my friend from Tennessee tells us that because we have reduced the differential duties below the Mills bill we have sent up the trust certificates. Now, since that statement was made I have received and hold in my hand a letter from the president of the Havemeyer Sugar Refinery, in which he says:

NEW YORK, *May* 12, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the use made in the House of the fact that sugar certificates have advanced since the publication of the committee's schedule, I desire to say that it is not true as charged that the advance has been caused by such schedule. The simple fact is that the advance is a reaction from the very low prices, and due to the manipulation of Wall-street operators who put the stock down from 115 to 50 at a time when the old tariff was undisturbed and the business more prosperous than now. Now they are on the other side. It is not just that the sugar schedule in the bill before the House should be held accountable for the action of a speculative clique who are not connected with nor controlled by the sugar-refining companies.

Yours, very respectfully,

JNO. E. SEARLES, JR.

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. MCMILLIN. How is it that he is writing you this letter if you are ruining him? [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will tell you. This gentleman, Mr. John E. Searles, who is well known to many members of the House, on both sides of the House, four or five days ago came to my room and insisted that the 4 cents that we give the sugar refiners was not sufficient to make up the difference between the labor cost here and the labor cost on the other side; and in the course of the conversation I asked him what was the fact as to what had produced the rise in the trust certificates since the introduction of the bill, referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee, and in answer he wrote me this letter, which will appear in the RECORD. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. And the letter explains nothing—nothing absolutely. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I present also a telegram from Hon. S. V. White, late a member of this House, bearing directly upon the same subject. He says:

NEW YORK, *May* 20, 1890.

To Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives:

Replying to question as to whether proposed rates on sugar caused advance in trust certificates, I answer in the negative. The advance may be set down to three things: First, to a reaction from very undue depression. The certificates had fallen from 126 per cent. to 50; the depression was unreasonable and a rebound of 25 per cent. at least was inevitable. Second, the general boom in values predicated upon expectation of passage of silver legislation advanced everything, and trust certificates went with the rest. Third, an important legal decision has been anticipated in favor of the trust, and that has been discounted and is being discounted in the market. Well informed men hold that the bounties of foreign governments paid on exports will nearly neutralize the protection named in the revenue bill; but it is believed here that a Republican Congress will treat this industry as fairly as it does others.

S. V. WHITE.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute if the time for debate has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. CRAIN. Is it in order now to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this time.

Mr. CRAIN. When will it be?

The CHAIRMAN. Whenever certain other amendments are out of the way.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I desire to ask whether the substitute is not now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is that proposed by the gentleman from California, to which an amendment is offered by the gentleman from Vermont; and to all of which a substitute is offered by the gentleman from Iowa. The pending question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLEMAN. I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman, offered and pending, which was printed in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask that the amendment we are to vote on be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is informed that the printing of an amendment in the RECORD would not make it in order at this time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. As the gentleman from Ohio occupied a few minutes over the time, I would like to have consent to have about three minutes to explain the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio did not exceed his time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Then I ask unanimous consent to have three minutes in explanation of the amendment. [Cries of "Regular order!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment yesterday morning, and I would like to know whether it is not first in order.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment could have been offered on yesterday, for the schedule was not under consideration.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a question of order. I understood the Chair to state that the amendment first in order was that of the gentleman from California. The Chair stated that an amendment to that was pending. Now, the first question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It would seem to be so, but it is the maple-sugar amendment to which I referred.

Mr. SPRINGER. But that would be first in order. The first amendments, of course, are to perfect the text.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will so treat it and then submit the substitute.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The substitute should not be voted upon until the text of the bill is perfected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated that he will so treat the question.

Mr. COLEMAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understood on yesterday that amendments were to be offered. I offered mine at the time, and now I want to know when I am to offer it to-day to have action taken upon it. By good faith I think I am now entitled to action upon my amendment; it was offered by consent of the House, printed in the RECORD, and I made a speech upon it. [Laughter.] The amendment was to strike sugar from the free-list.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have read to the gentleman and the committee, if necessary, the discussion in the House under which these amendments were offered. The gentleman from Louisiana will see that his amendment is in no better condition that if it had never been written.

Mr. COLEMAN. Then I will ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there will be forty or fifty other amendments offered.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I demand the regular order.

The CHARMAN. The regular order is the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, and for the simple reason that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont is not applicable to nor germane if that amendment go into the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then it is not an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Would it not be in order to amend the final text?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be an amendment to the final text if the amendment of the gentleman shall prevail. If it does not prevail then it would not.

Mr. SPRINGER. On the original text of the bill it is in order to offer an amendment and one amendment to that. That is the amendment of the gentleman from California. Now it is in order to offer a substitute for that amendment, and when the vote is taken the vote is taken on the substitute first. Some gentleman offered a substitute for this amendment, and the substitute will be in order first. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not so understand the rule.

Mr. BAYNE. The position of the gentleman from Louisiana is that when this amendment now pending shall have been voted upon his amendment can be offered and voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not furnishing information to anybody. The Chair is only acting on matters as they arise. There is no amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana here except the amendment printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Mr. BAYNE. He can offer it after these others are voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California, which the Clerk will now report.

The amendment of Mr. MCKENNA was again reported.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I desire to offer an amendment to that.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already a substitute pending. This is an amendment to the original proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Then I offer an amendment to the amendment. That is surely in order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment already pending.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I think the Chair should first submit the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds some little difficulty in the matter, and therefore will first submit the amendment of Mr. MCKENNA, and if that amendment is adopted then this amendment will not be pertinent, and if the amendment of the gentleman from California is defeated then this will be a pertinent amendment. After that the gentleman can offer his substitute. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA].

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MCKENNA. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 111, noes 103.

Mr. MCKENNA. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] introduced his amendment. That, as I understand, was proposed to be amended by the gentleman from Vermont, and to that I offered a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is made too late. By consent of the committee, the Chair has submitted the vote in the order that it is being taken.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I tried to get the attention of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 115, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Vermont, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend schedule E, sugar, as follows:
On page 47, line 15, after "cane," insert "or maple trees (producing sugar testing not less than 75 degrees by the polariscope)."
On page 48, line 8, before "or sugar-cane," insert "maple trees."
And on same page, line 18, insert "maple trees" after "beets;" and in line 22, after "beets," insert "maple trees."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this the maple-sugar amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

The question was put; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, noes 117.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. STEWART, of Vermont, and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed.

The amendment was rejected—ayes 51, noes 95.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Iowa, to which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] offers an amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I offer an amendment to the original text, which I believe is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that the question was on the substitute of the gentleman from Arkansas, but the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] has offered an amendment to the original text, which comes first in order. The amendment will be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out Schedule E, sugar, commencing on line 9, page 47, down to and including line 5, page 49.

Mr. HOLMAN. That strikes out the bounty.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. HOLMAN; and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 137.

Mr. HOLMAN. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. MCKINLEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

The amendment was read, as follows:

On all sugars, all tank bottoms, all sugar drainings and sugar sweepings, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada and concrete and concentrated molasses, polarizing 75 degrees or less, seventy-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and two-hundredths of 1 cent per pound for each additional degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the substitute proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE E.—SUGAR.

All sugars not above No. 13 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 polariscope not above 75 degrees, shall pay a duty of ninety-four-hundredths of a cent 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 sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay a duty of one and seventy-nine-hundredths of a cent per pound.

Molasses testing not above 56 degrees by the polariscope shall pay a duty of 2 cents per gallon; molasses testing above 56 degrees shall pay a duty of 4 cents per gallon.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "Dutch" wherever it occurs. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know whether I can offer my amendment now. I understand the rule to be that one amendment can be offered to the pending measure and that an amendment can be offered to a substitute for the entire subject-matter; but that, before the substitute and the amendment to that substitute are voted upon, the original matter shall be perfected. Now, it is my desire to perfect the original matter before the substitute shall be voted upon, and it seems to me that that is a question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a question of privilege. It is a question of order. The gentleman may send up his amendment and have it voted upon.

Mr. CRAIN sent the amendment to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that the paper sent up by him is wholly unintelligible.

Mr. CRAIN. I will read it myself. It is intelligible to me.

The amendment was read, as follows:

At the end of line 21, page 49, add:

"SCHEDULE E.—SUGAR.

"That in case a bounty is paid on sugar, then, until July 1, 1905, there shall be paid, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the producers of tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton, hay, prunes, cabbages, eggs, nuts, raisins, hops, and potatoes a bounty of 2 cents per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, and said products shall be placed on the free-list.

"The producer of said products to be entitled to said bounty shall have first filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue a notice of the place of production, with a general description of the machinery and methods to be employed by him, with an estimate of the amount of said products proposed to be produced in the next ensuing year and an application for a license to so produce, to be accompanied by a bond in a penalty and with sureties to be approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that he will faithfully observe all rules and regulations that shall be prescribed for such production of said products.

"The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, upon receiving the application and bond hereinbefore provided for, shall issue to the applicant a license to produce said products at the place and with the machinery and by the methods described in the application; but said license shall not extend beyond one year from the date thereof.

"The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall from time to time make all needful rules and regulations for the planting and cultivation of any of said products, and shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, exercise supervision and inspection thereof.

"And for the payment of these bounties the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to draw warrants on the Treasurer of the United States for such sums as shall be necessary, which sums shall be certified to him by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, by whom the bounties shall be disbursed."

[Laughter.]

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] may have two minutes to explain his amendment, which is a very important one and offered in good faith.

Several members objected.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, and the Chairman declared that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 78, noes 125.

Mr. SPRINGER. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 84, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLEMAN. I move to amend by striking out paragraph 727, page 120; in other words, my motion is to strike sugar from the free-list.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. COLEMAN was rejected; there being ayes 36, noes 129.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I desire now to offer an amendment to another part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There is still an amendment pending to the sugar schedule, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I ask for a vote on the substitute which I submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the question on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa, which the Clerk has already reported. The question is upon agreeing to that substitute.

Mr. HEARD. Let us have it reported.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been reported; but if there is no objection the Clerk will read it again.

Mr. FRANK. I object.

The amendment of Mr. KERR, of Iowa, was rejected.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now ask the Clerk to read the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In paragraph 131, line 17, page 21, strike out the word "fourteen" and insert the word "eleven."

In paragraph 132, line 21, strike out the word "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let us hear the paragraph as it will read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

131. Freestone, granite, sandstone, and other building or monumental stone, except marble, unmanufactured or undressed, not specially provided for in this act, 11 cents per cubic foot.

132. Freestone, granite, sandstone, and other building or monumental stone, except marble, not specially provided for in this act, hewn, dressed, or polished, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. FLOWER. Is that a reduction?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I filed yesterday an amendment referring to the section which has just been read. I would like to have a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Amendments which were printed in the RECORD for information are not in order until regularly offered.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] a question. While the amendment now pending reduces the rate from what is proposed in the bill, does it not still leave it 100 per cent. higher than it is in the existing law?

Mr. MCKINLEY. All I can say to the gentleman is that we propose in the bill a duty of 14 cents per cubic foot, and this amendment reduces it to 11 cents; and in lieu of a duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem proposed in the bill we make the duty 40 per cent.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Can you not make it 30?

Mr. MCMILLIN. The duty is now 20.22 per cent. ad valorem upon the articles enumerated in paragraph 131. This amendment will make the duty about 100 per cent. higher than it is under the present law.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask a division of the question. The amendment embraces two distinct propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is divisible.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I offered the two propositions together in order to save time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will first be taken on the first branch of the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. I move to put these articles on the free-list——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the motion of the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. I move to strike out "50 per cent." and insert "20 per cent.," leaving the duty as at present.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I suggest that the amendment of the gentleman will more properly apply to the second branch of the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, we are about closing the action of the House on this bill——

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the first division of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BLAND. I want to submit a few observations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman propose an amendment? The Chair understood the gentleman to suggest an amendment to the second proposition.

Mr. BLAND. I desire to be heard on my motion.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope the gentleman may be heard for five minutes if he desires.

[Mr. BLAND withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. On Saturday last two gentlemen on the other side attacked the duty on granite as fixed by this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH].

The latter gentleman arraigned me in severe terms for going before the committee and advocating this increase. He claimed it "was a tax on the dead," and also chanted the good old Methodist hymn about "salvation's free for you and me," and argued therefrom that building stones, monuments, and gravestones should be the same.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did go before the committee as charged, and advocated this increased duty on granite, and I convinced the committee that it should be made, and I can convince this House, if my time will admit, and I can convince the gentleman from Kentucky, that this increased duty is not a tax on the dead, but is for the benefit of thousands of living workmen, as honest a class of intelligent mechanics as can be found in the country, who have petitioned for this increase.

I will go further and say that if this duty shall stand as reported by the committee, and our workman shall be relieved from the competition of the pauper labor of Italy, Scotland, and Europe, we shall not only benefit our own manufacturers and workmen, but we shall develop the

great granite and marble quarries, not only of Massachusetts, Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire, but of Virginia, Tennessee, Missouri, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and other States, where the supply is inexhaustible, and make gravestones and building material cheaper than ever, besides giving additional employment to thousands of American workmen.

Oh, how our Democratic brethren love the poor laboring man and how they weep over his wrongs and sorrows. I call the attention of these gentlemen to the circular I will print with these remarks, issued by that great organization the Granite Cutters' National Union, in which they show the absolute necessity of an advance in the duty on granite to a higher point than is fixed by this bill. They give conclusive and satisfactory reasons why this advance is absolutely necessary to their protection.

This foreign granite is brought here as ballast, at nominal freight, and thus the labor of our stone-workers is brought into direct competition with the underpaid, poorly paid stone-workers of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, in the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor are three cities; one of them, the city of Quincy, having 12,000 or 15,000 inhabitants, has for its principal business the quarrying and finishing of granite for building, monumental, and other purposes.

This is not an infant industry, though I shall show that it needs protecting all the same. King's Chapel in Boston was built one hundred and fifty years ago, and was built from granite quarried in Quincy and drawn there by the patient oxen; and from that day to this the business has been carried on and increased, and has now come to give employment to a large number of workmen, and is engaged in by many different firms. There are 1,400 men employed in this industry in Quincy alone.

But my constituents are confronted by a new obstacle, namely, the importation of foreign granite, which, I repeat, is brought here as ballast at nominal freight, and the workmen are brought into direct competition with the poorly paid and underpaid labor of Europe.

I hold in my hand a petition of forty-nine firms engaged in this business in Quincy, also from 691 granite workmen, asking that the present duty of 20 per cent. may be increased to 50 per cent., as called for by this bill and which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means after hearing all sides.

This increase is a necessary, just, and proper one, not only for the protection of the industry in Quincy, but for the protection of the same industry in all the New England and other States.

Now, what are the arguments against this duty? First, that this country does not afford the same colored granite as Scotland, from which place $49,950 of granite was imported to Boston alone, 10 miles from Quincy, last year.

In answer I have to say that the thousands of yards of red granite capping on the terrace upon the west side of this Capitol building give the lie to the statement that this country does not furnish as handsome red granite as is to be found upon the face of the earth.

I hold in my hand a sample of granite from Red Beach, Me., and I invite the members of the House to confirm my statement by examining this beautiful sample of red granite, and I am told there is no limit to the supply of red granite in Maine and elsewhere.

The opposition to this item in this bill comes from the printed circular and petition sent out by importers of foreign granite to dealers in this country, to be forwarded to members of Congress. This false and lying circular contains the statement that this country does not contain red granite equal to Scotch granite and gives the impression that there is a scarcity of red granite for monumental and business purposes in this country.

The statement is ridiculous and absurd. The state-house at Des Moines, Iowa, has standing in the rotunda red granite columns, a most magnificent and beautiful feature of the state-house, quarried at Graniteville, Iron County, Missouri, and the member representing that section of Missouri tells me that the red-granite quarries of Missouri at that place are simply inexhaustible. Minnesota has large quarries of red granite at St. Cloud and Ortonville, where the business of quarrying and finishing is extensively carried on and where the supply is inexhaustible. Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has beautiful red granite and extensive works for its manufacture. There are large gray granite quarries near Richmond, Va., which are extensively worked.

Thus it will be seen that the protection afforded by this duty is by no means sectional and by no means confined to New England.

Now, will not some gentleman tell me why we should bring rocks and stones 3,000 miles across the Atlantic Ocean? Pray, have we not ledges and rocks enough in this country from which to quarry every conceivable kind of material for building or monumental purposes?

There can be but one answer, and that answer is that these stones can be wrought by the poorly paid, underpaid, and pauper labor of Europe cheaper than they can in this country, and cross the Atlantic and be laid down in our markets for less than they can be quarried and wrought here.

In the name of my constituents in Quincy, in the name of the honest workmen in that city, who are as industrious, intelligent, and thrifty a class of mechanics as are to be found in the country, I ask that the duty as fixed by the Committee on Ways and Means be allowed to stand.

I am aware that a machine letter and circular have been sent by some of these importers of foreign granite to granite dealers asking them to write their members of Congress, or, if they have not time to write them, to sign and forward a protest which they kindly inclose.

Now, I hope all that will be taken for what it is worth. The letter accompanying this circular which I have here contains a misstatement of facts, and had the facts been known I apprehend that few, if any, protests would have been signed or letters written to members of Congress on this subject.

I am told that one of these importers, who also buys American granite of one of my constituents, procured his signature by intimidation and a threat of withdrawal of his patronage if he refused to sign; and I say further that the New England protest against the passage of this higher duty comes almost exclusively from importers of foreign granite.

I am told that the business of Jones Bros., who appear in the evidence here as American manufacturers, is largely and principally in the importation of foreign granite.

They say the red granite of this country fades. Will they not tell us how much time it takes to have it fade? I venture the assertion that no living man can testify to the assertion.

Yes; the American red granite will fade and so will foreign, but not any to speak of until Gabriel's trump shall sound; "not until the elements melt with fervent heat and the works thereof are burned up."

No, Mr. Chairman, I believe in American granite for American buildings and in American wages for American workmen, and hence I ask that the duty as fixed by the Committee on Ways and Means, after the most patient and exhaustive hearing, may be allowed to stand.

Mr. Chairman, under the permission of the House to print and in answer to the circular offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH], I caused to be printed in Saturday's RECORD the following circular from one of the great labor organizations of the country:

OFFICE OF THE GRANITE CUTTERS' NATIONAL UNION
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Barre, Vt., February 3, 1890.

SIR: Understanding that an effort is being made in the interests of importers and foreign manufacturers to have the tariff on granite reduced, I am instructed to protest against any reduction whatever being made in the tariff on granite, manufactured or unmanufactured, and to ask you to use your influence to have the tariff on the same increased to 60 per cent. The State you represent is interested in the prosperity and development of the granite industry, and therefore we ask you to assist us against the unfair competition of foreign manufacturers. Monuments are being imported into this State from Europe cheaper than can be manufactured here. There are probably millions of dollars invested in the granite trade in this State alone, and to hand this trade over to foreign manufacturers, who have no interest in the development of the country, is not wise statesmanship, and we hope you will, in so far as it lies in your power, aid us against those mercenaries in the granite business who, for the few dollars they can make as importers, are endeavoring to destroy our trade in this country. Our manufacturers are also handicapped in this matter by the freight rates they are compelled to pay, as the freight rate from Liverpool, England, to New York is 75 per cent. less than from Barre, Vt., to New York, which you will readily perceive is a great advantage to foreign manufacturers over our own.

The foreign manufacturer can undersell our own 30 per cent. at the present tariff, and therefore we ask for an increase to 60 per cent., which we consider only fair and just to preserve to American citizens the freedom we enjoy, inasmuch as enterprising men who engage in business must necessarily have a certain profit to insure themselves against risks, and, if in unfair competition with low-paid countries that profit is wiped out, then the workman must suffer by reduced wages in order to meet that competition, and in all low-paid countries the workmen are practically serfs, devoid of ambition, as you are well aware. In our trade there are a class of wreckers whose only stock in trade consists of an office-room, or desk-room in somebody else's office, in some office building in a city, a few designs, and a great deal of cheek. They have their so-called agents scouring the country, competing at every point with bona fide manufacturers who have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in quarries and works which require a great amount of machinery, thus giving employment to other trades besides our own. Yet these manufacturers who have thus invested their capital are undersold by people whose whole outfit would not fetch a hundred dollars if sold at auction. Believing, therefore, in the old maxim that "charity begins at home," we believe that all, whether native-born or adopted citizens, who have the prosperity of the country at heart should see to it that our citizens are not impoverished by the unfair competition of these importers, as we hold that one manufacturer doing a legitimate business is worth more to the country than fifty importers with their sheets of electrotyped or lithographed designs. And so, in the interests of our trade generally, many of whom are your constituents, we ask you to assist us in raising the tariff so as to preserve fair wages to our workmen, fair profits to our employers, and happy homes for all.

Yours respectfully,

JOSIAH B. DYER, *N. U. Secretary.*

It is proper to repeat that I hold a petition from one single city in my district bearing the signatures of 691 members of the above great organization, praying for an advance of the duty on granite; and it is proper to add further that since this bill was reported, increasing the duty, with the prospect of relieving this great industry from foreign competition, these men have demanded and secured from the manufacturers an advance in wages of 5 to 10 per cent.

I desire also to submit the following communication, showing the cost of American and foreign monuments and showing the necessity of the increased duty as called for by this bill:

QUINCY, *April* 2, 1890.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Granite Manufacturers' Association last evening a portion of your letter to Mr. Shaw, referring to letter received from dealers, stating that the resolutions sent you some time since, asking an advance in duties on foreign-dressed granites, was read, and the inclosed prepared and signed, as you will see, by forty-nine firms. There being about sixty-five firms engaged in the business here, this certainly represents the majority in numbers, and a very large majority in amount of business. And of the balance we could have

secured the names of all but four or five, who are interested in selling foreign granites, if we could have seen them. So that you will see that, as I wrote you before, the resolutions before sent you practically represent the whole granite industry here, in the published edition on revision of the tariff which you were kind enough to send me.

I notice letters on the subjects protesting against the increase asked. The four firms are all large importers of foreign granites, and while they deal in American granites the fact that they can supply the general demand for monumental work with foreign granites when the native granites are not demanded, at a much greater profit to themselves, unquestionably influences their action in this respect. That you may be able to make comparison of the cost of both granites, I inclose you designs of a few ordinary monuments and give prices on same.

No. 318 is 3 feet 1 inch square, base 7 feet 6 inches high; is all polished, composed of 5 pieces; price of same in Scotch granite, duty paid, delivered in New York	$214.00
In Quincy granite material would cost	45.00
Labor cost	225.00
	265.00
Add for profits, etc., 10 per cent	26.50
Cost in American granite	291.50

We can not afford to do business on this margin, but you can see the difference even at that.

No. 26 (4 pieces), 2 feet 2 inches square at bottom, 10 feet 8 inches high, all polished; price at New York in Scotch granite, duty paid	$137.00
Material	25.25
Would cost in Quincy granite, labor	156.00
	181.25
Ten per cent	18.13
Cost in American granite	199.38
No. 25 (6 pieces), 4 feet 2 inches at base, 13 feet high, all polished except drapery; price in Scotch granite in New York	760.00
Material	121.00
Quincy labor	784.00
Ten per cent	90.50
Cost in American granite	990.50
No. 24 (3 pieces), round, 2 feet 8 inches diameter at base, 8 feet 8 inches high, polished where shaded; price in Scotch granite at New York	93.00
Material	33.00
American labor	158.00
Ten per cent	19.00
Cost in American granite	210.00

This last is hardly a fair sample, as being round they cut it by machinery there, which not having the machinery here we can not do, but the others would be cut and finished under the same conditions except as regards cost of labor, or day pay. The case quoted by Jones Bros. is not a fair one, it being one almost entirely out of the question, since little, if any, work of this kind is imported. The ordinary run of monumental work is composed of stone containing from 5 to 20 cubic feet, costing in Barre granite 80 cents per foot; costing in Quincy $1 to $1.20 per foot; costing in Quincy $1.14 to $1.62 per foot. So that we have no fear of the raw material. The proportionate cost of labor in the class of work sent here is from five to six times that of the material, depending on the design, whereas in the case mentioned by Jones it is about being simply a plain block, without polish, of which I doubt there being twenty-five pieces received here in a year.

I notice by last night's paper an increase on granite reported, so do not know as this will be of service to you, but trust you may be successful in securing the passage of the bill.

Yours, respectfully,

WM. H. MITCHELL,
Secretary Granite Manufacturers' Association.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.

I desire also to submit the following statement from forty-nine of the granite manufacturers of Quincy to refute certain misstatements of a few importers whose only interest in this great American industry is the commission they get from the foreign manufacturers, and whose only investments are sample pictures and price-lists of foreign monuments and stone-work:

QUINCY, MASS., *April* 1, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Understanding that letters have been sent to you by individual firms, members of this association, stating that the resolutions sent you by the secretary asking for an increase in the duty on foreign granites do not fairly represent the granite industry of this city, we take this means to contradict that statement and state that by their signatures hereto they heartily support the resolutions sent you, and renew their request for an increase of duty on foreign granites to 50 per cent. ad valorem.

Mitchell Granite Works, M. Gratto Bros., O. T. Rogers Granite Company, Milne Chalmers & Co., John Thompson & Sons, Field L. Wild, McKenzie Patterson, William T. Spargo, McIntosh & Son, John S. Pool, O'Brien & Co., Elcock & Sons, McDonnell & Sons, Adams Granite Works, Turner & More, McGilloway & Jones, Malnocte Bros., Swithin Bros., John Smith, T. F. Mannex, Bizzozero & Monti Falconer & Marnock, McDonnell & Kelley, Nicolls Granite Works, Thomas & Miller, Merry Mount Granite Company, Allen C. Walker, McDonnell & Cook, Norfolk Granite Company, Burke Bros., Miller & Leull, Frederick Field, Joseph H. Vogel, Craig & Richards Granite Company, McDonnell Bros., Joss Bros., F. Hardwick & Son, C. H. Hardwick & Co., John Fallow & Sons, Lewis Dell & Co., James F. Desmond, Jones & Desmond, James N. White, Daniel Hayes, Adam Vogel & Son, Badger Bros., Fuller, Haley & Co., F. J. Fuller & Son, Carey Bros.

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, M. C.

While I should prefer a duty of 50 per cent., as first reported by the committee, I shall be reasonably satisfied with the reduction to 40 per cent. as proposed now by the committee, and think it will afford the protection prayed for by my constituents, but I ask my Republican associates to stand by me and resist any further reduction as proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

I have stated before and repeat now that any tariff bill which we can pass, owing to the conflicting interests in this great country of ours, must in the nature of the case to some extent be a compromise. The Committee on Ways and Means have given exhaustive and patient consideration for days and nights, for weeks and months, and have brought forth this measure. The tariff must be revised. The Republican party promised in the last campaign that it should be revised on protection lines. That policy bears hardly on some of the industries in my district. There are idle heavy iron industries in my district and there are those that say if they could have free coal and free iron from Canada they could be run with profit.

Protection to these great interests of coal and iron in our country forbid free coal and free iron, and the committee in this bill have continued the protection principle towards those interests. In my district is located the largest cordage company in the world, the Plymouth Cordage Company. They ask for free hemp. The hemp-growers in this country demand protection, and this bill places a duty on hemp to the injury of my constituents. I tell them, and tell them truly, that I can not demand nor expect protection to the products of their factories unless I grant protection to the industries of other sections. Now I ask, and think I have a right to demand, that this protection principle shall be extended to the great granite industry of my district.

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

The amendment was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio in line 110, paragraph 129.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion to strike out "forty" in the proposed amendment and insert "twenty," which leaves the duty precisely as it is under the existing law.

This law, which is now the law of the land, was adopted in the interest of protection. Everything in it was put as high—I was going to say as the consciences of the Republican party would permit [laughter], and I know of no English phrase that expresses more limitless power and scope than that. I know of nothing that has happened since 1883 to the industry which is described in this clause to require a higher rate of protection than the present law imposes. The freight on it from abroad, the duty now upon it, is an ample protection for every form of stone that really meets with foreign competition, and this increased duty is simply to make a prohibitory duty against other classes of stone which do not now compete with this stone and which ought not now to be prohibited.

The motion made by the gentleman from Ohio is in the right direction, that is, to change the 50 per cent. ad valorem to 40 per cent., but it does not go far enough. It is comparatively a small matter as compared with the sixty millions you have taken from the public Treasury by the vote on sugar and is small compared with the increasing millions you are going to take out of the public Treasury and pay as bounties on sugar and silk, and which must come out of the toil of men that produce other articles. But still it is in the direction of protecting a comparatively narrow industry in very small and few localities, of an article that must be used, and where the protection is that which added to the price of the article must be paid out of the industry of the country, and that without a word of explanation as to the reason why it is increased 100 per cent. Hence I make the motion.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi, rose.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Will the gentleman from Mississippi allow us to take a vote on this question and take the floor on the next amendment?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Very well.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Before passing from this question I desire to be heard for a few moments. I will call attention to a matter which occurs so frequently in this bill that I feel some stress should be laid upon it before we finally pass it to-morrow. It will be observed that in this section, 131, and the schedule that is prepared to accompany it the rate of duty is given, namely, $1 per ton, the proposed rate 14 cents per cubic foot; the number of tons imported for the fiscal year 1889 15,183.44, and the value $75,095, while the duties imposed on it amounted to $15,183.44.

Then there is a statement that the duty estimated under this bill will be only $15,183.44. Although the committee has doubled the rate of duty, they put in a statement representing that the duty collected under this proposed bill will be the same that was collected under the present law. This note is appended to the bill:

The amount of duty collected under the present law is inserted here, as there are no quantities given in the importations from which the specific duties can be computed.

And hence the statement of the gentleman from Ohio in the opening of the debate and the schedules that have gone with this bill are wholly misleading. There are no less than one hundred and twenty-

five—indeed, I should speak with more accuracy if I said one hundred and fifty—propositions of a similar misleading character incorporated in the bill, in which the same statements are given as to the results that will flow from it. These, when aggregated, will amount to not less than $25,000,000, including the increased duty on tin-plate. This $25,000,000 should be added to the $40,000,000 which the majority admit has been added to the schedules other than the sugar schedule by this bill.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Tell them that the evidence before the Committee on Ways and Means shows that these stones are imported in a rough state and give employment to a great amount of American labor. The duty proposed by the committee is prohibitory, and therefore it takes employment from American labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was put; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Has the question been taken on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. We did not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. If gentlemen will observe order we will be able to get along with business. The Chair put the vote, but it appears that it was not understood, and the Chair will again put the vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, to strike out the word "forty" and insert "twenty."

The question was again put; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKINLEY. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Paragraph 50, page 28, line 25, strike out the worde "45 per cent. ad valorem" and insert "7 cents per pound."

Mr. MCMILLIN. What section does that apply to?

Mr. MCKINLEY. On page 28, paragraph 150, line 25. This applies to tool steel. The duty under the bill as at present given is 45 per cent. ad valorem on steel that costs about 25 cents a pound. It would make it from 12 to 12½ cents. We have reduced it by this amendment to 7 cents a pound.

Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I expect to say nothing new in discussing the tariff question, but I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks that have been made, and note that there seems to be so much stress put upon the products and requirements of certain localities, without any regard to the general effect of the tariff upon the country as a whole, that I feel that we had better ask the lawyers to listen for a few minutes to the business side of the question. If the protective-tariff system is to be maintained it must be maintained in its entirety. The schedules must be so adjusted as to meet the existing demands. It is a system of reciprocal benefit.

By its operation the plane of living in the United States has been elevated to a higher standard than that enjoyed by any other country in the world. But let that system once be successfully attacked at any vital point and the whole structure must fall. This is very well understood by the English economists and their emissaries in this country, and hence we find them concentrating their forces on certain points in our line. Wool and lumber are the favorite points of attack, and for that reason the friends of protection must rally and stand united there. Let the line once waver, and all is ruin and disaster.

Mr. Chairman, force free lumber upon this country, and the lumbermen will immediately demand free axes, free saws, and cheaper labor. Take off the duty on woolen goods, and the manufacturers will demand free wool, and so on through the schedules. Chaos will reign, our present system will be overthrown, and our country will yield its present proud position of independence to one of dependence upon foreign manufacturers. Does any reasoning man doubt that the price is governed by the supply and demand? If you wipe out the duty and increase the demand for foreign goods, does any man doubt for a minute that the price will be eventually raised?

Take lumber. The coarser grades of lumber sell in this country for $11 a thousand. There is a specific duty of $2 a thousand on lumber, and the Canadian who seeks a market in this country must lay his lumber down at the border at $9. Does any practical business man or any one but a wild dreamer, reveling in free-trade theories, imagine after this duty is repealed that the Canadian is going right along selling his lumber in the United States for $9 when he can get $11? The result will be that the Canadian manufacturers will get the benefit of that $2 instead of the United States Treasury, and the amount of deficit that this leaves will have to be made up by direct taxation from the people. And while on this subject of lumber I want to call attention to a provision in this lumber schedule which I think will have the effect of curing an abuse practiced by the Canadian Government.

For years Michigan has been denuded of her finest timber, oak and pine, to be shipped unsawed to Canada and Europe, until to-day the ship-builders and manufacturers of Michigan are obliged to import their oak from outside the State; and now the Canadian Government has levied an export duty of $2 a thousand upon logs brought into this country to be sawed. This schedule provides that where this is done the amount of the export duty on logs shall be added to our import duty on sawed lumber. This will have the effect, I believe, of causing Canada to repeal the duty at once.

Mr. Chairman, I am a ship-builder, and every article I use in the construction of a steel or wooden ship carries a tariff duty. I expend $2,000,000 annually for labor and materials. My labor is expensive by reason of the wages paid to labor in surrounding protected industries. If I considered the tariff a tax, which I do not, I would say that my average tax on labor and material was 25 per cent., or $500,000 a year. If this is a tax I want to pay it. Why? Because, being a practical man, who has had some small measure of success in his business, and not a theoretical political economist or a demagogue from some remote section of the United States, looking only for the vantage of some particular staple, I see that if I get my free materials and cheap labor the demand for my boats is gone.

The original cost of a boat is but a minor item; it is the guaranty of business after a boat is built that invites capital to investment in ship-building. The same theory upon which I work governs the farmer (and if my friends on the other side of this House think he does not understand this question they are mightily fooled); if the parrot-like repetition of "the tariff is a tax" makes any impression upon him at all he is quick to see that it is to his advantage to pay that tax in order to secure for himself a sure market.

But he is too intelligent to be misguided. He has seen, year by year, a reduction in the price of every article he uses and a corresponding increase in the price of his products, with the exception of the past few years, when a surplus of grain has been raised to be dumped into an already overcrowded market. And the farmer sees plainly that the remedy for this decline in price is not in sending still more products to these "markets of the world" to further bear down prices, but to enlarge his home market so as to take up this surplus of agricultural products.

I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, that my mind has not become narrowed in the study of these questions. I am thankful that I can measure the greatness and glory of this country by a higher standard than the size of a dollar. We are not a cheap people, and no effort of the English manufacturers, headed by their shrewdest statesman, backed by a subservient and subsidized press in this country and the votes of a powerful political party anxious to repay the debt of Confederate bonds to British holders, can make us so.

The animus of the opposition in this debate has been directed against the manufacturers of this country.

To hear the Democratic members of this House talk one would imagine that the manufacturers were a band of robbers, and, instead of the fierce competition among them which we see on every hand, that they were united in one monster head to devour the people. According to the average Democratic orator the American manufacturer has no rights worth respecting and the quicker we subdue his haughty spirit the better. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, as everybody knows, that the great fortunes that have been made in this country, with one or two exceptions, have not been made through protected industries, but through the oil trade, imports, stocks and mines, and real estate.

The vast majority of manufacturers to-day are working on borrowed capital, paying honest wages to an army of workmen, and increasing their plants under this American system of protection. Wipe it out and witness the universal destruction of our industries. Watch the flames go out in our furnaces, the tall factory chimneys crumble and totter; watch the army of prosperous workmen retire suddenly to the fields to increase our production of "cotton and grain at lower prices," or standing idly by to be fed by the hand of charity. This picture is not a fancy sketch, but an illustration from the pages of history. Every time you have tried free trade in this country you have experienced the like result. Can we never profit by the experience of a former generation? Must a Walker be followed by a Mills in each stage of our history?

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has submitted a table in which he attempts to show that the laborer is not protected in the same proportion as the manufacturer. He says that the average wages paid to the laborer in 1850 was $244 and the value of his products was $1,063; in 1860 the average wages were $288, and value of production $1,438; in 1870 the average wages $377, and the value of products $2,060. He says the rate of increase of product for one man is greater than the increase of his wages.

Of course this is so, and any man who reasons will be quick to see the cause, which lies in the improved methods and appliances of manufacture, the result of Yankee genius, which would never have had a chance for development under the system of free trade advocated by the gentleman and his party. But the difference of these figures does not show the profits of the manufacturer, because material enters very largely into the manufacture of any product. Also, there is an expense account, insurance account, and shrinkage account; all of which com-

bined bring down the profits of the average manufacturer to a legitimate and proper basis.

But a free-trader should never have introduced those figures into his speech; they represent too glaring a contrast between the increase in the average wages paid between the decade of free trade from 1850 to 1860 and the period of protection from 1860 to 1870. If our wages are not higher than in England and the opportunities in life for workingmen not better, why is it that the tide of emigration is in this direction? Would men leave the home of their childhood, the traditions of their fathers for a new home amongst strangers unless material benefits were to be gained? And this silly talk about the American laborer not being protected against the pauper laborer.

When a man becomes a citizen of this country does he not become an American laborer, does he not become a consumer of American products, and does his toil not go to the development of our resources? The difference between protection and free trade is that under the former policy the foreign capitalist and laborer to secure an opening in our market are forced to come here and increase our wealth, while under the latter or Democratic policy they would remain at home and send their products to us to be paid for in "cheap grain and cotton," to quote from Gladstone. Under the tariff system we are the peers of any nation in the world; under the free-trade policy we would become the "hewers of wood and the drawers of water" for the British manufacturer, and in case of war with that country we would be at their mercy.

The tariff is a tax upon the importer, levied to protect home manufacturers, much the same as a tax is levied by cities upon roving peddlers for license to sell goods. They pay neither rent nor taxes to help maintain the city, and the authorities say to them that if they want to compete with the merchants who are residents of that city, whose wealth is a part of the wealth of all the people, whose prosperity is for the benefit of their neighbors, they must pay something to the city for the privilege, which tax will reduce the burdens of the people just so much and at the same time afford protection to the merchants against cheap competition.

The Democratic party is wasting a great deal of sympathy in this discussion on the farmers of the country, as the victims of this iniquitous policy of protection, forced on them by the Republican party. I think the farmer understands this question better than his self-appointed champion. The farmer knows that he must look for better times, not by groping after an opening in the crowded markets of the world, but through the extension of his home market, and this he knows can only be accomplished by a reduction of imports and an increase in manufactures.

The farmer sees the benefit of a home market in the increased value of farming lands in counties where manufacturing has been developed over those counties that are purely agricultural. In the former the farmer has a market at his door, not only for his wheat, corn, and oats, but for his butter, poultry, eggs, small fruits, and the perishable products which form such an important part of the small farmer's wealth. The same rule that applies to the county applies to the country at large. Upon the same principle that induces men in new towns to offer a bonus for the establishment of factories in their midst, the Government guaranties protection from the ruinous competition of European pauper labor to the men who will establish and maintain factories in this country.

What is protection? Call it by what name you will, tariff, subsidy, or bounty, whether exercised on land or water, it is the same fostering care given by the parent government to her infant industries for the benefit of the people of the whole country in their competition with the people of other countries.

England protected her manufacturers by tariff until they could defy competition, and then she proceeded to protect her shipping by subsidies, and has continued that policy until this day, when she controls more than half the shipping of the world.

Our Government subsidized its railroads, and to-day owns half the miles of railroad in the world, which we control through the wise provisions of the interstate-commerce law, and by competition have forced an equitable and uniform adjustment of freights. And I would like to say in passing that hardly any single measure that has passed Congress in the last few years has worked such advantage to the agriculturists of the West and the manufacturers all over the country as the interstate-commerce law.

By means of the competition of the great trunk-lines from the East to the West through freight has been reduced to a fairly remunerative basis, and the interstate law has stepped in to prevent the benefit of that competition being lost in local freight by the long and short haul clause.

Mr. Chairman, the question has often occurred to me, if the tariff on our imports is not paid by the foreign manufacturers, why it is they so strongly object to the levying of such duties. If the American consumer pays the duty it ought to make no difference to the foreign manufacturer. He certainly does not object through sympathy for us. And, Mr. Chairman, you will find that our friends across the water are more candid among themselves when discussing our tariff than their allies in this country are when discussing a tariff bill in this House.

The Democratic voters tell us that the tariff is in the interest of the "robber barons" and against the interests of the people. The Englishmen tell each other, however, that the American tariff is in the interest of the American people and against the interests of England. When it was proposed to place a duty on tin-plate sufficient to enable American manufacturers to get a start in the production of this most important necessity, the Tories of this country immediately raised the cry that the poor workingman's dinner-pail was to be taxed for the benefit of the "robber barons." The wail for the poor workingman has become common in this country. This same cry was raised when it was proposed to place a tariff on calico, selling at 50 cents a yard.

The "robber barons" proceeded to take advantage of this tariff and by competition among themselves reduced the price to 5 cents a yard. The same pitiful cry went up, and the Republican party was abused as the friend of monopoly, when it placed a tariff on steel rails manufactured in England and sold in this country at $80 a ton. The "robber barons" again went to work and succeeded in reducing the price as low as $25 a ton, and made it possible to build the thousands of miles of railroad which have played such an important part in the development of this country.

We could never have stood the drain of gold necessary to purchase these rails manufactured abroad. To show the difference between the refreshing candor of our friends on the other side in discussing these questions and the demagogy of their allies in the Democratic party, I wish to quote the following article from the London Iron and Steel Trades Journal of April 12:

> The most important item in the proposed new schedule is that affecting tin-plates. The duty is now 1 cent per pound and the suggested tariff is 2 cents and 2.10 cents per pound. If this is carried, the occupation of three-fourths of those engaged in the tin-plate trade will be gone, and our manufacturers and their workmen, if they continue in the business, must employ their capital and experience on the other side of the Atlantic.
>
> The great obstacle to tin-plate making on a large scale in the States is the entire absence of cheap female labor, so necessary in the industry and so abundant in Wales, but if the enormous duty of 12s. a box is adopted possibly the labor difficulty may be gotten over. Until the bill is actually passed we shall continue to believe that the people of America will refuse to impose upon the consumers of tin-plates this enormous tax. Tin-plates can not possibly be made in the States so cheaply as they can be in this country; the existing duty is ample proof of this, and to abolish the duty entirely would be more appropriate than to increase it.

Our English friends and their allies, the Democratic party, insist that we should raise more cheap wheat and cotton to be exchanged for cheap manufactures in foreign markets. Did they ever compute how many millions of bushels of wheat it would have taken to exchange for the tons of steel rails laid in the United States during the last twenty years?

One of the favorite arguments against protection in this country is that through its influence our shipping is paralyzed. This, Mr. Chairman, is pure nonsense, and I cannot help but think that gentlemen know it to be nonsense when they advance it.

Our shipping on the coast and on the lakes is growing at a phenomenal rate. We are building our own ships, sailing them between American ports and carrying American products. In this trade we are amply protected and if the Government would offer the same protection to American ships in the foreign trade as she does to the vessels in the coast and lake trade, the Stars and Stripes would flash upon every sea and our manufacturers would not need free raw material to lay their products down in every promising market in competition with the rest of the world. But, in strange contrast to our liberal policy in developing our internal commerce, we have pursued a niggardly and short-sighted policy in regard to our foreign shipping interests.

England began in 1840 to subsidize her vessels owned by private companies, to enable them to cut rates and drive the shipping of every other nation from the sea, and in this she has nearly succeeded.

In our case we are completely at her mercy; but France and Germany, in order to meet this ruinous competition, have adopted like tactics, and are to-day giving liberal subsidies to encourage foreign shipping. In some cases the English subsidy has amounted to a guaranty of dividend, and in an official report dated July 20, 1870, I find this significant passage:

> By the terms of the contract concluded with the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company on the 19th of November, 1867, the subsidy to be paid the company is set down at £400,000 ($2,000,000) a year, with a stipulation, on the one hand, that whenever the annual income of the company from all sources does not admit of the payment of a dividend of 8 per cent. on the capital employed the subsidy shall be increased by so much, subject to a limit of £100,000 ($500,000), as is required to make up such a dividend; and on the other, that whenever the increase is sufficient to allow a dividend exceeding 8 per cent. to be declared the company shall pay to the Postmaster-General one-fourth of the excess.

What American capitalist will invest his money in even "free ships" and run them in competition with lines so protected and insured from loss by the English Government? If the ships were given to an American company outright under our present conditions with the difference of taxation, labor, etc., I very much doubt if they could run in competition with these subsidized lines.

It certainly does not speak very well for the credit of our Government that our mails are being carried in English bottoms. The money that is given to the Cunarders each year for the transportation of American mails had much better be increased and used to establish Amer-

ican lines, so that in case of war we would have something to depend upon, something to cope with these greyhounds of the ocean, changed by magic at the bidding of the English Government into formidable cruisers for the swift transportation of armies and the munitions of war.

Mr. Chairman, there is no method of raising money for the General Government that falls so lightly on the people as that of levying tariff duties upon imports of articles manufactured in this country. For some years to come it will be necessary to raise large sums of money in this way.

We must adopt a more liberal policy of paying pensions. The people promised the veterans at the close of the war that for their deeds of heroism and patriotic devotion to country they should never want. The time is creeping along when many of that grand army of veterans are experiencing very hard times. Many of them are unable to earn a livelihood by reason of wounds or insidious disease the origin of which they are unable to prove by the technical rules of our present laws. The people must redeem their pledges to these men, but if the money has to be raised by direct taxation I fear this will never be done.

The great work of clearing and broadening the internal water ways of commerce has been undertaken by the Government and should be carried out, but it will not be if the money for this purpose has to be raised by direct taxation.

It is absolutely necessary, if we are to adopt a more liberal policy of pensions, build navies, and improve our internal water ways, to raise all the money provided for in this bill.

The tariff is a manifold blessing and should not, for the present at least, be abandoned. Under this system the money necessary to run the Government is raised with the least possible inconvenience to the people, and besides it forms a sea wall around our coast and protects us from the flood of foreign importations and enables us to work out our own salvation, and through home competition to bring down the price of every necessity and luxury to a fairly remunerative basis. [Applause.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is more than double the present specific tax upon this article. This is an increase of the specific tax of more than double, and that without any explanation by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as to the necessity for it.

Mr. BAYNE. You are mistaken about that.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. We have had no explanation that I have heard.

I want to say to gentlemen who have convictions of conscience, with Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, who addressed the House a day or two ago, that they ought to join with the Democratic side of the House in demanding some statement of the cost of labor in whose name these taxes are laid. I say to this House that when they take the testimony they will not find in this book from lid to lid a single examination where any Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means has sought to determine the cost of production in this country as compared with the cost of production in other countries. They have not thus sought to determine the duty to be fixed on the product under our tariff laws.

The stereotyped inquiry on the part of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means was, "What do you want; what will suit you?" and in not a single instance has there been an analysis to determine the duty upon the basis of the comparative cost of production, and nobody knows that better than the gentleman who now stands up and addresses me.

Mr. BAYNE. Will the gentleman permit me to say that the duty on Mushet steel—and that is what is sought to be amended by this provision—is now $250 a ton and at 45 per cent. ad valorem. This will reduce it over $100 per ton. It is a large reduction from the 45 per cent. ad valorem provided for in that section.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Precisely. You refer to what is provided for in this section of the present bill. But under the present law the rate is 3½ cents a pound, and now you propose to make it 7 cents a pound. There is not a rate in the present law that Mr. MORRILL and the other originators of the tariff did not state was in excess of the needs of protection, and were only asked for the wants of the Government, and not for protection.

There is no one rate in the present law except increases in 1883 or a little earlier that was not adopted by the early Republican Congresses with an apology and based solely upon the plea that it was needed temporarily for the wants of Government; and yet gentlemen come here with general statements about this tariff. Your present rate as proposed by the pending amendment is more than double the specific rate of duty upon this article under the present law, and no attempt is made to give a statement of the cost of production. I have thought, sir, that we should not vote upon these proposed increases of taxes without some statement of a practical character about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Paragraph 315, line 14, after the word "confectionery," add the following: "Chocolate, commercially known as sweetened chocolate."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Let the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means explain.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

Mr. GEAR. That is a defect in the law. This is to prevent its coming in under the classification as confectionery, instead of what it is—commercially known as sweetened chocolate. It does not apply to the rates at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means how many amendments are in that widow's cruse of oil, that never seems to give out, that he seems to have in his desk?

Mr. MCKINLEY. If my good friend will patiently wait he will learn.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am very patient, but my friend from Ohio said to us on Saturday that that was the last amendment the committee had, and we put that in the RECORD until Monday morning. And now it is Tuesday evening and the gentleman seems to have an unlimited supply of amendments, and I would like to know how many more there are?

Mr. MCKINLEY. That statement was quite correct at the time it was made.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman tell me how perfect he thinks a bill is that has so many amendments to be offered by the gentleman who prepared it that he does not even acknowledge the number? [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Did they not do it daily with the Mills bill? Now, let the boys have a chance.

The question was put; and the Chair announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I offer the following amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As we can not find how many amendments there are; and as the gentleman permits no discussion, I move that the committee rise.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Division! We get no satisfaction; we get no information as to how many amendments there are; we are not allowed to ask any questions, or at least our questions are not answered except by a cry of "Vote!" "Vote!"

Mr. MCKINLEY. I supposed the gentleman's inquiry was a playful one. It seemed to me so when he made it, and that is why I replied as I did. I have no objection to telling the gentleman, if he makes the inquiry in earnest, just how many amendments there are remaining. There are five committee amendments yet to be offered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Why can not the committee take a recess until half past 7 or 8 and then come back here and discuss these amendments properly and decorously?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I think it is better to dispose of them now while we are all present.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky; and there were—ayes 78, noes 114.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 51, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The amendment was read, as follows:

Paragraph 420, line 23, add at the end of the line the following:
"Plain paper for photographer's use, not albumenized or sensitized, 15 per cent. ad valorem."

Mr. MCKINLEY. I want to say to the committee that this is a reduction of the rate of duty on the paper used by photographers.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. How does it compare with the rate under the present law?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I believe this article is not classified under the present law.

Mr. DORSEY. The duty is 25 per cent. under the existing law.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Insert after paragraph 421 the following:
"Paintings, in oil or water colors, and statuary not otherwise provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem. But the term 'statuary,' as used in the laws now in force imposing duties on foreign importations, shall be understood to include professional productions of a statuary or of a sculptor only."

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment that it is not germane. It relates to a different subject and a different paragraph.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to be heard upon that. It is true that the provision is not under the head of "Art," but it belongs to the same subject-matter to which the proposition of the committee presented by the chairman [Mr. MCKINLEY] relates, the same general class which embraces books and other publications.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The amendment of Mr. MCKINLEY was agreed to.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out paragraph 458 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Gloves of all descriptions, composed wholly or in part of kid or other leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall pay duty at the rates fixed in connection with the following specified kinds thereof, 14 inches in extreme length, when stretched to the full extent, being, in each case, hereby fixed as the standard, and one dozen pairs as the basis, namely: Ladies' and children's smaschen of said length or under, $1.75 per dozen; ladies' and children's lamb of said length or under, $2.25 per dozen; ladies' and children's kid, of said length or under, $3.25 per dozen; ladies' and children's suedes, of said length or under, 50 per cent. ad valorem; all other ladies' and children's leather gloves and all men's leather gloves of said length or under, 50 per cent. ad valorem; all leather gloves over 14 inches in length, 50 per cent. ad valorem, and in addition to the above rates there shall be paid on all men's gloves $1 per dozen; on all lined gloves, $1 per dozen; on all piqué or frick seam gloves, 50 cents per dozen; on all embroidered gloves with more than three single strands or cords, 50 cents per dozen pair: *Provided*, That all gloves represented to be of a kind or grade below their actual kind or grade shall pay an additional duty of $5 per dozen pairs."

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to oppose that amendment. I will ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] to explain what would be the effect of this proposed change.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The effect of this amendment is to reduce the duty below the rate proposed in the bill. We have made all the rates specific in this amendment. On some grades it may raise the duty a little, but on others it lessens it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will it increase the rate?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Not on the general line.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can the gentleman state what would be the probable ad valorem increase?

Mr. PAYNE. There will be a slight increase on the average ad valorem rate on those of 14 inches in length. The others will remain as at present.

Mr. SPRINGER. Why is this change proposed from the rate contained in the bill as reported?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I will say to the gentleman that this change is proposed for the better administration of this particular section of the bill. There has been much undervaluation in the glove trade. Very great complaint has been made by reputable merchants, such as Marshall Field & Co. and Arnold, Constable & Co., of the uncertainty of importation, by reason of our ad valorem rates, and those reputable merchants have requested us to make these duties specific, so that when they are engaged in the business of importing these gloves honestly they may know that there is not some disreputable consignee who is bringing them in at an undervaluation and is therefore able to undersell the honest merchant.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will not this largely increase the ad valorem rates upon the cheaper goods while it lessens the ad valorem rates on the higher priced goods?

Mr. PAYNE. No.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who has had very much to do with this schedule, informs me that the change will reduce the rate on the lower grades.

Mr. SPRINGER. How can it reduce the rate on the lower grades when you put a duty of so much per dozen which applies to both the high and the low grades?

Mr. PAYNE. On gloves under 14 inches in length we put a specific duty. The average duty according to the testimony before the committee was less than 35 per cent. Under the existing law it is 50 per cent. Now we simply make the duty specific in order to avoid the frauds that have been practiced, so that while we have had a duty of 50 per cent. we have really collected less than 35 per cent.; that being the concurrent testimony of the manufacturers, the importers, and the merchants.

Mr. SPRINGER. Where did you get that information? I do not find it in the printed book.

Mr. PAYNE. We have had hearings for the last two or three days, or rather nights, in reference to this, and the importers, the manufacturers, and the officials were all represented before the committee and concurred in this proposition.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I believe those hearings have not been before the full committee, have they?

Mr. PAYNE. They have been before the members of the committee who offer these amendments now.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I have not heard anything of them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. My time has been so much occupied by other gentlemen I have had no opportunity to speak myself.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move to amend by striking out the last word. These amendments are coming in as the amendments of the Committee on Ways and Means. It might aid us very much if the gentleman from Ohio when he rises to offer an amendment would say whether it is unanimously recommended by the committee upon examination by the committee in a full meeting. That statement might save us some time and trouble. Do we understand that to be the case in this particular instance?

Mr. MCKINLEY. This is not the unanimous recommendation of the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have yielded the remainder of my five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is aware that the Chair, at the beginning of this debate, announced that the rule would be enforced and that no gentleman occupying the floor would be permitted to yield his time to another gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Then will my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] ask me the question in regard to which he desires information, and I will in turn put the question to the gentleman on the other side. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has yielded the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have not lost my five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yielded the floor and can not resume it.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MCKINLEY, it was agreed so.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. COWLES. I desire to raise a point of order on the amendment just sent up. There are several amendments already pending——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman's point of order as soon as the amendment sent to the desk has been read.

The Clerk read the amendment of Mr. MCKINLEY, as follows:

Strike out paragraph 573 and insert the following:

Fish the product of American fisheries and fresh or frozen fish caught in fresh waters, except salmon.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to oppose that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COWLES] will state his point of order.

Mr. COWLES. My point of order is this: There are several amendments which were introduced last evening and were considered as pending; they have not been acted on yet. I insist that no member on this floor—not even the gentleman from Ohio, though he be the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—has a right to snatch away from members their opportunity to have their amendments acted on.

The CHAIRMAN. The conclusion of the gentleman would be correct if his premises were not wrong. The amendments to which he refers were not considered as pending.

Mr. COWLES. They are considered as pending; the RECORD so shows. I merely want them to come up in regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The order of the committee last night was that those amendments might be published in the RECORD for information. So far as being acted upon, they occupy no better position than if they were in the desks of members.

Mr. COWLES. The RECORD says they are pending subject to points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The RECORD shows that the gentleman's own amendment was considered pending and that has been disposed of by a vote of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COWLES. That is not the amendment to which I allude; there is another amendment——

Mr. MCKINLEY. The amendments to which the gentleman refers were only printed in the RECORD for information.

Mr. COWLES. No, sir; they were considered as pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read from the RECORD what took place:

Mr. MCMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen who desire to offer amendments may be permitted to present them now and have them printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SAYERS. I was about to make that request.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope that will be done, and that general leave will be given to have amendments printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee to print amendments in the RECORD to be offered after paragraph 111 of the bill?

There was no objection.

That disposes of the question of order. The question is now upon the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to amend.

Mr. MCCREARY. I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] to give us some information as to why he desires the change which this amendment proposes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], who is very familiar with this subject.

Mr. DINGLEY. The change in this provision, which is made by agreement of all the fishing interests on the lakes, is simply for the purpose of allowing all fish caught upon the lakes or in other fresh waters to be admitted free of duty. The provision as reported in the bill provided simply that fish caught by Americans in the open waters of the lakes forming the boundary between the United States and Canada should be admitted free of duty. But this change has been made so as to admit all fresh-water fish free of duty except salmon.

Mr. MCADOO. Does that include Canadian fish?

Mr. McCREARY. Why do you exclude salmon?

Mr. DINGLEY. Because they are the product of our own lakes and rivers, and we can produce them ourselves.

Mr. McMILLIN. It allows fish caught by British vessels to come in free, the same as by American vessels, then?

Mr. DINGLEY. It allows all fresh-water fish to come in free of duty.

Mr. McMILLIN. That is what I mean; it allows fish caught and brought here by British vessels to come in just the same as on American vessels?

Mr. DINGLEY. It is simply the present law under the existing tariff, so far as the lakes are concerned. It changes nothing in that regard.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then why is it recommended here if it changes nothing?

Mr. DINGLEY. It changes the bill, that is all; not the existing law.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will this increase the trade with Canada? For, if so, I am in favor of it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he proposes to give an opportunity to this side of the House to offer amendments after he has offered the committee amendments; and, if so, when?

Mr. McKINLEY. Why, gentlemen have had ample opportunity for offering their amendments.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. When?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has that motion pending.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I will submit to the gentleman to make a statement for me, and I will yield to him for a question.

Mr. McMILLIN. I want to reply to the last statement of the gentleman from Ohio. He says that there has been ample opportunity for those opposed to the bill to offer amendments. I undertake to say, and every member of the House except the gentleman from Ohio will bear witness to the fact, that there has been no opportunity whatever offered to amend the most of this bill. More than one hundred pages of it remain and will remain untouched. There never has been an opportunity and there can not be under the rule which you have adopted any chance to amend it. Under the leave given yesterday to print them, scores of amendments are printed in the RECORD and doomed for want of time. Now, what are the facts? I mean as to that portion of the bill after page 16, for to that I am addressing myself.

After spending several days in considering the bill under the ordinary rules of the House, and when we had reached page 16, the Committee on Rules reported a rule and forced it through the House, taking this bill from the Committee of the Whole and from the ordinary run of business and putting it under the operation of a special rule which fixed a limit when it was to be taken from the committee and voted upon in the House. This was done Monday of last week. You limited the time for consideration under the five-minute rule.

But, Mr. Chairman, I make the assertion that three-fourths of the time has been taken up by the members constituting the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means in offering amendments to their own bill. How, then, can the gentleman claim, with any show of accuracy, that the minority or that this side of the House have had opportunities of offering their amendments? The Committee of the Whole did not begin to consider the amendments offered by the members of the House until yesterday, and part of to-day is taken by the chairman, Mr. McKINLEY, in offering amendments. Less than ten hours are given to strike at bounties, strike at increases, and move amendments to hundreds of excessive rates proposed in this bill.

Therefore, never until yesterday morning did we get to consideration of the bill with an opportunity to amend the sections after page 16. Since that time what have we reached? The tobacco amendment, the sugar amendment, internal-revenue laws, and a part only of the amendments proposed to the lead amendments. But we have not touched the woolen schedules, the wood and willow ware, the free-list, the linen, the tobacco schedule, the hemp, flax, and jute schedule; in fact, we have not touched the great majority of the most important provisions of the bill. It will be utterly impossible under the limit given by your rule to ever touch them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the effect of this rule on the bill which it is proposed to rush through without consideration or opportunity for amendment on this side.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman from Tennessee forgets that Missouri had a good opportunity and came in quite frequently.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Maine and other gentlemen on that side no doubt occupied as much time——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Oh, no; that is a mistake.

Mr. McKINLEY. The only reason the gentlemen on the other side have not had an opportunity to offer their amendments is because they have consumed the time by prolonging the discussion and by insisting upon tellers on every vote.

Mr. McMILLIN. That is not true.

Mr. McKINLEY. They have consumed more than half the time by dilatory motions, by calling for tellers, by calling for divisions over and over again since we commenced.

Mr. McMILLIN. And there were tellers called for frequently by that side.

Mr. McKINLEY. And they can not hide themselves behind the fact.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why do not you change your rule and give us an opportunity for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKINLEY. If we gave you two weeks we would have but a repetition of what we have gone over during the last week. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. And out of the time the gentleman and his committee have given to perfect the bill they, after it has been brought in, have consumed three-fourths of the time themselves.

Mr. McKINLEY. This is a Republican bill. I will say to the gentlemen on the other side that the Republicans mean to pass it. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McMILLIN. And it is the Republican death-knell when it is passed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Pass your bill; you say it is Republican and is a Republican measure, and as such you intend to pass it; and you are passing it by Republican methods, throttling debate and preventing amendments. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield for a question at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this is exhausted; and the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. McKINLEY. I offer the following amendment:

Strike out paragraph 174 and insert the following:
"On shotguns valued at not more than $12, 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at more than $12, 40 per cent. ad valorem; pistols and revolving pistols, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, as there seems to be a general desire to hear from me before this debate closes [laughter], and as some of my Mississippi friends are in the gallery who want to hear me speak before leaving the city [renewed laughter], and the delegation of manufacturers who telegraphed me yesterday of their coming are now here, and as I have some words of consolation for them, I will submit a few remarks.

Some think that telegram I read yesterday announcing the coming of that delegation of manufacturers was sent to me by mistake. It may have been, as I am not the special champion of their interest; but my explanation of it is that they feared I might speak before they arrived and they would lose the opportunity of hearing me. [Laughter.]

I do not purpose, in the short time allowed me, to go very much into the details of the bill presented by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee or to deal very much in statistics in which the debate abounds. I will have something to say of the general scope of the bill and the record of the Republican party on the subject of the tariff.

Two years ago, when the Mills bill was under discussion, the Republicans answered our demand for tariff reform by admitting that the tariff needed reforming, but they said it should be reformed by its friends, the Republicans, and not by us. In the speech I then made, which attracted so much attention throughout the country [laughter], I said in answer to that suggestion that I would as soon think of sending to the jail to get a jury to try the criminal docket as to trust the Republican party to reform the tariff as it should be reformed, and the sequel has demonstrated the wisdom of what I then said. [Laughter.]

We are treated in this bill to a specimen of tariff reform by its friends. I really believe it to be a very bad bill, the worst, in my judgment, ever presented for the consideration of any Congress. It is truly "protection gone mad." The reformation the people wanted and demanded was a reformation in their interests, one lowering the tariff and relieving them from the burdens of unnecessary and unjust taxation. What have you given them? A bill "highering" the tariff [laughter] and increasing their burdens. "They asked for bread and you have given them a stone." They wanted the tariff revised downward, but you have revised it upward.

The acknowledged theory of your bill is to make the tariff prohibitory, thereby increasing duties, but diminishing the revenue, which simply means less money to the Government and more to the rich capitalists who have their money invested in protected industries. The people wanted less money in the Treasury, but they wanted it left in the pockets of the people to whom it belonged, not taken from them by operation of law and given to those who already have too much. If the effect of this bill is really to reduce the revenue to the Government, which I do not believe it is, there is no dispute about the fact that it increases to an alarming extent the protective duties.

Mr. Chairman, I had supposed, as did many others, that if there was a man in the United States who thoroughly understood the tariff question I was that man. [Laughter and applause.] I had discussed it not only here, but I had discussed it from the hurricane-deck of a canal-boat, named the Thomas Jefferson, all the way down the Erie Canal from Syracuse to Albany and then up to Whitehall, with the result as already known. [Laughter and applause.]

When I returned from that trip a day or two after the election I went up to the White House and had a talk with our tariff-reform leader, Mr. Cleveland, the then President of the United States. Neither of us was in the best of spirits. [Laughter.] But we were agreed that the agricultural people of the North and West, in whose interest we had made the great fight, had not seemed to appreciate our efforts in their behalf. [Laughter and applause.] However, we both then expressed the hope and belief that, with a little more time and education such as we were capable of giving and willing to give, they would come to see this question in its true light and to realize that the Democratic party, with its tariff-reform ideas, was their only salvation, and, sir, we are still instructing them, and I am proud to say the wisdom of my predictions is again being vindicated. [Laughter.]

The people are getting around right, and you will hear from them next fall. I desire now to say a few words for the benefit of our Northern and Western farmers. Our Southern farmers are all right. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] complained yesterday of so much talk about the farmers, and he reminded us that there were other people in this country besides farmers. That is true; but he ought to permit us to talk for the farmers, for talk is all the farmer gets. [Laughter and applause.] The other fellows get "the provisions in the bill."

The question as to whether the agricultural people are depressed or prosperous has been much discussed in this debate. Several gentlemen on the Republican side, and some of them from agricultural districts, have strenuously insisted that the farmers of the country are prosperous, and some of them have gone so far as to contend that farm mortgages are only emblems of prosperity among the farmers.

This is a fair specimen of Republican logic. I had supposed that the fact that there is general agricultural depression throughout the whole country was admitted and would not be controverted in this debate, but two years ago when we were trying to get the farmers to help us pull them out of the ditch you succeeded in persuading them that they were prosperous, and I suppose some of you think you can do it again. I think you will find it hard to do this time. Things were bad enough two years ago, but they are worse now. The committee that reported this bill say in their report, in speaking of agriculture—

That there is a widespread depression in this industry to-day can not be doubted.

We have now a member of the Cabinet, the Secretary of Agriculture, whose business it is to look after and promote as much as possible the interests of agriculture. We have given him a most elegant building, located in the most beautiful grounds in this beautiful city. He has plenty of assistants and employés to enable him to keep well posted as to the condition of his special charge. It is true he is surrounded at all seasons of the year by the rarest and most beautiful flowers and the most delicious fruits, but amid all this luxury he has discovered that agriculture is greatly depressed. I read from a recent letter of his on the subject of agricultural depression and its causes:

For months past from all parts of the country there have reached me communications, many of them from large bodies of men, all of them from persons deserving consideration, and all of them deeply in earnest respecting the present condition of agricultural depression.

It would be a work of supererogation at this time to undertake to prove the existence of severe agricultural depression. This is universally admitted. Representative farmers and farmers' associations are constantly calling my attention to their condition, urging the necessity for some measure of relief. The situation warrants all the attention which our wisest minds can devote to it.

Nor, Mr. Chairman, does he seem to regard farm mortgages as so much of an unmixed blessing as some of the gentlemen of the majority? I now read from the same letter a part of what he has to say on that subject:

FARM MORTGAGES.

The burden of mortgages upon farms, homes, and lands is unquestionably discouraging in the extreme, and while in some cases no doubt this load may have been too readily assumed, still, in the majority of cases, the mortgage has been the result of necessity. I except, of course, such mortgages as represent balances of purchase money, which are rather evidences of the farmer's ambition and enterprise than of his poverty.

On the other hand, those mortgages with which land has been encumbered from the necessities of its owner, drawing high rates of interest, often taxed in addition with a heavy commission, have to-day, in the face of continued depression in the prices of staple products, become very irksome and in many cases threaten the farmer with loss of home and land. It is a question of grave difficulty to all those who seek to remedy the ills from which our farmers are suffering. At present prices the farmer finds that it takes more of his products to get a dollar wherewith to pay back the dollar he borrowed than it did when he borrowed it. The interest accumulates, while payment of the principal seems utterly hopeless, and the very depression which we are discussing makes the renewal of the mortgage most difficult.

The Secretary and I do not differ as to the situation, but we are very wide apart as to the remedy. I have not been able, in the face of so much testimony, to understand why gentleman insist that this depression does not exist. I have thought, when the committee admitted it in their report, they supposed they could fool the farmers this year by increasing the duty on corn, wheat, meats, etc.; but that is entirely too thin to fool anybody with, so that they have concluded to go back and try to persuade them they are prosperous. You have fooled the farmers so much, no wonder you think you can put off any sort of spurious or specious logic on them.

Just think of it, the idea of raising the duty on corn and wheat, when we did not import any at the present duty and would not import any if there was no duty at all. You had as well talk of putting a duty on raw cotton. I think the farmers should resent this bald-faced effort to make them think they are getting some of the benefits of protection. Their programme is that when they go back to their agricultural constituents and are called to account for raising the duty on almost every thing the farmer has to buy, they will say to him, "Well, well; now did not we increase the duty to 15 cents a bushel on corn?" and they hope to get him to swallow that.

But as to whether or not there is agricultural depression I will not discuss that question further. We will submit that issue to the people next November and let them decide it; let them say whether or not they are as prosperous as they ought to be; and if they think they are, if they think they are getting a fair divide of the immense wealth of this country, according to their deserts; if they agree with you that they are, then let them vote for the party that inaugurated and has maintained the system that made present conditions possible. If they do they should never be heard to complain again, and I will certainly have to withdraw much of my sympathy.

If, on the other hand, they do not think they are being fairly dealt with and are not getting fair compensation for their toil, that they are not getting a fair share of the prosperity that other interests and industries enjoy, then come and vote with us, the only party that is in earnest in demanding that the Government take its hands out of their pockets and give them a fair chance in the race of life, that it cease to make exactions of agriculture to bestow bounties on those who do not need them.

The Western farmers have had more leisure this winter than usual. They have not had to shell their corn. You see they burned it on the cob. [Laughter.] They have had a good deal of time for reflection, and some of them have reduced their thoughts to poetry. I repeated some here in my last speech. I will give you some more:

THE WESTERN FARMERS AND THE TARIFF.

'Tis true we haven't Sunday clothes nor very much to eat,
And corn is good for nothing now except for making heat;
We haven't laid a dollar by for all our toil and sweat,
But still we're very thankful that we have the tariff yet.

We'd like to buy some farm machines, but everything's so steep
Our crops would never pay for them, for all we sell is cheap.
But politicians tell us that we needn't ever fret;
They say we're very lucky, since we have the tariff yet.

We put a mortgage on the farm that's pretty nearly due;
We never can remove it, and the future's awful blue;
And now and then in thoughtless spells we very near forget
How thankful we should be to know we have the tariff yet.

And when election day's at hand we'll come from far and near
And vote the same old ticket we have voted year by year.
We realize we all are getting deeper into debt,
But still we love the G. O. P.: it gives us tariff yet.

[Laughter.]

When the farmers of the North and West go to determine the issue thus made up between the Republican and Democratic parties as to whether the farmer is prospering as he deserves to under the beneficent Republican idea of protection I want them to contrast their condition and surroundings with those of the real beneficiaries of Republican legislation.

On the other hand you have the millionaires with individual fortunes ranging up into hundreds of millions, with castles in the mountains and cottages by the sea, with steam pleasure-yachts, silver-mounted coaches, liveried servants, homes on both sides of the sea, living amid luxury and splendor that I have no power to describe, with plenty of surplus money with which to purchase political preferment if their tastes or interests should incline them that way, and, if not, to purchase it for others who will be serviceable to them.

Just here I will incorporate into my speech a liberal extract from the great speech of Senator VOORHEES, in which he gives a description of a feast given in this city not long since by Mr. Andrew Carnegie, a man who is said to have accumulated $25,000,000 under a protective tariff engaged in a protected industry; and strange to say he is still a protectionist with an income, they say, of over $5,000 a day. Here is a striking page from Senator VOORHEES'S speech.

Who is it, then, if not the working people, that protection has pampered into more than oriental magnificence in the iron and steel works of Pennsylvania? Three or four weeks ago there was a banquet spread in this city, a description of which the next morning was the joy and the glory of the newspapers and the sensation of the whole country. Accounts were head-lined as follows: "Like Lucullus of old—Gorgeous dinner that rivaled an ancient Roman feast—Mr. Carnegie's entertainment—Over two thousand tulips and crocuses and thousands of roses used—A *menu* which almost the whole world furnished—Delightful musical programme."

We are informed that this banquet was given to the President of the United States and his Cabinet, and also to the delegates and officers of the International Conference, and the brilliant reporter proceeds to say that—

"All that money could provide and taste suggest to combine beauty of surroundings with the enjoyments of an epicurean repast had been brought into requisition to secure the desired end, and the result was a success far beyond that anticipated, but none the less gratifying. * * * Undoubtedly it was the most elegant affair ever given in this city, if not in the United States. The room resembled a conservatory supplied with plants and blossoms. The side halls were almost completely hid from view by plaques of palmetto leaves, intertwined with Southern smilax, deep green and glossy, and which grows wild in the Carolinas, whence this had been brought. The north hall, back of where President Harrison and Mr. Carnegie sat, was a gem from the florist's hands."

Then, after a vast deal more of the same sort about "maiden hair-ferns," "palms 16 feet high," "mammoth four-leaf clover," "mounds of Ulrich Bruner, Gabrielle Luizeti, and Magna Charta roses," the reporter told a gaping world what the modern Lucullus, sired by a protective tariff, gave his guests to eat. Among other things, the farmers and wage-workers of the country were informed that the fish, being a "sole, was secured from England, the mutton from Scotland, and the spring chickens from Louisiana. The celery, olives, and anchovies were served in the finest cut glass, and the salted almonds and radishes in dishes of solid silver. The forks and table-ware used throughout the dinner were also of solid silver, while the plates and service comprised Haviland china, with the exception of the fish course, which was served on plates of royal Worcester." It is also stated that the silver alone on the table cost $3,000.

To the farmer now in trouble, with a mortgage on his homestead, the interest unpaid, foreclosure approaching, no demand for what he has to sell, and no money in the house—to him I commend this picture of the Carnegie banquet as the best explanation of a high protective tariff ever before known in American history. At one end of the tariff question the manufacturer, the protected monopolist, spreads an imperial banquet-board, loaded with epicurean dainties from every clime, and flowing with wines costlier than nectar, while at the other end of the question farm laborers, wage-workers, and all who live by the sweat of their faces are in deep apprehension, in sighs, in distress, and often in tears. When I reflect on the bitter trials which the farmers are undergoing at this time, and the depression and suffering attendant upon other working classes, there is but one other occasion of the kind which can parallel, to my mind, the impious mockery of Carnegie's entertainment.

"Belshazzar, the king, made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.

"They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.

"In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote."

Then the sacred historian says the king was filled with terror, his knees smote together, and he cried aloud, and for a time in vain, for an interpreter of the writing on the wall. An interpreter came into his presence at last, and after taxing him with the use of the sacred vessels taken from the Temple of Jerusalem, said:

"And thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know; and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified."

How swiftly your minds anticipate the remainder of the old and sublime story! "*Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*" signified the downfall of a kingdom upheld by injustice, impiety, and crime.

Now turn from this picture and look at the great mass of the laboring people, the real producers of the wealth of this country, living in humble homes, many of them mortgaged, oppressed, harassed and discouraged by debt; living hard, toiling hard, with little to show for it; strikes in the factories and evictions from the farms. These, gentlemen, are the fruits of your boasted systems.

I do not deny that the country is growing in wealth, but it is the unjust and improper distribution of that wealth to which I object and that I regard as the greatest danger that now confronts us as a free people.

It is now estimated that there are about 65,000,000 people in this country, and it is also estimated that 20,000 people own half the wealth of this entire country; that is, they own as much as the other 64,980,000. This is an alarming condition of things, yet the Republican party proposes to aggravate it, to make it worse.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to a little piece of history. Two years ago on this floor I heard the distinguished gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House [Mr. REED], the most conspicuous Republican in the country to-day, unless it be Senator QUAY, and I will not allude to him lest I incur the wrath of the Republican committee of Pennsylvania. [Laughter.] Mr. REED, in his great speech closing the general debate for the Republicans on the Mills bill two years ago, in replying to the contention that the tariff laws robbed the Western farmer, gave an account of his visit to the West and what he saw there, and said:

After some days I became sulky. I said, "Gentlemen, of course we have robbed you; your Congressman would not lie about trifles like that; but what disgusts me is that we did not do it more thoroughly."

Mr. Chairman, this was the comment of the leader of the Republican party in the House two years ago on the condition of the Western farmer. His only regret seemed to be that they have not been more thoroughly robbed. Now you see that leader is the idol of his party and they do not intend to have any condition existing that excites his disgust. So they go to work and elect him Speaker of the House and he appoints the Ways and Means Committee, who give us this McKinley bill that makes the robbery more complete, to suit the taste of the Speaker. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I wonder how those Western farmers feel if they know that by their votes they have helped to place at the head of their party the gentleman who only felt disgusted that they had not been more thoroughly robbed, and have placed him in the position to finish the job, which he seems to be doing with distinguished ability. It was in that same speech that he, in ridiculing the idea of trusts being injurious or dangerous, said:

What unreasonable talk this is. A dozen men fix the price for sixty million freemen? They can never do it. There is no power on earth that can raise the price of any necessity of life above a just price and keep it there.

I mention these things because coming from the source they do shows they are genuine Republican sentiments, for the gentleman who uttered them has been indorsed and promoted above his fellows.

I do not know how much consolation it will be to the people of this country to know that trusts can not fix the prices of necessities of life. I should think they would feel something like the man talking to his lawyer through the bars of the jail. When he stated his case to the lawyer, the lawyer said, "Why, they can't put you in jail for that;" but the man replied, "They have done it, and I am in here all the same." So you may tell the people, as the Speaker did, that trusts and combinations can not fix prices, but we all know they do it all the same.

I have noticed through this whole debate the representatives of the "jute-bagging trust," that has been preying on our cotton-planters for a few years back, sitting in the galleries watching the McKinley bill, in which they have so much interest and which is to be passed without our having an opportunity to vote an amendment to put jute bagging on the free-list. Our cotton-planters ought to feel very grateful to the Republican party for increasing the duty or tax on cotton-ties from 35 per cent. to 115 per cent. This certainly ought to earn for the Republican party the everlasting gratitude of the colored Republicans of the South. This is one of the greatest outrages of this outrageous measure.

I had hoped that I might have an opportunity before the final vote was taken to offer as an amendment to this bill a bill I have prepared providing for an income and succession tax. I wanted to make some of these great fortunes pay some of the taxes, bear some of the burdens of the Government. I made application to the chairman of the Committee of the Whole several days ago to get recognition for the purpose of offering such an amendment. I did want a vote on it so as to let the people see where the members of this House stand. But it is very evident the Ways and Means Committee do not mean to let us vote on that, or but very few other amendments. Never mind, gentlemen, the income tax will come.

I have been struck with many things in this debate. I have heard it here half a dozen times when questions were put to the members of the Ways and Means Committee as to why duties were fixed as they were in certain schedules, and the reply would come that the people who appeared before the committee engaged in that industry agreed that they could afford that or that they must have that or were willing to take that.

Now, is not this a fine business for the American Congress to be engaged in—fixing their revenue bills with special reference to what individual interests say they are willing to take—using the taxing power of this great Government for such a purpose?

The farmers are here now knocking at doors of your committee with something they think will be for their special benefit, with their subtreasury bill. You know you have no notion of giving it to them, but they are as much entitled to it and more deserving of it than many of the things you are doing, and it is the things you have been doing for other interests that you should never have done that have put the farmer to making his demands; and if you are going to pursue that system, do not make it one of favoritism; take the farmer in and give him something substantial; do not try to delude him with a tariff on corn and wheat.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means a question. He said that the longer this bill is debated the stronger it got. Why is he so anxious to close debate if that is true? Or is he afraid it will be like my landlady's butter, get so strong nobody can stand it.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The debate has demonstrated the fact, as I have said, that it was stronger every day we have debated it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Stronger like rancid butter?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Stronger in the affections of the people.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Yes, sir; it is the "ransomest" bill that the American people have had to swallow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must close; but before doing so I had promised to give some word of consolation to the representatives of the combinations, trusts, and strugling infant industries, who are watching this debate with so much interest from the galleries, and as I have discussed this bill in poetry and prose I will now close the discussion in song, which is really my strong suit. This is for the struggling infants.

Several MEMBERS. Sing, sing!

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. It is—— (Singing.)

Rock-a-bye, babeis, you are on top,
When the fat fries the cradle will rock;
When the fat stops the cradle will fall,
And down will come Republicans and babies and all.
Rock-a-bye, rock-a-bye; nothing to fear;
Rock-a-bye, rock-a-bye, the G. O. P. is here.

[Great laughter.]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to put the question.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think I am entitled to be heard. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there seem to be a couple of hundred gentlemen who desire to be recognized.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Then let them be heard. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the committee permit the gentleman to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I decline to be heard upon any man's permission. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I had the floor before that vote was taken, and I will be heard on my rights or not at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen are constantly demanding recognition from the Chair, and if the Chair started to search out every gentleman and ask for what purpose he rises, we should be here till doomsday.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. That may be.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair had known that the gentleman wanted to be heard he would have certainly been recognized.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Then I will proceed. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. There has been so much confusion for the last fifteen minutes that it has been impossible for us to hear what is going on, and it renders it impossible for the Chair to recognize gentlemen who ask to be heard or ask for recognition, before the Chair puts a question for a vote upon an amendment in the confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hopes gentlemen will take their places and give attention to business, and we will get along very much better.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask whether I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Now, I want to say to this House, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Ways and Means have come to the point where the ways divide. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of protecting American industries they have come to the point where they are striking them down by this amendment which they now offer. It is a fact that the manufactures of this country of revolving fire-arms, which are an American invention, which are now largely made in the duplicate system, which is also an invention of this country, while breech-loading fowling pieces are an invention of Europe—it has come to that pass that to-day not a single factory in this country can live at the duty that is fixed by this committee, in the amendment they propose or by the existing duty. Within four or five years the machinery of a number of factories in this country has been taken to Europe, where the wages are not more than one-third of what they are here. In the Senate, when they made their bill two years ago, they fixed certain rates after sober and careful investigation, which rates are absolutely necessary for the continuance of the industry in this country, which are the rates as they now stand in the McKinley bill, and if the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is adopted there will not, in five years, be a single one of these industries carried on in this country.

I have personal knowledge of this industry, which is carried on in the city where I live and in the district which I have the honor to represent upon this floor, but in which I have not a particle of pecuniary interest. If we are to pursue the protective system, I beg this House to vote down this amendment and leave the bill precisely as reported originally by the committee.

I wish to say furthermore that I have begged the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to strike out entirely all duties on guns costing less than $6, if he thinks it is not desirable that they should be made in this country, and let them come in free, rather than offer this amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I have only five minutes, and I shall probably be shut down at the end of that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman understands these questions better than many of us do. Will he be kind enough to explain the exact difference between the duty as proposed in this amendment and the duty as proposed in the original bill?

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio makes the duty 35 per cent. The present duty, except on a certain class of guns, he puts at 40 per cent. It is unnecessary to explain the matter in detail. The material that enters into revolvers and shooting guns and rifles does not average to cost 10 per cent. of the cost of the completed article. Ninety per cent. of the cost or over is labor, and the labor that enters into this class of work costs in Europe not more than one-third what it costs here.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What is the proposed reduction?

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. The proposed reduction is to take off the specific duty of $2 and of $4, respectively, proposed in the bill in addition to the 35 per cent. ad valorem now imposed. I did not know that this amendment was to be offered until a few minutes ago, and since then I have begged the committee to take the duty entirely off the cheaper classes of guns that are imported and sold here at a profit of from 100 to 200 or even 300 per cent. I have asked them, if they would not do that, to take off $1 and leave the specific duty $1 less; but no, for the sake of conceding to a sentiment entirely created by gun dealers, they propose to strike down this industry and leave it practically entirely out of the protective system. Let me say to this committee that up to 1873, when the Vienna Exposition was held, and up to 1876, when we had an exposition in this country, Europe scarcely knew what we were doing in the gun business, and we have been losing our control of our own market every day from that time to this.

There is not one gun in five that is used in this country now that is made here. We made and exported of rifles in 1871, $13,463,916; of $5,259,813 in 1875; and of $1,720,655 in 1885, and only $820,933 in 1889; but if this amendment passes there will never be any more arms of any kind made in this country for any European country. I would like to have time to go into particulars, but I can not have it, and I use my five minutes to the best advantage I can. What I say upon this subject I say of my own personal knowledge of the business, as well as from most careful personal investigation.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The gentleman probably does not know that the amendment has already been adopted.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Then I have been a fool to talk here. [Laughter].

A MEMBER. Move to reconsider.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I decline to do so. I had the right to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the committee——

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no point of order that can intervene to cut the Chair off from making a statement that is partly made. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I beg the Chair's pardon; I did not know that he was making a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the committee that the vote upon this amendment was taken hurriedly, the Chair supposing that it was merely a formal matter; and now, with the consent of the committee, the Chair will treat the vote as not having been taken and will submit the question again.

Mr. McKINLEY. I hope that will be done, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANSUR. I move to strike out the last word. I desire to speak to this subject of guns and pistols. I saw in an editorial on Saturday last a statement that articles of various kinds, including guns and pistols, were sold to be exported at much lower prices than they were sold to our people at home, and that a list of them was published in a certain document. I tried to get that document. I applied at our library for it, but failed; I tried at Brentano's, but failed; I sent to New York and got the export edition of the Mining and Engineering Journal of May 3, and in it I find fourteen pages containing a list of articles of various kinds, knives, forks, scissors, buggies, agricultural implements, blacksmith tools, guns and pistols, and many other articles at reduced prices "for export only."

Here is the Marlin rifle, said to be the best in the market, embodying all the latest improvements; "for export only," discount 25, 10, and 10 per cent., making 45 per cent. discount. Then here are Colt's pistols; discount "for export only," 10 per cent. off from American prices. Here on fourteen pages of this periodical are about a thousand articles that I have marked showing similar reductions "for export only."

The doctrine of American protection as proclaimed on the other side has been that it diversified manufacturing industries and gave profitable employment to a large number of laborers; and in return for the taxes imposed to bring about those desirable things we have been told continuously Americans were to be benefited by lower prices. Let my friend from Missouri on the Republican side and other gentlemen from the West go home and face this doctrine as illustrated in this paper, for I shall have this with me in the West and will show the people that these various articles in common use are invariably offered to foreigners at lower prices than to us.

Mr. FRANK. Does the gentleman really believe that those articles are sold abroad at 10 per cent. less than the American prices?

Mr. MANSUR. Yes, sir; that is plainly proclaimed by these advertisements in large letters.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What firm is the gentleman advertising?

Mr. MANSUR. The publication to which I have referred is the Engineering and Mining Journal, the "export edition." As I have stated, when I applied to our Congressional Library for this edition they had only the American edition; when I applied to Brentano's only the American edition could be had there. This "export edition" is not for circulation among Americans at all; it exposes too much; it lets the cat out of the bag. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as explaining this matter better than I can do I will publish with my remarks the editorial to which I have referred. It is from the St. Louis Republic, May 5, 1880:

The current number of the "export edition" of the Engineering and Mining Journal, intended for foreign circulation, contains numerous advertisements of "protected" American goods, with "discounts for export only." Thus Tommins & Adams advertise that they will sell spoons and forks 60 per cent. cheaper to foreigners than their advertised home-market prices (page 517, issue of May 3, 1890); pruning shears, 35 per cent.; scissors, "60 and 10 per cent.;" butchers' knives, "25 and 10 per cent.;" table knives, "25 per cent." discount to foreigners,

and so on. S. L. Allen & Co., dealers in hardware and agricultural implements advertise on page 515 of the same edition "discounts for export only" of 30 per cent. on the Planet seed drill, 30 per cent. on the "Fire Fly" cultivator, 30 per cent. on hay forks, manure forks, hoes, plows, and potato diggers, "70 and 5 per cent." on garden rakes, and "40 and 10 per cent." on scythes.

Colt's rifles are offered to foreigners at 10 per cent. less than American market-list prices; Smith & Wesson revolvers at "25, 10, and 10 per cent." less; Ryder's hatchets at 50 per cent. under home-list market prices, and so on through page after page of advertisements, showing how greatly foreigners are benefited by the Republican policy, when our manufacturers accidentally have goods on hand that they can not sell at home without selling them cheaper than monopoly rates, and so "breaking the home market."

The managers of Tariff Reform have been attempting through correspondence with manufacturers to reach exact figures of the difference in the home market and foreign prices of the same American goods, and they give the following as a fair sample of the written statements received from the leading manufacturers and exporters of agricultural machinery throughout the country from Maine to Illinois:

"Our prices to the domestic trade average about 10 per cent. more than to the export trade. We box and deliver in New York all our export goods; domestic goods are quoted on cars here."

There is no fixed standard or discounts below list prices for the home market, as a favored buyer may secure larger discounts; but as a result of its investigation Tariff Reform has collected sufficient data to give a comparsion of home market and "to foreigners" prices on numerous articles.

Thus on cultivators, protected by duty of 45 per cent., it gives these differences:

	In home market.	To foreigners.
Wheel-hoe cultivator, rake and plow	$11.00	$8.40
All-steel horse-hoe cultivator with wheel	8.00	6.75
All-steel plain cultivator with wheel	7.20	4.50

The above prices to the exporters as well as for sale here are for single articles. For export the cultivators are delivered free on board ship at New York.

On plows, protected by high-tariff duty of 45 per cent., these differences are shown:

	In home market.	To foreigners.
Plows, two-horse chilled, 9-inch cut	$5.60	$5.04
Same, all steel	8.40	7.56
Two-horse chilled, 10-inch cut	6.30	5.67
Same, all steel	10.50	9.45
Two or three-horse chilled, all steel, Sr	14.00	12.60

On hammers the home-market price for No. 7 is $4.18 per dozen; the price to foreigners, $3.82½. On first-quality brazed axes (protective tax 45 per cent.) the home-market price is $7.76; the price to foreigners, $6.75 a dozen. On sad irons (protective tax 1½ cents a pound) the price to Americans is $16.20; to foreigners, $13.50 per dozen sets for nickel-plated. "For hollow-ware—such as tea-sets, cake-dishes, etc., listed at $10—the home dealer pays $5.40, but the buyer for the foreign market pays only $4.61 for the same articles. On knives, forks, and spoons and other flat-ware listed at $10 the price to the dealer in the home market is $4.36, but a buyer for export, regardless of the quantity he may take, pays only $3.73 for the same articles."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I move *pro forma* to strike out the last two words. As I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that we are likely to adjourn after we get through with his amendments, I wish to call attention to an amendment I would be glad to offer. It is not a large matter, but it serves very well as a specimen of the character of this bill. I refer to buttons. In paragraph 429 the bill of the Committee on Ways and Means provides a duty of "1 cent per line, button measure," on what are known as hard buttons, and 25 per cent. ad valorem. What is called a "line" is a dimension in width of one-fortieth of an inch, and the measure is used to determine the diameter of buttons.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has before them some evidence on this subject, which will be found on page 708 of the hearings. One of the manufacturers to whom this protection is given presented the committee with a specimen of his buttons. He stated that the wages he paid on the buttons he showed the committee was from 20 to 25 cents a gross. The specific tax given him to cover the difference between the cost of labor here (the total of which is 20 or 25 cents a gross) and the cost of labor abroad is 30 cents a gross. The committee gives him a protection of 30 cents a gross in specific tax and 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, when the chairman of the committee gets through with his amendments I would be glad to offer an amendment to this part of the bill. I want to reduce this bill to the rates now provided by law. On this point I desire the attention of gentlemen on the other side of the House who have said that they would not vote for any increase that could not be shown to be necessary to cover the difference between the amount paid for labor in this country and that paid abroad. I can go to the committee-room and bring here the specimen of that button (and it will be recognized by every member of the committee), on which there is given a specific duty something like 50 per cent. in excess of all the wages paid on this side of the water and 25 per cent. in addition. This makes about twice the amount of the wages the manufacturers confessed they pay their men. I would like to get a vote on that proposition and see whether the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], whom I now see in his seat, and other gentlemen on that side who have expressed similar sentiments, will vote for such an increase in face of that confession on the part of the manufacturer himself.

Mr. SMYSER. Mr. Chairman, I happen to have here a newspaper article commenting upon what has been referred to by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANSUR], "discounts for export only." The Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 13th of this month took up this subject of "discounts for export only" and published the following:

In a late issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal are thirty-nine closely printed columns of advertisements of articles upon which our manufacturers offer "discounts for export only." On the average the foreigner gets them about 50 per cent. off the wholesale prices to Americans. Here are some discounts to foreigners which the farmer will be interested in, as the figures represent the excess paid to the manufacturers by the dealers, who charge the farmer a profit and a percentage on the difference also: Foreigners buy rakes at 70 per cent. discount from wholesale prices charged Americans, drills, 30 per cent.; scythes, 40; hatchets, 50; table-knives, 25; shears, 60; feed-cutters, 30; grinding mills, 25; barn-door hangers, 50; sheaves, 50; wrenches, 55; vises, 50; washtubs, 25; lawn-mowers, 60; scroll-saws, 25; water-motors, 40; nails and tacks, 60 and 70; post-hole-diggers, 40; oil stoves, 30; common farm pumps, 70; wood screws, 50; screw-drivers, 70; hammers, picks, and adzes, 60; planes, 40; whiffletrees, 45; wind-mills, 40. MCKINLEY's plan is to make the difference still greater.

Now, in reply to that article the Cleveland Leader of May 14 states what is the fact and what the gentleman from Missouri will find to be the truth when he investigates this matter more thoroughly.

A more false and contemptible attack on American manufactures was never published. It is absolutely atrocious in its abominable perversion of the truth. The only possible apology for such misstatements that can be offered is to plead a degree of ignorance that absolutely unfits the author for discussing any public matters.

The Engineering and Mining Journal of May 3 did contain nineteen columns of matter, not advertisements, descriptive of manufactured articles suitable for export, with the list of prices thereof and the "discounts for export only." It was a little scheme of the Journal to promote foreign trade, and manufacturers were invited to make use of the Journal's columns for that purpose free of charge.

On the basis of the statement that the discounts are "for export only," the Plain Dealer recklessly and wickedly—for ignorance is no justification where the facts were so easily ascertainable—asserts that it is proposed to sell these goods to foreigners at prices 25 to 70 per cent. less than they are sold to Americans; in other words, that American farmers, and other home consumers, are charged this difference above what foreigners are asked to pay with the retailers' profits and percentages on the excess added. It is amazing that any one should believe such a thing possible, much more so to publish it without careful investigation. How plain a tale shall put that free-trade falsehood down, our readers may now see.

A representative of the Leader yesterday called upon one of the most prominent hardware and agricultural-implement dealers in the city and showing him the article in the Journal asked him to state what discounts were allowed to him by the manufacturers of the identical articles described. This merchant is a Democrat and a "tariff reformer," and the Plain Dealer can have his name, but not for publication, if it desires to investigate the accuracy of the statements to follow. The figures to be given may also be verified by calling on any local dealers in the articles mentioned. The list of articles compared was very large, but we shall confine the comparisons here made mainly to those named in the Plain Dealer.

In the Journal a manufacturer of steel and malleable-iron garden rakes offers them at a discount of 70 per cent. "for export only." The same manufacturer sells them to the Cleveland dealer at a discount of "70 and 5," equivalent to 71½ per cent. off. He offers scythes "for export only" at "40 and 10 off," equivalent to a discount of 46 per cent., and to the Cleveland dealer the same goods at "50 and 5 off," equal to a discount of 52½ per cent. The same manufacturer offers the "Chieftain" horse-rake No. 1 at 40 off "for export only," while to the Cleveland merchant he allows "50, 10, and 2½ off," a discount of 56½ per cent. from the list price. The discount on hatchets "for exportonly" is 50 per cent. and to the American dealer "50, 10, and 5," equal to 57½ per cent.

On table knives and shears the discounts offered are the same "for export only" and to the home merchant. A manufacturer of feed-cutters offers his "No. 1," with two 6½-inch knives, at $18, 30 per cent. off "for export only," and the Cleveland merchant buys the same cutter for $10 net. The manufacturer of grinding-mills allows the home dealer 10 per cent. more discount than the foreign dealer. Barn-door sheaves and hangers are offered 50 off "for export only," and 60 off to the home trade. The discounts on wrenches and vises are the same in both cases, and on lawn-mowers also. "For export only," scroll-saws are offered at 20 to 25 off, while the Cleveland merchant is allowed 25 to 30. The discount on nails and tacks is 10 per cent. more to the home that to the foreign dealer. But there is no need of further extending the comparisons. In not a single case in the whole list is a larger discount offered "for export only" than to the American dealer, and in most cases the latter is allowed a larger discount than the foreigners.

[Mr. WILLCOX withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard for a moment or two on this question. When the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] got the floor a few moments ago, and I knew he would get it the very moment that we struck shotguns in the bill, for that is one of the articles that they want to have cheap and handy in his district and ready at any moment [laughter]—but when he got the floor and began his oration and what he was saying in reference to this bill, I was reminded very much of a story that was once told me about the way they took a man's measure down in Mississippi for a suit of clothes. The questions are asked about in this way: "Hip pockets?" "Yes." "How many?" "Two." "Four or six shooter?" "Six." "Inside coat pocket?" "Yes." "Pint or quart?" "Quart." And in that way they get the dimensions of a suit of clothes. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, that was not the main object I had in taking the floor. The gentleman promised us that he would sing, and I desired to hear him sing. I was never so hungry in my life for a song. I thought he meant what he said. I have had my heart broken on several occasions before. [Great laughter.] I have gone to bed hungry, but I never was so shocked, never was so disappointed in my life as when he promised to sing and then made that noise. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I could only take that song in a graphophone and distribute it over this country amongst

the 65,000,000 of people living in this great land and convince them that it was the voice of Democracy from Mississippi we would carry every district in the United States at the next election. [Laughter and applause.]

One word more as to the prophecy of our distinguished Speaker, whom he calls the great leader of the Republican party; and we are glad that he does him that honor. He speaks of the prophecy the Speaker made, but we did not hear just what it was, when he was speaking of the prosperity of Western farmers and said he was sorry that they did not get more of that prosperity for themselves, and he turned the prophecy in the manner that he did. I was reminded of another prophecy that our Speaker made, to the effect that when the Mills bill passed the procession would then move on, and you gentlemen on that side would be in the minority. That prophecy of the Speaker has proven true, and if the gentleman will permit me to respond in the same meter of his own——[Cries of "Don't sing!"] I will promise not to sing. [Laughter.] Those who have heard me agree that I can not sing. [Laughter.] But you remember the gentle verse he recited some time ago about Wannie running the Sunday-school and somebody else the bar. In the line of the prophecy of the Speaker of the House of Representatives I will, in the same meter, only say to him that—

John Bull bossed your White House,
Your whole party runs the bar;
Lord Sackville-West his letter wrote,
And, damn it, there you are!

[Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. McKINLEY. I hope the gentleman will yield and allow us to have a vote on this amendment first.

Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts. I shall not detain the committee but a moment. We have had considerable merriment in this debate, in which I have not been able to join because of my strong feeling for my constituents. It is all well enough to be amused in the proper time and place, but when I remember that six hundred men have been waiting two years for this amendment to the law with reference to putting suitable duties on foreign goods that they might have employment and remember when you vote on this amendment you vote to compel them soon to leave the industry they are engaged in and have been all their lives and seek some other, I beg and plead with this House that they vote upon the amendment in a spirit of consideration, and make it a question of their own homes, their own firesides, and their own wives and children. [Applause.]

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, I wish to present to the House two letters, bearing directly upon the pending amendment, from a reliable hardware firm of Peoria, Ill., familiar with the subject. The letters have no uncertain ring and speak for themselves:

PEORIA, ILL., *April* 16, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of a circular from the cutlery and gun importation houses of New York, urging us to write to you to use your influence against the increase in the duty on cutlery, guns, etc. Instead, however, of objecting we are decidedly in favor of the measure for the reason that we in this country can and do produce better goods in most grades of cutlery, and the German and English goods sold here are either the very cheap and inferior grades of goods or the better grades whose value is made up largely of the labor in making, which is so much cheaper in Europe than America.

I have been in the importing cutlery business for twenty years and my experience has been that twenty years ago our sales were mostly of foreign cutlery, but as the American brands began to be established they crowded out the foreign goods, the quality has improved, and just about in proportion as the amount of the American output increased the price has decreased. So that, notwithstanding the high tariff on cutlery, we have bettered the quality and reduced the price.

It is my firm conviction that if the schedules proposed by the McKinley bill become a law it will add largely to the number of men employed in making cutlery in this country, soon cheapen the price, and drive out of the market a lot of worthless goods that no well posted dealer would buy for his own use.

Yours, respectfully,

CHAS. D. CLARK.

P. S. POST, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

PEORIA, ILL., *April* 17, 1890.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed find a circular which is being sent out generally by the importers of New York and other cities. We are not with these people in their protest. The goods they sell in the cutlery line, with the exception of razors, while costing about one-half what American goods would cost, are practically worthless. To prove our statement we send you by this mail a jack-knife which is bought by the retail trade for $2 and sold by them to the consumer for 25 cents. American manufacturers could not produce such a knife, because the labor on it would cost as much as they could get for it. We claim no one is benefited by a tariff that will allow them to buy goods that are worthless, and for this reason, if no other, we are ready to see the tariff made so much that they can not get them into this country.

Yours truly,

CLARK, QUIEN & MORSE.
Per C. E. ROBINSON, *Manager.*

Hon. P. S. POST, *Capitol, Washington, D. C.*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] is here, or was a moment ago. I am not going to take time to read a letter and inclosure, but I want to say to the House that I have here a letter written to me by the Oliver Chilled Plow Company, and I am not acquainted with any one who is connected with that firm. In that letter they request me to call attention of the House to the statement therein touching the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] a few days ago that the Oliver chilled plow was sold for considerably less money or less money in Canada than in the United States, and they deny *in toto* and altogether the correctness of the statement, and I will place the letter with the inclosure in the RECORD. It is respectful in form, and I will not take up further time.

The letter and inclosure are as follows:

SOUTH BEND, IND., *May* 17, 1890.

DEAR SIR: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of date Tuesday, May 13, appear certain references to ourselves and the goods we manufacture, which were we to pass without notice would partake of culpable neglect on our part. We refer to the statements of Hon. W. B. HATCH, wherein that gentleman adheres to the charges made by him in 1888, that "Oliver chilled plows were exported to Canada and there sold at retail to Canadian farmers at an average of $4 less than the same plows could be bought by the American farmer." Mr. HATCH continues to use as authority Mr. William de H. Washington, late commercial agent at London, Ontario, and cites certain evidence furnished by him and now on file in the State Department.

We care not what evidence may be offered in support of the charges made by Mr. HATCH and reaffirm our statement that there is no truth in them. We do not export plows to Canada, directly or indirectly. We do not sell or furnish to any agent or other person plows to be exported to Canada. We do not sell or furnish to any person, persons, companies, or corporations at prices that would permit the plows to be taken to Canada, pay the Canadian duty, and allow them to be sold at prices less than the retail prices in the United States. We do not sell to any foreign trade at any less price than charged the American dealer, and the man does not live that can produce truthful evidence to the contrary.

We have reason to believe that our plows are imitated in Canada (we know they are in Great Britain), and possibly Mr. Washington and his informants were not willing to discriminate between the genuine and the imitation goods. We should be glad to sell our plows to Canadian buyers, but the Canadian tariff acts as an effectual bar to our so doing, and we are absolutely shut out from that market. We beg to inclose clipping from the South Bend Daily Tribune of October 13, 1888, in which is printed our letter of October 11, 1888, to Mr. HATCH, denying the charges made by him, and we now reaffirm every statement therein made by us.

Our suggestion to Mr. HATCH that he again rise to a question of privilege and place our communication before the House as fully and publicly as he had submitted his side of the case was probably negatived by him, as we have seen no record of his so doing. We beg that you will favor us by having this letter, as well as the one to Mr. HATCH, read in the House at the proper time, assuring you that our only object is to finally and forever set at rest the false statements made regarding our manner of doing business.

If we have not kept within strict parliamentary lines in our communications, we must plead in excuse that we are only plow manufacturers and have not had the opportunities for acquiring parliamentary knowledge that have fallen to the lot of the gentleman from Missouri. Our constituency is large and growing, and we hope to continue to please it, notwithstanding the efforts of Mr. HATCH to prejudice the farmers of this country against us.

Soliciting your good offices in this matter and begging pardon for the liberty taken, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

OLIVER CHILLED PLOW WORKS.
NICAR.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST PLOWS—DEMOCRATIC REVENUE REFORMERS TRYING TO WIN FARMERS' VOTES BY MISREPRESENTATION.

The Democratic speakers and newspapers for several weeks have been trying to win the votes and support of the farmers of the United States by falsely asserting that agricultural implements made in this country are sold for a less price in foreign countries than they are in this and that it is because of a protective tariff. In every case where they have made the charge it has been proven false. Not a single case has been found where any kind of agricultural implement was sold for more in this country than in a foreign country. On the contrary, it has been proven in every instance that the farmer of the United States got the United States implement cheaper than the farmer in the old country.

So far have these attempts of the revenue reformers gone that the matter in one instance at least has got into Congress. On the 28th of August last the Hon. W. B. HATCH, member of Congress from Missouri and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, made a speech at Kirksville, Mo., wherein he stated that "Oliver chilled plows made at South Bend, Ind., were exported to Canada and there sold at retail to Canadian farmers at an average of $4 less than the same plows could be bought by the American farmer." Mr. H. F. Millan, of Kirksville, wrote to the Oliver Chilled Plow Works, giving the substance of Mr. HATCH's statement, and asked if it were true. To this, under date of August 31, the Oliver Chilled Plow Works replied, denying the statement and expressing surprise that Mr. HATCH should make it.

The letter of denial was published in the Kirksville Journal and other Republican papers in Northern Missouri, and recently was brought to the attention of Mr. HATCH. On the 8th instant that gentleman rose to a question of privilege in the House and reaffirmed his statement, notwithstanding the denial made by the Oliver Chilled Plow Works. On the same day he wrote to the Oliver Chilled Plow Works, not only adhering to the statement made by him at Kirksville, but giving as his authority one William de H. Washington, commercial agent at London, Ontario, submitting at the same time copies of correspondence furnished by the Department of State between Mr. Washington and Mr. Rives, Assistant Secretary of State. The reply of the Oliver Chilled Plow Works, dated October 11, will be found below, and effectually disposes of the statement made by Mr. HATCH and his coadjutor, Mr. Washington:

OFFICE OF THE OLIVER CHILLED PLOW WORKS,
South Bend, Ind., October 11, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We acknowledge receipt of your favor, 8th instant, with accompanying "campaign documents," and have given the same our careful perusal and attention. Perhaps it would have been more courteous to us had you written and received our reply before rising to a question of privilege as reported in the House proceedings of the 8th instant, but, waiving that feature, we will reply to your letter with such courtesy as its statements and tone merit. You discredit our denial that we export our plows to Canada and there sell them for a less price to the Canadian farmer than they are sold to the American farmer, and submit certain so-called evidence to sustain you. With all due respect for the position you occupy and for yourself personally, we reaffirm our denial and say positively that there is not one word of truth in the statement that our plows are exported to Canada or any other country and there sold to the user at a less price than the American farmer pays for them. You may be honest in your belief and statements and we are inclined to think you are, but they are founded on information which we can show to be false, and, if disposed to be at all fair, you will heed what we say to you.

The only evidence you submit in proof of your charge is the statement of Mr.

Washington, commercial agent at London, Ontario, who says: "I find that plows of American manufacture are among the most prominent of the imports in this line. * * * I have before me on my desk an offer from an Ontario dealer in the Oliver plows to sell same free on board at his city in Canada, for $10 each in quantities. The retail price here is $12 and numerous transactions take place at that figure. The same plows, I understand, are sold in quantities at the factory (not for export) at $14 each and cost the American farmer at retail $16." Were it not that the name Washington is historically connected with the greatest respect for truth and veracity, we should think the commercial agent of that name had sadly degenerated in the attributes for which his distinguished namesake received such prominence, but we are charitable in his case also, and will simply say that he, too, has been misinformed.

The so-called Oliver chilled plows referred to by him were not made by us, were not exported by us, and we are in no sense responsible for them. No Canadian dealer buys Oliver chilled plows of us directly or indirectly, and if he did he would pay us the same price that American dealers do, which, with freight and 35 per cent. duty added, would make it impossible for him to sell the plows at $10. Let us say right here that we have no chilled-plow trade in Canada, and under the present Canadian tariff make no effort for any. What goods we do sell in Canada consist of extras and repairs for plows sold there before the present tariff took effect. Our books show that our entire Canadian sales for the past twelve months will not amount to $200, and if you or any committee you may select care to examine them, we shall be very glad to give you full facilities for so doing.

Again, the records of the various custom-houses on the Canadian border will show whether or not we are telling the truth, and certainly you can have access to them. Mr. Washington says: "I understand the same plows are sold in quantities at the factory (not for export) at $14 each and cost the American farmer $16." If you had taken the pains to inquire in your own State and district, you would have found that the largest chilled plow we make retails there for $11, and when a wheel and jointer are added (which is a rare case) the full retail price does not exceed $14.

We have shown Mr. Washington's information to be untrue in the features upon which he bases his conclusions, and his deductions and campaign assertions therefore fall to the ground. We are prepared to show that in every foreign country where plows of our manufacture are sold they retail for a higher price than American farmers pay for them. Let us say right here that every genuine Oliver chilled plow made is made here in South Bend at our factory, and we neither manufacture in any foreign country nor have any interests, direct or indirect, in any foreign factory or manufacture.

In your letter to us you say: "You admit that you have some trade with Canada, but are careful to omit that country from the list of those enumerated to which you export your plows." We omit Canada simply because we export no plows to that country, and you can not furnish truthful evidence that we do. The evidence you do furnish, whether official or not, is based on wrong information and wrong assumptions, and is entitled to no consideration whatever. Our letter to Mr. H. F. Millan, of Kirksville, Mo., was written in answer to his inquiry if the statements made by you at that place, August 28, were true. We have nothing to take back in our letter, and we repeat what we therein said, that "We are somewhat surprised that a gentleman of Mr. HATCH'S national reputation should make such statements without satisfying himself of their truth."

You are familiar enough with law to know the value attached to an *ex parte* statement and in simple justice should have heard both sides before making the broad statement you did. We speak for ourselves alone and leave other manufacturers to fight their own battles. We are willing that the farmers of this country should decide as between you and ourselves, for years of intimate association with them and the confidence they have given us forbid the assumption that we would be guilty of what you charge against us. Will it not be the proper thing for you to again rise to "a question of privilege" and place our communication before the House as fully and publicly as you submitted your side of the case?

Respectfully yours,

OLIVER CHILLED PLOW WORKS.

Hon. W. B. HATCH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, of course I have not heard this letter read. I am glad that the gentleman presents it and has it put in the RECORD, and I may have something to say about it after having had an opportunity to read it. But I will state to the gentleman, as I stated before upon the floor of the House, that I read or had read from the Clerk's desk every word of the letter that the Oliver Chilled Plow Company sent me in regard to the statement made by Mr. Washington, the consul at London, in denial of his statement. I then sent a copy of that letter to Mr. Washington, and he sent to the State Department the affidavits substantiating the statements made by him in his original communication. When I have an opportunity of reading that letter I may have something further to say to the House.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may read it.

Mr. HATCH. I just want to say that in this whole matter I have treated every one with the courtesy I always extend to any gentleman who may raise a question with me. I have read to this House every single statement they have made in regard to the original transaction. I had their letter, and also a letter from the Walter A. Wood Company, read in the Fiftieth Congress.

Mr. HEARD. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means a question relative to the amendment now pending. As I understand the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]—for I am not familiar with the amendment, nor with the text of the bill, and therefore do not know how it will affect the bill—but as I understand from the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts the effect of the amendment now offered is to lower the rate proposed in the McKinley bill, the bill under consideration. Now, I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio, How will the rate fixed by the bill amended as now proposed compare with what is now the existing law?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I would say to the gentleman that it is exactly the same rate of duty up to $12, and above $12 an advance of 5 per cent.

Mr. HEARD. Then I shall vote for this amendment, since it proposes to lessen the duty, as against the original proposition that was offered when the bill was originally submitted to the House.

Protests have come to me from all over my district against the increase proposed in that bill originally presented to the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I should be false to my duty if I did not stand up here and say that I hope this amendment offered by the committee will not be adopted. I desire to say that I indorse every word my colleague [Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts] has said. I have in my district a prominent citizen, a loyal and patriotic man, who rendered service for his country at the front, now manufacturing fire-arms, who employs over six hundred men. He tells me that the duty originally proposed in this bill is imperative and absolutely necessary for the protection of his business.

I protest in the most earnest manner against this amendment offered by the Committee on Ways and Means at this eleventh hour. My constituency would desire to see the requirements of that business met, and they believe that this bill, with that exception, would be the best that this Republican House could pass; and I trust that the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GREENHALGE. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 111, noes 21.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 92, Schedule N, insert as a separate paragraph the following:
"Bristles, 10 cents a pound."
On page 105 strike out line 21, which reads as follows: "Bristles raw."

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to oppose this amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] stated a few minutes ago that this bill was getting stronger with the country the more it is discussed. I have an article in my hand, published in the Rockford Gazette, a Republican paper, published in the Republican city of Rockford, Ill. That paper states that a petition was circulated in that city among the merchants of that city protesting against the passage of this bill and that every one to whom it was presented signed that protest without one single exception. The article is as follows:

AN ILLINOIS PROTEST.

According to the Rockford Gazette, a reliable and influential Republican journal, the business men of that city are opposed to the McKinley abomination. The Gazette says that a protest "bearing the signatures of nearly all the leading dry-goods and clothing merchants" of Rockford was forwarded to Washington. "Only one merchant," the Gazette says, "to whom the petition was presented—Joseph Burns—refused to sign."

Among other things, the Rockford merchants in their petition say:

"We, the undersigned merchants of Rockford, Ill., desire to enter our protest against the passage of bill H. R. No. 9416, known as the 'McKinley tariff bill,' because we believe the present tariff on imports is excessive and should, in our opinion, be reduced rather than increased.

"The bill advances the present rate from 25 to 100 per cent. on goods that are not and, in our judgment, never can be made successfully in this country. We refer particularly to manufactured linens, which are advanced from 35 per cent. (the present rate) to 70 and 100 per cent.; linen laces, from 30 to 60 per cent.; cotton laces, lace window-curtains and embroideries, from 40 to 60 per cent.

"On dress goods manufactured wholly or in part of wool we believe the present rate, averaging over 70 per cent., is high enough to give American manufacturers sufficient protection, and the same sentiment of the country will not approve of the great advance proposed by said bill.

"On the same ground we protest against the great increase on manufactures of silk goods, especially the enormous increase of rates of duty on plushes and velvets. On cotton hosiery and underwear the proposed rates on leading lines are almost prohibitory.

"We believe that higher ad valorem rates of duty would lead to further undervaluations by dishonest importers and would still further encourage the adulteration of American manufactured goods. We are in favor of reasonable protection to the industries of this country, but earnestly protest against prohibitory rates on articles and fabrics not made here."

The Bloomington Leader, a Republican paper, commenting upon the above protest, says:

"There is, in fact, a general protest against the passage of the McKinley bill from merchants, business men, and farmers throughout the United States. The chief supporters of the measure are its beneficiaries, the millionaire monopolists."

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that, representing a constituency very largely agricultural, I shall vote for this bill. I shall vote for it because it does more and will do vastly more for the farming classes of this country, as I believe, than any tariff measure that has ever become a law in the United States.

Like every member, I presume, upon this floor, there are different articles and different schedules I should be glad to have changed in the interests of my constituents; but with all the varied interests of this country, with all its diversified industries to be subserved, I should feel myself recreant to the trust reposed in me not to support this measure. I support it because of its many provisions in favor of the farmer and his interests.

I shall vote for it because I believe it will place multiplied thousands of sheep upon our Western prairies, from whose wool will be manufactured, and manufactured in the towns and cities of these prairies, around about which these flocks feed and thrive, $60,000,000 worth of woolen fabrics, now yearly imported into this country.

Mr. HAYES. Will they not freeze to death in the winter?

Mr. MCADOO. They will be "protected" so that they can not freeze. [Laughter.]

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman from Iowa has no ground to talk to South Dakota of cold weather.

I shall vote for it for the reason that every wool-grower, every herdsman, every employé that shall be engaged in these great industries that will spring into existence by this protection upon wool will eliminate just so many competitors in the raising of wheat in our great Northwest. And not only eliminate them, Mr. Chairman, as producers, but place them in the class of consumers, and consumers, too, that under this great Republican system will receive wages that will enable them to purchase of the food-producers in such quantities as will insure their wives and children against the pangs of hunger and provide them with such comfortable, pleasant, and happy homes as the poorly paid laborers of the Old World can never know.

I am in favor of this bill because it furnishes such protection to the manufacturers of flax fiber as will enable its manufacture in this country, so that the farmer who now raises flax for seed alone will secure a double return for his labor without additional expense. I am in favor of it because it protects hemp and will cause the nearly $2,000,000 worth last year imported into this country to be produced by American farmers.

And so, Mr. Chairman, the protection afforded by this bill to the manufacture of flax and hemp fibers will develop this industry to one of national importance, will encourage the farmers to larger acreage of these products, until every article susceptible of manufacture from these fibers will be produced by American manufacturers, by American labor, from American-grown products.

I am in favor of this bill because it reduces the duty on binder-twine from 2½ to 1½ cents per pound, which saves to the farmers of the great West and Northwest one and a quarter million dollars per annum.

I favor this bill because it increases the tariff on barley from 10 to 30 cents per bushel and on flaxseed from 20 to 30 cents, which will stimulate our own farmers to themselves raise the 15,000,000 bushels of the former and the 3,000,000 bushels of the latter which were last year imported into this country.

I favor this bill because it increases the duty on potatoes from 15 to 25 cents per bushel, and thus our own farmers hereafter will raise the nearly 9,000,000 bushels of this product imported last year into the United States.

I favor it because it increases the duties on farm and animal products, which were, under the present duties, in the aggregate, during the past year imported to the amount of about $200,000,000, because I believe our own farmers will raise these products, and it will in so much lessen the competition in the production of wheat.

I favor the bill because it destroys the sugar trusts, puts sugar on the free-list, and thus places this necessity at the lowest possible rate upon every poor man's table in the land, and, Mr. Chairman, because it offers a bounty of 2 cents per pound for every pound produced in this country, thereby insuring the development of another great industry by the farmers of the United States, and which I believe will be especially advantageous to the farmers of my own State.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, before this bill becomes a law it may place a duty upon hides; and although it does much for the consumers of binder-twine I should be glad to see it on the free-list.

This Congress will do well to furnish the farming interests of this country the protection afforded by this bill.

And in addition the farmers of this country demand more money as a circulating medium, demand money sufficient to do the business of the country. They demand, Mr. Chairman, and in such tones that it can not much longer go unheeded, that the Government shall, through their subtreasury bill or some other measure, furnish the people direct with money to do the business of the country at a nominal rate of interest. Such relief they demand, and such relief they are entitled to. Never have the producing classes been more in earnest upon any question than upon this one for more money and cheaper money. It is a necessity, and a necessity Congress should provide for, and provide for without delay. No higher duty devolves upon this Congress, in my opinion, than to pass some measure of relief. Neither should it be a make-shift or a mere temporary expedient, but some measure that will afford permanent and abiding results.

The committees of both Senate and House have accorded several hearings to the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union and other friends of the measure proposed, and I trust, Mr. Chairman, we may have prompt action by that committee and by this House. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to impress upon the Committee of the Whole House now having under consideration the tariff bill the careful consideration of its provisions concerning the tin industry.

TIN.

We desire protection for this industry of tin-plate manufacturing, which has before it such great possibilities in this country, and there should have likewise been a duty on block tin.

In the development of the tin mines of my State and the manufacture of the product is involved the employment of a vast amount of labor, and when developed will secure to the people of this country an article—a necessity of life—at a cheaper price than it will be otherwise obtainable if this industry remains undeveloped, and render it possible to retain at home the many millions of dollars now annually paid foreign countries for the vast quantity of tin product consumed in the United States.

William H. Cronemeyer, representing the American Tinned-Plate Association, appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, and I quote from his evidence:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: I come here to represent the American Tinned-Plate Association, the object of which is to try to foster the tin-plate industry, a thing which does not exist at the present time. The industry was killed right from its start by a decision made by Secretary Fessenden in 1864. At that time the laws imposed upon tin, or iron coated with tin, a duty of 2½ cents a pound. It was decided by Secretary Fessenden that that did not mean iron plates coated with tin, but that tin-plates should be classified with tin in sheets and pay an ad valorem duty at that time of 15 per cent. An attempt was made several times to manufacture tin-plates, but very unsuccessfully. The manufacturers who went into the business at that time were very much misled by the high prices we had to pay out for the English tin-plates, and they could figure it out at a very good profit at these prices. Now, the firm with which I am connected is the United States Tin-Plate Company, in Pittsburgh. There were two corporations there that went into the business of manufacturing tin-plates and were very successful for a year or two.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was this?

Mr. CRONEMEYER. 1873, 1874, and 1875. We were making a good profit.

Mr. GEAR. There was a premium on gold then?

Mr. CRONEMEYER. Yes, sir, there was some premium on gold. At that time we were making some money out of the business, and when we had hardly got started the price came down till the price fell to $4.50 for some classes of goods, and that of course knocked us out of the market altogether, and we had to give up.

Mr. BAYNE. Will you state what the tin-plates sold for?

Mr. CRONEMEYER. They sold for $12 and they came down to $4.50. Besides our mill there were two other mills started simultaneously.

Mr. MCMILLIN. In what year was this selling for $12?

Mr. CRONEMEYER. In 1873. We gave up the business in 1876. We were forced out of it; and we then engaged in the manufacture of sheet-iron of various kinds. In 1879, when we were supposed to be entirely out, the price of tin went up to $9 or $10. We immediately started again, and we had only scarcely started in than the price went right down. Of course we investigated how that was shortly after we had started, and we found out the importers, when they learned we were making tin-plates, would put down their prices so as to kill us off, and when they thought they had us dead they would put all the prices up again. It was always just this way.

As to the extent of the industry he states:

Mr. BAYNE. Will you furnish that to the stenographer, if you can?

Mr. CRONEMEYER. Yes, sir. Will you allow me to state what an enormous industry this tin-plate would be if we ever have it at home? I think I have mentioned that there was during the last fiscal year some 360,000 tons of tin-plate manufactured. This means about 500,000 tons of pig metal, about 500,000 tons of limestone, about 1,000,000 tons of coke, about 36,000,000 pounds of lead, and perhaps 1,000,000 pounds of tin. So if this mine in Dakota or some other mine is developed we find the home material right here.

Mr. GEAR. How many men does it take to make this plate?

Mr. CRONEMEYER. I can describe it in this way: In a mill like ours—we have only working four mills, in which we can produce about 4,000 tons in a year of these light plates; with 360,000 tons consumed it would take ninety mills. In our mill we employ about 225 men, which would show that it would take only in the tin-mills about 23,000 people. Again we come to the extra labor required in manufacturing pig metal, getting the coal, getting the lead, tin, and lumber for boxing and the sulphuric acid, and the amount of capital involved would be about $30,000,000. Of all these men about 50,000 will support families, say, 200,000 people, and 200,000 people will supply money to other trades, the tailor, the shoemaker, the butcher, and so on; and if all these people were together you would have a city nearly as big as New York City.

Samuel Untermyer, of New York, stated before the committee as to the tin production of the world and labor employed as follows:

Tin production of the world.

	1885.	1886.	1887.	1889.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
Cornwall	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,300
Straits	17,320	19,674	23,977	28,355
Australia	8,496	7,503	7 025	6,125
Banca	4,200	4,379	4,384	4,377
Billiton	3,760	4,128	4,978	4,700
Bolivia	.....	.....	.....	1,500
Total	42,776	44,687	49,364	54,357

Of this total supply of the world, in each of the years named, about 60 per cent. was produced by Chinese and Malay labor, as follows:

Produced by Chinese and Malay labor.

	Tons.		Tons.
1885	25,280	1887	33,339
1886	28,181	1889	37,339

While the production of the English mines has fairly held its own, and that of Australia has diminished, the production of the Straits tin fields, worked by Chinese and Malays, has steadily augmented each year. The increase of the world's productions was only 7¾ per cent.

The amount of bar-tin annually imported into the United States is about 14,000 tons, of which 11,951 tons was received at the port of New York alone. This was chiefly Straits tin. The Straits tin is the kind chiefly in use in coating tin-plates, because of its superior quality.

The population of the Straits Settlements, where the Straits tin is produced, in 1889 was 387,234, nearly all of whom were engaged in tin mining, etc. This population is composed of—

Europeans	3,497
Malays	170,163
Chinese	173,279
Natives of India	40,295
Total population	387,234

So that less than 4,000 Europeans direct this army of nearly 400,000 coolies and others, the cheapest laborers in the world, whose product enters the United States

free of duty, so that, while the immigration of Chinese laborers into the United States has been prohibited, American labor will, in the absence of the duty now asked for, be compelled to compete with a class of laborer little better than slaves.

The Parliamentary Blue-Book on mines and minerals, published in 1888 (at page 294) gives the number of persons employed in English tin mines as follows:

Employed under ground	6,120
Above ground	5,507
Total	11,627

Griffith's Guide, published in the Iron and Steel Journal of London for January 25, 1890 (at page 125), states the names of the registered tin-plate mills in the United Kingdom on January 1, 1890, showing—

The number of mills to be	480
The number of persons directly and indirectly employed in the tin-plate industry in England is estimated at	500,000
The annual product in tons for the English tin-plate industry is estimated at	500,000

It is confidently expected that the development of the tin industry in this country will, if properly fostered and protected in its infancy, in time enable us to manufacture tin-plate out of our own product so as to supply our country.

If the 336,692 tons of tin-plate annually imported into the United States were made here employment would be given to at least 300,000 hands who would be needed to produce that amount and coat it with the 10,000 tons of pig-tin required for the purpose. Moreover, as 97 per cent. of these tin-plates is iron or steel, our domestic iron would be used for its manufacture instead of foreign iron.

The number of tons of tin-plate imported into the United States for the past three years and the values thereof are stated in the report of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, dated December, 1889, and the statement will be found at page 84, as follows:

Tin-plate.	1887.	1888.	1889.
Tons	268,355	292,626	336,692
Value	£3,562,972	£4,091,147	£4,674,455

Equivalent to an average of about $23,000,000.

In addition to the tin found in the State of North Carolina, we have in the State of South Dakota, in the Black Hills country, tin sufficient to supply the world.

In connection with the proposition I desire to quote from the report of the British consul at Chicago, in the year 1887, to his Government. He says:

"The discovery of tin in the Black Hills must be regarded as of the highest importance, and there is now little doubt that the mines are of enormous extent and value. The district known as the Black Hills is an isolated group of mountains lying principally in Dakota and partly in Wyoming, between the two main forks of the Cheyenne river. The group is of nearly oval form, about 90 by 69 miles, rising from an arid plain. It is thickly wooded and covered with verdure, and has rich, deep soil in well watered valleys. Of the two known tin districts, the southern section, 4 miles wide, lies around the north and west sides of, and probably runs all around, the central mass of granite called Harney's Peak; and the other, or northern section, is about 20 miles west of Deadwood.

"Tin was first discovered here in 1883, but the miners were only in search of the precious metal and little attention was paid to it.

"Some of the mines are now commencing regular operations, sinking shafts and erecting machinery, and before long there will probably be a regular supply of metal.

"The quantity of ore appears to be unlimited, and as it lies near and crops out from the surface and on lofty wooded hills the cost of working and transport will not be great. Little has, however, yet been done, except the production of specimen bars and the examination of localities which appear to be most likely to yield paying quantities of ore, though there are considerable quantities extracted ready for concentration.

"Chicago, as well as other cities West, is a large consumer of tin, which has hitherto been wholly imported, and great interest is taken in the development of the discovery of this metal."

Mr. Untermyer continues before the committee as follows:

We herewith submit also a leading editorial from the London Mining Journal of February 15, 1890, headed, "The tin-plate outlook and restricted production," and call attention especially to the following statement in that article:

"Within the last thirty years the English exports of tin-plates have risen from rather under 1,000,000 hundredweight to nearly 9,000,000 hundredweight. The exact figure of shipments for 1889 was 8,612,469 hundredweight, of which total sum 75 per cent. was purchased by the United States. The attempts which have lately come to a head in America to utilize the tin, iron, and steel resources of that country in the manufacture of its own tin-plates would receive an enormous impulse, and there would be considerable danger of the 20,000 to 30,000 tons bought monthly by that market declining to a very small total."

Ever since the report of the British consul at Chicago to his Government of the extent and richness of the tin mines in the Black Hills, the English tin-miners have been alive to the danger of their industry that will result from a development of these mines, and the subject has received constant and prominent attention in the English press. Such leading journals as the London Mining Journal, the Statist, the Money Market Review, the Economist, and the Sunday News have devoted pages of their paper to the discussion of these mines, and have undertaken to demonstrate to the British public that America will shortly be able to supply its own needs in this direction from the tin mines in the Black Hills.

I beg leave to submit, on this argument, some of the articles that have appeared in the English press upon this subject.

It would not be demonstration of the commercial value of these properties to say that we have raised capital for the purpose of working; but it is an important circumstance tending to show that we have demonstrated to the people who have put money into the enterprise that we have the ability to produce tin in paying quantities. We have recently put into our treasury $1,500,000 for development. Prior to that time we had spent in the erection of mills, hoisting and drilling apparatus, dwellings for employés, boarding-houses for men, stables, etc., about $200,000, besides which this company has acquired and controls certainly upwards of five hundred mining claims, upon which it has done and is doing the assessment work required by law, and the following is a brief statement of the development work done upon some of the mines:

WORK DONE.

Shafts and winzes sunk on February 1	feet..	1,864
Tunnels, levels, adits, drifts, etc., run February 1	do..	5,225
Expended in erection of mill, hoisting and drilling apparatus, dwellings for employés, boarding-houses for miners, stables, etc., about		$200,000

We have spent vast sums of money in purchasing claims. We went to England to secure additional money with which to continue the development of these mines, and there we met with the opposition of the vast interests of the Cornwall mines. We met, also, and are still contending against the opposition of those who handle the foreign tin in this country, and we were encountered by a fierce attack from a London financial paper as to the commercial value of our properties. It required over two years of active labor and demonstration to overcome the suspicions thus created, and to convince the people from whom we desired to borrow money to aid us in our enterprise that these were the greatest tin mines yet discovered on the face of the earth, and we have succeeded in that demonstration. The newspaper which made the attack was compelled to withdraw it. The history of that transaction is very fairly set forth in the Money Market Review of December 8, 1888, and we beg herewith to submit that article.

The certificates of these men selected to take charge of the mill-crushing of the ore from the Hills, which took place in London, demonstrated effectually the great wealth of these mines and their commercial value to this country. Never has a property been submitted to so crucial a test as that to which these properties were subjected for the purpose of overcoming the attacks upon it.

Since those criticisms were answered in the conclusive way shown upon the results of the mill-crushing of the ore, we have increased our holdings of properties, many other locations have been discovered in the Black Hills owned by other persons and corporations, and we have now five hundred men at work upon the properties, which is a very small proportion of the number of men whom we shall employ when the mines are fairly opened and the work of crushing the ores is begun.

Our pay-rolls for the past six months have amounted to $120,000, and during that time we have done assessment work upon six hundred and ninety mining claims, besides development work. Although the great bulk of the tin used in this country comes, as has heretofore been stated, from Straits, and is the product of Chinese and Malay labor, still we do get a part of our supply from the Cornwall mines, and the comparative statement of the wages which we pay our laborers and those paid in the Cornwall mines may be instructive as showing the present need for the protection of this industry. We pay $3 and $3.50 per day for labor, and we pay men for light work above ground $2.50 a day, and to firemen $4 per day.

In Cornwall they pay 20*s.*, or $5 per week, or 83 cents per day, as against our $3 or $3.50 per day. The men in Cornwall who do light work above ground are paid from 2*s.* (50 cents) to 2*s.* 6*d.* (62½ cents). The girls who do the selecting of the ores are paid from 1*s.* (25 cents) to 1*s.* 6*d.* (37½ cents), and the women for dressing and the lighter work are paid 2*s.* shillings (50 cents) per day.

AS TO THE RICHNESS OF THE PRODUCT.

Messrs. Johnson, Matthey & Co. and Mr. Frederick Claudet are the assayers to the Bank of England. The mill-crushing for the great quantities of ore taken from the mines by the special commissions sent out from England was done under their direction. The shipment of this ore was made under the direction and control of a special commission sent out from England to examine the mines and to ascertain the reliability of the statement that had been made with regard to the property. We submit herewith the certificates of these renowned assayers showing that there were in all fourteen lots, and that the ore consisted, in many instances, of solid blocks weighing from 100 pounds up to 3,000 pounds. The mill crushing resulted in demonstrating that the ore contained 837 pounds to the ton of pure tin oxide, being 78.67 per cent. of metallic tin. Combining the two series of tests made, the ore appeared to be worth between 80 pounds of black tin to the ton, which is a phenomenal showing of richer and far exceeding the averages obtained in the Cornwall mine.

Then again, the ore is more friable, and therefore more readily treated than is the case with tin produced from other sources, and being found quite near to the surface, its handling is less expensive; all of which facts demonstrate the great commercial value of the industry.

We have had some experience in the early stages of this particular corporation as to the time, money, energy, and ability which those interests are ready to devote to our destruction. Two years of the life of this company has been spent in refuting the slanders which those interests have boldly circulated against the tin interests of the Black Hills. Those slanders were hurled at us by the money in England, the money market of the world, where we were endeavoring to secure the aid of capital with which to develop our property; and the contest which was there waged is one which will be memorable in the financial interests of that country. The clippings from the London Press herewith submitted will convey some faint idea of the history of that controversy.

Some of the members of this committee seem to be of the impression that this company is dominated by English interests, and it is but fair to the gentlemen constituting its board of directors that this impression should be corrected. This company has a share capital of $15,000,000, and less than one-fifth of its shares are owned abroad, the balance being all owned in this country by citizens of the United States, and over two-thirds of the shares being owned by its present board of trustees, all of whom are residents of the city of New York.

We believe the time will soon come when we, with our improved machinery, our superior class of labor, and our inventive tendencies, will be able not only to supply our own country with this product, for which millions are now annually paid abroad, but will be able to sell our product in foreign markets, notwithstanding the great disparagement in the cost of labor. But, in order to do that, we must be enabled to grow strong, which we can not do without protection in the infancy of our industry.

The Hon. JOHN F. LACEY, member of this House, in a letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, under date January 8, 1890, speaking of tin-ore in South Dakota, says:

"I will not go into details unless you should so request, but as the result of my personal examination of a large number of mines and prospect shafts I became fully convinced that tin exists in very great abundance in both regions of the Black Hills.

"Stream-tin abounds in the creeks and ore deposits are plainly exposed and traceable upon the surface.

"A want of adequate capital and lack of knowledge of the best methods of extracting the ore have prevented the successful operation of the mines heretofore, but money is now being freely invested in the Harny Peak region, and an extensive output of cassiterite may soon be expected."

In considering the tin question, in my judgment, the committee will be safe in doing so upon the theory that the mines of South Dakota will be able to supply our wants in the near future, and, in time contend with Malacca and Cornwall in the markets of the world.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by quoting from the able speech of Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, upon this bill, delivered May 10, 1890, in this House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, speaking of this industry in the United States, used the following language:

What is the tin-plate history of the United States? It is instructive. In the last five years we have sent out of this country $100,000,000 to buy the tin-plate consumed here. Why? Because the duty upon it is so far below the protective point that every attempt to manufacture it here is met with a reduction in price of the foreign article, low enough and long enough continued to stop American production. It was shown by the testimony taken before your committee that in 1873 tin-plate was selling at $12 per box of 108 pounds. The manufacturers began making some headway in this country, but foreign producers were unwilling to yield this market and forced the prices to five and a half and six dollars, when the

manufacture was abandoned here in 1879. When the field was again clear for the British syndicate, they put the prices up and up until in 1870 tin-plate was nine to ten dollars per box. Again American manufacturers began to turn out tin-plate, and again the English tin-plate association drove them to the wall. American tin-plate of the better grade can be made with the present prices of material at $6.50 per box. And though the foreign price of like grade is higher than that, our makers know from a dear experience that under existing duties any attempt to manufacture will bring a reduction in prices, which will close them up with all the loss attendant upon such procedure, and therefore keep out of the business for the present, though the foreign association maintains the price above profitable production here. This again illustrates the glorious advantage of the American consumer being dependent upon a foreign association under a tariff below the protective point.

What will a protective duty on tin-plate accomplish? It will enable us to make from twenty to twenty-five million dollars' worth of tin-plate in this country annually. What does that mean? It means that to produce the 1,000,000 tons of additional iron ore, the 2,000,000 tons of additional coke and coal, the 450,000 tons of additional pig-iron, the quarrying of 700,000 tons of additional limestone, the 15,000 tons of Dakota block tin, the 3,000 tons of additional lead, the 6,500 tons of additional tallow and oil, the 20,000 tons of additional sulphuric acid, the 30,000,000 feet of additional box lumber, to turn the pig-iron into sheet-iron, to make the machinery and keep it in repair, and to freight the materials will give constant and remunerative employment to 40,000 men, with their families, making a population of 200,000 directly dependent on this great industry, which will build up quickly in this country under this bill. To these added wage-workers will be paid annually $21,000,000 in wages, to be in large part expended among the farmers and merchants of this country.

That is what this increased duty will do. It will do more; it will give us very soon tin-plate at a cheaper rate than we pay to-day, give us a steady and reliable market which will respond to the gradual cheapening cost of production and the controlling laws of domestic competition.

Mr. LIND. Before the gentleman from South Dakota sits down, I want to ask him a question. Is he aware that this bill increases the protection—not the duty, but the protection—upon binding-twine 700 per cent.?

Mr. PICKLER. The bill provides exactly to the contrary. I do not know to what the gentleman alludes. It provides in so many words for a reduction of the duty.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I made the statement that this bill as first reported increased, not the tariff duty, but the protection on binding-twine, 700 per cent., and I knew what I was saying. There is not a member of the committee who will undertake to dispute the correctness of my proposition on the basis of percentages. I have sat here during the consideration of this bill patiently watching for an opportunity to get recognized to move a reduction, a just and legitimate reduction, of the duty upon binding-twine, but I have begun to despair.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, rose.

Mr. LIND. I beg the gentleman to desist. I am not talking for home consumption. I want to point out some facts and bring them before this committee, so that if hereafter in the course of time I should be recognized for five minutes to offer an amendment the committee may be prepared to vote upon it intelligently. Under the present law the raw material of which binding-twine is manufactured pays a duty of 20 per cent. and the manufactured article 2½ cents per pound, which is equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 21.84 per cent.

Hence the differential duty which constitutes the protection on the manufacture of binding-twine is 1.84 per cent. The committee have put the raw material on the free-list very properly, and I thank them for it; but, instead of allowing less than 2 per cent. to the manufacturers, as heretofore, they have run it up to 1¼ cents a pound, equivalent to about 12 per cent. ad valorem. I maintain that that is too much, and if I can be conceded ten minutes to demonstrate that proposition I will do it to the satisfaction of every Republican protectionist on this floor, and I am one of them. I know what I am talking about. There was a gentleman before the Committee on Ways and Means who was examined in my presence.

I heard every question put to him, and I noted his statement well, because, Mr. Chairman, the State which I have the honor in part to represent is wrapped up in the question of wheat. It is our great dependence, our all. We can raise wheat enough in my State to feed this entire nation.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. And foreign countries, too.

Mr. LIND. I say I noted the answers that were made by that gentleman. I noticed that the president of the Associated Textile Industries—I believe that is his title—was present. I do not know that that is the exact name, but we know that the trust exists and we know the president of it was before the committee. He stated that at the present time and for the ensuing season they proposed to sell manufactured twine at a figure from 3 to 4 cents per pound in excess of the present cost of raw material plus the cost of manufacture. That was his statement. Not a member of the committee can dispute this.

Now, I say that when a man has the cheek to come before the American Congress, or before any committee of Congress, and state that he proposes to exact blood-money to this extent from the working-people, from the farming classes, the hardest-worked people in the land, he is not entitled to the preference, consideration that this gentleman received at the hands of that committee. He stated, furthermore, that the whole cost of manufacturing binding-twine was 1½ cents per pound. He stated, in addition to that, that it cost from one-half to three-quarters of a cent per pound to place it with the retailer. So that the entire expense of manufacturing, paying commissions, and placing the article in the hands of the retailer does not exceed from 2½ to 2¾ cents.

In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] as to the difference in the labor-cost of production here and abroad, he said the difference was 40 per cent., that is the foreign labor employed in this industry was 40 per cent. cheaper than ours. Hence what it costs $1 to produce abroad it would cost $1.40 to produce here, and when you have a differential duty, which is much in excess of that, it is too large.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I would rather the gentleman would get in his amendment, so that we may have a vote on it.

Mr. LIND. That is what I want. I do not want to talk.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] whether that manufacture is not in a trust.

Mr. LIND. Certainly it is; I have so stated.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It seems to me that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], and other gentlemen on that side should have some opportunity to offer amendments, not the "ample opportunity" which has been spoken of which cuts out everybody, but insufficient opportunity that gives a chance to members to get in.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. If it had not been for the incessant discussion on the other side we would have had numbers of votes on amendments. You talked and talked until you forced this rule upon the House.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following:

Hon. J. A. GEISSENHAINER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: We desire to call your attention to the proposed new tariff bill increasing the duty on breech-loading guns from 35 per cent., as at present, to 80 to 100 per cent. There is no excuse or reason for any such advance. It will not affect the buyer who is able to purchase a high-grade gun, as this class is almost exclusively American make; but it will fall heavily on the poorer man who can not afford to pay $30 or more for a gun, and it will prevent thousands of our farmers and farm laborers from buying a gun at all. It will be a severe blow to my business, cutting off at least one-half of it, doing no good to any one. There are no guns made in this country to take the place of cheap imported ones; they are reliable, safe, and effective, and by what law of justice or common sense shall the poor man be compelled to pay $4 to $12 of his hard-earned money to benefit no one?

We consider the advance uncalled for and injurious, and appeal to you to use all your influence to prevent this piece of unjust legislation.

Yours, respectfully,

P. W. ELMER,
Clarksburgh, Monmouth County, New Jersey.

The undersigned, interested in the sale or use of breech-loading guns, cordially indorse the above protest, and earnestly request your aid in defeating the uncalled-for advance in duty.

Mr. HAYES obtained unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD the following:

CHICAGO, *May* 4, 1890.

DEAR SIR: We believe in protecting American industries, and regret that the proposed tariff bill will, if passed, impose excessive duties upon articles which require no protection, and unnecessary taxation upon the poorer classes of consumers for the sole benefit of the United States Treasury.

In this list of articles you will find cheap guns. They are not and can not be manufactured in America. The cheapest double-barreled breech-loading gun now produced in this country nets the manufacturer about $19. The cheapest imported double-barreled breech-loading gun costs the importer about $5.50, after paying the 35 per cent. duty now imposed.

The great bulk of imported guns cost (present duty included) less than $12 each. You will readily see that adding $2, $4, or $6 specific duty to the present 35 per cent. ad valorem will not put them within the reach of the American manufacturer, but will compel the farmers and their boys to either pay a large advance or forego the purchase of a double-barreled gun.

If manufacturers of $30 to $200 guns, such as are used by sportsmen, require further protection, we have no protest to offer, but we do not believe that a prohibitory tariff should be placed upon the cheaper grades.

The manufacturers who earnestly advocate the proposed change are two or three makers of little single-barreled guns, who hope to prohibit the importation of double-barrels, and thus create a demand for their goods.

We beg you to examine in detail this section of the bill before considering it favorably.

Respectfully,

HIBBARD, SPENCER, BARTLETT & CO.
A. C. BARTLETT, *Secretary.*

Hon. WALTER I. HAYES,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

CHICAGO, *May* 7, 1890.

DEAR SIR: In a letter of recent date we said the cheapest American gun is $19. The writer overlooked an article that is sold by manufacturers at $15, but is not up to the standard of a $12 imported gun.

Respectfully,

HIBBARD, SPENCER, BARTLETT & CO.
A. C. BARTLETT, *Secretary.*

Hon. WALTER I. HAYES,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SWENEY. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it relate to the pending amendment?

Mr. SWENEY. It is an amendment pertaining to bristles.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MCKINLEY, it was agreed to.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk proceeded to read the following amendment:

Strike out section 32, on page 143, and substitute the following:

"SEC. 32. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall assign one or more internal-revenue store-keepers and gaugers to every vinegar factory employing the vaporizing process and lawfully established under this act, to have charge of such factory under the direction of the collector of the district, and may transfer such officer or officers from any such vinegar factory or bonded or distillery warehouse to another. And there shall be levied and collected on each proof gallon, or fraction thereof, of distilled spirits or low wines produced in such a vinegar factory, to be paid by the proprietor of such factory, a tax of 5 cents, which tax shall be assessed monthly by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and shall be a first lien on the spirits produced, the factory, the stills, vessels, fixtures, and tools therein, and the lot or tract of land on which the factory is situated, from the time the spirits are in existence until the said tax is paid.

"SEC. 33. That section 3282 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, be amended by striking out all after said number and inserting the following:

"'No mash, wort, or wash, fit for distillation or for the production of spirits or alcohol, shall be made or fermented in any building or on any premises other than a distillery duly authorized according to law; and no mash, wort, or wash so made and fermented shall be sold or removed from any distillery before being distilled; and no person other than an authorized distiller shall by distillation, or by any other process, separate the alcoholic spirits from any fermented mash, wort, or wash; and no person shall use spirits or alcohol * * * in manufacturing vinegar or any other article, or in any process of manufacture whatever, unless the spirits or alcohol so used shall have been produced in an authorized distillery and the tax thereon paid. Every person who violates any provision of this section shall be fined for each offense not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, and be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than two years: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to fermented liquors or to fermented liquids used for the manufacture of vinegar exclusively. * * * But it shall be lawful for manufacturers of vinegar to separate, by a vaporizing process, the alcoholic property from the mash produced by them, and condense the same by introducing it into the water or other liquid used in making vinegar.

"'But no worm, goose-neck, pipe, conductor, or contrivance of any description whatsoever whereby vapor might in any manner be conveyed away or converted into distilled spirits of high proof shall be used or employed or be fastened to or connected with any vaporizing apparatus used for the manufacture of vinegar; nor shall any worm be permitted on or near the premises where such vaporizing process is carried on.

"'Nor shall any vinegar factory, for the manufacture of vinegar as aforesaid, be permitted within 600 feet of any distillery or rectifying house.

"'The manufacturer shall erect in a room or building to be provided and used for that purpose one or more receiving cisterns of sufficient capacity to hold all the low wines or distilled spirits produced during the day of twenty-four hours, into which shall be conveyed the entire product of each day, the cistern and cistern-room to be constructed in the manner to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Such cisterns and the room in which they are contained shall be in charge and under lock and seal of the storekeeper and gauger; and all locks and seals requisite for that purpose shall be provided by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue at the expense of the United States.

"'On or before the third day after the spirits or low wines are conveyed into such cisterns they shall be drawn off under the supervision of the storekeeper and gauger; but before the same are drawn off, or any part thereof, they shall be gauged and proved by the storekeeper and gauger, who shall ascertain and report to the collector of the district, in such manner as shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the quantity of such spirits or low wines in wine and proof gallons.

"'It shall be unlawful to manufacture any distilled spirits or low wines in any vinegar factory of a greater strength than 30 per cent. of proof spirits; and any spirits or low wines of a greater strength produced in a vinegar factory shall be forfeited to the United States, together with all the stills, tools, machinery, utensils, materials, spirits, or low wines and vinegar on the premises of such factory.

"'No person shall remove, or cause to be removed, from any vinegar factory or place where vinegar is made any vinegar or other fluid or material containing a greater proportion than 2 per cent. of proof spirits. Any violation of this provision shall incur a forfeiture of the vinegar, fluid, or material containing such proof spirits, and shall subject the person or persons guilty of removing the same to the punishment provided for any violation of this section.

"'And all the provisions of section 3276, 3277, and 3278 of the Revised Statutes of the United States are hereby extended and made applicable to all premises whereon vinegar is manufactured, to all manufacturers of vinegar and their workmen or other persons employed by them.'

"SEC. 34. That every manufacturer of vinegar shall register his vaporizing apparatus with the collector of the district in the same manner as is now required concerning stills set up, and be subject to all the penalties provided in section 3258 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for having in possession such an apparatus set up and not so registered.

"SEC. 35. That every manufacturer of vinegar, before commencing or continuing business, shall give duplicate notice in writing, subscribed by him, to the collector of the district in which the business is to be carried on, stating his name and residence, and, if a firm, company, or corporation, the name and the residence of each member thereof; the precise place where such business is to be carried on; a particular description of the premises to be occupied, and of the mash-tubs and fermenting-tubs, and of the vaporizing and condensing apparatus to be used by him; also whether the factory was established and operated as a vinegar factory prior to March 1, 1879, or not; the distance of said factory in a direct line from the nearest distillery or rectifying house; the day when the manufacturer will commence to operate, and all such additional particulars as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may from time to time prescribe; and every person failing to give such notice or giving a false or fraudulent notice shall be liable to the penalties provided in section 3259 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

"SEC. 36. That every manufacturer of vinegar shall, before commencing or continuing the business, and on the 1st day of May on each succeeding year, give a bond in the form prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that he shall faithfully comply with all provisions of law concerning the manufacture of vinegar by the use of alcoholic vapor.

"Said bond shall be, with at least two sureties, approved by the collector of the district, and for a penal sum of $5,000. A new bond may be required in any contingency affecting the validity or impairing the efficiency of the previous bond, at the discretion of the collector or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Any manufacturer of vinegar as defined in this act who shall commence or continue the business after the passage of this act without giving such bond, or who fails or refuses to renew the same, or who gives any false, forged, or fraudulent bond shall forfeit his factory and apparatus, and shall be fined not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, and imprisoned not less than six months nor more than two years.

"SEC. 37. Every manufacturer of vinegar by the vaporizing process or person employed in such factory who, in the absence of the storekeeper and gauger or person designated to act as storekeeper and gauger, uses or causes or permits to be used any material for the purpose of making mash, wort, or beer, or for the production of spirits or low wines, or removes any spirits or low wines, shall forfeit and pay a tax of 90 cents per proof gallon on the spirits so produced, distilled, or removed, and in addition thereto be liable to a penalty of $1,000.

"SEC. 38. That every manufacturer of vinegar shall keep a book in the form prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in which he shall enter daily the kind and quantity of all materials purchased by him and brought upon the premises to be used in the manufacture of vinegar, and from whom purchased, the kind and quantity used each day, the quantity and strength of the vinegar manufactured, and the quantity sold or removed from the factory, and any other particulars that may from time to time be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Said book shall be kept at the factory, shall be preserved for two years after the last entry is made therein, and shall constantly be open to the inspection of any revenue officer; and whenever any manufacturer of vinegar shall omit or refuse to provide said book, or to make the entries required to be made therein, or shall make any false and fraudulent entry therein, or shall fail to preserve said book for the period required, or shall not produce said book for the inspection of any revenue officer, with intent to defraud, the factory, apparatus, the vinegar manufactured or in process of manufacture, and all personal property on said premises used in the business there carried on shall be forfeited to the United States.

"SEC. 39. That storekeepers assigned to vinegar factories shall keep in a book to be provided for that purpose, and in the manner prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a daily account of the kind and quantity of material brought upon the premises and used in the manufacture of vinegar, the quantity and strength of the vinegar made, and the quantity sold or removed from the factory, and shall enter in said book all other particulars, and keep such other records and make such reports of the operation of the factory as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may require.

"SEC. 40. That every package, cask, or barrel containing vinegar manufactured by the alcoholic vaporizing process shall have plainly marked thereon when it leaves the factory and shall be so kept plainly marked while it contains such vinegar the words 'Spirit vinegar.' Any person or persons manufacturing, selling, or having in possession for the purposes of sale any such vinegar contained in any package, cask, or barrel not so marked shall upon conviction thereof pay a fine of $5 for each and every such package, cask, or barrel, and in addition thereto shall pay the costs of prosecution.

"SEC. 41. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may make all such regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary to give full effect thereto."

Mr. HOLMAN (before the reading of the amendment was concluded). The reading of this paper furnishes no information; it is impossible to follow the reading, as there is so much confusion. I suggest that the whole paper be printed in the RECORD of to-morrow morning so that we may see exactly what it means. We certainly can not vote upon such an amendment as this without some opportunity of understanding it.

Mr. GEAR. This is the last amendment of the committee. Other gentlemen wish to offer amendments and to discuss them. I hope that the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana will not be agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. I understand it is the purpose to sit here to-night until the amendment now pending and any others that members desire to offer shall be submitted and considered. If that is so, let us understand it and go to work. We have been kept here in suspense for some time. Now we want to know what chance there is to be to offer amendments.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Let us finish up the committee amendments and then dispose of some more besides.

Mr. FLOWER. I hope the same privilege will be accorded to a gentleman on this side that is accorded on the other. I have amendments I desire to offer.

Mr. MCCREARY. I move that the committee rise. I make this motion because we have now been in continuous session for nine hours. If the motion should be agreed to, I propose to move that the House take a recess until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock. I insist on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] moves that the committee now rise.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Before that motion prevails the substitute which the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. SAWYER] desires to offer for the amendment now pending ought to be submitted, to be printed in the RECORD if the other is printed.

Mr. FLOWER. I do not understand why a gentleman from New York on the other side should have an opportunity to offer an amendment any more than a gentleman on this side, and one who is a member of the committee.

Mr. MCCREARY. I insist on my motion.

Mr. FLOWER. My constituents are just as dear to me as those of the gentleman on the other side are to him. There are industries of my constituents which are to be ruined if this bill passes in its present form, and I desire a chance to offer amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. No gentleman from New York has been recognized to offer any amendment or substitute.

Mr. FLOWER. I would like to know why I have not the same right as a gentleman on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. No gentleman from New York on the other side has been recognized. There is where the gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. FLOWER. Then I am sorry for the gentleman on the other side; I sympathize with him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that the reading of the amendment which has been sent to the desk by the gentleman from Ohio can not be interrupted by a motion that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KERR, of Pennsylvania. I desire to introduce an amendment

which has been printed in the RECORD and which it was understood we should have an opportunity to offer and have acted on.

Mr. MCCREARY. Nothing is in order except a motion to rise.

Mr. KERR, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment printed in the RECORD, and I want that side to stand up and say whether they are going to let us have an opportunity of having a vote upon it or not, or if they will deny me the right to submit it to the action of this committee.

Mr. FLOWER. We will meet gentlemen on the other side on this question hereafter.

Mr. BAYNE. I demand the regular order.

Mr. HILL. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HILL. Whether it will be in order now to move that the amendments offered and printed in the RECORD be considered as formal amendments for the action of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not be.

Mr. BAYNE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAYNE. Was the amendment proposed by the committee read through by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that a few lines of it were not read.

Mr. BAYNE. Then I make the point of order that the motion to rise is not in order and that the reading can not be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had already ruled upon that, and is of opinion that the committee can rise at any point of their labors and go into the House and report.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Right in the midst of a division or at any time, then?

Mr. BAYNE. I hope the committee will not rise.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 43, noes 74.

Mr. MCCREARY. I ask for tellers.

Mr. BAYNE. I ask the gentleman to let us get through with this one amendment.

Mr. MCCREARY. They insist on this side that tellers be ordered.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. MCCREARY and Mr. MCKINLEY were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 30, noes 66.

Mr. CALDWELL. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is not necessary to rise. The Clerk will conclude the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment as above.

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, I will state for the information of the committee——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. This is a very important matter, and I would like to ask order on the floor.

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, I will detain the committee but a very few moments.

Mr. SAWYER. I desire to offer an amendment as a substitute.

Mr. GEAR. I want to state for the information of the committee that this is a carefully prepared amendment to what is known on the statute-books as the vaporizing act, by which white-wine vinegar is manufactured from vaporized alcohol. This law has been upon the statute-books since March, 1879.

Under it these people are permitted to manufacture the low wines in a certain manner. There has not been under any provision of the law any proper surveillance of these people who are engaged in its manufacture, so as to prevent frauds. The Internal Revenue Department have considered this matter and recommend the passage of this proposition. The amendment has been draughted, as I said, carefully by the Internal Revenue Department, and provides, first, that these parties manufacturing these spirits and vinegar shall be under the strict surveillance of the department.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. Let me ask the gentleman if this amendment was before the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration.

Mr. GEAR. Yes, sir; and was reported favorably by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. What effect will it have upon this manufacture of vinegar from cider?

Mr. GEAR. I will tell you directly.

Mr. HAYES. Have you examined this amendment sufficiently to be able to say that it protects the interests of the ten vinegar factories in Iowa, considering the fact that we are not allowed under the prohibitory law to have a distillery?

Mr. GEAR I have not examined it in that light, I will say to my friend, because I am not a lawyer; but the amendment has been drawn carefully by the law officers of the department of the Government.

Mr. BAKER. Have you any opinion as to whether or not this is in the interest of the whisky distillers?

Mr. GEAR. I will tell you all of that if you do not interrupt me.

Now, the amendment provides certain penalties for violation of the law.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Where has the law been violated?

Mr. GEAR. Well, within thirty days, by the seizure of several hundred gallons of alcohol in Chicago, for instance.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. GEAR. If the gentleman will be patient and not interrupt, I will see that he has time for himself.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I will not depend upon any gentleman except the Chairman for recognition on this floor.

Mr. GEAR. Not at all; and yet you may be at some time dependent upon others.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I wished to ask the gentleman a question which is very pertinent to what he was saying, and in rather an impertinent way, as I think, he replied.

Mr. GEAR. Not at all; I am perfectly willing to answer the question at the proper time, but I want to be allowed to proceed to make my statement first.

Now, it provides for certain penalties for violation of the law, and then it provides in addition that the vinegar shall be branded so that it shall sell for exactly what it is. Therefore it will not interfere with the parties who manufacture spirit vinegar, and the penalty for violating this provision is $5 a barrel.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to know whether this amendment is not directly antagonistic to the men who make honest vinegar out of honest cider.

Mr. GEAR. No, sir; we have heard from the fruit associations of this country and a large proportion of the men representing those who make white-wine vinegar, and they all agree on this bill among themselves.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Where were they from?

Mr. GEAR. They were from New York, Chicago, and all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I desire to know what conclusion the committee arrived at upon the subject of cider vinegar being sufficient for the requirements of the market?

Mr. GEAR. I do not know what would be the necessary supply. That is like xyz in algebra. That is a mathematic problem. The production of spirit vinegar is 627,000 barrels.

Mr. BAYNE. There is a provision in this bill, I understand, which prohibits the coloring of this vinegar so as to make it an imitation of the cider vinegar.

Mr. GEAR. Yes, sir; there is also a provision in the bill which prohibits selling white-wine vinegar as cider vinegar. Now I will answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I knew that no one would be less inclined to be disrespectful than the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GEAR. I did not mean to be in any way disrespectful, but I did not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. MCMILLIN. What I was going to say was this: It is asserted that it is a committee amendment. I suppose it is understood by that that it was prepared by the majority.

Mr. GEAR. That is correct.

Mr. MCMILLIN. So far as I was concerned I never heard of it, and while it may be a very proper amendment, and may contain a proper provision, and may be altogether in the direction of correct legislation, not having seen it or having heard of it before it was presented I did not want it to go forth that it was recommended by the entire committee.

Mr. GEAR. We did not wish to burden the minority of the committee with any responsibility in regard to it. As a member of the majority, I, with them, assume all the responsibility for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit the Chair to inform him that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLOWER] has been trying to ask him a question for a long time?

Mr. GEAR. Then I will hear the question of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FLOWER. I ask the gentleman from Iowa if this is the storekeepers' bill or what is known as the Sawyer bill?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. It is the storekeepers' bill.

Mr. GEAR. It is not the Sawyer bill.

I want to say in conclusion that this arrangement is in harmony with the general understanding made by the men who manufacture spirit vinegar and those who make cider vinegar.

Mr. BAKER. I understand the gentleman from Iowa this amendment has been submitted and is approved by the manufacturers of vinegar made from cider?

Mr. GEAR. Precisely.

Mr. BAKER. And it meets with their approval?

Mr. GEAR. It meets with their approval.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Was it prepared at their direction?

Mr. ADAMS. It was.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. I would like to know whether the effect of this amendment will be to stop the ordinary manufacture of vinegar from cider.

Mr. GEAR. Not at all. [Cries of "Vote."] The bill provides that "spirit" vinegar should be branded as such and that the "spirit" vinegar manufacturers are prohibited from branding and selling their goods as "cider" vinegar. This provision is in the interests of the apple-growers of this country.

Mr. SAWYER. I desire to offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee, and upon that I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will request gentlemen to be seated, as this is a long bill which will require half an hour to read.

Mr. McKINLEY. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the amendment which the committee offered, together with the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York, shall be put into the RECORD, and that the further consideration of this subject be postponed until the session of to-morrow morning. [Cries of "All right!"] I make this request, and couple with it the further request that debate upon the two propositions be limited to-morrow morning to twenty minutes; ten minutes on a side.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I suggest that we take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow. [Cries of "That is all right!"]

Mr. BAKER. I have an amendment I desire to offer.

Mr. FLOWER. I sympathize with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BAKER. I do not want your sympathy.

Mr. FLOWER. You have got it, however.

Mr. BAKER. I have got the friendship of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I wish to say to my colleague, the chairman of the committee——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend until the committee comes to order.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The twenty minutes suggested by my colleague will be too short to consider the provisions of this long amendment. It makes very radical changes in two or three industries, and I apprehend gentlemen will want to know what those changes are, so that I suggest we have an adjournment for an hour earlier or give a longer time for consideration of these two propositions. They are both reported on favorably by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as equally satisfactory to him and as meeting the public requirements, but there is a difference on them between gentlemen.

Mr. McKINLEY. I make this suggestion and I think it will meet the views of my colleague and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SAWYER]. Now, the proposition that was last offered is a very long one, and in order that it may be understood I suggest that they both be printed in the RECORD to-morrow morning and that we spend an hour to-night debating them, explaining the points of one and the other, and then to-morrow have twenty minutes in which to conclude the debate.

Mr. McMILLIN. There ought to be a free discussion of the amendments that are here to be considered.

Mr. McKINLEY. An hour and a half can be used for their consideration.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have five or six amendments that I desire to offer, and there has not been a suitable opportunity to do it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That is because you have not been here.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I am aware of that, and am not discussing that. I desire to have them voted upon. We are trying to consider this proposition that is reported by the committee and the proposition offered by the gentleman from New York, and I do not know how we shall dispose of anything else. I would have been very glad to have an opportunity to offer these six or seven amendments that I now hold in my hand, but fear I will not have the opportunity to do so.

But as this proposition is now pending I do not know how we shall be able to dispose of much else. I am frank to say that I would have been glad of an opportunity to offer six or seven amendments to the bill and have them considered, and I know that several other gentlemen are in a like situation.

Mr. BAKER. I have one amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. McKINLEY. Why not go on with the discussion to-night?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. As to discussing the matter to-night, I have only to say that those who are to vote upon it are not here now.

A MEMBER. They will come back.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] how it has happened that he has been unable to offer his amendments under the ample facilities which his colleague from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY] states have been given for amending this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I suggest to my colleague [Mr. McKINLEY] that my friend from New York [Mr. SAWYER] state the substance of his proposition, and then it can be published in the RECORD, where members can see it, and probably thirty minutes' debate to-morrow will enable us to dispose of it.

Mr. BAKER. My colleague from New York [Mr. SAWYER] has a substitute, and I understand that both the original and the substitute are acceptable to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BAKER. I should like to have them explained.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that discussion be had upon these two propositions for the next three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. DUNNELL. That is too long; thirty minutes is enough.

Mr. McKINLEY. Well, then, for the next thirty minutes, and that in the morning ten minutes on each side be allowed for the discussion of the respective propositions.

Mr. BAKER. When do you propose to have a vote?

Mr. McKINLEY. We propose at 12 o'clock to-morrow to have a vote upon the bill and such amendments as shall have been reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the arrangement be as I have suggested.

Mr. HEARD. Thirty minutes is not enough. Several gentlemen have announced their desire to speak on this subject.

Mr. McKINLEY. Will you accept forty-five minutes?

Mr. HEARD. The original proposition was an hour.

Mr. McKINLEY. Is it an hour you want?

Mr. HEARD. Give us forty-five minutes after the reading of the amendment.

Mr. REILLY. I object. The trouble has been that the session of to-day and the greater part of the session of yesterday have been devoted to a few special subjects to the exclusion of others.

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

Mr. REILLY. I want only five minutes. I do not want to talk on this subject at all.

Mr. McKINLEY. Well, you can talk on another subject.

Mr. REILLY. But I shall not get the chance. You propose that the committee shall rise after the debate on the pending amendment is concluded.

Mr. McKINLEY and other members. Oh, no.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The understanding is that we are to have an hour's debate to-night and at the end of that time adjourn until what hour to-morrow?

Mr. McKINLEY. When the committee rise to-night and the House adjourns, it will be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Why not say 10 o'clock?

Mr. McKINLEY. We do not want to say 10 o'clock. We have been sitting here for a long time and everybody is very tired.

Mr. BAKER. I had the promise not only of the chairman of the Committee of the Whole, but also of my friend from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY] that I should have an opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. McKINLEY. I have not the slightest objection to the gentleman offering any amendment he desires at any time when he can get recognized for that purpose.

Has there been unanimous consent given to my request?

Several MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McKINLEY. My request is this, that we devote forty-five minutes to-night to the discussion of these two propositions and twenty minutes to-morrow and then vote upon them.

Mr. McRAE. I object, unless an opportunity can be given to amend the item in relation to jute bagging, and also to move to strike out the section giving a bounty on silk and cocoons. I am not going to consent that vinegar shall be considered while those two important subjects are ignored.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to restore tin to the free-list.

[Mr. GEISSENHAINER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Chairman, I give notice that I had important amendments to the bill pending, and I will object to any arrangement which would prevent them from being considered.

Mr. McKINLEY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the debate shall go on in the regular order.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Let the substitute be read.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, was the reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio concluded?

The CHAIRMAN. It was. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SAWYER] to the fact that a paper called a bill for a certain purpose has been forwarded by him to the Clerk's desk without any suggestions that it is an amendment or any suggestion as to the place where it is intended to come in.

Mr. SAWYER. I desire to substitute that as an amendment for the proposition of the committee. Let the Clerk strike out the formal parts of it, and then I will offer it as a substitute for the protection of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that we can not understand the effect of that amendment from the reading of it, so I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read and that the gentleman from New York have an opportunity to make a brief explanation of its purport.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. SAWYER is as follows:

No mash, wort, or wash fit for distillation, or for the production of spirits or alcohol, shall be made or fermented in any building or on any premises other than distillery duly authorized according to law; and no mash, wort, or wash so made and fermented shall be sold or removed from any distillery before being distilled; and no person other than an authorized distiller shall, by distillation or by any other process, separate the alcoholic spirits from any fermented mash, wort, or wash; and no persons shall use spirits or alcohol or any vapor of alcoholic spirits in manufacturing vinegar or any other article, or in process of manu ac ure whatever, unless the spirits or alcohol so used shall have been produced in an authorized distillery and the tax thereon paid. Every person who violates any p ovision sha l be fined for each offense not less than $500 nor more than $5,000 and be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than two years: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to fermented liquors: *Provided further*, That no vinegar factory shall be permitted within 600 feet of any distillery or rectifying house.

SEC. —. That distilled spirits upon which all taxes have been paid may hereafter be used in the manufacture of vinegar, with the privilege of drawback when received on the manufacturer's premises in the distiller's original casks or packages, and where the product of such manufacture contains not more than 2 per cent. of proof spirits. The drawback allowed shall be computed on the quantity of spirits actually used in the manufacture of such vinegar, and at the same rate per proof-gallon, as shown by the tax-paid stamp affixed to the cask or package containing the spirits. The evidence that the tax has been paid, and that the spirits have been so used, shall be furnished to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by the manufacturer claiming the allowance of drawback, and under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may from time to time prescribe. Any sums found to be due under the provisions of this act shall be paid by a warrant of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Treasurer of the United States, out of any money arising from internal duties not otherwise appropriated; but no claim for a fractional part of the contents of any cask or package used in the manufacture of such vinegar shall be entertained or allowed, nor where the amount claimed is less than $20; nor shall any such claim be entertained or allowed unless filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within thirty days from the expiration of the month in which spirits were removed from the distiller's original cask or package for the purpose aforesaid.

SEC. —. That every person engaged in the business of manufacturing vinegar from distilled spirits, before being entitled to the drawback provided for in the preceding section, shall file with the collector of the district in which such business is to be carried on a notice, in duplicate, under oath, setting forth his name and residence, and if a company or firm, the name and residence of every member thereof; the name and residence of the owner or owners of the premises on which the business is to be carried on; the name and residence of every person interested or to be interested in the business; the precise place where the business is to be carried on; the process by which the applicant intends to manufacture vinegar from distilled spirits; the estimated quantity of vinegar, in gallons, at a given strength, which can be produced at his factory or establishment every twenty-four hours, and the estimated quantity of distilled spirits, in proof-gallons, required for the manufacture thereof; one copy of which notice to be retained by the collector and one copy to be forwarded to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In case of any change in the location, form, capacity, ownership, agency, superintendency, or persons interested in the business so carried on, or in case of any change in the process of manufacture, notice thereof shall be given to the said collector within twenty-four hours after such change; and upon the receipt of any distilled spirits on the manufacturer's premises an entry thereof, in duplicate, shall be made by the manufacturer and filed with the collector, one copy of which entry shall be forwarded to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; and the notice and entry required by this section shall be in such form and shall contain such particulars as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may from time to time prescribe.

SEC. —. That every manufacturer of vinegar shall, on filing his notice of intention to carry on such business, and on the 1st day of May of each succeeding year, execute a bond in duplicate, and in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that the principal shall faithfully comply with all the provisions of law and regulations relating to the business to be carried on by him, and shall pay all taxes, penalties, or fines incurred by or imposed on him for a violation of any of said provisions; and the said bond shall be signed by at least two good and sufficient sureties, to be approved by the collector of the district, and for a penal sum of not less than double the amount of tax on the spirits which can be manufactured into vinegar during a period of fifteen days, to be compared from the estimated daily capacity as shown by said notice; but in no case shall the penal sum of said bond be less than $500; the original of such bond to be retained by the collector of the district and the duplicate thereof to be forwarded to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. And in case of death, insolvency, or removal of either of the sureties to said bond or in any other contingency in the discretion of the collector or the Commissioner of Internel Revenue, a new bond shall be required.

SEC. —. That every manufacturer of vinegar who has given the notice and bond prescribed in the preceding section shall provide a book, to be prepared and kept in such form as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe, and shall enter therein the transactions of each day; and such entries shall show the quantity of spirits and other materials received on the premises each day to be used in the manufacture of vinegar, the name of the person from whom such spirits or materials were purchased and received, and, in case of distilled spirits, the name of the distiller by whom and the district in which such spirits were produced, the serial number of each cask or package containing such spirits, and the actual contents of such casks or packages, in wine and proof gallons, when so received. He shall also enter in said book the day on which and the purpose for which the spirits so received were removed from each of said casks or packages, and the quantity of such spirits and the quantity of all other materials used in the manufacture of vinegar; the quantity of vinegar, in gallons, and the strength thereof, manufactured during each period of twenty-four hours; the quantity of vinegar removed from the premises each day, and the names and residences of the purchasers or consignees to whom each lot so removed was sold or consigned. And the said manufacturer shall, on or before the tenth day of each month, make a full and complete transcript, in duplicate, of all entries made in such book during the preceding month, and shall, after verifying the same by oath, forward the same to the collector of the district, one copy of which shall be forwarded to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The book herein prescribed shall be kept on the manufacturer's premises and shall at all times be open for the inspection of any revenue officer, who shall also at all times have access to the premises for the purpose of inspecting said premises, or any stock, vessel, utensil, apparatus, or appliances found thereon; and the said manufacturers shall, on the demand of such officer, furnish all needful assistance and appliances to enable the said officer to make such examination and inspection; and when the book herein prescribed has been filed it shall be preserved by said manufacturer for a period not less than two years, and during such time it shall be produced by him to every revenue officer demanding it.

SEC. —. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may himself, or through the collector of the district, assign at any vinegar factory where distilled spirits are used with benefit of drawback an internal-revenue gauger, or a storekeeper and gauger, who shall perform the duties prescribed by the Commissioner, including the weighing, gauging, testing, and inspecting all distilled spirits and other materials received on the premises or in the process of manufacture, and all vinegar and other article or substance which may be manufactured on the premises or removed therefrom, and the said officer shall, at the time of gauging any distilled spirits received on the premises, remove all tax-paid stamps found upon the packages containing the spirits, and shall dispose of such stamps and shall perform such other duties and make such returns as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by regulations may prescribe. And the said Commissioner may, in his discretion, prescribe and have affixed to any cask or vessel on the manufacturer's premises suitable manufacturing stamps and brands, the stamps to be engraved and labels provided and furnished by the several collectors as in the case of other stamps and labels and to be charged to them and accounted for in the same manner; and for the expense attending and affixing such labels and stamps 10 cents for each stamp or label affixed shall be paid to the collector by the manufacturer; and all such stamps and labels so affixed shall be canceled and removed, or otherwise disposed of, at such time and in such manner as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe. It shall not be lawful for any person to remove any spirits from any cask or package inspected and gauged under the provisions of this act except for the purpose herein named, or to remove from the manufacturer's premises any cask or vessel containing such spirits; and all spirits and all casks or vessels removed in violation of this section, together with the spirits or other substances contained therein, shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. —. That any person who shall violate any provision of this act, or who shall make or render any false or fraudulent notice, entry, bond, or account under this act, or under any regulation issued in pursuance thereof, shall be fined not less than $500 and not more than $5,000, and be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than three years; and every person who shall, under the provisions of this act, fraudulently claim or seek to obtain any allowance or drawback, or shall fraudulently claim any greater allowance or drawback than the tax actually paid on the spirits used as aforesaid, in the manufacture of vinegar, shall, in addition to the fines and penalties herein imposed, forfeit triple the amount wrongfully or fraudulently claimed or sought to be obtained; and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may, from time to time, prescribe such rules and regulations respecting the receiving, using, and accounting of distilled spirits at vinegar factories, and the marking, stamping, and branding of packages containing vinegar, and the allowance of drawback on spirits so used as will protect the Treasury of the United States against fraud.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated here we have what is called the vaporizing process for making white-wine vinegar. Under the provisions of the law the manufacturers of white-wine vinegar carry on the process of distilling from corn, rye, and malt the alcohol which they use in the manufacture of their vinegar. It is conceded, as I understand, that to a greater or less extent frauds have been committed, and the alcohol which has been distilled in partial distilleries has been sold, to the prejudice of the rights of the common distillers, an undue advantage being thus gained, as is claimed, over the manufacturers of cider vinegar. The amendment proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means gives to the manufacturers of white-wine vinegar the power to continue their process of distilling their own alcohol.

It is true the provisions of that proposition have been guarded under the advice of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but the point is here: Under the amendment of the committee the manufacturers of white-wine vinegar distill their own alcohol free of any tax to the Government, and they not only get the alcohol which they distill for the manufacture of their vinegar, but they also get the additional advantage of having the refuse to use in the manufacture of compressed yeast.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. What does your substitute propose?

Mr. SAWYER. The substitute I have offered takes away from the manufacturers of white-wine vinegar all right to distill alcohol, but it allows them on the alcohol which they buy a rebate for the tax. In other words, under this provision the manufacturers of white-wine vinegar get a privilege that no other manufacturing industry has: the privilege of getting all the alcohol they want to use free of any Government tax.

Mr. DALZELL. Is it not a fact that under your amendment the men who have invested capital in the purchase of machinery, the erection of a plant, etc., for the manufacture of vinegar under the existing law will lose all that they have thus invested?

Mr. SAWYER. I will answer that question in a very few words. according to the testimony of the leading representatives of the white-wine-vinegar industry, it is claimed that with their machinery they can make just as strong alcohol and as much per bushel as the regular distillers, and that if they can put a worm—I think that is the word; I do not know what it is [laughter]—if they can put a worm in their present plant, they have a regular full-fledged distillery. Now, if they do not want to purchase their alcohol, let them put in the worm as part of their plant and let them go on and run their establishments as regular distilleries.

If a druggist engaged in compounding medicine wants to use alcohol he is not permitted to distill it; he must buy it and pay the tax. Now, what the cider-vinegar men want is this: That the white-wine vinegar men shall be content with the privilege of getting their alcohol free of any Government tax at all; that is all the advantage they ought to claim.

Mr. LANSING. Is there not a charge that the manufacturers of this white-wine vinegar do make alcohol, putting the worm in surreptitiously?

Mr. SAWYER. Yes. Only a few weeks ago in the city of New York one of the leading men engaged in this white-wine-vinegar business was arrested; and if he had not happened to be put in jail on the ground that he belonged to the Tammany organization he would have been convicted before this time. [Laughter.] In Chicago, within a few weeks, another man was arrested on a similar charge.

Mr. LIND. Will you let me ask you a question? You are advocating an amendment to compel the manufacturers of white-wine vinegar to buy alcohol.

Mr. SAWYER. That is one thing we want.

Mr. LIND. Now, do you think it is just to compel the vinegar manufacturers in my district to go down into Kentucky or Illinois to buy alcohol from the whisky trust, instead of getting the necessary cereals from the farmers in the surrounding country?

A MEMBER. Do you make any alcohol in your State?

Mr. LIND. No, sir.

A MEMBER. You make vinegar?

Mr. LIND. We do.

Mr. SAWYER. There are two competing methods of manufacturing vinegar, one from apples, the other from corn, rye, and malt. Now, the materials used in the manufacture of white-wine vinegar can be used for numerous other purposes, but the materials used in the manufacture of cider vinegar must be used for that purpose only or they are entirely valueless.

Now, the cider-vinegar men say that if the white-wine men alone of all the varied industries of the country are permitted to get alcohol free of duty they ought not to be permitted to manufacture and sell alcohol and come in competition not only with the cider-vinegar men, but with the regular distilling industries of the country.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman, we have witnessed some very remarkable spectacles since this debate began. This Committee of the Whole decided to-day to give a bounty of 2 cents a pound on sugar produced in the United States. Other farmers are to be taxed to pay this bounty, but they get no bounty themselves. The average farmer nowadays is lucky if at the end of the year he has money enough left to buy his wife a calico dress: yet this committee has also decided to tax him a dollar for every pound of silk that may be raised in this country. He is to be taxed to cheapen silk that can never be worn by the wives of the poor. After all this, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STEWART] offered an amendment to put on a bounty on maple sugar—a product of his State—of 2 cents a pound. This the House refused. Although the voters in the State of Vermont have voted for a high tariff until they have absolutely impoverished themselves——

Mr. BOUTELLE. What?

Mr. HERBERT (continuing). I have never seen such a manifestation of ingratitude on this floor as the refusal of the Republican party here to give to the people in the State of Vermont just simply 2 cents a pound upon their maple sugar.

Another spectacle was witnessed yesterday that is just about as singular. It was a fight between two interests here, the advocates of lead ore on the one hand and of the smelters on the other. The smelters contended that the twenty-four establishments which had grown up under the ruling of the former Secretaries of the Treasury, which let in certain lead ores free from Mexico, would be absolutely ruined if Congress should put the proposed duty of 3 cents a pound upon these ores. The question was whether the smelters of lead ores were to go or the diggers of lead ores.

Our Republican friends on that issue, Mr. Chairman, decided that the smelters must go; there were more voters who were digging ore than there were smelters who were engaged in smelting ore. And the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], who was one of the most zealous advocates of this duty of 3 cents on these ores and of the high tariff, went on to say that in white lead, one of the products of lead and one used all over the country, there was a trust, and nobody denied it.

Under this trust he said the price of white lead, which had been $5.83 per 100 pounds in 1887, had risen in the next year to $6.25 per 100 pounds, the next year to $7 per 100 pounds, and this year to $7.25 per 100 pounds.

But the duty this committee have decided must stand even though the trust stands. The people foot the bills and the Republican party seems to be content.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country, most of whom are not and can not be protected by any tariff laws the Government could pass, because the price of their products is regulated by foreign markets, are in a distressing condition. All over the country their homesteads are covered with mortgages. They have slaved and toiled. Heaven has blessed many of them with abundant crops, but the money is all gone to swell the coffers of those who are rolling in wealth. A war tariff for twenty-five years has hedged us about to keep away the cheap goods that the French and the Germans and the English would sell us. At the time this war tariff was passed the chairman of the committee that reported it, Mr. MORRILL, promised that when peace should come it would be reduced. It was only to be excused then, he said, by the necessity of raising money to carry on the war. But when the soldiers had all gone home and the revenues were no longer needed the manufacturers determined that this tariff wall which shut out foreign competition should not be lowered, and by their influence with the Republican party they have kept up war-tariff rates.

Now they have grown bolder than ever and this "bill of abominations" before us is the result of their dictation. There is being annually collected $100,000,000 more than is necessary for the expenditures of the Government. We ought to have before us a bill to reduce taxation. We passed such a bill through the last Democratic House; but the Senate was Republican and defeated it. We went to the country on that issue. Through bribery and corruption and by appeals to sectional prejudice the Republicans elected their President by a narrow margin, and by the same means they carried this House. And now we have here, not a bill "to reduce taxation," but a bill which, by its official title, is "to reduce the revenue," etc. How this is to be done the committee in their report explain—

> We seek by the increased duties recommended not only to maintain, but to enlarge our own manufacturing plants and check those supplies from abroad which can be profitably produced at home.

Here is a broad admission that in the opinion of the Republican majority of the committee our consumers are, even now, getting the necessaries of life too cheaply.

The agriculturists of the country have grown poor in paying prices that are 30, 40, 50, and often 100 per cent. higher than they need pay in foreign markets, and the monopolists demand that they shall pay higher prices still. "The increased duties recommended," say the committee, "are to check those supplies from abroad," that is to say, supplies of cheap clothing, table-ware, cutlery, household goods, etc., wanted by the farmers and other consumers, and "which," the report goes on to say, "can be profitably produced at home." "Profitably produced" by whom? Why, by the manufacturer, of course. He is the beneficiary of this bill. And there is no promise in the bill or in the report or in the facts of either the present or the past that this tariff is ever to be any less. If twenty-eight years of high tariff in the past brings an increase of rates now, let me ask here, Mr. Chairman, what will be the outcome of the future?

REPUBLICAN REPUDIATION OF HENRY CLAY'S DOCTRINES.

The reasonable doctrine of protection as held by Henry Clay was that infant industries were to be protected in order that in the end they might be able to compete with foreign markets.

June 2, 1864, Senator MORRILL, then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of this House, said: "Protection was never defended on any other ground than that; in the end the consumer obtained his supplies more cheaply." But now the doctrines of Henry Clay have been thrown to the winds; now the theories held by Republican leaders twenty years ago have been abandoned, for the Republican party has marched up and taken the position that Congress must "prohibit the introduction of foreign goods" in order to give to each American industry "control of the American market"—in the words of the report, revise the laws so as to "check supplies from abroad." To give any industry "control of the American market," which is to put duties so high as to take away all danger of foreign competition, is to place the consumer at the mercy, not of the workers, the laborers in that industry, but in the power of the capitalists, who control its products.

If this control be given to one man or one corporation a monopoly is at once established. If there be several corporations engaged in the manufacture they have all the benefits of a monopoly if only, as the law invites them to do, they will combine and form a trust. The public is at their mercy, for they can raise prices at will, as the bagging trust has done. The laborer is at their mercy, for they can limit production and turn their hands out of employment, all the time increasing their own profits. This is what the American Steel Association, the great exemplar of trusts, did away back some sixteen years ago. It paid the Vulcan Works of St. Louis at the rate of $70,000 per annum to shut down and turn its hands out of employment.

This is what the sugar trust did two years ago. It shut down its works at Boston and turned out its operatives. No one man in America can tell the extent of these combinations among capitalists, because most of them are kept secret. A friend of mine, himself a tariff reformer, told me not long since that he was interested in four different sorts of manufactures. In one of these he had no fear of competition, but in each of the other three there was an agreement as to prices with other manufacturers of the product. It can not be otherwise. Can gentlemen give to manufacturers absolute control of our market and then expect them not to control prices? And how can they control prices without combinations? Do you take them to be weak enough to deprive themselves by competition of all benefit of the market you have handed over to them?

Sometimes they are. When profits are so great that "fortunes are to be made in a year," then competition is often for a time very sharp; then comes overproduction, then bankruptcy, then operatives go tramping over the country, for our high tariff is the parent of the trust and the tramp. Everybody condemns trusts, which are combinations to raise prices, almost always, too, on the necessaries of life—conspiracies of a few rich men to rob the poor. Everybody knows, too, that these combinations, facilitated by railroads and telegraphs, are becoming more common day by day.

Look at that infamous combination, the bagging trust, that raised prices two years ago from about 8 to 13 cents a yard. Thank God the farmers who have come together in self defense now have the strong hand of the Alliance on its throat and have already brought it to its knees. I hope they will strangle it to death.

Mr. Chairman, no reasonable man objects to the establishment of home manufactures. All would be glad to see them prosper. No one objects to seeing them enjoy the benefit that would accrue to them from any fair and reasonable adjustment of tariff duties;

but the existing tariff is an injustice that cries out to Heaven, and the bill we are discussing is a monstrosity that ought to, and I believe will, raise a storm of indignation among the farmers of the North and Northwest, who have so long submitted to the merciless exactions of heartless monopolies.

It can not be explained to the people too often that the tariff is a tax and a burdensome tax. Let me read from my speech here of October, 1888, for I can not express myself more plainly:

A tariff is simply a tax imposed upon goods at the custom-house when they are imported into the United States. Whoever buys and imports a hat, paying for it at $1, and pays a tax upon it at the custom-house of 50 cents, has paid for the article $1.50. The importer, when he sells this article, must have his profit equally upon the money he paid for the article abroad and the money he paid for the right to introduce it. Suppose that the profits made by a wholesale dealer who has imported and paid duty on this hat amount to 10 per cent. The hat has cost him $1.50; his 10 per cent. profit is 15 cents. Adding these two together, the price the retail merchant pays for the hat is $1.65. Now, if the retail merchant makes, as he must, a profit of at least 20 per cent., his profit on the $1.65 he paid amounts to 33 cents. Adding this profit to what the hat cost him, which was $1.65, and the price of the hat to the consumer, the man who buys the hat of the retail dealer, is $1.98.

THE SUGAR BOUNTY.

There is practically but one concession to the consumer in this bill, the free sugar I spoke of. The bill makes imported sugar free and gives to the home producer 2 cents per pound as a bounty.

This is a confession by the Republicans of what many of them have heretofore denied, that the tariff is a tax. The majority report says, page 14:

In 1889 the duties collected on imported sugar and molasses amounted to $55,975,610. Add to this the increase of price of domestic sugar arising from the duty, and it is clear that the duty on sugar and molasses made the cost of the sugar and molasses consumed by the people of this country at least $64,000,000, or about $1 for each man, woman, and child in the United States more than it would have been if no such duties had been levied and the domestic product had remained the same.

In other words, this report means that the consumers of the United States are paying now in round numbers $8,000,000 to the American producers of sugar and $56,000,000 of duty on imported sugar, which duty goes to the Government as revenue. That is to say, the Government gets seven-eighths of all the increased price which the tariff compels the American people to pay for their sugar. This seven-eighths which now goes to the Government the bill proposes to release, and then it gives the American producer a direct bounty of 2 cents per pound, so that his sugar will net the producer nearly as much as it does now. This bounty the Government is to pay out of taxes collected from the people at large.

The exact product in 1888 of American sugar was 375,304,197 pounds. At 2 cents the bounty on this would amount to $7,506,083.94. This sum, if the production should remain as at present, the Government is to pay each year, for fifteen years—in all, over $112,000,000. But the theory on which it is sought to defend the bounty is that this contribution from the other industries to the sugar producing will encourage the making of sugar, so that at some time in the future—fifteen years seems to be the period fixed by the bill—we will make in the United States all the sugar we then consume. Our population in 1888 we may estimate at 62,000,000. Fifteen years hence we shall have probably 90,000,000 of people. The estimate of the Ways and Means Committee is that we consume 53 pounds to the inhabitant. If at the end of that fifteen years we should make our own supply and each inhabitant be then paying 2 cents per pound bounty, $1.06 on what he consumes, it will be a tax of over $90,000,000 per annum. Now, calculating that the production of sugar should have increased by regular gradations each year till we come to make our own supply at the end of the period, and we will have paid an average each year of not less than $45,000,000, and in the fifteen years will have paid $675,000,000 as bounty to the sugar producers—all put upon us by this proposed tax and not $1 of it going to the support of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are only beginning to discover by this mode of reasoning how the tariff takes from the people their hard earnings. The Republican leaders admit by this bill and by their report, as I have shown, that the tariff is a tax, for they claim that by taking off the tariff on sugar they relieve the people of a tax to the extent of about $1 per inhabitant. But if a tariff on sugar is a tax on the consumer, so is the tariff on every other article; and if this tax on imported sugar raises the price of the home-made sugar, so does the tariff on imported woolens raise the price of home-made woolens; so does the tariff on imported cutlery and crockery-ware and blankets and hats raise the price of home-manufactured cutlery and crockery-ware and blankets and hats.

Now let us take an article like woolen goods, of which we import only one-fifth. That duty-paying fifth regulates the price of the other four-fifths manufactured in this country. The manufacturer, where he makes an article equal to the imported article, charges you the price at which the imported article sells with the duty added. He will sell no lower than the price of the competing article compels him to sell. And on what you buy from the home manufacturer the Government gets nothing; so that whenever the American consumer buys of any particular line of goods four times as much from the home manufacturer as he does from the importer, then he is paying out $4 to the manufacturer and $1 to the Government. In other words, in that case the Government taxes the consumer $5 to get $1 into the Treasury. What our Republican friends really mean by these increased duties is that we shall not even pay that one-fifth into the Treasury. They intend to divert that also into the pockets of the manufacturers by "checking those supplies from abroad which can be profitably produced at home."

Let me take the figures as to woolen goods imported as shown by the Government reports, and the figures as to domestic manufactures of woolen goods according to the best estimates that can be made:

Year 1888, woolen goods imported	$52,681,482,56
Sixty-seven per cent. duties collected	35,373,627,05
Making invoice price to purchasers	88,055,109,61

The estimated amount of similar goods manufactured in the United States during the same year was $450,000,000. Now, if to make up this price of $400,000,000 the manufacturers have charged in the increased price the 67 per cent. increase allowed by the tariff, then, divested of this increase, the goods, if imported duty free, would have cost the consumers $270,000,000 instead of $450,000,000. In other words, the people paid in 1888 "to maintain and increase," in the language of the committee, "our manufacturing plants" of woolens $180,000,000, or nearly $3 per inhabitant.

That the manufacturers are making this increased charge against the people is evident. If they did not intend to charge the people higher prices still, they would not need these higher tariff rates.

The only answer the advocates of these high protective rates are able to make to this argument is that goods are, many of them, cheaper now than they were twenty and thirty years ago, and they say the high tariff did it, because the high tariff has been in existence all the time and the goods have gone down. If that reasoning is good, then it is the high tariff that has brought down the price of the farmer's wheat, and his corn, and his pork. Everybody knows that the high tariff had nothing to do with this fall in agricultural products. Railroads have opened up the fertile lands of the West, brought millions of acres into cultivation, and carried the products of these farms into the markets of the world. Improved machinery, gang-plows, and threshers and binders enable one man to cultivate and harvest now as many acres as three men could in days gone by. This it is that has multiplied and cheapened Western produce.

So it is in manufacturing, and even to a greater extent. New inventions, improved processes, these have done the work of multiplying and cheapening products in a manner that is marvelous. One hand in a factory can spin nearly forty times as much as a hand could spin with a wheel seventy-five years ago. Machinery is used everywhere and in almost every branch of manufactures. Goods are so rapidly and easily manufactured that every man who is a faithful laborer ought to have now for himself all the necessaries, and many of the comforts of life that once were luxuries only to be had by the rich. Gentlemen have paraded in this debate invoices of crockery-ware bought in Chicago in 1860 and 1890, to show that those articles are cheaper now than in 1860, and they demand a still higher tariff. The present high rates are not enough to shut out the foreign goods. Why? Because prices have fallen more rapidly abroad than here.

Be just to every man is the Democratic doctrine. Let all have a fair share of those good things which a higher civilization is multiplying day by day for the uses of man. But the high tariff monopolists who control the Republican party claim all the benefits of human invention, all the cream of the world, for themselves.

The present tariff is already monstrous in its discriminations in favor of the rich and against the poor.

I take the following tables, by permission, from the able speech of my friend from Illinois [Mr. WIKE]:

Table contrasting the tariff duties on articles in the nature of luxuries with those on the necessaries of life; compiled from the official reports of the Treasury Department for the year ending June 30, 1889, except as to last-named three comparisons, which are taken from a former report of the Treasury.

IN THE NATURE OF LUXURIES.

	Per cent.
Diamonds (rough)	Free.
Diamonds (cut)	10
Attar of roses	Free.
Straws for juleps	20
Birds' nests	20
Alabaster and spar, statuary and ornaments	10
Silk (raw)	Free.
Skeletons and crude bladders	Free.
Amber, ambergris, and bergamot	Free.
Chocolate	8
Canes and walking-sticks	20 to 35
Sachet powder	20
Amber beads	Free.
Feathers (for beds) and down	Free.
Sago and tapioca for the gentry	Free.
Fashion plates	Free.
Furs, fur-skins and catgut	Free.
Plum pudding	20
Spices	5 to 10
Toothpicks	20
Stuffed birds	Free.
Fossils and joss sticks	Free.
Ivory coral (unmanufactured)	Free.
Gold size	Free.
Meerschaum	Free.

NECESSARIES OF LIFE.

	Per cent.
Sugar	70
Sugar (highest rate)	108
Castor-oil	200
Salt (in bulk)	85
Woolen cloth (cheap)	95
Steel and iron beams, joists, and structural forms	115
Spool thread	61
Glass and glassware	58
Window-glass	114
Chicory	62
Cotton cloth	40 to 73
Burlaps and cotton bagging	30 to 54
Earthern and china ware	57
Rice	117
Coarse woolen shawls	88
Blankets and flannels	70 to 82
Woolen clothing	58
Nails, spikes, tacks, etc	52
Wool hats and yarn	70
Galvanized wire, iron	72
Lumber, per 1,000 feet	200
Highest rate on wool	125
Sheet iron	81 to 90
Starch	92
Trace-chains	50
Steel railway bars	72

	Per cent.
For the rich:	
Fine worsted trousering, costing at factory $3.36 per yard	58⅓
Beaver cloth, costing at factory $3.36 per yard	56⅓
Broadcloth, costing at factory $3.60 per yard	50⅛
For the poor:	
Cotton-warp cloth, costing at factory 64 cents per yard	121½
Cotton-warp melton, costing 24 cents per yard	153⅛
Cotton-warp reversible cloth, costing at factory 45 cents per yard	180¾

The tariff bill now under discussion contains even more glaring discriminations against the poor and in favor of the rich than the present law; for, while it mitigates none of the hardships of the present system, it introduces a more general discrimination, as the following table, compiled from the minority report on the proposed bill, will show:

Articles.	Per cent.
For the poor:	
Lowest grade of woolen yarn	112
Coarse, cheap blankets	106
Coarse, cheap wool hats	111
Women's and children's cheapest cotton-warp dress goods	106
Lowest grade woolen cloth	125
Cheapest quality knit goods for underwear	112 to 138
Coarse, lowest grade woolen shawls	135
Coarse, lowest grade worsted goods	130
For the rich:	
Costly yarn	72
Finest blankets	72
Finest wool hats	66
Finest quality women's and children's dress goods	73
Highest wool cloths	68
Best quality wool knit goods	78
Highest grade woolen shawls	90
Finest quality worsted goods	90

Table showing present duty and the duty proposed by pending bill on the articles named.

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Worsteds, knit goods under 30 cents	73.20	130
Worsteds, knit goods, 30 to 40 cents	66.73	147
Worsteds, knit goods, 40 to 60 cents	68.49	130
Worsteds, knit goods, 60 to 80 cents	68.24	112
Worsteds, knit goods, above 80 cents	52.96	90
Worsted shawls	61.82	93
Belts for presses (printing)	53.14	101
Blankets and flannels and hats	69.70	110
Women's and children's dress goods	68	103
Women's and children's dress goods	60	73
Women's and children's dress goods	85	110
Clothing, ready-made	54	84
Cloaks, dolmans, etc	60	82
Webbings and gorings, etc	64	99
Common window-glass, 10 by 15	67.61	73.72
Common window-glass, 16 by 24	115.41	123.10
Common window-glass, 24 by 30	128.58	135.34
Common window-glass, above that	132.29	138.04
Freestone, granite	20.22	40
Freestone, granite, hewn or dressed	20	50
Cotton-ties	35	115
Tin-plate	34	74
Steel ingots, etc., above 16 cents per pound	36	45
Wire fence rods, No. 6	45	54
Penknives, etc	50	75
Table cutlery	35	50
Shotguns	35	60
Mica	Free.	35
Horses	20	70
Cattle	20	61.94
Hogs	20	45.68
Sheep	20	50
Eggs	Free.	32.91
Plants, trees, etc	Free.	20
Fish, fresh	Free.	52.10
Tobacco	81	200
Plushes	40	100
Hosiery	40	60
Shirts and drawers	40	65
Burlaps	30	50
Brown and bleached linens	35	50
Brown and bleached linens	35	60
Yarns	35	100

TOTAL COST TO THE PEOPLE OF HIGH TARIFF.

My friend, Mr. WIKE, pursuing the calculations on the other schedules in like manner as I have given them on the sugar and woolen schedules, estimates the total annual cost of the tariff to the people as between one billion and one billion two hundred million of dollars.

He does not pretend that the figures are accurate, but they give some idea of the silent, stealthful robbery of the people that has been going on for twenty-five years.

Estimated on Mr. WIKE's calculations and putting the present population at 64,000,000, the annual cost of the tariff to each man, woman, and child in America has been at least $18; to a family of five, $90 a year, and to each such family for the whole twenty-five years past $2,250. If the farmer in the Northwest and in the South will ponder upon these things he will understand why it is that in America there are so many rich manufacturers, who pile in money to swell the corruption fund in political campaigns, who give dinners in America that eclipse the world in extravagance, who ride in bedizened coaches and four over the turnpikes of Europe, who rent castles in Scotland and on the Rhine, and whose highest ambition seems to be, spurning the plain ways of the American people, to marry their daughters to those seedy scions of spendthrift aristocracy who are ever on the watch to trade their titles of nobility for the fortunes of foolish American women; and they will understand, too, how it is that there are so many impoverished American farmers.

To the cotton-grower of the South who sends abroad to seek a market two-thirds of his crop and to the Western farmer the prices of whose grain and provisions are regulated by the foreign market, I think I need not say more than this on the tariff.

But let me add that cotton-ties and tin-plates and the materials of which fertilizers are made are all singled out in this bill for further taxation. Gentlemen have sought to quiet the farmer by increasing the tariff on certain farm products, when every one knows that the prices of those articles which are largely exported are governed by the foreign market. No merchant will ship a bale of cotton or a bushel of wheat abroad if he can sell it for as much at home as he can get in the foreign market. He only ships it when he can get abroad as much as the home market will yield, with freight and commissions added. So it is that the Liverpool market regulates the price of cotton and of breadstuffs.

Gentlemen would lull the Western farmer with pretended protection in this bill of his products. What is that protection worth? The home market was disturbed last year by the importation of the following values, amounting to not a drop in the bucket:

Lard		$88.00
Pork		978.00
Corn		1,212.70
Corn-meal		352.75
Rye	bushels	16
Wheat	do	1,946¾

The value of these articles exported in the same year was $142,000,000.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY RESPONSIBLE.

Now, Mr. Chairman, who is responsible for this tariff? The Republican party. Who made it? The Republican party. Who maintains it? The Republican party. Who proposes to perpetuate it and increase it? The Republican party. For one I am glad that the farmers of the country are looking around them to find out the causes of their distress. They will certainly discover the true reasons which lie at the foundations of present conditions before they cease to inquire. They may make some mistakes. It is human to err. They may even strike down some of their friends for a time, but just as sure as there is a God who overrules and guides the deliberations of honest men just so surely will intelligent public opinion settle down at last upon the solid foundations of everlasting truth, and then wo be to the Republican party! I believe that the mighty movement among the farmers that is so stirring the foundations of society to-day is but the first step that is to lead within the next two years to the overthrow of the Republican party that has so long legislated for the benefit of the classes and against the rights of the masses.

Look at the record of that party on questions of taxation. When taxes were to be abolished who was it that was favored? Let the following table, prepared by a Republican official, tell the tale:

Table showing amount and kind of internal revenue repealed since 1866 *(from Report of Commissioner of Internal Revenue for* 1880).

1.	Manufacturing products	$127,230,608.66
2.	Gross receipts, railroads, etc	11,262,429.82
3.	Sales, stocks, gold, etc	4,002,282,91
4.	Special taxes, etc	14,844,418.05
5.	Incomes	72,982,159.03
6.	Legacies	924,823.97
7.	Successions	246,154.88
8. 9.	Miscellaneous	1,693,122.73 3,750,037.32
	Total	236,236,037.37

I have voted whenever opportunity offered in this House to restore the tax on incomes which the Republicans abolished soon after the war. Such a law, imposing a tax on incomes over a certain sum, would lift some of the burdens of Government off the shoulders of the poor and put them on the rich, who derive more benefit from the strong arm of the Government that protects their property and who are better able to bear taxation. The rich menof monarchical Britain pay taxes on their incomes. Why should not the rich men of America? The answer is: The Republican party resists and defeats the proposition whenever it is made.

Let me give one instance where I have the figures before me. May 12, 1879, Mr. Dibrell, of Tennessee, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill imposing an income tax. A two-thirds vote was required to pass it. The yeas were 111, the nays 94. Voting for it were 101 Democrats, with 10 Republicans and Greenbackers. Voting against it, only 9 Democrats and 83 Republicans.

Now for other specimen votes to show how parties stand.

On the 30th of June, 1880, Mr. McKenzie, of Kentucky, moved to suspend the rules and place quinine on the free-list. This motion

was carried. It appealed so strongly and so directly to the popular sympathy in favor of the poor and the sick that this time 22 Republicans were found in the House ready to vote with the Democrats. These, added to the 106 Democrats who voted for it, were sufficient to carry it. Only 2 Democrats in the House were found to vote against this bill.

January 12, 1880, a motion was made by Mr. HATCH, a Democrat, to make all salt free: 100 Democrats voted for it and only 12 against it. But it failed, for of all the Republicans in the House, aided by the Greenbackers, only 15 were found to vote for it, and 104 Republicans voted squarely against it.

FINANCIAL POLICY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

A sound currency and plenty of it is essential to the prosperity of a people. Silver and gold are the money of the Constitution. The bonds of the United States were originally payable in currency. A Republican Congress made them payable in coin, by which it has been estimated the bondholders made a profit of $500,000,000. The next step the Republican party took to increase the value of these and all other bonds was to join in the movement that had been started by the capitalists of Europe to increase the value of their securities and demonetize silver. These capitalists thought there was too much money. The workingmen and land-owners were everywhere prospering. All business was thriving because of the increase of money that annually came from the mines of Australia and California when this movement began. But the rich men, the owners of bonds and other sources of fixed incomes, got control. These incomes were becoming less valuable and they induced many European Governments to demonetize silver. The American bondholder fell into line. He controlled the Republican party and the Republican party controlled the Government. So silver was demonetized.

The next step was to retire the greenback circulation and leave no currency but gold and silver and national-bank notes. By the act of 1875 a Republican Congress directed the Secretary of the Treasury to destroy all the greenbacks as they came into the Treasury. It was the financial policy of this party that had caused the panic of 1873, the effects of which were still lingering like a deadly blight over the land, and this act of 1875 but deepened the gloom. It was passed by an outgoing Congress, just as the victorious Democracy was coming into possession of this House, as it did in December, 1875. This was the financial condition the Democrats of the Forty-fourth Congress were confronted with. They tried to remonetize silver, but they failed. They tried other measures of relief, but they failed. The Senate was Republican and the President was a Republican.

But in the Forty-fifth Congress, aided by public sentiment they had created, the Democracy did succeed in stopping the retirement of greenbacks, and did succeed in partially remonetizing silver. I voted for both these measures. We were compelled to accept the law providing for the coinage of not less than two nor more than four millions of dollars. But the silver dollar, the dollar of the poor man, was restored as a legal-tender. Since then we have had coined at least $2,000,000 per annum. It was the Democracy, too, that forced through the law providing for the issuance of silver certificates based on silver dollars in the Treasury. These silver laws alone have saved us from another panic, but still we have not money enough for our expanding business and growing population.

In my opinion we would not be suffering so much as we are to-day from the depression that exists if the Treasury Department had coined each month up to the limit of the law. Yet, Mr. Chairman, more money alone would not and could not give to the farmers of this country the relief they need. It matters not what the volume of the currency may be, so long as so large a percentage of their earnings is drawn from the agricultural class and drained into the pockets of the monopolists who are bleeding them to death, the farmers can not have real prosperity. They must have relief from unjust taxation too. Allow the farmer to work for himself and not for another, and then he will ask no favors of any man that he does not stand ready to pay for. Let us coin the silver dollars, let us turn loose at least a hundred millions of the reserve that is in the national banks and locked up unnecessarily in the Treasury of the United States; let us reduce, not revenues alone, but taxation also, and let the people keep their money in their own pockets, and then we shall have the Government again that the fathers founded, and the people will rise up to bless us.

The fifth section of the St. Louis agreement between the farmers and the Knights at St. Louis expresses the true doctrine. It has the unmistakable ring of Jeffersonian Democracy:

5. Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special favors to none, we demand that taxation, national or State, shall not be used to build up one interest or class at the expense of another. We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all revenues, national, State, or county, shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the Government economically and honestly administered.

We of the South, Mr. Chairman, have all the interest in these questions that you gentlemen of the North and of the Northwest can possibly have; but there is another question, sir, that touches us more nearly still. It is the question of honest economical State governments, of the due and orderly administration of the law, a question, sir, of local self-government. That right was once taken away from us, and for a time we lived in pandemonium.

In 1867 the party that then controlled the Government, in order to perpetuate its power, enfranchised blacks and disfranchised whites, until by the aid of its emissaries and of the military, and by bonding and banding together the newly enfranchised colored man, it got possession of every Southern State. In each and every of these States the result was just the same. The same causes produced everywhere the same effects. The difference was only in degree. Where the negro was most numerous there the carpet-bagger and the scalawag most abounded and where these leaders got control they listened to all the suggestions of their constituency, pandered to their prejudices, and catered to their cupidity—prejudices which these leaders themselves had in large part created and cupidity which they themselves had aroused. And the plundering of helpless and prostrate peoples was just in proportion as the leaders felt secure in their power.

In Alabama, within six years, the State debt was increased over seventeen millions of dollars. City and county debts in many instances went up in like proportion, and there was nothing to show for the money that went. The credit of the State, that had been of the highest, was gone. For two years before the Democrats got control again of the State, not a bond could be sold at any price. In South Carolina, within four years, the debt was increased $13,000,000, and 90,000 negro militia marauded over the State. In Louisiana the State debt went up over $47,000,000, and the debt of the city of New Orleans was increased over $12,000,000. But I will not cite further examples.

The color line was drawn by the Republican party. It was the inevitable result of the measures they passed and the doctrines they advocated.

From the beginning of the Government down to 1867 suffrage had been left for the States to regulate. That was the theory of the Constitution. If that had been left so, the Southern States would, in time and as he was fitted for it, have conferred on the negro the right to vote. Then the negro would have been the friend of the Southern white man who had conferred suffrage upon him; but this was not to be. The Republican party was determined it should not be. They conferred suffrage on the negro themselves in order that they might get, as Mr. Sumner phrased it, "new allies" in the South. They sent to Alabama Mr. Kelley from the House and Mr. Wilson from the Senate to tell the negroes that they must all vote the Republican ticket because the Republicans had freed them and the Republicans had given them the suffrage; and then there were agents of the Freedman's Bureau and other agents of the Republican party who swore them in midnight leagues to vote for the Republican party. So it was, sir, that the negroes were all ranged on one side and in solid phalanx. They were told that if they would preserve their liberties they must stand together against their late masters; they must control the State government; and for a time they did it.

There was nothing left for the white men but to come together. On their side were intelligence and virtue, and courage, and experience in self-government. And when necessity at last compelled the white men of the South to unite the struggle for supremacy could have but one result. The power of the negro was broken. Good governments were restored in the South, the carpet-bagger disappeared from the political arena, and law and order and economical administrations were restored, and the Southern States started on a new career. During the last ten years they have prospered even more than the North. We do complain of unjust taxation, we do complain that the financial policy of this General Government is unjust to the masses, but at the same time, sir, we hold that paramount to all matters of this character is the one absorbing, overmastering question of the administration of our home government. And, sir, the Republican party, so long as it threatens, as it now does, to restore in the Southern States, or any part of them, negro supremacy again, will always compel us to stand together for the preservation of our liberties and our property. Other questions arise, some of commanding importance, but so long as this threat hangs over us—the threat of negro supremacy in county and State governments—we can not and we dare not divide.

The bills that have been introduced into this House and the other, and are now pending, to take Federal elections under Federal control, can have but one purpose, and that purpose is to solidify again the negro vote in the interest of the Republican party. If this purpose shall succeed it will hand over again to the negro and his allies the control of three States in the South and many rich counties in others of the States.

But I tell this House and the country these methods, if their purpose is to divide the South, will not succeed. They will only force us, the white men there, to stand closer together. We may discuss other questions and we may differ upon them, but wherever we go we will go all together, and we will never give up the fight for local self-government guarantied to us by the Constitution of our fathers. The Democracy of the Union are with us in this struggle, and hand in hand with them we will stand.

One of the questions of the day is the subtreasury or farmers' warehouse bill, pressed upon us by many of the farmers of the South and West. Mr. PICKLER introduced it into this House by request. Senator VANCE put in a similar bill in the Senate "by request." The

statement "by request" means, as we all know, that the Senator or Representative is not willing at the time to indorse the measure as one he approves.

I have examined these bills carefully, intending to vote for the proposition if I could. A Representative naturally wishes to support any measure his constituency or any considerable portion of them may approve. It is his duty to do so and he should resolve every doubt in favor of their wishes; yet he can not escape all responsibility himself. When clearly convinced either that a measure is not warranted by the Constitution he is sworn to support or that it is impracticable or that it is fraught with evil consequences, he must oppose it. He can not shrink from this duty, however painful it may be. He can not count the consequences to himself when the public welfare is at stake.

This measure grows directly out of, and is intended to remedy, the conditions in which the farmers of the country find themselves today. I think I have shown, sir, that the legislation of the Republican party is primarily responsible for the evil days that are upon the American farmer. A contributing cause, however, is overproduction. A Kansas farmer, in an able article, in a recent number of The Forum says that our present supply of beef is sufficient for 71,000,000 people, of swine for 76,000,000, wheat for 79,000,000, corn for 70,500,000, and oats for more than 100,000,000 people, while our population is estimated at 64,000,000. This surplus would bring in profit to the farmers if we had freer commerce with the outside world. But the Republican party has erected a high tariff Chinese wall around the country; it has prevented a fair exchange of commodities by onerous duties on imports, and other countries are retaliating by high duties on the products of American agriculture.

As the case stands, what will be the effect of the Pickler bill or the Vance bill if passed into law. That they will either of them ever become law I do not believe. But they deserve the most careful and respectful consideration, and ought to be reported and fully discussed, first, because of the number and character of the people who advocate them and, secondly, because of the importance of the subject-matter. Nevertheless, I make the prediction that the Republicans, who control both the House and Senate committees, will not bring them before Congress. They will prefer, I believe, to let them sleep in committee, while they take advantage of any divisions that may arise among Democrats who are discussing them with each other.

The proposition is that the Government shall build warehouses in which it shall receive cotton, corn, wheat, oats, and tobacco as security for money to be advanced to owners of these commodities to the extent of 80 per cent. of the values deposited. One of these bills appropriates $50,000,000 to build these warehouses.

Now, the Government has never yet built a warehouse to receive private property. When providing for the collection of the tax on whisky, the law reads:

"SEC. 3271. Every distiller shall provide, at his own expense, a warehouse to be situated on, and to constitute a part of, his distillery premises, and to be used only for the storage of distilled spirits of his own manufacture until the tax thereon shall have been paid."

Into this warehouse the distiller puts his product; he gives the key to the Government storekeeper, who watches the whisky there till the distiller pays the tax, which is 90 cents on a gallon costing only from 15 to 30 cents to manufacture. The distiller must pay the tax when the whisky is taken out for consumption, and he must pay it, at the latest, within three years from the date of manufacture.

The Government advances no money to the distiller. It only taxes his commodity from three to six times its value and impounds it till that tax is paid.

That the Government shall furnish warehouses for the storage of private property as contemplated in this bill is a new departure. No one of the statesmen of the past, Whig, Democrat, or Republican, ever, so far as I have learned, advocated such a measure. Its novelty ought not of itself to condemn it in the mind of any man. But this much is true, that when a scheme has, so far as we know, no precedent to support it, a legislator ought to scrutinize it with great care before adopting it. And now let us examine the plan as proposed. It is not intended to benefit all farmers, but only some of them, only those who make cotton, corn, wheat, oats, or tobacco. The makers of hay, of rye, barley, rice, and sugar, of salt pork, and salt-beef are excluded from its benefits. In this respect it violates the fundamental maxim of Democracy, so well expressed in the fifth section of the demand made by the farmers and Knights at St. Louis, "Equal rights to all and special favors to none." It proposes to give to the owners of these five products money at the low rate of 1 per cent. per annum interest, the depositor paying besides only necessary Government charges. Now there is no Government in the world under which the rate of interest upon loans to individuals is as low as or approximates 1 per cent. No Government has a better credit than the United States.

Governments can borrow money at lower rates than individuals, because government securities are considered the safest of all investments. And governments can borrow on bonds having a long period to run at lower rates than on short-time bonds, because long-time bonds are in the nature of permanent investments. It would be impossible for the Government of the United States to negotiate long-time bonds for a less sum than 2½ per cent. It could probably not negotiate a one-year bond for as low a rate as 3 per cent. Private loans can not now be had in New York City for one year on Government securities as collateral for less than 5 per cent.

The rate of interest in London, the money center of the world, in transactions between individuals for periods of one year is probably always over 3 per cent. and generally much more. So it follows that if the Government of the United States should advance money to the owners of corn, cotton, wheat, oats, and tobacco at 1 per cent. it would be conferring a "special favor" on the producers of these commodities. Have not the owners of hay, rice, sugar, and other farm products "equal rights" with other farmers? In fact, if the Government should furnish money at 1 per cent., or 2, or 4, or any other rate of interest, to any particular classes of farmers and refuse it to others it would be violating this fundamental principle, "Equal rights to all and special favors to none."

Indeed that principle would be violated if the Government should furnish money at any rate whatever to farmers as a class and not extend the same privileges to the producers of turpentine, lumber, coal oil, or any other product of labor. It would be unjustifiable class legislation. All the people of this country, of whatever station in life and whatever their occupation, are equal before the law. It would be impossible to pass through this House a bill, even if it should ever get reported, that granted this favor to the owners of these five products and at the same time excluded hay, barley, rice, etc. The hay crop is worth annually about $100,000,000 more than the cotton crop. The representatives of the hay-makers would never consent to the exclusion of their constituents.

It would not satisfy them to say that their product was more bulky and more expensive to house. They would not be content to be taxed to pay millions of dollars for warehouses that other farmers might get money at 1 per cent., while they had to go on the market for loans. And the rice producer would contend that his product is more valuable, bushel for bushel, than wheat or oats or corn, and the barley and buckwheat makers and the producers of salt-pork and salt-beef would show that there is no reason why they should be excluded. Sir, there can be no sound reason given why the product of every honest laborer in America should not stand on the same footing.

It is sometimes contended that, because other articles, as glass, metal, and earthenware, are protected by high tariff duties, therefore, the Government should make a direct appropriation for the benefit of farmers who are not and can not be protected by these import duties.

The wrong of which the farmer complains is that discriminations have been made against him. Shall the farmer discriminate now against his brother farmer or shall all the farmers as a class discriminate against everybody else? Shall they sanction class legislation by asking other class legislation? I do not believe they will do it. As it was well expressed by an intelligent constituent of mine recently, himself president of a county Alliance, "Two wrongs can not make a right."

Let the Democracy of the country and the farmers of the country, whose interests lie with the Democracy, stand together for the righting of the unspeakable wrong the Republican party has inflicted upon the country in imposing upon the consumer these high-tariff duties. This mighty movement, which is stirring not only the farmers of the South, but of the West, will, I believe, if the advocates of "equal rights to all and special favors to none" only stand firm, soon result in bringing together a mighty army of voters who will march upon and capture this Government, and then we shall have justice and equality under the law.

But, sir, if we yield up our principles, if we once admit that Government shall grant favors to one class and then grant favors to another class and then to another, we give up the fight, we yield up the Government our fathers founded, we admit that majorities may rob minorities, that the strong may take and the weak must suffer; we yield up forever all the safeguards of individual liberty embedded in our State and Federal constitutions. The theory of our Government is that the States reserve to themselves all powers not granted to the Federal Government. Why should we abandon that theory now? What is there in the history of the past that would justify us at this time in putting ourselves and our property and all that is dear to us at the mercy of this Federal Government?

What Government is responsible for the wrongs of which we complain? Certainly it is not any State government that has brought about these conditions of to-day. It is this Federal Government that has thus mismanaged our finances. It is this Federal Government that put upon us an unjust and oppressive system of taxation. Shall we deliberately increase its power to do injustice? Shall we act as if we had forgotten the lessons of history? It was this Federal Government that twenty-three years ago by a stretch of power and a violation of the Constitution robbed the people of ten Southern States of the right to govern themselves and placed those States, all of them, for years under the negro and the carpet-bagger. The people of no Northern State, if situated as we were in 1867, would have sanctioned the outrage of reconstruction. They approved these acts because they did not know and could not understand or else because

they did not sympathize with the situation. It always was and always will be so. The people of no State can be safely trusted to regulate and control the domestic affairs of distant States.

It was this idea—the idea that they could not expect good government from England across the seas—that caused the colonies to revolt against the mother country in 1776. It was for local self-government that Washington fought; it was the right of local self-government our fathers intended to perpetuate when they established the Constitution of 1789.

It was in order that they might reserve to the people of these several States the largest measure of control over their own domestic affairs that they provided an amendment to that Constitution that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." And so, when any power is claimed for this Federal Government we must look to that Constitution to see whether the States have granted it. Looking to that instrument we find that in section 8 the power is expressly given this Government "to borrow money on the credit of the United States," but nowhere can we discover any grant of power to loan money as contemplated in this bill.

It is sometimes said that the Government loans money to the banks, and this is quoted as a precedent for this bill. On this subject I can not do better than quote from a recent speech of my distinguished friend, Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas. There is no better friend of the people and no abler expounder of the Constitution than he is. He says:

> Some of the zealous and ablest advocates of this system assume that there is no difference in principle between a loan of the credit of the Government to national banks upon the deposit of United States bonds and the loan upon agricultural products contemplated by this bill. And since the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the laws authorizing the establishment of national banks were constitutional, no constitutional objection can be consistently urged against this scheme. And it is also insisted, with apparent plausibility, that the plan of relief proposed by this measure is not inconsistent with the principle involved in the law that authorizes the owners of distilled liquors to deposit them in warehouses under the supervision of the Government for a period of not exceeding three years, for the purpose of enabling the owner to postpone the payment of the taxes until his products become salable.
>
> These laws are presented as precedents to justify the favorable action of Congress on the subtreasury bill.
>
> The Democratic party opposed the passage of the laws authorizing the national-banking system, and also opposed the law authorizing the extension of the system passed by a Republican Congress in 1882, not upon the ground that Congress had no authority to authorize the establishment of a bank, for that had been settled by the Supreme Court in 1819, but upon the ground that the benefits, advantages, immunities, and powers conferred upon these associations in respect of issuing bank-notes, control of the volume of circulation and the like, and the guaranty of the payment of their notes by the Government were in the nature of class legislation; in that peculiar and valuable advantages which could not be enjoyed by all and might be employed by the beneficiaries to oppress the public were conferred upon a class of the population.
>
> For such and like reasons the Democratic party arrayed itself against the system. But the Supreme Court in 1875 decided the laws to be constitutional upon the ground that the Congress had authority to authorize the establishment of national banks as instruments to be used to aid the Government in the administration of an important branch of the public service.
>
> The court held that they are "appropriate means" to that end and that Congress was the sole judge of the necessity of employing such instruments to aid in the administration of the public service.
>
> The aid that national banks are claimed to render the Government in the administration of public affairs is not confined to the execution or to the carrying into effect any one power conferred upon Congress, but to several. For the purpose of these remarks, however, it is sufficient to say that the banks, as is claimed, furnish employment and demand for the bonds of the Government, and therefore aid in maintaining its credit; they furnish solvent depositories for public money to be applied and used for the public service throughout the country, and they aid the Government in maintaining a safe and solvent medium of exchange.
>
> These are some of the offices performed by the banks to the Government, and they are stated not for the purpose of approval, for I have always opposed the system and voted against its extension. I believe that the Government alone should issue and control the volume of circulation, and that no corporation should be permitted to dictate or regulate the volume of circulation, but I have enumerated these instrumentalities for the purpose of showing that there is no analogy between the system and the one proposed by the subtreasury bill.
>
> What important branch of the public service could the proposed system aid the Government in administering? Would the partisan warehouse managers furnish safe and solvent depositories of public moneys to be applied and used in all the branches of the public service throughout the country? What aid could this system render in upholding the public credit? Absolutely none.

Its purpose is to loan money to particular classes only.

But whatever be the argument to be drawn from the national-bank system, it can have no application to me. The system was established long before I came into public life, and I have opposed its extension whenever opportunity occurred. It is true that when the final vote upon the bill to extend the charters of the banks was taken I was absent in Colorado with a sick wife, but I had voted April 3, 1882, against even setting a day to take up and consider that bill. On April 17 I also voted against a similar motion, and again, on May 1, 1882, I emphasized my opposition by voting the third time against the consideration of the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we could get over the constitutional difficulties in the way of passing this bill, if we could feel assured that the Supreme Court would not declare it void when passed, and if we could secure the support of the classes against whom it discriminates, and enact this measure into law, how would it operate? We should first be obliged to amend it so as to make the Government safe in advancing money upon these commodities. The proposition is that the depositor of each of these commodities should be entitled to receive from the Government money equivalent to 80 per cent. of the value of the commodity deposited.

In other words, the Government is to be protected by a margin of 20 per cent. If it is at all probable that prices may vary more than 20 per cent. in a year, the utmost period for which the loan is to run, then that margin would be insufficient.

We must construct every law upon sound business principles, and we can judge of the future only by the past. Carefully gathered statistics show that during sixty-two consecutive years of the past, from 1825 to 1886, inclusive, corn varied during fifty-two years 20 per cent. and over, cotton varied 20 per cent. and over forty-three years, oats varied 20 per cent. and over fifty-two years, wheat varied 20 per cent. and over forty-five years, and tobacco varied over 20 per cent. sixty years out of the sixty-two.

If the past is any criterion, Mr. Chairman, no one would for a moment contend that the Government could safely advance to the farmer as much as 80 per cent. of the value of any one of these commodities. Let us look to see whether 50 per cent. would be a safe margin. Certainly it would not if the variations in prices are found to be over 50 per cent. for more than one-third of the time.

I put in here a table taken from Spofford's Almanac for 1888, a standard authority, showing the actual range of prices in the New York market, and following that is another table, the result of calculations made for me by an expert, showing variations by percentage during that period. The second is calculated from the first

These two tables taken together show that during that long period of sixty-two years corn varied in price over 50 per cent. during more than one-third of the years covered by that table; cotton, over 50 per cent. nearly one-half the time; oats, over 50 per cent. greatly over one-half the time; tobacco, over 100 per cent., counting from the lowest to the highest, over two-thirds of the time; and wheat, over 50 per cent. nearly one-third of the time—that is, nineteen years out of sixty-two.

These figures tend very strongly to show that money can not be loaned safely on these commodities without further security unless upon a margin of over 50 per cent., such a margin, in fact, in favor of the Government as almost to destroy the value of such a system to the farmer, even if it were otherwise practicable. This is what statistics teach.

The experience of the Alabama State Bank, fifty odd years ago, furnishes us the same lesson.

The bank was established during a period of great depression. Its purpose was to loan money to the farmers. It began by advancing on cotton. On one shipment, I am told by a gentleman who was its cashier, the bank lost over $100,000. Advances on cotton were abandoned and loans were made on notes believed to be properly secured.

Political favoritism soon ruined the State Bank of Alabama. Men with political influence behind them borrowed money, and the bank broke, leaving a debt upon a portion of which the people of that State are now taxed every year to pay interest.

I put in here these tables and ask gentlemen who favor this system to study them carefully and draw their own conclusions.

Lowest and highest prices of corn, cotton, oats, tobacco, and wheat for sixty-two years: 1825–1886.

[Where no mention of quality is made it is understood that the price quoted is for the cheapest grade of each commodity. The prices are those of the New York market.]

Year.	Corn, bushels.		Cotton, upland, pounds.		Oats, bushels.		Tobacco, Kentucky leaf, pounds.		Wheat, bushels.	
	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.
1825....	$0.42	$0.75	$0.13	$0.27	$0.26	$0.40	$0.03	$0.09	$0.75	$1.06
1826....	.62	.83	.09	.14	.42	.60	.03	.08	.84	1.02
1827....	.54	.75	.08	.12	.31	.56	.03	.06	.90	1.25
1828....	.46	.62	.09	.13	.24	.37	.03	.06	.95	1.62
1829....	.48	.64	.08	.11	.27	.46	.05	.07	1.00	1.75
1830....	.48	.65	.08	.13	.26	.40	.03	.07	1.00	1.15
1831....	.54	.75	.07	.11	.27	.48	.03	.06	1.06	1.35
1832....	.50	.87	.07	.12	.38	.56	.03	.06	1.12	1.35
1833....	.65	.86	.09	.17	.30	.48	.03	.08	1.15	1.28
1834....	.53	.75	.10	.16	.28	.48	.04	.08	1.02	1.10
1835....	.70	1.12	.15	.20	.33	.75	.06	.11	1.04	1.50
1836....	.83	1.12	.12	.20	.40	.75	.06	.10	1.37	2.12
1837....	1.00	1.15	.07	.17	.40	.75	.03	.09	1.55	2.10
1838....	.76	1.00	.09	.12	.25	.60	.04	.13	1.35	2.00
1839....	.75	.98	.11	.16	.30	.60	.08	.16	1.15	1.37
1840....	.46	.63	.08	.10	.24	.43	.03	.16	.95	1.25
1841....	.47	.81	.09	.11	.37	.50	.04	.14	.90	1.50
1842....	.54	.68	.07	.09	.25	.53	.02	.09	.83	1.30
1843....	.48	.60	.05	.08	.27	.34	.02	.07	.84	1.20
1844....	.43	.54	.05	.09	.27	.37	.02	.06	.82	1.12
1845....	.45	.85	.04	.09	.29	.51	.02	.07	.85	1.40
1846....	.55	.80	.06	.09	.28	.48	.02	.07	.80	1.35
1847....	.64	1.10	.07	.12	.39	.65	.02	.08	1.01	1.95

Lowest and highest prices of corn, cotton, oats, tobacco, and wheat, for sixty-two years: 1825–1886—Continued.

Year.	Corn, bushels.		Cotton, upland, pounds.		Oats, bushels.		Tobacco, Kentucky leaf, pounds.		Wheat, bushels.	
	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.
1848....	$0.52	$0.78	$0.05	$0.08	$0.32	80.51	$0.03	$0.08	$0.95	$1.40
1849....	.57	.70	.06	.11	.33	.49	.03	.09	1.20	1.35
1850....	.55	.72	.11	.14	.37	.51	.05	.14	1.00	1.50
1851....	.53	.68	.08	.14	.65	.80	.03	.14	.93	1.22
1852....	.62	.78	.08	.10	.75	.86	.03	.09	1.03	1.15
1853....	.64	.82	.10	.11	.41	.52	.04	.10	1.20	1.80
1854....	.76	.98	.08	.10	.45	.75	.05	.11	1.75	2.50
1855....	.93	1.15	.07	.11	.42	.82	.06	.13	1.96	2.80
1856....	.48	.94	.09	.12	.35	.50	.06	.16	1.30	2.17
1857....	.71	.98	.13	.15	.40	.66	.07	.20	1.25	1.95
1858....	.58	1.03	.09	.13	.40	.53	.06	.18	1.20	1.50
1859....	.76	1.05	.11	.12	.36	.58	.04	.14	1.30	1.65
1860....	.64	.95	.10	.11	.37	.47	.03	.13	1.35	1.70
1861....	.48	.74	.11	.28	.30	.47	.03	.16	1.20	1.60
1862....	.50	.75	.20	.68	.37	.67	.06	.30	1.30	1.55
1863....	.68	1.23	.54	.88	.53	.90	.08	.36	1.25	2.00
1864....	1.25	1.97	.72	1.90	.86	1.02	.08	.55	1.72	2.75
1865....	.70	.97	.33	1.22	.45	.90	.07	.45	1.25	1.88
1866....	.80	1.32	.32	.52	.55	.85	.08	.18	2.20	3.45
1867....	1.00	1.40	.15	.36	.67	.94	.09	.16	2.30	3.40
1868....	1.01	1.41	.16	.33	(*)	(*)	.08	.15	2.05	3.25
1869....	.75	1.16	.25	.35	.62	.84	.08	.13	1.45	2.18
1870....	.76	1.15	.15	.26	.52	.69	.07	.12	1.40	1.90
1871....	.65	.90	.15	.25	.42	.70	.06	.11	1.45	2.00
1872....	.61	.80	.18	.25	.42	.55	.09	.16	1.65	2.10
1873....	.50	.77	.13	.21	.42	.58	.09	.16	1.55	2.25
1874....	.53	.84	.15	.19	.38	.53	.07	.25	.93	1.35
1875....	.49	.76	.13	.17	.30	.64	.09	.28	.92	1.37
1876....	.38	.49	.11	.13	.28	.35	.07	.19	.84	1.27
1877....	.41	.58	.11	.13	.22	.46	.07	.16	1.06	1.85
1878....	.45	.60	.09	.12	.29	.45	.04½	.07	.83	1.31
1879....	.44	.64	.09¼	.13½	.31	.50	.04½	.07½	1.10	1.56
1880....	.48	.61	.11	.13¾	.36	.49	.05	.07½	1.03	1.59
1881....	.48	.76	.09⅞	.13	.42	.52	.05½	.12	1.14	1.56
1882....	.63	1.00	.11⅝	.13	.37½	.72	.03½	.09	1.03	1.43
1883....	.55	.70	.10	.11½	.36	.51	.05	.11	.95	1.24
1884....	.45	.66	.10⅛	.11⅞	.32	.42	.05	.09	.74	1.05
1885....	.40	.57	.10	.11⅛	.27½	.41½	.07½	.09	.88	1.05
1886....	.43	.55	.08 13/16	.09 5/16	.30⅝	.39	.07¾	.09¾	.83	.95½

*Nominal.

Average differences in prices of commodities for sixty-two years: 1825 to 1886.

Per cent.	Corn.	Cotton.	Oats.	Tobacco.	Wheat.
	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.	Years.
500 and over	.....	.....	.....	2	.....
400 and over	.....	.....	.....	4	.....
300 and over	.....	.....	.....	4	.....
200 and over	.....	2	.....	14	.....
100 and over	.....	7	10	21	.....
90–100	2	.....	2	.....	.....
80–90	1	3	5	4	1
70–80	5	3	5	7	1
60–70	2	4	5	2	7
50–60	12	11	12	2	10
40–50	20	6	6	.....	14
30–40	10	7	7	.....	12
20–30	9	7	8	2	9
10–20	1	12	2	.....	7
1–10	.....	.....	.....	.....	1
Total number years	62	62	62	62	62

Corn, twenty-two years, over 50 per cent. variation. Cotton, thirty years, over 50 per cent. variation. Oats, thirty-nine years, over 50 per cent. variation. Tobacco, forty-five years, over 100 per cent. variation. Wheat, nineteen years, over 50 per cent. variation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope every one into whose hands these tables may fall will study them carefully. My reasoning on this point is based upon the facts presented by these figures. They are undoubtedly accurate.

Another element to be taken into consideration is the liability of grain to deteriorate in value from the attack of insects and other causes. The reply has been made to the argument based on these figures that the warehouse system will steady prices, that one-twelfth will be taken out each month for consumption, and that by the aid of the contemplated law to prevent speculation in futures there will be no speculation.

A glance again at the tables given will demonstrate that variations in price were perhaps greater from 1825 to 1860 than they were from 1865 to 1886. The system of gambling in futures had its origin about thirty years ago. Prior to that time variations seemed to be greater than since.

Those men and those men only speculated during that first period who could control money in large sums.

What will be the effect of allowing nobody to speculate except the money-kings, the men who count their money by the millions and who can so easily combine in these days of railroads and telegraphs?

I do not undertake to answer that question, I merely suggest it. Let each man who studies this question answer it for himself.

But how is it that the law of consumption is to regulate prices by having one-twelfth consumed each month when we make a surplus of provisions and of cotton and tobacco each year?

Who shall designate the farmers that shall export breadstuffs or the months in which they shall export them? Who shall determine how much of the cotton crop of the South shall be exported and how many farmers shall sell in January, how many in March, and how many in July?

If prices run up what is to prevent farmers from rushing their products upon the market? There is and there can be, sir, no human law to regulate prices.

The law of supply and demand will always have its field of operation, and so long as the home market is insufficient to take all the products of American farms, as it must be for many generations to come, the price at which we can sell in the markets of the world will always exercise a controlling influence over markets at home. We must make a surplus and we must always export that surplus if we are to have any commerce.

If by any possible combination among home producers, the Government aiding them, home prices should ever rise appreciably above the price in foreign markets, our exported surplus would immediately be brought back and would inevitably bring down prices at home until this surplus was either consumed or re-exported.

The only remedy for a surplus of farm products is commerce, free exchange.

If the commodities we have to sell are cheap, let us exchange them for the cheap commodites we need from abroad.

But, Mr. Chairman, suppose we warehouse six or eight hundred millions of dollars' worth of farm products, we inflate the currency of the country suddenly by that amount. The natural tendency of this would be to suddenly inflate all other values, and if near the end of the crop year the Government shall have called in and destroyed all or the greater portion of this money, we should then contract values of all property in a similar ratio.

Who is there with property to sell, lands or goods of any description, that would not rush into the market to make his sales when money was flush? On the other hand, who is there having goods or property to buy that would not, if he could, wait to make his purchases at that season of the year when money was scarce and property was down? The poor man who must buy as he needs and can not lay in his supplies six months ahead would suffer from these fluctuations. The rich who could afford to purchase in large quantities would profit. There can, sir, be no evil that could befall the country greater than such as would result from a currency fluctuating by hundreds of millions of dollars from one season to another; and there can be no greater blessing than a sufficient volume of sound, stable currency.

A careful study of this question has convinced me, however, that the volume of our currency ought by some means and within reasonable bounds to be made more flexible than it is.

But after all, sir, the true remedy, the remedy that alone can give permanent relief, is less and fairer taxation; more money in the pockets of the people and less in the coffers of the Government; more justice to the farmer and fewer subsidies for monopolies. We will come to that when the Democracy once come into possession of both Houses of Congress under the Presidency of such a man as Grover Cleveland. Mr. Cleveland recently wrote a letter approving the general ideas which underlie the Farmers' Alliance as set forth in the letter he was answering. I approve every word of that letter, but I am very sure Mr. Cleveland could not support such a measure as this subtreasury bill, though he approves, as I do, the purposes the farmers have in view, the bettering of their condition by every practicable means.

One of the dangers to be feared from an overissue of currency is depreciation, that the money will become a commodity and subject of speculation instead of being a stable measure of value. History is full of examples.

In December, 1789, the French Government, being in great need of money, passed a law for the issuance of assignats to the extent, if I remember correctly, of 100,000,000 of francs. The first result seemed happy. Then there was issue after issue. The money began to depreciate. It rapidly went lower and with each successive issue. The government did everything possible to hold the money up. It was enacted that any Frenchman who speculated in these assignats should be imprisoned for twenty years in chains. Another law provided that a Frenchman who invested money in foreign countries should be hanged. Then laws were passed fixing a maximum price on farm products. Then farmers refused to bring in their products for sale. Then laws were passed putting town people on an allowance because provisions were scarce. But no law could make good the overissue of money, and in 1796, less than seven years from the day when the first bill was passed, a law was enacted allowing assignats to be sold for their real value. The day of the irredeemable assignat was over. And from that time to this the French have had good sound money.

Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island had their fiat-money periods before our Constitution was made, and they learned lessons then that their people have never forgotten. In Rhode Island the law could not give State-bank money circulation, even though it provided test oaths and made it a misdemeanor to refuse it. Her State money became, like the issues by the United States during the Revolutionary war, absolutely worthless. That United States currency of the Revolution left behind it a phrase that is current to this day, "not worth a continental."

I can conceive it possible that, if the Government should take into its charge all the crops that were for sale and the farmers should hold, prices might temporarily go up. If breadstuffs went up the poor would feel it first and all who produce no breadstuffs would feel it more or less. Consumers would stint themselves and consume less. And so our surplus which we make every year would, in the hands of Government, largely increase.

The same would be the case with cotton. And the production of wheat and cotton abroad would be stimulated just as India and Egypt increased their crops of cotton during our civil war.

And then if while these crops were stored we should produce other large crops and increase our surplus what would this Government do? If the money kings were in power Government might rush all the surplus on the market at once. But, if not that, what would the Government of the United States do with the surplus on hand and with the surplus coming in?

By this system the farmer would not get rid of mortgages. The General Government would be a vast mortgagee in possession of our property. Would it be allowed to buy at its own sale? If so how would it save itself from loss? I can think of but one mode. That would be to say to the farmer by law, You shall not plant so much and you shall not sow so much; we must limit production. Then it would become a mere question of majorities. If the majority section wanted high prices for their provisions and cheap cotton to clothe themselves with, and if they could regulate prices by law, would not legislation tend in that direction?

But more than that, Mr. Chairman. If we throw aside the protection of the Constitution, what is to prevent the majority from regulating by law not only our farming, but our mining and our manufacturing? And what is to prevent majorities from enacting that no man shall have a farm of more than forty acres, so long as anybody is unprovided for?

The poor man and the laborer are, and always should be, the chiefest concern of the legislator, because the rich are better able to care for themselves. I believe in this, but I believe also in that Constitution which spreads its ægis over all, over the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the strong and the weak, and which is properly interpreted in the fifth section of the agreement at St. Louis, "Equal rights for all and special favors for none."

I have never seen a measure that tended more directly towards the consolidation of all power in this central Government than this. I represent in part the weaker section of this country. I do not wish to see the rights of my section turned over absolutely to the mercy of whatever majority may control this Federal Government. I do not wish to see the property of the people I represent under the lock and key of this Government. There are now more than ten millions of dollars belonging to citizens of Alabama locked up in the Treasury of the United States. It has been there for twenty-five years. It was taken from them under color of a tax on cotton, a tax that the Supreme Court, Republican though it was, would not declare to be constitutional.

During the last Congress the question of refunding this cotton-tax came up on an amendment to the direct-tax bill. That bill was to refund to the States which paid it, nearly all of them Northern States, a direct tax that was regularly laid and constitutionally collected. Nearly every Northern Representative and Senator voted for it. Of course, the majority section passed it, and it would have become a law but for the fact that Grover Cleveland had the courage to veto it. An amendment to that bill, while pending, to refund the cotton-tax was offered by my colleague, Mr. OATES. He and others of us pleaded earnestly for its adoption; but by a sectional vote we were denied even the poor privilege of submitting to the Supreme Court of the United States the simple question whether the Government of the United States could lawfully retain this money. Shall the people of my section, who grow the cotton wanted for cheap clothing by the majority section of this country, consent that this Federal Government shall even attempt to fix by law the price of their staple? I can never believe they will agree to it when they have fully examined it.

These warehouses, it is estimated, are to be at least eight or nine hundred in number. One of the advocates of the system I heard declare that this number ought to be largely increased. The three or four hundred warehouses to be established in the South would each of them become a center of political influence, a means of reviving in the South the defunct Republican party. If the law should provide for the appointment of their managers by the President, we know, by the appointments made to the receiverships of public moneys at Montgomery and Huntsville, Ala., the class of voters from which these appointees would come; and well do we know who their assistants would be.

But the Pickler bill provides that these managers shall be elected by the voters of the several counties in which the warehouses are to be built. These warehouses would be located in what are called the black counties of the South, where the most cotton is made.

The managers are to be elected at the same time with Congressmen and under the same laws. The Republicans in this Congress are considering bills to place these elections under the control of Federal appointees, who are to take and count and return the votes. The purpose is to solidify again and march to the polls under Federal auspices the majorities that dominated in the South during the unhappy days of reconstruction.

I do not believe, sir, that the Southern people will consent to place their property under such management.

Mr. Chairman, I am called upon to take my position, and it is with the greatest reluctance, as I have said, that I have been forced to the conclusion that I ought not to support this bill, but I feel I am walking in the path of duty to my constituents, and I sincerely trust that when they come to consider they will look upon this measure as I do, as impracticable and unwise.

Once before I stood where I do now. In the Forty-fifth Congress a bill was before this House to grant a subsidy to the Texas Pacific Railroad. I examined it and declared to its advocates on this floor, many of whom were leading Southern men, that I could not support it. It was sought to reach me through my constituency. The newspapers of the South, most of them, favored the subsidy. I do not remember a paper in the district I represented that opposed it. Agents were sent through that district. They set forth in glowing terms the prosperity the road was to bring to the South. Petitions were sent up to me from nearly or quite all the towns in the district. They were signed by more than two-thirds of the leading men of those towns, but I felt it to be my duty to examine and judge myself for the district I represented. The responsibility was on my shoulders. I opposed the bill and laid my reasons before the people, and they sustained me. The road was subsequently built by private enterprise, and, as I predicted, no benefit has come to the Second district of Alabama from the building of that road that any man there can point to. But the Government was saved from the indorsement of bonds to the extent of $38,000,000 and I had the satisfaction of contributing actively to that end. I sincerely trust that when the people come to consider and think carefully over this measure they will see it as I do.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am much surprised that the committee has offered no explanation of the duty on binding-twine, in view of the grave charge made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] an hour ago. If his statement be correct—and I have no doubt of his familiarity with the subject—then it seems to me that, instead of spending the rest of the few hours during which we may consider the bill on this vinegar amendment, it would be much better if we should get at the question of binding-twine, of tin, and several others.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that men inherit their political beliefs much as they do their religious faith, the opinions of the father being accepted by the son. I was born a protectionist, as many gentlemen on that side were born free-traders. This is the third tariff debate to which I have listened, and the more the subject is examined the more fixed is my belief in the wisdom of the protective policy for our whole people and nation. In May, 1884, I defined the doctrine of protection and adhere to that definition to-day, as follows:

> I advocate the principle of levying such a tax upon imported articles which are or might be produced by us as shall, by at first increasing the price thereof to the consumer, give a greater profit to American than to foreign manufacturers and farmers, and so protect American labor and industry against the cheaper labor of other nations. I favor a tariff which will, by virtue of this extra profit, assure such competition between our manufacturers as shall cause them to share this extra profit with their employés in the shape of better wages, and with our farmers or miners whose products they use, in the shape of better prices, thus securing remunerative wages to American labor in its broadest sense; a tariff which will also protect the American people against the cupidity of our manufacturers by maintaining such competition between them as shall insure the lowest reasonable prices of the articles they make; a tariff which, while fixing the duty sufficiently high to secure these results, shall not place the rate so high as to free our manufacturers from the check of foreign competition, and thus deprive the consumer of this needed safeguard against exorbitant profits; one which will promote the prosperity of the whole country by fostering those industries that, after due protection, shall become self-depending and of national value.
>
> I advocate such a tariff on the one hand as against free trade, or a tariff for revenue only, or one for revenue with incidental protection; and on the other hand as against a prohibitory tariff, which, by lifting manufacturers above the plane of competition, may give them a monopoly hurtful to the American farmer, operative, miner, and purchaser alike—in other words, a competitive as opposed to a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. Chairman, we are all agreed upon the necessity for reducing the revenues derived from imports. This may be done in either of two ways: first, by placing articles on the free-list; second, by fixing the duty so high as to prevent all importation. The first method is that of the free-trader, who stands at one extreme of the question, and the second is that of the ultra-protectionist, who stands at the other extreme. If the policy of either of them be fully enforced no revenue at all could be derived from imports and the money needed for the National Government would have to be raised by direct taxes, as in the case of State governments. But we always have taxed and will tax foreigners for the privilege of importing their wares and of enjoying our markets. Every nation

raises much of its funds by this mode. And when doing so it is just as well to tax those articles which we too can produce, and thus diversify our industries, as only to tax those which we can not produce. In the former case foreigners may, and largely do, pay the tax, while in the latter our own people alone pay it. That proposition is the base on which the system of protection rests.

But there always have been and will be differences of opinion among the truest and stanchest protectionists as to just what articles shall be taxed and what ones shall not, and also as to the degree of taxation on an article, whether high or low. These differences spring both from the diversity in judgment of men and from the diversity in the local interests of the various sections of our continent. No two members of the Ways and Means Committee would draught similar bills in all the details, and each man on that or any other committee would propose a measure different from all the rest, and yet because of this fact nobody would or could question the Republicanism of those gentlemen.

Precisely the same right of judgment as to the articles to be taxed, and as to the rate of tax belongs to each of us in the fullest degree. As Republicans we stand in line on the doctrine of protection as against free trade, but in determining the details of three thousand articles and of the rates each of us is entitled to his own opinion. If this be not so and if the bill as reported by the committee be the only Republican bill, then, in case the Senate should adopt a different measure, would the Republican Senators thereby become Democrats?

The eight Republican members of our committee have labored with assiduity and sincerity to frame a tariff upon the lines of protection as distinct from those of free trade, and have reported a bill that reduces the taxes $60,000,000. Accordingly I shall vote for it. None of us wish to vote against a reduction of revenues. That it is far preferable to the Mills bill I have no doubt, and that it gives a greater protection to our farmers than any other tariff heretofore reported is undoubted. That its general purpose, scope, and effect are preferable to the existing law is also true.

At the same time and exercising the same right of judgment that the committee has exercised, there are several details of the bill I would change were it possible; but no one man is the whole House. It has happened more than once that 329 of the 330 members on this floor have gone wrong on questions by not thinking just as I thought or *vice versa*. In framing so great a measure as this we must allow to every gentleman and each interest their fair voice, and it must necessarily be a compromise measure.

To my notion, the first paragraph should contain the amendment which I offered the other day, and which was voted down, empowering the President to suspend any duty on any article which is monopolized by a trust or other combination of manufacturers. While a tariff does not create trusts and while the greatest of trusts controls articles which are not imported, yet it is nonsense to deny that trusts may be formed on dutiable articles. In such event competition is throttled and the consumer left helpless in the clutch of bandits. Under the guise of "protection" protection itself is murdered. And there is no length to which I am not ready to go, either under the tariff or outside of a tariff, in protecting the people against trusts, gamblers in futures, and the most direful of all combines, that of pooled railroads, which collect $5 from the people where the tariff collects one.

The principle which has governed my vote upon the various amendments is a thorough belief in competitive, as distinct from prohibitive, duties. I desire to make the duties high enough to encourage home industry and to enable our manufacturers to compete with those of other nations; high enough to allow for the difference in wages here and abroad, and just a little higher in order to guard against fluctuation; but when this point is reached I want to stop, in order that our people may be defended against the rapacity of our own manufacturers.

It is on this principle that I shall vote against two of the amendments of the committee increasing the duty on yarns and cloths in the woolen schedule, and on tin. I prefer the bill as they reported it, to the higher duties which they have since proposed.

There are several amendments that I have offered, but which can not be reached. One is for free lumber; another for placing petroleum on the free-list; another striking out the proviso which may increase the lumber duty to the extent of the export duty placed on logs by Canada. I would put salt on the free-list, and hides on the dutiable list, but need not specify other changes. In my opinion many of the rates are higher than they ought to be; but, as I said before one man is not three hundred and thirty men.

Notwithstanding these preferences I shall vote for the bill, and the more freely because of a confident hope that the Senate will change many of the features that are objectionable. I trust that it will not put a tax on tin and paintings on the free-list for the benefit of millionaires having picture galleries. I vastly prefer taxed statuary to free tobacco.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] for one minute.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, on the 13th of May, the following took place in Committee of the Whole (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, current paging 4800):

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. So far as I am concerned the question of the gentleman from Iowa, as with most of his questions, does not affect me at all. I was in favor of much wider changes even than the bill itself made. But as to alcohol, the trust was developed to be in the State of Illinois and other States north of the Ohio River, and it was represented on this floor by gentlemen who voted against the Mills bill.

[Here the hammer fell.]

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

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I renew it, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose, in two minutes, of completing the history of the investigation of the whisky trust. I was a member of the committee that investigated the trust, and the gentleman from Kentucky stopped short in his history of it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not catch the gentleman's statement.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I said I was a member of the committee which investigated the whisky trust, and I was sorry you stopped short in your statement as to the history of it.

The fact was developed that there had been a combination of gentlemen engaged in the production of whisky in Kentucky. That will not be disputed by any one, because the testimony proved it conclusively, and the testimony was further conclusive to the effect that that trust was simply in abeyance and ready to be put into active operation at any time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As I understand the gentleman, he said that the testimony taken by the committee showed that the whisky trust resided—where?

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I said that the testimony showed that there had been a combination of the producers of whisky in Kentucky; that combination for the time being was in abeyance, but that the machinery was in existence ready to be put into operation whenever the exigency might arise.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman know that he has only said, if it be the truth, one-half of the truth, and that this existing whisky trust had its headquarters at Peoria, Ill.; that what was then the whisky trust was in Illinois and Ohio?

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I expressly said that my only purpose was to speak of the portion of the trust that the gentleman from Kentucky had not stated. He stated one portion; I stated the remainder.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Well, now, as to the part that the gentleman stated, I will take the liberty of saying that if he had read the testimony——

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I heard it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not mean to say that you did not hear it, but you interrupted me before I finished my sentence. I was stating that if he will read the testimony intelligently he will find that the statement is inaccurate, as will be seen by anybody who will intelligently read the testimony.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I did not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. SPRINGER. He said that you were inaccurate.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. My statements are literally accurate.

I have here the testimony taken before that committee. I read from the testimony of Mr. J. M. Atherton, of Kentucky:

Then there was, I believe, incorporated a company in Kentucky in 1885, under the general incorporation laws of the State of Kentucky, which looked to fixing some method by which the amount of whisky made annually in the State could be regulated; but that movement fell through and nothing came of it. Then an agreement, of which, I think, you have a copy, was made in 1887, in the spring. The object of that agreement was as specified in the text of the agreement itself under date of June 9, 1887.

The agreement had its origin in the depressed condition of the market that had existed since the overproduction of 1881 and 1882, to which I alluded a moment ago. About 10,000,000 gallons of whisky were exported out of these products. That whisky was in Europe, and, the shippers being unable to find a market in that country, many of them were compelled to bring the whisky back to this country in order to endeavor to find a market here in the course of time. That whisky was coming back and added to the dullness, and the Kentucky distillers, so far as their names appear to this agreement, thought it was best to curtail the product for 1888, in order that this surplus that had been accumulating for many years, much of which was still in Europe, could be sold without serious loss to the parties who had invested their money in it. The agreement states exactly the scope and intent of that movement. If you have not read it I will state that there is nothing in the nature of a trust in it. There is no consolidation of property, no transfer of title, no merging of interest, simply an agreement to suspend operations from July 1, 1887, to July 1, 1888.

(Paper produced and shown witness.)

Here is a copy of that agreement:

ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *June* 9, 1887.

The undersigned do mutually agree and covenant each with all and every the other as follows, to wit:

First. It is for the pecuniary advantage of each and every the parties hereto that each and every the other parties should not make more whisky in the season July 1, 1887, to July 1, 1888, than is hereinafter set down opposite the signature of the several parties as their agreed production during said distilling season.

Second. It is further agreed that the several parties hereto can, and do, enter into this agreement with the other parties hereto and assume the obligations hereinafter expressed, upon the mature and deliberate conviction that it is for the pecuniary benefit of each so to do.

Third. And the parties, in consideration of the premises, and of $1 to each the other paid, and of divers other valuable considerations, each of them moving, do mutually agree and covenant that they will severally make, during the distilling season of July 1, 1887, to July 1, 1888, the quantities of whisky set opposite their signatures, with full liberty and right, however, to each and every signatory hereto to manufacture as much more whisky as he may choose, upon the conditions hereinafter set forth.

Fourth. If any party hereto shall conclude to make, and does make, whisky in excess of the amount set opposite his name, he shall and will pay, and hereby covenants and agrees to pay, within thirty days from the close of each month in which whisky is produced in excess of this agreement, unto a trustee to be by them selected, a sum of money equal to 20 cents for each proof-gallon of whisky so made by him in excess of the production set opposite to his signature, the same to be distributed by said trustee unto the other signatories hereof not producing more than the amounts set opposite their names, as compensation to them for refraining from so doing, and to reimburse to them the profit which they surrender by not making a greater amount of whisky than is opposite their names set forth, and as an offset to the increased profits to such overproducer. The said distribution shall be equal pro rata among those not making more than is set opposite their several names, based upon the contemplated production of each as set forth.

Fifth. And the parties hereto, recognizing fully the rights of each to make as much whisky as he may choose, agree and covenant that the said sum of 20 cents per gallon so to be computed is a fair and just compensation, and is fixed as the liquidated and indisputable remuneration to be made by such producer to those parties hereto who, for his profit and at his request, refrain from making more than herein by them indicated, and thereby lose profit which they might otherwise make.

Sixth. The said Herman Beckurts, trustee, may sue for any such remuneration in his own name as trustee for the benefit of those concerned, and the proper compensation of said trustee, and his outlays and expenses, including counsel fees, shall be paid by ratable contribution on the part of those who produce no more than the quantities set opposite their names.

The trustee shall be named in writing by a majority in number of the signatories hereof, and any vacancy occurring in said trusteeship by death, resignation, refusal to act, or other disability shall in like manner be filled.

The trustee may call meetings of the signatories at any time on ten days' notice, given through the United States mail.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SIGNERS.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *January* 25, 1888.

At a meeting this day called by the "trustee" of the signers to the agreement made June 9, 1887, "not to produce any whisky in Kentucky for the season of 1888," it was unanimously resolved:

First. That the distillers who signed said contract and who compose 90 per cent. of the producing capacity of Kentucky realize the good effects resulting therefrom.

Second. That we regret the necessity of stating that The Mellwood Distillery Company, The J. B. Wathen & Bro. Company, Boldrick & Callahan, Labrot & Graham, W. S. Harris, J. Swigert Taylor, Davis County Club Distilling Company, and a few other smaller distillers, have repeatedly been appealed to to cooperate in our endeavor to restrict production, have persistently refused so to do, and seem inclined to ignore the fact that there has been an overproduction and great losses resulting therefrom to the trade.

Third. That the distillers, parties to the compact, having exhausted all means within their power to persuade these few selfish distillers to unite with the signers to the agreement heretofore entered into, we now appeal to the trade at large, realizing that they alone can compel their co-operation, and ask them to abstain from purchasing any goods made by any one in the running season of 1888.

Fourth. If the dealers fail to exercise their influence in this direction, the responsibility of any future overproduction and losses resulting therefrom will rest with them alone.

Fifth. That the trustee be directed to call a meeting on or about the 15th of May next to take some action toward regulating the production in Kentucky whiskies for the season of 1889.

Resolved, That the trustee be instructed to bring suit against any signer to this agreement who is or may be directly or indirectly interested in the manufacture of Bourbon or rye whiskies.

Resolved, That the trustee be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to every dealer in the United States.

SIGNERS TO THE AGREEMENT.

The Anderson and Nelson Distilleries Company, The J. M. Atherton Company, Anderson County Sour Mash Distilling Company, Ashbrook Bros., F. S. Ashbrook & Co., Allen Bradley Company, Belle of Nelson Distilleries Company, M. S. Bond Distillery, H. C. Bowen Distillery, D. S. Brooks, The Berry Distilling Company, E. J. Curley & Co., L. N. Crigler, Cliff Falls Distillery Company, R. Cummings & Co., B. B. Cook & Co., E. A. Chase & Co., Daviess County Distilling Company, Eagle Distilling Company, J. W. M. Field, Glenmore Distillery Company, Glen Spring Distillery Company, W. A. Gaines & Co., J. A. Grimes, Headly & Peck, John Hanning Distilling Company, W. S. Hume & Co., James H. Hutchings, John A. Huguely, King of Kentucky Distilling Company, Charles Kobert & Co., The Kentucky Distilling Company, S. P. Lancaster, James Levy & Brothers, T. J. Megibben, T. J. Megibben & Brother, Mattingly and Moore Distilling Company, M. P. Mattingly, J. G. Mattingly & Sons, George D. Mattingly & Co., R. Monarch, Marion County Distillery Company, E. L. Miles & Co., Moore & Selliger, Murphy, Barber & Co., The J. A. Monks and Sons Distillery Company, J. A. McBrayer Distillery, W. H. McBrayer, William Nock, The New Hope Distillery Company, The Nelson County (Kentucky) Distilling Company, Old Times Distillery Company, Old Lexington Club Distillery, James E. Pepper & Co., Redmond Distilling Company, Rich Grain Distillery Company, Rily Distilling Company, T. B. Ripy, Sharp Distilling Company, Spring Hill Distillery, Sour Mash Distilling Company, T. W. Samuels, E. H. Taylor, jr., & Sons, G. W. Taylor, E. H. Taylor, jr., Company, William Tarr & Co., John B. Thompson, Warwick Company, Wathen, Mueller & Co., Wigglesworth Bros., Alvin Wood.

I again quote from Mr. Atherton's testimony:

Q. Do I understand you to testify that from July 1, 1887, to July 1, 1888, there was no whisky made by the signers of this agreement?

A. No whisky was made by the signers of the agreement.

Q. I observe that the agreement itself provides that the signers will generally make during the distilling season from July 1, 1887, to July 1, 1888, the quantities of whisky set opposite their names.

A. Yes, sir. In the written agreement itself 100 gallons is set opposite the name of each person, but the quantity was so small that none of the distillers could afford to begin operations, of course.

Q. And the amount of 100 gallons was allowed to be made and set opposite the names of each one of the signers of this agreement?

A. Yes, sir; but it was not made.

Q. Then there follows this provision:

"With full liberty and right, however, to each and every signatory to manufacture as much more whisky as he may choose, upon the conditions hereinafter set forth." That liberty and right these parties did not exercise?

A. They did not exercise it.

Their agreement was for the year 1888. As to the one then in process of signature for the year 1889, Mr. Atherton testified July 27, 1888. The witness stated:

Q. But this agreement was entered into only by persons residing in Kentucky?

A. Only in Kentucky, yes, sir; and the movement proposed for 1889 embraces only distilleries located in Kentucky and producing the fine Kentucky whisky for age and has no connection with any other manufacturing interest in the whisky business.

Q. Does the movement as proposed for 1889 apply to the signers of this agreement?

A. No, sir; it is a different agreement entirely. Many of the signers there probably will sign the new agreement and some probably will not. I do not know yet who will and who will not sign it. I have signed the 1888 agreement, or rather the agreement beginning July 1, 1888, and ending July 1, 1889, but it is not to be binding upon those who sign it until a sufficient number have signed it to give it some substantial commercial value.

Q. There has been a formal agreement for 1889?

A. Yes, sir; very much similar in its scope to the other; pretty much a copy of the agreement which you have before you.

Q. Can you furnish us with a copy of the proposed agreement?

A. I have no copy with me. I have been away from home for five weeks. It is very similar in most respects to the agreement you have here; I think an exact copy in most respects.

These combines were formed, to some extent at least, of lesser combines. I append the following testimony of Mr. Atherton, given in response to questions asked by myself:

Q. Am I correct in understanding you to say that the J. M. Atherton Company is a corporation created under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Kentucky?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. At what time was that corporation formed?

A. In the summer of 1881, I think, it went into operation; on the 1st of July, 1881.

Q. What is its capital stock?

A. Five hundred thousand dollars.

Q. Paid up?

A. Paid up in money and property.

Q. What property was put in as part of the capital stock?

A. The various distillery properties, the firm names of which I enumerated in answering the question.

Q. Give me the name of the first one, please.

A. J. M. Atherton & Co.

Q. Where was that distillery located?

A. It was located previously to the formation of this corporation where it is now located, in La Rue County, in the fifth collection district of the State of Kentucky.

Q. Owned by whom?

A. It was owned by myself and by several partners.

Q. Was it a chartered company or a corporation?

A. It was owned by private individuals and so was all the property.

Q. That was put in as part of the capital stock?

A. Yes, sir. It was sold by the individuals to this corporation and put in as part of the capital stock.

Q. They received stock up to the value of their property?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that was the case with each of the other firms?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was the next one located?

A. All right in the same place; they are all together, covering about 15 or 20 acres of land.

Q. In one town?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Previous to that they were owned by separate parties?

A. Previous to that they were owned by separate parties.

Q. And each of these parties deeding the property to the corporation received in lieu of the property so deeded certificates of capital stock?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How soon after the formation of the corporation were these transfers made?

A. They were made previously or simultaneously with it.

Q. Practically, the formation of the company and transfer of the property was all done at the same time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the company was organized for that express purpose, was it not?

A. The company was organized for the purpose of owning and operating distillery property, or having it operated, and for doing business in Kentucky whisky.

Q. But it was well understood among the incorporators that these distilleries would be put in this company and the parties owning the distillery receive in lieu thereof stock in the corporation. That was all understood at the time?

A. Of course. We have in Kentucky a general statute authorizing the incorporation of companies for various purposes, the purposes to be definitely set out in the articles of incorporation.

Q. That is so in almost every State. The corporation was formed under that law, was it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many conferences among the owners were held before this consolidation was effected?

A. That is impossible for me to state. There were four or five owners and parties interested in that property, all of whom conveyed it to the corporation, taking the equivalent that they were satisfied with of stock in the corporation.

Q. What purpose had these separate owners in view respecting the consolidation?

A. It was simply to avoid the difficulty and expense of keeping separate accounts with each one of the separate firms who were doing business as separate firms; as a matter of economy to simplify the business, all taking stock in the corporation equivalent to the value of the property and the individual interests. For instance, there was no need of individual and separate purchases of grain and separate management of the property.

Q. What was the date at which that transfer was effected?

A. It was effected at the time the agreement went into effect, about the 1st of July, 1881.

Q. Is the J. M. Atherton Company one of the signers of the agreement that has been produced here?

A. Yes, sir.

I leave the matter right where this testimony puts it.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Chairman, the object of the amendment offered by the committee is to put the vinegar business, that is making vinegar from vaporized alcohol, entirely under the control of the Internal Revenue Bureau. The complaint made against the makers of this article, I think, has been exaggerated, for the reason that during the eleven years in which the manufacture has been under the supervision of the Internal Revenue Department there have been but twenty cases brought to the attention of the courts in which it was claimed that there had been a violation of the law, and of these twenty cases a very great majority resulted in acquittals.

There is no real contest between the cider vinegar and these vaporized vinegars. Cider vinegar and grape vinegar, or any vinegar made from fruit, retains the taste of the fruit, and therefore, when used for pickles, spoils the pickle in that regard. Then again, as a general rule, indeed, as the entire rule, they do not contain alcohol enough to preserve the fruit or to preserve the vegetable as a pickle. There must be a very high percentage of alcohol, and as every one knows who is familiar with pickles of commerce, pickles by the barrel, pickles by the jar, pickles in bottles, there is a great difference in the quality. Al-

most invariably those which are preserved in fruit vinegars become what is called mushy and soft, whereas those which are preserved by the vaporized vinegars, which is a strongly alcoholic vinegar, retain their firmness and make a palatable pickle. Somebody spoke about vinegar-makers being able to use a worm in their factories. That is not so. They are prohibited from doing that by law, and the amendment offered by the committee does not confer any such privilege upon them.

Mr. BAKER. Prohibited unless they take out a license.

Mr. CHIPMAN. If they go into the distillery business then of course there is no necessity for this enactment; but, on the other hand, many of these factories are in States where they will not be permitted to carry on the distillery business, that is, the distilling of spirits for the purposes of a beverage, whereas in those States they would be at perfect liberty to use their establishments for making vinegar, and vinegar alone. Now these factories employ a large number of men and use an immense amount of vegetables. There are fully a hundred of them distributed throughout the country, and they use large quantities of cucumbers, beans, and all the vegetables that are used for pickles; and the effect of the bill as it stands, an effect which is sought to be obviated by this amendment, would be practically to drive many of these factories out of the business, because it would oblige them, in order to continue it, to go out of the vinegar business pure and simple and to erect distilleries, and so to lose the value of their present plants and the money invested in them.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. The gentleman seems to be familiar with this subject, so I will ask him to state what it costs these manufacturers to produce vinegar under the present law.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I hardly know. They produce it very cheaply. I say very cheaply because they sell it very cheaply. It costs only a few cents a gallon. It is one of the cheapest articles that we buy, but if they are obliged to go to the distilleries or to erect distilleries, the first effect will be an increase in the price of this palatable table vinegar and the next will be an increase in the price of pickles from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this motion in order that I may say a few words in regard to the action of the committee upon the question of the duty on binding-twine. If the statement of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] is correct, the committee ought to have reduced the duty a great deal below what it is. But my friend is entirely mistaken as to his figures. He says that the duty under the present law——

Mr. DUNNELL. I would inquire if my colleague [Mr. LIND] is in the Hall.

A MEMBER. Yes; he is over there.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What difference does it make?

Mr. DUNNELL. It makes a good deal of difference.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] states that the duty under the present law is 20 per cent. ad valorem on the manila and sun grass of which this binding-twine is manufactured. The fact is that the present duty on manila is $25 per ton, which is equivalent to 1¼ cents per pound. The duty upon sun-grass is $15 per ton, which is equivalent to three-fourths of a cent per pound. Binding-twine is composed of about equal parts of these two materials, with a small proportion of jute, which pays a duty of about half a cent per pound; so that the duty upon the raw materials of which binder-twine is composed is equal, under the present law, to an average of 1 cent per pound, while the duty upon binding-twine is 2½ cents per pound, leaving a differential duty under the existing law of 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not time.

Now the committee have put upon the free-list the manila and the sun-grass of which this twine is manufactured and at the same time they have reduced the duty upon binding-twine, not to a cent and a half a pound, as they would have been justified in doing under the present law, but to a cent and a quarter a pound. The committee did that because of the demands of the wheat-growing interests that we should reduce this duty to the lowest possible point.

Why, Mr. Chairman, nearly all the binding-twine used in this country is manufactured in this country. There are some forty establishments scattered over the different States engaged in this manufacture. They employ a large number of hands. They manufacture this twine in competition with each other, and they put the price down to the lowest possible point at which they can put it and pay American wages. We thought, therefore, that it was but right and just that we should put a duty upon the manufacture of binding-twine that would enable our manufacturers to produce it here for our own people, by the employment of American workingmen.

Mr. Chairman, it will be said later that there is a "trust" in the manufacture of binding twine. Now, before the argument is raised, I propose to meet it. It is true that a number of years ago the manufacturers of this twine formed an association. One feature of their agreement was that there should be a committee formed to buy all the raw material that was required by the different manufacturers. They did that because they found that under the old system each one was striving to get a supply a year ahead.

This article, coming from Calcutta, has to be ordered a year ahead, and each factory was ordering more than it needed, and they believed that their competition with each other in the foreign markets was putting up the price of the raw material. Therefore they thought it was better to form a purchasing committee to purchase for the factories all the raw material that was needed for all, apportioning to each its proper share. Under that arrangement the cost of the raw material fell year by year down to 1886, when the association was dissolved and each one went in for himself.

The result was that they ran up the price of the raw material from about 6 cents a pound to nearly 12 cents a pound in 1889, and for that reason they found it necessary to charge the farmers of the United States 16 cents a pound, while even at that price the manufacturers complained and showed before the committee that for the last three years they had made no money in the business.

Mr. LIND. How did they show it?

Mr. PAYNE. In view of these facts these gentlemen last January formed another association and appointed a purchasing committee, and one part of their agreement was that each member of the association should, within so many days, report the amount of raw material he had purchased. Those reports were made and were published to the world. They found that they had a supply for a year or a year and a half in advance, and within thirty days after the publication of that report the price of the raw material fell from 12 cents to about 9 cents.

And they expect before they need to purchase any more that the raw material will go down to 5 or 6 cents a pound.

We take off the duty from the raw material; we reduce the duty on the manufactured article (and it is a high grade of manufactured twine, because it must be made uniform in order to form the knots that bind the grain) to 1½ cents a pound, while on all other twines the duty is 1½ cents a pound. We have fixed this duty barely at the protective point; we have not put it a farthing higher; and if by any amendment we reduce it we simply transfer the manufacture of this twine from these forty establishments competing with each other in the United States and send it to Canada or to England and let the foreigners make it for us and charge what they please on a limited production.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OATES. Mr. Chairman, when the general debate began on this measure I was absent in the execution of an order of this House, and thereby was prevented from participating, as I desired to do, in the general discussion. This is my apology for speaking on the general subject at this late hour in the debate.

We are confronted by a grave question of political economy, upon which statesmen and scholars have differed for centuries. The first tariff law enacted by the Congress of the United States was in the year 1789, one hundred and one years ago, and during the entire history of subsequent legislation there has never been a time at which there was such radical difference in opinion as exists to-day on this subject. There was never a time when the difference between the two great political parties was so well defined and distinctly marked as it is to-day. Yet in some respects there never was a time in our history when the two parties on this great question were so perfectly in accord up to a given point. I emphatically deny that the Democratic is in any sense a free-trade party.

If we regard mankind as one universal brotherhood and without conflicting national interests, there can be no question of the beneficence, wisdom, and justice of absolute free trade; but each nation, characterized by that selfishness which is a part of man's nature, and without which he could not exist, has recourse to such a policy, in respect to its commerce, as is supposed to secure to it the greatest advantages over other nations of the world.

I maintain, sir, that both the Democratic and Republican are protective parties. They both favor protection to home industries and domestic manufactures; but when it comes to the method, manner, and measure of the protection to be afforded, when we undertake to fix the schedule of duties, there we part company. There has never been a tariff law passed by Congress in which much and prolonged consideration was not given to the question of the effect of the rate of duty upon any given article of American manufactures of similar articles of commerce. The Democratic party regards all tariff duties as taxes, which Congress derives its sole right to impose for purposes of revenue.

It never occurred to any of the framers of the Constitution, nor to any public man of respectable ability for nearly a century, that the taxing power could be used interchangeably with or in lieu of the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. That honor belongs to the latitudinarians, or, speaking more appropriately, to the centralists of this age. Every Democrat worthy of the name and sufficiently intelligent to comprehend the ordinary use of the English language adheres to the fundamental doctrine that ours is a Government of enumerated and limited powers, and that the powers conferred on Congress should be used only for the purpose of making uniform, just, and equal laws; that is, laws that distribute both the burdens and benefits of Government equally and equitably upon all the people. In the language of Andrew Jackson, the seventh and one of our most illustrious Presidents—

It is not in a splendid government supported by powerful monopolies and aristocratical establishments that they will find happiness or their liberties pro-

tection, but in a plain system, void of pomp, protecting all and granting favors to none, dispensing its blessings like the dews of Heaven, unseen and unfelt, save in the freshness and beauty they contribute to produce. [Applause.]

It is such a government that the genius of our people requires, such a one only under which our States may remain for ages to come, united, prosperous, and free. [Applause.]

In 1888 the Republican party for the first time in its history boldly assumed the position and declared it in their platform that the taxing power should be used for the purpose and to the extent of giving American manufacturers exclusively the American market; that it should be used, not for the purpose of revenue, but to enhance the price of domestic manufactures for the benefit of those engaged therein at the expense of the general public. The Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte said that "duties should never be a fiscal instrument, but a means of protecting industry." That was well adapted to his policy, which was one of perpetual involvement in war, but in time of peace duties should never be made an instrument of rapine, either internal or external. The Republican party of this country, speaking through the majority of this House as its organ, by the bill under consideration is attempting to enforce the Napoleon dogma of laying duties, not for fiscal purposes, but as a means of protecting existing industries and encouraging the development of new ones, and that, too, without due regard to the necessity for the products or their adaptability to the circumstances of this country. And to do this they propose to retain taxes and duties at the high rates laid to meet the exigencies of war, and in some instances to increase them far beyond that rate.

If they should succeed in preserving the American market exclusively to be supplied by American manufacturers what, I ask, is to become of any surplus production? Where is the market to be found for that? If our manufacturers go abroad to find a market for their wares they must necessarily sell at a lower price than they sell to their own countrymen, and this they are now doing in many cases. Our farmers pay American manufacturers $7.76 per dozen for axes, while the same manufacturer ships and sells the same axes in foreign countries at $6.75 per dozen; he sells to our farmers a plow at $11 which he will sell to a foreigner for $8.40. For a gang-plow our farmers have to pay $58.80, while the manufacturer will sell it to a foreigner for $52.90. Our farmers have to pay $9.20 per dozen for shovels which our American manufacturers will sell abroad for $7.86 per dozen. These discriminations are entirely due to our high protective tariff.

The advocates of this restrictive bill contend that high protection makes the article cheaper than it can be bought in foreign countries. If this be true, with the present high rates on almost everything, our manufacturers should not only successfully rival, but outstrip all others, and completely command the markets of the world. But the falsity of this argument is made manifest by the paucity of manufactures annually exported, which last year amounted to but $138,500,000, a fraction less than 19 per cent. of our total annual exports.

When the American market is fully supplied any additional production of a given article must be at a loss, unless a foreign market can be found therefor. It is a fact that in some cases a rate of duty so high as to exclude foreign competition has enabled the buyer to obtain the goods manufactured here at even a lower price than that for which they could be bought in a foreign market. This results from the extraordinary stimulus which at first and for a few years enables the American manufacturer to sell his goods at an immense profit, thereby inviting large investments of capital in the business protected until it is overdone, and more goods of the particular kind are made than can be sold for remunerative prices.

And then what follows? Strikes of labor against reductions of wages and mills running on half time. Then what? To prevent insolvency and financial ruin a combination or trust is formed, by which all mills engaged in the particular business are put under one management, a part of them stopped so as to limit production and restore prices to a profitable level, with an agreement among all the proprietors to share the dividend equally. Why, sir, a protective tariff such as that comprised within the pending bill is the legitimate progenitor and propagator, the father of all trusts and combines now so much inveighed against and condemned by all classes and parties excepting only members of the combine! The industry, thus stimulated by the high-tariff tax against foreign competition, must run several years before sufficient capital is induced to invest therein so as to reduce the price of the manufactured article by competition to or below the cost of its foreign rival, and during all these years its development is at the expense of the consumers of that article. This presents the case of laying and collecting a tax from one class of citizens for the benefit of another. It is not a tax for a public purpose, but for private benefit. It is true that public benefit in some cases may ultimately flow from it, but this does not bring it within the principle of just taxation.

In the case of The Loan Association *vs.* Topeka (20 Wallace, 663, 664) Justice Miller, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

> To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of a citizen and with the other bestow it upon favored individuals, to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation; it is a decree under legislative forms. Nor is it taxation. * * * Beyond a cavil there can be no lawful taxation which is not laid for public purposes.

The people of our country in respect to this question are divided into two classes, producers and consumers, whose interests are directly in conflict and are not susceptible of being made perfectly harmonious. The producer is ever desirous of scarcity, because that enhances the price of what he makes to sell, while the consumer is equally desirous for abundance, because that reduces the price and enables him to buy more cheaply that which he consumes. I submit to the judgment of every candid man the proposition, which is more conducive to the happiness of every American citizen, abundance or scarcity of that which he consumes? The primary object of a protective tariff is to produce scarcity; high duties are laid to prevent goods of prime necessity from coming to our shores or to diminish and to prevent those which do come from being sold at low prices.

Now, I ask in all seriousness if, when this bill becomes a law, the people will be better fed because there is less bread, less meat, less wool, or less clothing in the country? Will the people be better dressed because this law will make fewer goods in our market and these to cost a higher price? Will the people in the cold winter be better warmed because there is less coal? Or will they be better, happier, and more prosperous because implements of industry, iron, machinery, cotton and baling ties are made scarcer and more expensive? Is it a satisfactory answer, and will it compensate for this enforced scarcity to say that this policy has kept our money at home and prevented it from being sent abroad for the purchase of more abundant supplies? People do not eat money, nor do they dress in greenbacks and silver. Why should the poor man care whether there is more or less money in the country provided he has more bread in his cupboard, more meat in his larder, more clothes in his press, and more wood in his cellar? What does he know about the balance of trade between ours and other nations, and what does the average citizen care about that if he be able to obtain all of that which supplies his wants and makeshim happy?

The balance of trade is not always a conclusive evidence of our prosperity. Under our high protective tariff, with an average rate of over 47 per cent., the balance of trade has frequently been against us. It depends as much, even more, upon what we have to export than upon what we import. It matters not that the aggregate of our imports be great if we have an equal or greater amount in exports. Why, sir, last year the United States exported $238,500,000 worth of cotton, which was two-thirds of the crop made, the other third fully supplying the demands of the home market, $124,000,000 worth of breadstuffs, $104,000,000 worth of provisions, $19,000,000 worth of tobacco, $18,000,000 worth of live animals, and sundry other articles, aggregating as our total exports about $742,500,000, while the total imports during the same period amounted to $745,000,000.

If every Republican member were retired from Congress or withdrawn from any voice whatever in the revision of the tariff, and that work intrusted alone to the Democrats of the two Houses, they would leave a sufficiently high rate of duty to sustain every American manufacturing establishment worthy of the name, and would not reduce the rates enough to injure or destroy any, except such as are palpable frauds and live on the enforced contributions of the people alone. Two years ago the Republican party by the false charges against the Mills bill as a free-trade measure succeeded in forming the most gigantic and powerful trust that was ever organized in the civilized world, composed of all the manufacturers of the United States, to accomplish its defeat. Free trade indeed! Why, the average rate of duty proposed by that bill was 42 per cent., the exact rate to which the Republican Tariff Commission had previously recommended a reduction of duties!

The greatest exception was taken to the proposition to put wool on the free-list, by which our manufacturers would have obtained an abundance of free raw material, have kept their mills in constant operation, employed a largely increased number of laborers, could have supplied American consumers with warm woolen goods at reduced prices, and could have gone out into the markets of the world as rivals of English manufacturers, and thus have largely increased our export trade. The United States, with superior advantages for the manufacture of woolen goods, exports annually less than a half million dollars' worth, while Great Britain exports over $120,000,000 worth. The woolen mills of the United States manufacture but little over 300,000,000 pounds annually, nearly a third of which is imported and paid a duty last year of nearly $6,000,000. The American mills have the capacity to manufacture nearly double the present amount, or 600,000,000 pounds of wool per annum; and they would do it provided the foreign wool could come in free.

There are three classes of wool, the superfine, the intermediary or combing wool, and the coarse or carpet wool. This country produces only the second-class or intermediary, and hence no protection is necessary to either the first or third classes, and without those grades to intermix with American wool the best results can not be obtained. In Ohio, the greatest wool-growing State in the Union, the annual value of all the wool grown is but 3 per cent. of the total farm products of that State and the average amount grown is but 5 pounds to each inhabitant, whereas the amount used in clothing for each person in that State averages 10 pounds. The annual value of this industry is less than the value of the eggs laid by the industrious hens of the Buckeye State.

Under the present law the average rate of duty on wool is 61 per cent. The bill under consideration proposes to increase it to an average of nearly 92 per cent., making on the basis of last year's importa-

tions an increase of duty on raw wool alone of $2,250,000. For what is this done? Confessedly to make wool-growing more profitable to those engaged in that industry by enabling them to sell their wool at higher prices and exclude from competition a large portion of that which now comes to this country from abroad. The inevitable effect of this policy will be to make woolen goods more expensive to those who are compelled to use them.

Last year we imported manufactured woolen goods of the value of $52,681,000, upon which we paid to the United States in duties thereon the sum of $35,373,000. The bill under consideration proposes to increase the duty so that it will aggregate on a like amount of importations over $50,000,000 annually. Sir, you need not tell me that this increased duty will not increase the price. I have on a suit of clothes now for which I paid in London—tailor-made—$15, and no gentleman can buy such a suit of like material anywhere in the United States for less than $35. Here is a silk hat the like of which can not be bought anywhere in this country for less than $8. I paid for this, made to order, in London, 16 shillings, equal to $3.84. What makes this difference if it is not the tarift which you impose upon these goods?

The present tariff on tin, not a pound of which is made in the United States and which every one knows is an article of absolute necessity, especially to the poor people of this country, aggregates about $7,500,000, and by the provisions of this bill this tax is to be doubled, under the pretext merely of developing a new industry; and while thus developing it this heavy tax will depress the manufacture of imported tin and increase the cost of it to the consumer.

The pretext of the Republican party for keeping tariff duties at such a high rate has been for years that it was necessary in order to enable manufacturers to pay their laborers higher wages than they are paid in any European country. On August 28, 1888, Mr. Jonas Denby, of Lawrence, Mass., a native of Yorkshire, England, who came to this country but two or three years theretofore and was a skilled operative in woolen and worsted manufacturing, testified before the Ford investigating committee as follows:

I find wages higher here than in England. My condition at present time is better than it was in England, but when I came to Abbott & Co. I summed up what I had to live on, clothe my family and other domestic things and articles used for months, 17 cents per day per head. My condition was better in England than when working for Abbott over here at the prices I then received. I was nice and comfortable in England. I found living cheaper there than here; cheaper in the cost of flour. I could buy for my family a bag of 250 pounds of flour for 27 shillings. And the clothing was cheaper; I never wore more than an $18 suit—the best suit I ever had or that anybody would wish to have—and you buy the same suit here and you can not get it under $35. In England sugar cost me 4 cents (per pound) and here it costs me 9 cents. And coal I could get there for $2.75 per ton, whereas we have to give from $8 to $8.25 per ton here. So unless we get a good deal higher wages here than there we are worse off. Our wages, I consider, ought to be double all the way round to make them equal to what we get in England, because the cost of living is nearly double as much here as there.

Mr. George Foster, also of Lawrence and a native of Yorkshire, who came over at the same time and is a blacksmith by trade, testified on this point as follows:

I work at Lawrence and at the Washington mills. I get $2.25 per day. In England I received 8 shillings per day for ten hours. There I worked ten hours for five days and five hours on the sixth day; but in this country I have to work sixty hours, ten hours per day for six days. My daughters get better pay for work in the mills here than they did in England, but it is just about as much more as it costs them in living and clothing. I consider my condition a little better here than it was there, but not much. We live better on the whole over here and of course handle more money, but it costs us more in fuel, living, and clothing than it did there. I was satisfied in England until I saw the advertisments in the papers that I could do so much better here in America, and I thought I was going to improve myself, so I came.

Much other testimony could easily be adduced to show that the benefits of the higher wages paid skilled laborers in this country over those paid in England are lost by the increased expense of living caused by the high tariff in this country.

To show how little truth there is in the claim that manufacturers give all of the increased price which tariff duties enable them to sell their goods for to their laborers I submit the following table, compiled by Mr. Seaton, Superintendent of the Tenth Census, giving the manufactured products under the head of "Industries," with the value of the same, the amount paid to labor in producing the same, with the percentage of the labor in the total cost, the rate of tariff duties under the present law on similar products of foreign manufacture, and also the proposed tariff rate:

Industries.	Value of product.	Paid for labor.	Percentage of labor.	Present tariff.	Proposed tariff.
Carpets	$31,792,802	$6,835,218	21.5	46.31	60.88
Cotton goods	210,950,383	46,614,419	21.6	35.64	38.00
Bolts, nuts, etc	10,073,330	1,981,300	19.7	32.00	30.00
Nails and spikes	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	52.00	41.00
Iron pipe, wrought	13,292,162	1,788,258	13.5	74.00	62.00
Oil, castor	653,900	44,714	6.8	220.00	125.00
Oil, linseed	15,393,812	681,677	4.4	44.00	53.00
Screws, smallest	2,184,532	456,342	20.9	72.00	84.00
Wool hats, cheap	8,519,569	1,893,215	22.2	68.00	111.00
Woolen goods	160,606,721	25,836,392	16.1	71.00	90.00
Worsted goods	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	67.00	103.00

The people of our country engaged in agricultural pursuits, who constitute more than one-half of the entire population and the value of whose annual products is estimated to be not less than $10,000,000,000 and constitute about 81 per cent. of all our exports to foreign countries, have been the victims of class legislation for the past twenty-five years; that is to say, while not directly legislated against, they are the people upon whom the evil effects and consequences of legislation for the benefit of certain favored classes has been made to fall. By legislative contrivance their hard earnings have been made to respond to the cruel exactions of special classes and favored industries. The farmer who toils in the field is as much engaged in a domestic industry as the manufacturer, and is just as much entitled to have his labor protected.

If it be possible, which it is not, to so lay tariff duties as to furnish the same measure of protection to all domestic industries the whole thing would be rendered nugatory, and this system of protection would be utterly destroyed; hence the best thing to be done, the only just method of tariff taxation to all domestic producers of this country, is to lay duties primarily for revenue to support the Government, with such incidental protection as naturally and necessarily flows therefrom when judiciously and wisely distributed among our manufacturing industries according to their respective necessities. The very life, breath, soul, and body of a protective tariff consists of inequalities. Inequality is its foundation-stone, the pedestal, and it can no more exist without it than the Washington monument can stand suspended in mid-air with its base swept from beneath it. [Applause.] It is in direct conflict with the Democratic touchstone of legislation, "Equal rights to all, special favors to none." [Applause.]

Our farmers are told by the protectionists that their system withdraws from the field hundreds of thousands of laborers and gives them employment in manufacturing, which furnishes a home market at liberal prices for their surplus products. This argument contains just enough truth to be thoroughly misleading; it is like a grain of wheat in a peck of chaff. If too many people are disposed to engage in agricultural pursuits why do you encourage a rapid increase of that number by inviting and receiving from foreign lands a half million of emigrants each year, and by your laws offer them every one a homestead of 160 acres of the public domain if he will but locate upon and cultivate it?

Diversification of labor is good; it does furnish a home market for a portion of the surplus of farm products; but it is the demand of the foreign market to which the farmer must look with hopefulness for a generous reward for his toil. And when a liberal system of exchange of foreign manufactured products, which our farmers need and must have, is denied to them or restricted by a prohibitory or high tariff, they realize much less on their farm products in the foreign market because they have to be paid for in cash.

From 1846 to 1861 a Democratic or revenue tariff was in operation, and from the latter date we have had a high protective or Republican tariff. A fair comparison of the effects of the two systems upon agriculture may be had by contrasting the value of farms and domestic animals during the decade from 1850 to 1860, with those from 1860 to 1870 and from 1870 to 1880. The following figures are official, being taken from the census of 1880:

The value of all the farms in the United States, as shown by the census of 1850, was $3,271,575,426. In 1860 the value was $6,645,045,107. In 1870 the value was returned at $9,268,803,861 and in 1880 the value was estimated at $10,127,096,776.

It follows from these figures that during the decade from 1850 to 1860 the rate of increase of the value of farms was more than 100 per cent, from 1860 to 1870 the rate of increase was less than 40 per cent., and from 1870 to 1880 the rate of increase in value was less than 9 per cent.

It further appears that the value of all the live-stock in the United States in 1850 was $544,180,586, in 1860 the value was $1,089,329,915, and in 1870 the value was $1,525,276,547. In 1880 the value was returned at $1,500,464,609.

The rate of increase from 1850 to 1860 was over 100 per cent, from 1860 to 1870 less than 40 per cent., and from 1870 to 1880 instead of an increase in the rate the total value declined more than $25,000,000.

This shows that during the ten years from 1850 to 1860 the farmers owned more than one-half of the wealth of the country, while in 1880 they owned only a fourth of the wealth. Under the Republican tariff, during the twenty years from 1860 to 1880, the half of the population not engaged in agriculture and deriving benefits from tariff provisions increased their aggregate wealth sixfold more than the farmers and agriculturists increased theirs. It was in the ratio of 4 to 23, nearly sixfold.

The Chicago platform of 1888 declared that the Republican party would effect all needed reduction of the "national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden upon agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes," etc. The present bill is a feeble effort in that direction, and effects a reduction of revenue to the extent of about $9,000,000, but instead of removing this "annoyance and burden on agriculture" the tax on tobacco is to be reduced but one-half and all the annoyances of the system, with its spies and informers, are to be retained.

It is claimed by the advocates of this bill that it reduces internal revenue from tobacco $10,000,000 and from the tariff about $61,000,000, thus aggregating a total reduction of $71,000,000; while on the other hand it increases the duties on chemicals, earthenware, metals, cutlery, wood and wooden wares, cotton goods, flax, woolens, silk, pulp, paper, the agricultural schedule, and sundry other articles in daily use

and consumption by the people, at least to the extent of $65,000,000, estimating on the same amount of importations as of the last fiscal year, while a number of articles now on the free-list are made dutiable. So that, while this bill pretends to reduce taxation it does not do so, but only makes some shifts and changes designed to give still greater protection to the already too highly protected industries. The bill is deceptive; it is a sham and a fraud, born of the political necessities which confront its authors.

In the face of the great depression of agriculture, the threatening bankruptcy of the farmers, and with farm mortgages so numerous that Congress deemed their enumeration a proper subject for the census-taker, the sponsors for this bill mock at the farmer's calamities and laugh when his fear cometh. A hypocritical solicitude for his welfare is shown by increasing the duty on cotton-ties and iron-ties for baling hay and hooping tubs and barrels from 35 to 114 per cent., by laying a heavy duty on chemicals used in the manufacture of commercial fertilizers, which are now on the free-list, thereby enhancing the cost to the farmer to the extent of about $2.50 per ton, and by putting a duty of 15 cents per bushel on corn in the face of the fact that but 2,388 bushels were imported last year, while nearly 70,000,000 bushels were exported and sold abroad.

Why, the whole amount of importations could be raised in any ordinary year upon 60 or 70 acres of good land. On corn-meal they put a duty of 20 cents per bushel, when but 396 bushels of it were imported last year, the tariff on which would be $79.20. It would be a very insignificant Kansas farm that this amount would protect from the ruthless invasion of the foreign importer of corn-meal. We exported this product last year to the amount of nearly 1,000,000 bushels. The bill provides for a duty of 25 cents on wheat, while the total of our importations of this grain are but 1,946, and our exports are 46,414,129 bushels. On rye they propose a tariff of 10 cents per bushel. Last year the sum total of the rye imported was 16 bushels, the duty on which would be $1.60. There is a vast amount of protection to the farmers of this country in this magnificent sum of $1.60. That is enough, truly, to drive out the fellow who had the temerity last year to import 16 bushels of rye. Of this product our farmers had a surplus and exported 237,252 bushels. A duty of 2 cents per pound is to be put upon lard, when the whole amount of our last year's importations was but 1,073 pounds, the duty on which would be $21.56, while our exports were 318,242,990 pounds. The small amount of corn, wheat, oats, rye, etc., which is imported into this country comes from the Canadas, a kindred people on the same continent separated from us by an imaginary line and against whose products it is doubtful whether there should be any tariff or other barrier. To show more conclusively what kind of solicitude is felt for the farmers by the authors of this bill I invite attention to the following list of articles in common use by our people, with a statement of the present rate of duty and that to which this bill increases it:

Table showing the present rate and the increase of duty made by the bill on articles in daily use.

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Common window-glass, 10 by 15	67.61	73.72
Common window-glass, 16 by 24	115.41	133.10
Common window-glass, 24 by 30	128.58	135.34
Common window-glass, above that	132.29	138.04
Freestone, granite	20.22	40.00
Freestone, granite, hewn or dressed	20.00	50.00
Cotton-ties	35.00	115.00
Tin-plate	34.00	74.00
Steel ingots, etc., above 16 cents per pound	11.89	45.00
Wire fence-rods, No. 6	45.00	54.00
Penknives, etc	50.00	75.00
Table cutlery	35.00	50.00
Shotguns	35.00	60.00
Mica	Free.	35.00
Horses	20.00	70.00
Cattle	20.00	61.94
Hogs	20.00	45.68
Sheep	20.00	50.00
Eggs	Free.	32.91
Plants, trees, etc	Free.	20.00
Fish, fresh	Free.	52.10
Schedule F, tobacco	81.00	200.00
Plushes	40.00	100.00
Hosiery	40.00	60.00
Shirts and drawers	40.00	65.00
Burlaps	30.00	
Brown and bleached linens	35.00	50.00
Brown and bleached linens	35.00	60.00
Yarns	69.00	100.00
Woolens and worsteds, knit goods, etc	94.59	125.00
Do	88.43	135.00
Do	93.81	124.00
Do	68.41	147.00
Do	67.60	130.00
Worsted knit goods, under 30 cents	73.20	130.00
Worsted knit goods, 30 to 40 cents	68.41	147.00
Worsted knit goods, 40 to 60 cents	67.60	130.00
Worsted knit goods, 60 to 80 cents	68.98	112.00
Worsted knit goods, above 80 cents	71.22	90.00
Worsted shawls	61.82	93.00

Table showing the present rate and the increase of duty, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Present duty.	Proposed duty.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Belts for presses (printing)	53.14	101.00
Blankets and flannels and hats	69.70	110.00
Women's and children's dress goods	68.00	103.00
Do	60.00	73.00
Do	85.00	110.00
Clothing, ready made	54.00	84.00
Cloaks, dolmans, etc	60.00	82.00
Webbings, gorings, etc	64.00	99.00

In addition to tariff discriminations against farmers their interests have also suffered from various other causes, to wit: The demonetization of silver, by which the bonds of the Government became payable in gold, and thereby enriched the bondholders to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars; by the contraction of currency and destruction of greenbacks down to a point below the necessary amount of circulation, and the extraordinary privileges extended to corporations and other aggregations of capital.

While professing the doctrine of universal protection to all American industries, the Republicans, in the bill under consideration, are guilty of a departure from their professions in this: They propose to put upon the free-list all sugars up to and including No. 16 of Dutch standard in color, which will release about $55,000,000 of revenue, and to pay from the Treasury 2 cents per pound on all sugar produced in this country as a bounty to encourage its production. Mr. MCKENNA, a prominent Republican and a member of the committee which framed the bill, dissents from the majority of his colleagues, and says:

> The bill in its sugar schedule makes an arbitrary and invidious distinction between the sugar industry and other industries, a distinction inconsistent with the principle upon which the bill is framed and upon which it can only be justified.
>
> Protection, as understood politically, is the clear right of all industries or of none. The means of it is a tariff, not largess from the Treasury. The distinction is not one of words. It is a distinction firm and clear in substance and effect.

It will take from the Treasury to pay this bounty at the present rate of production $7,520,000 the first year, or $113,000,000 during the fifteen years which it has to run. But the object of the bounty is to increase production, and, should it have the effect claimed for it by its advocates, the last annual payment from the Treasury will be over sixty-one and a half millions of dollars.

The bill also provides for the payment of a bounty of $1 a pound on all raw silk produced in this country, and 7 cents per pound on all fresh cocoons. What right has Congress, moral or constitutional, to tax the people generally for the benefit of those engaged in these two particular industries? What right or principle can ever justify the taking of 2 cents from a man who grows cotton on one plantation lying alongside another in Louisiana, and giving it to the owner of the latter as a bounty on each pound of sugar he raises? The man who does not use sugar or silk is by this proposed law compelled to aid in paying the bounty to make these commodities cheaper to those who do use them. The provision is downright injustice, gross favoritism, and wholly indefensible. It is worthy of the condemnation of all honest men.

Some who have not had the time nor opportunity of keeping pace with the course of legislation in Congress and the shifting of responsibilities with the changes of Administration may inquire why it was that the Democrats failed during the Administration of Mr. Cleveland to correct the evils of which we now complain. The answer is easy to give. The Democrats have not since 1860 had control of both Houses of Congress and the Executive at the same time. The Senate, it should be remembered, all during the late Democratic Administration contained a Republican majority, which refused to sanction the reforms inaugurated by the Democratic House and embarrassed the Administration in every way it could. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmers of the country, with a view to the betterment of their condition, have organized themselves into a powerful association and are industriously seeking to find the cause of their financial distress. They adopted a platform of principles at St. Louis in December last, and the legislative committee has formulated a bill, and had it introduced into Congress, which they believe will remedy the evils from which they now suffer. It is known as the "agricultural warehouse and subtreasury bill." I have already given my opinion to my constitutents on the most important features of this bill. Now, in order that they may have on this subject the views of other members of this House, I extract the following from a speech delivered on the 10th instant by Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas, whose ability is acknowledged by all who know him.

> It is no pleasure to a Representative from an agricultural district to oppose a measure designed to relieve agriculture from financial depression. On the contrary, every doubt is resolved in favor of such measures, and it is only upon the clearest conviction of duty that opposition is made.
>
> After some consideration of this bill it seems to me that if those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits would carefully consider its provisions they could not fail to arrive at the conclusion that it is unconstitutional in principle, unwise in policy, and violative of the fundamental principle upon which the National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union was formed.

The principle upon which this measure is based may be stated substantially as follows: That it is the duty of Congress to provide for the warehouses contemplated, for the managers, officers, employés necessary to conduct them, and to supply the manager of each warehouse with a sufficient quantity of legal-tender Treasury notes with which to advance to the owners of cotton, wheat, corn, oats, and tobacco, who may desire to store such products or either of them, 80 per cent. of the value of the product deposited; a warehouse receipt made negotiable to be given to the depositor; the deposit may continue for twelve months; if not sooner redeemed to be sold for cash at auction, and when money is realized, either by redemption or sale, the expenses, etc., are to be paid and money remitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall destroy the same.

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE BILL IS INDEFENSIBLE.

The Government of the United States is one of limited powers, specifically defined, and the Congress has no authority to legislate except as authorized by some one or more of the enumerated powers.

The power to borrow money is expressly conferred upon Congress, but the power to loan money either with or without interest or to advance public money, upon or without security, is not conferred.

The framers of the Constitution wisely provided the power to borrow money, as emergencies for the use of large sums of money might arise, when it would be impossible or impracticable to provide it by taxation; but they never contemplated the necessity of providing a power to authorize Congress to loan the public money.

Such power would be inconsistent with the theory of the Government. The money necessary to carry on the Government is raised under the taxing power conferred upon Congress. Congress has no authority to raise money by taxation for any other purposes than those specified in the Constitution.

To take by taxation from one citizen more money than his proportionate share of taxes necessary to defray the actual expenses of Government for the purpose of loaning it to another or for building warehouses in order to make the business of another citizen or class of citizens more profitable, is as repugnant to the Constitution and the theory of the Government as abhorrent to justice and good morals.

The Democratic party was organized upon the fundamental principle that the General Government was one of limited powers only, and should exercise no power except such as was conferred upon it by the Constitution or necessarily implied from a granted power. It has always denied the authority of Congress to take the property of one citizen for the purpose of bestowing it upon another or to promote by legislation the business of any individual or class of persons at the expense of the public. The depressed condition of agriculture now is the result of class legislation, and it would be strange indeed if there could be found any considerable number of farmers who would advocate the adoption of the principle of this measure, which involves a tax upon the people for the purpose of bettering the condition of persons who may chance to own either of the products named.

Section 5 of their declaration of principles adopted by the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union at St. Louis last December is as follows:

5. Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special favors to none, we demand that taxation, national or State, shall not be used to build up one interest or class at the expense of another. We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all revenues, national, State, or county, shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the Government economically and honestly administered.

It is pure Democratic doctrine and is worthy of the great organizations which represent agriculture and labor.

If we test the subtreasury bill by the great principle embodied in the fifth section of the platform it will be seen that the principle of this measure violates that declaration of principle. I have said, therefore, that when the alliances come to consider this bill by the side of the Constitution and the principles of their organization it will be repudiated by them.

The principle declared in the fifth section of the platform "demands equal rights to all and special favors to none." Under the provisions of the bill any person (he may not be a farmer) who may chance to own cotton, corn, wheat, oats, or tobacco may secure the aid of the Government in the manner prescribed. A special favor is conferred upon those only who may own the products named. The Government is obliged by the bill to help that class only. The persons who may chance to own any other product are denied the aid of the Government. Can this be fair and exact justice to all farmers—to all classes? Surely not.

If one citizen or class of citizens may obtain aid from the Government to increase the profits of business why may not any other citizen or class of citizens obtain like aid? And, if so, why may not the Government be converted into a general tax-gatherer for the purpose of promoting the private business of the people?

The platform further declares:

"We demand that taxation, national and State, shall not be used to build up one industry or one class at the expense of another."

The money necessary to construct the buildings which (because no plans are given and no limit fixed to their cost) may require anywhere from fifty to five hundred millions of dollars, and the money necessary to pay the army of partisan Federal office-holders under the bill and to make good the loss the Government may sustain by the failure of depositors to redeem, certainly will have to be raised by taxation upon all the people. This measure, therefore, would oblige the Government to tax the people to raise money for the benefit of a certain class, namely, those who may own any one or all of the five products named in the bill. They may be farmers, or they may be speculators who have cheated the farmer out of the products, or it may be the members of a trust who may have obtained the products by oppressive means. The bill is therefore clearly obnoxious to the demand of the Alliances in respect of taxation.

The measure, if it should become a law, will establish a most unwise policy, unjust to the people and to the Government. If the Government receives the products, the bill requires it to hold them twelve months, unless sooner redeemed. If speculators, as they may do, should buy up the negotiable receipts issued by any of the warehouses, why may not the people who do not own any of these products, and who buy them as they are needed, be forced to pay exorbitant prices for even the necessaries of life? In such case (and it is reasonable to suppose that such cases will constantly occur) the Government would be made the instrument of the grossest extortion.

It is provided by the bill that the Secretary of the Treasury shall furnish each manager with a sufficient amount of legal tenders to furnish the owners of the products who may desire to store them 80 per cent. of their value. The very lowest estimate I have heard made as to the amount that would be required under the bill is a billion of dollars. It is contemplated that this amount of Treasury notes will be needed for six months in each year, when, as supposed, they will be returned to the Treasury, or their equivalent in lawful money, and whatever money is returned, whether it be the new issue of Treasury notes or Treasury notes now outstanding, or gold or silver, must be destroyed.

What effect will be produced upon the business of the country by casting into the channels of trade annually a billion or more dollars of legal-tender Treasury notes with a broader legal-tender function than possessed by existing legal-tenders, for the purpose of supplying the necessities of those who own the products mentioned in the bill, while the products are locked up in a Government warehouse awaiting higher prices than an unfettered market would justify? No one can undertake to answer the question. Evidently conservative trade and commerce would be paralyzed, an era of the wildest speculation would be inaugurated, and the country strewn with the wrecks of fortunes and livings.

With a billion or more dollars' worth of agricultural products—breadstuffs, if you please—stored away in the warehouses of the Government, with no authority reserved to the Government within twelve months to place the product on the market, what will become of the poor farmers who may not own such products or those who live on the proceeds of their daily toil, and how may the absolute wants of the millions of people who are unable to buy the necessaries of life, except from day to day or from month to month, be supplied? The Government, with all its great power, stands guard over the necessaries of life and is powerless to prevent suffering or extortion without breaking its contract with its depositors.

Some of the zealous and ablest advocates of this system assume that there is no difference in principle between a loan of the credit of the Government to national banks upon the deposit of United States bonds and the loan upon agricultural products contemplated by this bill. And since the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the laws authorizing the establishment of national banks were constitutional, no constitutional objection can be consistently urged against this scheme. And it is also insisted, with apparent plausibility, that the plan of relief proposed by this measure is not inconsistent with the principle involved in the law that authorizes the owners of distilled liquors to deposit them in warehouses under the supervision of the Government for a period of not exceeding three years, for the purpose of enabling the owner to postpone the payment of the taxes until his products become salable.

These laws are presented as precedents to justify the favorable action of Congress on the subtreasury bill.

The Democratic party opposed the passage of the laws authorizing the national-banking system and also opposed the law authorizing the extension of the system passed by a Republican Congress in 1882, not upon the ground that Congress had no authority to authorize the establishment of a bank, for that had been settled by the Supreme Court in 1819, but upon the ground that the benefits, advantages, immunities, and powers conferred upon these associations in respect of issuing bank-notes, control of the volume of circulation and the like, and the guaranty of the payment of their notes by the Government were in the nature of class legislation, in that peculiar and valuable advantages which could not be enjoyed by all and might be employed by the beneficiaries to oppress the public were conferred upon a class of the population.

For such and like reasons the Democratic party arrayed itself against the system. But the Supreme Court in 1875 decided the laws to be constitutional upon the ground that the Congress had authority to authorize the establishment of national banks as instruments to be used to aid the Government in the administration of an important branch of the public service.

The court held that they are "appropriate means" to that end, and that Congress was the sole judge of the necessity of employing such instruments to aid in the administration of the public service.

The aid that national banks is claimed to render the Government in the administration of public affairs is not confined to the execution or to the carrying into effect any one power conferred upon Congress, but to several. For the purpose of these remarks, however, it is sufficient to say that the banks, as is claimed, furnish employment and demand for the bonds of the Government, and therefore aid in maintaining its credit; they furnish solvent depositories for public money to be applied and used for the public service throughout the country, and they aid the Government in maintaining a safe and solvent medium of exchange.

These are some of the offices performed by the banks to the Government, and they are stated not for the purpose of approval, for I have always opposed the system and voted against its extension. I believe that the Government alone should issue and control the volume of circulation, and that no corporation should be permitted to dictate or regulate the volume of circulation; but I have enumerated these instrumentalities for the purpose of showing that there is no analogy between the system and the one proposed by the subtreasury bill.

What important branch of the public service could the proposed system aid the Government in administering? Would the partisan warehouse managers furnish safe and solvent depositories of public moneys to be applied and used in all the branches of the public service throughout the country? What aid could this system render in upholding the public credit? Absolutely none. But the advocates of the system may insist that it would aid the Government in getting into circulation a billion or more dollars once in each year with which to handle the crops. That power is not the object of the system.

The purpose is to house the crops, to suspend the markets for crops, and to place them (so far as the products named are concerned) out of the reach of the poor or the necessities of the people until the price is enhanced by necessity. It will hardly be assumed that the Government will need in the administration of any branch of the public service the aid of an instrumentality or system that will paralyze all industries, starve the poor, and promote merciless extortion. The laws providing for bonded warehouses present no analogy to the proposed system; substantially they provide that distillers (not the Government) may furnish warehouses for the storage of distilled liquors; they may be deposited for any period not exceeding three years upon the owner giving bond to pay the taxes when the product is withdrawn. The Government pays the gauger or storekeeper his salary to prevent fraud.

Whenever a gallon of distilled spirits is produced it is at once liable to a tax of 90 cents a gallon; but because it is unsalable and unfit for use when new the Government does not enforce the collection of the tax if the product is placed in a bonded warehouse until the product is withdrawn for sale and consumption. No product is withdrawn until the tax is paid.

It would seem upon the face of the transaction that it was obnoxious to objection as class legislation, but when it is remembered that distilled spirits constitute the highest taxed product in the world, the tax being six times greater than the cost of the product; that the Government derives from it many millions of dollars revenue each year; that it is unsalable when new; that the product is not one of the necessaries of life, but a luxury, so to speak; that the interests of all the people are prompted by conserving this fruitful source of revenue, the advantages of the system, it will be seen, are not confined to a class, but the Government and the people share them. There is therefore no analogy between the system proposed and the bonded-warehouse system.

Mr. Chairman, the evils which have resulted, the oppression and wrong which have been inflicted, the distress and poverty that have been brought upon one class of our population, embracing more than one-half of all the people, while other classes have prospered and become enriched from unequal and unjust legislation, can not be removed, redressed, or modified by enlarging the scope of such legislation or by increasing the number of individuals or classes who are to become the beneficiaries of such iniquitous policy. The lawful method, the true, honest, and patriotic mode of redressing the wrongs and removing the evils which have resulted to agriculture from class legislation is to restore the Democratic policy of equality and justice in legislation.

Favoritism in legislation, policies, and systems that promote the success and gain of one individual or class of persons at the expense of another ought to be made odious and impossible. The right to what an individual earns in the sweat of his brow or by the labor of his brains, subject only to the just demands

of Government for his proportionate share of the burdens of good government, should be held inviolable and sacred. The power to enforce this principle rests with the people.

For more than one hundred years the Democratic party has struggled to maintain this great fundamental principle of free institutions. While other parties have come and gone, it numbers in its ranks more than half the voters of the United States. Founded upon the eternal principles of equal and exact justice to all, it is imperishable. If the farmers of the United States will resist the schemes and policies which seek to commit them to the pernicious doctrine that Government may rob one citizen under the forms of law to enrich another and stand by the great party of the people in its grand struggles to secure equal laws, equal burdens, and equal justice for all men, the despotism of class legislation will soon be broken and overthrown and its beneficiaries and promoters driven from power and place. When that time comes, and not until then, prosperity for all will abide in this country and those engaged in agriculture will enjoy the fruits and earnings of their labor, freed from taxation imposed to enrich other classes and from policies that despoil the value of their products to promote and increase the gain of others.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, if we had the time which I think we ought to have had I should be glad to discuss many of the schedules of the tariff bill now before the Committee of the Whole. Many of my constituents—Republicans and protectionists—object to many of its provisions. They are for protection and they are for tariff revision. They believe, however, that the first duty of this Congress was to reduce the unnecessary surplus revenue of the Government without inflicting upon the existing industries of this country the injury with which they were threatened by the tariff bill of the last Congress and by the economic theory upon which that bill was based.

They do not believe in giving unnecessary protection to anybody. They do not believe in giving additional protection to an existing industry till the necessity for it has been clearly shown; nor are they in favor of levying in the name of protection a tariff duty upon goods which, in the present state of mechanical and chemical invention, are not likely to be produced in the United States, except at a great and permanent increase of expense to the consumers of this country. Such tariff duties, even though levied in the name of protection, are not protective duties in the true sense of the term. They are revenue duties, and as such are a burden to the people.

But I have not time to speak of them at length. I wish to speak to the amendment now pending before the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Chairman, the white-wine vinegar industry is of special interest to me, because it is of special interest to my constituents. I represent a district which includes purely agricultural towns lying north and west of Chicago. Throughout these towns, and throughout Northern Illinois and the neighboring States, there are thousands of farmers engaged in raising cucumbers and other vegetables for pickling.

The pickling business is a very important one in the Northwest. I have two constituents who have been in that business for over forty years. They are intelligent and reputable men. They sell their products by their trade-mark and the reputation they have established. They can not afford to use any but the best materials. These gentlemen tell me (and I believe them) that they can not carry on this business successfully with any other kind of vinegar than the alcoholic or white-wine vinegar.

No one contends, that I know of, that white-wine vinegar is better than good cider vinegar for table use. All that we contend for is that for the purpose of preserving vegetables in the form of pickles nothing can take its place.

Any provision of law which would prevent or render difficult the use of this white-wine vinegar in the pickling business would be an injury to the consumers of this country and an injury to a large class of the farming population of the Northwestern States. To compel the vinegar-makers to buy the tax-paid alcohol as the material of their industry, would add at least 10 cents to the cost of every gallon of white-wine vinegar. That is what the bill originally proposed.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I think my friend is in error in saying that the cost of every gallon of vinegar would be increased 10 cents. There would be such an increase on a gallon of alcohol; but that would make many gallons of vinegar.

Mr. ADAMS. My friend misunderstood me. I referred to section 32 of the tariff bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It repeals the vaporization law of 1879. If that is repealed the vinegar-maker must buy his alcohol from the distiller and pay the tax of 90 cents a gallon. If the gallon of proof spirits makes 6 gallons of vinegar that makes 15 cents a gallon of strong vinegar and probably 10 cents a gallon of the strength used in pickling.

Now, the committee proposes an amendment to the bill and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SAWYER] proposes a substitute for that amendment. The committee amendment is a storekeeper's bill. It places the vinegar factories under the Internal Revenue Department and imposes a small tax to pay the cost of administration. The bill of the gentleman from New York proposes that the vinegar-makers shall not distill at all, but shall buy the alcohol they need and have it free of tax.

The committee amendment is the fairer of the two. It imposes an internal-revenue tax of 5 cents on every gallon of proof spirits used in the manufacture of vinegar. That is equivalent, as the Commissioner says, to a tax of 1 cent a gallon on the 70-grain vinegar. It is a tax of one-half a cent a gallon on the strength used for table use and about three quarters of a cent on that used for pickling. All this, in my judgment, is unnecessary; but I do not object to any supervision of these vinegar establishments which shall prevent the alleged fraudulent distillation of high wines under the name of low wines or low-proof alcohol for the manufacture of vinegar. To say that these people who manufacture this vinegar must buy their alcohol, even though they get it free of duty, is to say that they must go to the distillers for the raw material of the vinegar they manufacture. I do not see why they should be compelled to do this. I do not see why the establishments which have been built up under the existing law should be injured or abolished. All that is reasonable is that they should be supervised. The cider-vinegar men can not ask that the use of another article of food (for that is what it is) shall be discouraged. All they can ask is that frauds which they allege shall not be perpetrated.

I wish to say before I forget it that I have recently been informed that the use of this white-wine vinegar is necessary not merely in the pickling of fruit and vegetables, but is also found essential in the pickling of meat for exportation. I do not mean salted meats, but pickled meats. The preparation of these meats for export is an industry of considerable importance and interest to the Northwestern farmer. Anything you do to interfere with or render more difficult or expensive the production of this cheap and wholesome white-wine vinegar is an injury to many interests beyond the interests of the vinegar people themselves.

[Mr. KERR, of Pennsylvania, withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. LIND was recognized.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that the Chair has been furnished with a list of names of gentlemen who propose to speak.

Mr. BAKER. And my name is not on the list? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. BAKER. It must be a beautiful list.

Mr. WALKER, of Missouri. I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that this debate——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. WALKER, of Missouri. To discuss the pending proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in reply to the gentleman from New York on the binding-twine question a few words. I notice that he did not deny my statement, to wit, that the chairman of the twine trust, who was before the Committee on Ways and Means and made a statement, admitted that the binding-twine trust or binding-twine manufacturers are now selling twine at from 3 to 4 cents a pound more than the price of the raw material, with the cost of manufacturing added.

Now, I made a statement awhile ago that, while the committee had done well in reducing the tariff on this schedule, nevertheless they had increased the protection, and I am ready to prove it. I cite the committee to page 660 of the last Report on Commerce and Navigation, the current number of the report, in proof of what I say. That report shows you that the ad valorem rate of duty on jute is 20 per cent., that being the amount fixed by the present law. The ad valorem rate on manila and sisal grass is a fraction over 15 or nearly 16 per cent. Now, binding-twine is made largely from manila, sisal, and sun grass, but it is also made of jute.

The core of the twine is usually from the jute, and the wrapper, or the outside, is of more elastic or shiny fiber, such as sisal or manila grass. On the average, taking the two in the ratio in which they are usually used, I submit to you upon the Government report that the ad valorem duty on the raw material is about 19 per cent. The ad valorem duty on the binding-twine according to your table on page 72 is 21.48, so that the differential, to wit, the protection to the manufacturer, is the difference between the duty on the raw material and the manufactured article, which is slightly over 2 per cent., and that is all the protection the twine manufacturer has under the existing law.

Substantially my statement is correct. Now, I say you have put raw material on the free-list, and you have given, as reported in that bill, according to your figures, the manufacturer an ad valorem protection duty of 15 per cent., which would be an increase of nearly 700 per cent. of protection.

Mr. BOUTELLE. How do you figure that out?

Mr. LIND. I figure that out easily.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like the gentleman to make that clear.

Mr. LIND. Permit me to give the gentleman from Maine a lesson in arithmetic. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would be glad to have it.

Mr. LIND. I have taught arithmetic, and I have thought that I had good scholars, and I trust the gentleman from Maine will prove to be one.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will not compliment myself.

Mr. LIND. Twine under the existing law, as I demonstrated, has about 2 per cent. protection over the raw material. That is the dif-

ference between the duty on the raw material and the manufactured article. If you double that once then you make it 4 cents, and that is an increase of 100 per cent. If you make it 6 you treble it, and 8 and 10 and so on. Now, you can carry out the operation of it. Is not that correct? Is not that good common-school arithmetic?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have not figured it out.

Mr. LIND. The gentleman will have to have a slate to understand it. I appreciate that.

Mr. BOUTELLE. You have passed that.

Mr. LIND. Gentlemen have spoken about trusts being all over the United States. Assuredly a trust is the very finest thing in the world for those who are in it, but to the farmer who comes to buy twine it is not so desirable. I want to state that I represent a very large farming district, although I have not been "howling" about the farmers. The farmers, most of them, are competent to take care of themselves if you will give them decent laws. They have to work long hours, and they do not come here claiming pay for eight hour's work and go back for eighteen years. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIND. I move to strike out the last word. That has been done often and I have not trespassed upon the time of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota be permitted to proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes' further time allowed him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas that the gentleman from Minnesota be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I will state that every penny that our farmers can save counts so much. The average twine bill of a farmer in my district is $50 a year. It varies from $30 to $100, but the average is about $50. I speak of my own knowledge. Now, a difference of 7 per cent. or 8 per cent. in the price of twine is quite an item. The twine bills of the farmers of the Northwest run up to nearly $4,000,000. If we can save a few cents a pound—if we can save 7 or 8 per cent., it is worth while. Gentlemen plead for the laborers who work in this binding-twine industry and the gentleman from New York wanted to shield them against competition.

Mr. PAYNE. Did I speak of any binding-twine industry in New York?

Mr. LIND. I know they are there, whether you alluded to them or not. [Laughter and applause.]

Now let me say, and I ask particular attention to this, you have pleaded in behalf of the American market, in favor of American labor and against competition with the pauper labor. I, too, plead in behalf of American labor. The situation as it is now compels the farmer in the Northwest to seek a market for his wheat in the markets of the world in Europe. What kind of wheat does he meet there? Does he meet protected wheat? Does he meet there a commodity raised by protected labor? On the contrary he meets the wheat of India, which is produced by as low-priced labor as any in the world. Still we go there and meet it. We are compelled to do so. We do not complain, but when we ask for cheaper twine you ought not meet us with the plea of protecting your labor at the expense of ours.

The chairman of the committee in his opening speech said that "we will give rebates to every American who seeks the foreign market and who has been burdened by a tariff on his productions." We want him to give it to us in the way of reducing the price of twine. [Applause.] But you can not help us by a rebate, because our twine is not exported; it is consumed in the very use of it. You give a rebate to the miller on the jute-bags. I voted to give a rebate on cotton-ties. That is why I am pleading for leave to offer my amendment to reduce the duty to one-half cent per pound. I do not ask to put twine on the free-list. I am willing to allow a sufficient duty to protect American labor to a reasonable extent, but we do not propose to be bled by this trust any longer.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] be permitted five minutes longer.

Mr. SPRINGER. And I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to have a vote on his amendment.

Mr. REYBURN and Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Who objects?

Mr. REYBURN. I do.

Mr. LIND. Is there a twine manufactory in your district?

Mr. REYBURN. There is not.

Mr. WILSON, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND]. I believe he begins to realize now that the tariff is a tax, but if he still labors under the hallucination under which he seemed to be laboring a short time ago, when he stated that if he had ten minutes he could satisfy the Ways and Means Committee that they had committed a grievous error in that part of the schedule, I should think that by this time he must have found out that he has been talking to those who, having ears hear not, and having eyes see not.

Mr. McMILLIN. "Neither understand." [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON, of Missouri. Now, sir, the idea of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] endeavoring to convince that committee or any other gentleman on that side of the Chamber that it is right to vote as he argues is ridiculous, and I think he has ascertained by this time that he has reckoned without his host. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Minnesota is not alone upon that side of the Chamber. I believe that if it were possible for many an honored Representative over there to throw off the yoke of King Caucus and defy the party whip, they would range themselves in line with us upon the side of the people. But it is not to be. The fiat has gone forth. This bill, as it emanates from the lips of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that part of it in addition to the part which has been presented to us in print, will leave this Chamber the law of this land so far as it can be made a law here.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Let me say to the gentleman that there is not an item in this bill that has been fixed by caucus dictation.

Mr. WILSON, of Missouri. My friend says it has not been fixed by caucus dictation. The "caucus" that I allude to is the Committee on Ways and Means, who are more autocratic in this Chamber than the Czar of Russia in his dominions; and my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], even with his own great power, dare not resist the authority of that committee. But that there is to be a day of reckoning there can be no question.

Mr. Chairmain, I represent—and in saying this I mean to make no invidious distinction—I represent upon this floor the finest agricultural district upon the continent, and I have the authority of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture to back me in that statement. The people of that district are equally divided in politics or have been heretofore. A few days ago the largest convention ever held in the district, representing almost every farmer in it, a representative convention of Democrats and Republicans, assembled in the city of St. Joseph and passed a series of resolutions, which I hold in my hand. That convention was held after this tariff debate had been flashed upon the wires all over this country. The resolutions are as follows:

The demands or, more properly speaking, the platform of the Farmers and Laborers' Union is as follows:

I. That we demand the abolition of national banks and the substitution of legal-tender Treasury notes in lieu of national-bank notes, issued in sufficient volume to do the business of the country on a cash system; regulating the amount needed on a per capita basis as the business interests of the country demand; and that all money issued by the Government shall be legal tender in payment of all debts, both public and private.

II. That we demand that Congress shall pass such laws as shall effectually prevent the dealing in futures of all agricultural and mechanical productions, pursuing a stringent system of procedure in trials as shall secure the prompt conviction, and imposing such penalities as shall secure the most perfect compliance with law.

III. That we demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

IV. That we demand the passage of laws prohibiting the alien ownership of land, and that Congress take early action to devise some plan to obtain all lands now owned by aliens and foreign syndicates, and that all lands now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of such as is actually used and needed by them be reclaimed by the Government and held for actual settlers only.

V. Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and especial favors to none, we demand that taxation, national or State, shall not be used to build up one interest or class at the expense of another. We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all revenues, national, State, or county, shall be limited to the necessary expense of the Government, economically and honorably administered.

VI. That Congress issue a sufficient amount of fractional paper currency to facilitate exchange through the medium of the United States mail.

VII. That the means of communication and transportation shall be controlled by and operated in the interest of the people, as is the United States postal system.

And it is further agreed, in order to carry out these objects, that we will support for officers only such men as can be depended upon to enact these principles into statute law uninfluenced by party caucus.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON, of Missouri. I want only a few moments more to express my sympathy for my friends upon the other side. [Laughter.] I feel sorry for them over there; I do upon my word. [Laughter.] I look upon them more in sorrow than in anger. I am giving a reflex of the sentiment of the farmers of the West, in Iowa as well as Missouri, for my district borders upon the State of Iowa and I am familiar with it. A narrow thread of water separates my district from Kansas and from Nebraska, and I know the sentiments of the people there, and this convention held at St. Joseph represents the people of those States as well as of those who were present at it or directly represented. I say that the hour is rapidly coming, and will dawn next November, when it will be too late for my friends on the other side to bewail the part they are taking under the leadership of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and driven by his party whip-lash.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a tariff speech nor am I going to make a political speech. There are some few things, however, in this bill to which I want to call the attention of both sides of the House. I have sat here now for about eight days listening with attention to discussions on the tariff schedules, but as yet I have heard nothing in regard to jewelry or diamonds and but very little in regard to statuary or paintings. What I have to say I want to say as much for the benefit (if I may so speak) of the committee as of the members of the House.

I first call attention to the schedule in regard to jewelry. The rates upon jewelry range from 10 to 50 per cent., none being higher than 50

per cent. The duty upon diamonds, cut and set, is only 50 per cent. There are three clauses in regard to jewelry: paragraphs 452, 453, and 454. The last provides that precious stones of all kinds, cut but not set, shall pay a duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem; if set, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Without making any application or any comment upon the schedules, I pass to the next clause, paragraph 559, if my memory serves me correctly. That refers to diamonds, uncut or rough. This bill admits such diamonds and all such precious stones free of duty. They are placed upon the free-list, I suppose, on the ground that they are regarded as necessary to life.

Passing from that, I call the attention of the committee to clause 758, in regard to statuary and paintings, admitting these works of art free of duty, absolutely free.

I have offered and had printed in the RECORD certain amendments in regard to these several clauses as to jewelry, diamonds, statuary, and paintings, amendments which I hope will have the attention of the committee, and through the committee be brought to the attention of the House to-morrow before a vote is taken upon this bill.

A MEMBER. What do you propose to do in regard to jewelry?

Mr. HILL. I ask that the import duties upon jewelry be raised, that diamonds, rough and uncut, be placed upon the dutiable-list, and that statuary and paintings imported for private use be also placed on the dutiable list.

A MEMBER. Do you not know if that were done it would interfere with the rich people?

Mr. HILL. I suppose very likely that is the fact. We all know that under the provisions of this bill a wealthy man of America can go to Europe, store a ship with diamonds or paintings or statuary of the finest character, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, and bring them into our ports absolutely duty free. I say that is not Republican doctrine; I say it is not Democratic doctrine; I say it is not fair to the toilers of America. If there is any class of imported goods that should pay duties it is these luxuries of taste: diamonds, jewelry, statuary, and paintings.

In this connection I wish to read from the statement of Thomas Donaldson, made before the Ways and Means Committee at its present session. He says:

> Three gentlemen appeared before the honorable Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on December 30, 1889, and asked that foreign art for the purpose of luxury be admitted free of duty.

Mr. J. Carroll Beckwith, Mr. Kenyon Cox, and Mr. William A. Coffin, all of New York City, were the gentlemen. It will be especially observed that they all came from New York City. Mr. Beckwith said nothing, but advertised a new nine-months-old organization called the National Free Art League, and had noted the fact that he was of the executive board. Mr. Cox said that he was also of the executive board of this new art experiment, and Mr. Coffin also notified the expectant committee that he was of the same board. The board probably consists of three. Beyond this what he said was of little real moment, as it was statement, not reason. These three gentlemen did not file a petition or present a line from any artist, layman, dealer, or buyer asking for the admission of art works free for luxury.

Mr. Cox was the chief spokesman, and he labored under the difficulty of not stating what was true and being ignorant, unintentionally of course, of both the law and facts. He demanded the free admission of foreign art for educational purposes. It is so admitted now.

The act of March 3, 1883, the existing tariff law, provides that all foreign art for education, culture, exhibition, museums, churches, associations, etc., enters free. See also sections 2503, 2508, 2509, Revised Statutes United States.

Foreign art imported for private use, luxury, decoration of private houses, trade, or commerce, as are silks, feathers, diamonds, ribbons, velvets, champagnes, brandies, Persian rugs, only is now taxed for expenses of the Government.

Mr. Cox stated:

> The first tariff on art in this country was passed in 1861, putting a tariff on works of art, as a war measure. * * * Up to that time works of art had been admitted into the country free of duty.

Of course he does not know anything about the law, and so is excusable. The several tariffs on foreign art used for luxury have been as follows:

In the tariff of 1790, 1791, 1792, 10 per cent. ad valorem; acts of 1794, 1795, 10 per cent.; acts of 1797, 1800, 12½ per cent.; acts of 1804, 1807, and 1808, 15 per cent.; acts of 1812, 1813, 1815, and 1816, 30 per cent.; acts of 1841 and 1842, 20 per cent; acts of 1812 and 1846, paintings on glass, 30 per cent.; act of 1861 to March 3, 1883, 10 per cent.; act of March 3, 1883, 30 per cent. The committee, with the above knowledge in their minds, must have smiled at the law statement of Mr. Cox.

Mr. Cox evidently knows nothing of the Tariff Commission of 1882 and its acts. That commission was charged with the investigation of the tariff and to advise as to reductions or increases.

The free foreign art clause, for luxury, was considered in open session; testimony was taken, the reports of special agents of the Treasury were used, and one especially, that of Col. George C. Tichenor, now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in line with retention of this duty, and the commission reported to Congress that the duty on foreign art brought into the United States for luxury and trade and commerce be made 30 per cent., and the House Committee on Ways and Means so ordered, and it became a law March 3, 1883, more than seven years ago. The petition filed at that time from American artists was one to reduce the duty on frames. From that moment to the present the battle has been incessant by a handful of men to repeal this law and admit foreign art free for luxury. They have been millionaires, art dealers, art hucksters, artists, who earnestly believe in free trade, artists who are dependent, and some cranks, almost all of these urged on by rich men. In justice to a majority of them, it must be stated they have asked that oil-paintings, water-colors, statuary, etchings, engravings, and lithographs be admitted free.

Almost all of these movements have originated in Europe and are aided by American artists who received their art education in Europe and are "so thankful, you know." In May, 1884, so incessant was this demand that the Ways and Means reported a bill on the subject. It was a less vicious proposition than this present scheme. It was a bill to merely reduce the present 30 per cent. duty to 10 per cent. On the 19th of May, 1884, on this bill, reported by Mr. Hurd, of Ohio (got left the following fall in a manufacturing or laboring district), the House of Representatives, after a full discussion on the question of suspending the rules for the passage of H. R. 6751, the above bill, which was to reduce the duty on foreign art used for luxury from 30 to 10 per cent., in thirty-five minutes set its eyes in death by a vote of 52 in its favor to 179 against it, and 92 not voting. Of the 52 who voted ay only 17 survived in the Congressional election of that fall.

Make a note here, brethren; free luxuries and taxed necessities do not work well together in a popular government and under a protective tariff.

Brethren, on pages 4294 to 4298 of the RECORD of the first session, Forty-eighth Congress, you will find some mighty interesting reading in this matter. By the way, the dinner-pail frequently has brains at the handle. During 1885, 1886, and 1887 the free-foreign-art-for-luxury people never ceased their efforts. In 1888 the Mills bill placed foreign art for luxury on the free-list. The indignation aroused by this was so great that in the caucus of the Democrats of the House held in May, 1888, on motion of Mr. HOLMAN, of Indiana, the free-art-for-luxury clause was stricken out, and almost without opposition. July 9 following, in the House, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE made a motion to concur in this, and so monstrous was the proposition considered that at once his motion was unanimously agreed to, and this in the midst of a heated partisan tariff discussion.

The Finance Committee of the Senate, during 1888, were urged to insert free foreign art for luxury in their bill (see the RECORD). Oh, no; too much experience in that committee to be caught, and the matter was not inserted. The appearance of the three gentlemen from New York is the next move. It will be noted here that the Secretary of the Treasury, in his recommendations for tariff reduction in 1889, did not suggest free foreign art for luxury. He fully understands that duty is only paid on paintings or statuary when entered for private use, luxury, or trade or commerce, and that for every purpose of education, art education and culture, exhibition, decoration of public places, etc., such articles are admitted free by the present law. Art for private use and purposes of decoration is purely luxury. You can not eat, drink, or wear it.

Permit me in this connection to suggest that in revision of tariff laws no duty now fixed by the law of March 3, 1883, on an article of luxury should be removed until taxes are first removed from articles of necessity. And, further, in this connection, the following lines from the platform adopted by the Republican party at Chicago, Ill., June 21, 1888, and upon which the present Ways and Means Committee obtained power, are of interest:

> The Republican party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenue by repealing * * * etc., and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which, etc.

This means that articles imported for luxury are to remain upon the dutiable list so far as the action of the Republican party can effect it.

Do not be mistaken, gentlemen; you are not asked to relieve the poor or to take a duty off of a necessity. You are not asked to aid education. You are asked to further aid the rich and provide them with free art luxuries, and the poor are to pay duties on necessaries to the end that revenues may come from customs to pay interest on the public debt and expense of Government.

Why not take the duty off of champagne? Every drinker will petition for it, vote for it. Why not give him free champagne as well as Vanderbilt, Marquard, Belmont, or other rich picture-buyers their foreign pictures free?

Let us balance the books a moment.

If one kind of art is to be free, why not all? Why should not this free-art clause embrace the art of engraving, etching, lithographing, and all carving and statuary? And why not porcelains and bronzes? All are pleasant aids to culture.

Give the poor man his low-priced picture free if you give the rich man his high-priced one free.

Statistics of importations of paintings and statuary.

Year.	Duty.	Value.
	Per cent.	
1882	10	$2,574,816
1883 (last year of 10 per cent. duty)	10	3,088,673
1884 (first year of 30 per cent. duty)	30	637,753
1888	30	1,440,753
1889	30	1,193,072

The duties collected in 1888 from foreign art and statuary for luxury and commerce amounted to $432,225.85, and for the year 1889, $357,921.47. The present bill, Mr. Chairman, proposes to dispense with the collection of these duties, which in two years have amounted to nearly $800,000, and make foreign art and statuary absolutely free; in other words, as I understand it, to practically donate to the importers or dealers in art and statuary and the wealthy men—the millionaires of this country—a sum now amounting to nearly $400,000 a year. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that this policy is either wise or justifiable. As I understand the policy of the Republican party it has been to release from import duties only those articles of foreign production, like food and raiment, which are necessary to the comfort or sustenance of the people, and never before in the history of this nation has any of the great parties which have controlled the Government attempted to release works of art or other like luxuries from the imposition of such duties.

We have heard much during this discussion, Mr. Chairman, about the laboring men of this country and the great depression in agriculture, and orators on both sides of the House have vied with each other in their expressions of sympathy for both of these classes. That sympathy would be better expressed in acts rather than in words. The wealthy men need no protection at the hands of the Government. Wealth protects itself; but not so with the poor. We have them with us always, and they need the strong, protecting hand of Government. If fortune has not smiled upon them, the laws at least should not frown upon them.

Lovers of art and those able to indulge their taste for fine art can well afford to pay duties upon these importations. The Government needs it, and it must have revenue from some source to defray its needful expenses. It costs now over $1,000,000 daily, Sundays included, through the whole round of the year to run this great Government of ours. Who should pay these expenses? Not the poor, surely, whose every dollar is needed to feed and clothe themselves and families. At best they receive but little protection at the hands of the Government; they have little to protect. Not so with the wealthy. Every dollar that the rich man calls his own remains his by the protecting arm of the Government. Let him pay for this protection. If he chooses to indulge in works of art and other like luxuries of taste or dress, let him pay for that privilege, and let that payment go into the general Treasury for the use of all the people.

A few words more, Mr. Chairman, in regard to diamonds and jewelry and I have done. As I have already stated, this bill proposes to admit diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut, including glaziers' and engravers' diamonds, unset, as well as diamond dust and bort, and jewels to be used in the manufacture of watches, absolutely free of duty, while upon precious stones of all kinds, including diamonds, cut or unset, is imposed a duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem, and, if set, only 25 per cent. ad valorem. Why this discrimination and why these low rates of duty? To my mind it is wholly indefensible. The only argument I have heard suggested in way of defense is that precious stones, and especially diamonds, can be smuggled into this country, and thus entirely evade the revenue laws; but surely it is as easy to smuggle an uncut diamond as one that is cut, and the former is placed upon the free-list while the latter is charged only with an ad valorem duty of 10 per cent.

It is true that articles of this kind, especially diamonds and other like precious stones, can be more easily smuggled across the ocean or border than more bulky commodities, and that such smuggling would be to some extent practiced if the import duty upon them was high enough to tempt the avarice of the would-be smuggler is no doubt true; but this explanation fails to explain why a simple duty of but 10 per cent. is placed upon those that are cut and no duty at all upon those that are uncut. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, it is well to remember that the days of smugglers and smuggling goods in any quantity or of any character, either across the ocean or across the border, are practically ended. Our commerce across the ocean is now carried on in great steam-ships, and the ports along our coast are bountifully supplied with custom-houses and custom-house officers whose sworn duty it is to see that the custom laws are not evaded; and along the border of the great lines of traffic between this country and Mexico and Canada officials are constantly on the watch for the same purpose; and in these days of railroads, telegraphs, and revenue-cutters, the smuggler, even of diamonds or other precious stones, ought to stand a strong chance of speedy detection and punishment.

In any event, where a principle is at stake, it is worth the trial. Under the law as now proposed no revenue will be collected from the uncut class of precious stones and but a trifle from the other, and the Government could not be a loser by the effort to enforce a high rate of duty, and the principle at least of taxing foreign imports of luxuries and of thus making the wealthy bear a ratable proportion of the expenses of the Government would at least be maintained.

To my mind diamonds, statuary, paintings, precious stones, and jewelry of all kinds imported should not only be placed upon the dutiable list, but a high rate of duty imposed.

As this bill now stands it gives strong color to the charge that legislation is influenced in the interest of the few and at the expense of the many, for the wealthy and to the neglect and ultimate loss of the laboring poor.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not mean to charge or even insinuate that legislation is so influenced or controlled; but the charge will be made and it must be met on the stump and before the people, and even the suspicion of the truth of such a charge should be avoided. Let us remember here and now that this is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and not a government "of the few, by the few, and for the few."

[Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois, withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE withholds his remarks for revision. [See Appendix.]

Mr. BAKER. I should like to ask for information of the Chair whether the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota or the cider amendment is being considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to answer.

Mr. BAKER. I shall object to any further discussion except it be relevant to the amendment pending.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I want to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question. Although he has had an additional five minutes given to him, I could not get a question in. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin give his attention for a moment? I represent a part of a State in which four-fifths of all the hemp raised in America is raised, and the question I desired to ask the gentleman was, how can you protect American hemp by admitting its cheapest competitor free from duty? Now, American hemp makes the best binder-twine, and when it is put in connection with certain other things it is the very best. How does it protect the hemp to put on the free-list its cheapest competitor?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will tell my friend.

Mr. BAKER. I object. I make the point of order that this is not discussing the vinegar amendement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to state these facts so definitely that it will become clear to see that even with manila and sisal on the free-list hemp can be manufactured into binder twine and sold in this country so as to undersell the manufacturer here.

Mr. BAKER. I raise the question of order that this discussion is irrelevant to the question pending before the committee. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLARKE].

[Mr. CLARKE, of Alabama, addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I want to address myself to the amendment. Two propositions are pending before the House of the same origin.

Mr. BAKER. I should think there were about forty. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. There are only two that are being immediately considered, and they have reference to the manufacture of vinegar from spirits or low wines and from apples. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has, at the request of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, submitted two propositions. They are equally acceptable to him so far as protecting the interests of the Government is concerned. They are not, however, equally acceptable to those who are engaged in the several branches of the business which will be affected by these propositions.

It has been suggested here by honorable gentlemen that there is some disposition to deprive the manufacturers of spirit vinegar of their opportunity to obtain the spirits necessary to conduct their business free of tax. Neither proposition contemplates that. It has been thought by the manufacturers of cider vinegar, it has been thought by the distillers of the country, that it is quite enough for the manufacturers of vinegar that they are placed upon an equal footing with other industries. As my friend from New York [Mr. SAWYER] has said, there is not another industry in this country which is permitted to use alcohol free of tax and to manufacture it for use except those who are engaged in the manufacture of spirit vinegar.

The proposition of my honorable friend from New York [Mr. SAWYER] is that they shall still have their alcohol free of tax. The prop-