

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 41, noes 21.

Mr. DOCKERY. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make the point that no quorum is present?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do.

Mr. CANNON. As it is now about 5 o'clock and as there seems to be no quorum in the House, I move to adjourn.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. CANNON, it was agreed to.

CHARGES AGAINST COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

Pending the announcement of the vote on the motion to adjourn,

The SPEAKER said: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YODER] declines to serve on the committee to investigate charges against the Commissioner of Pensions. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be excused, and the Chair will appoint in his place the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LEWIS].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 314) for the relief of Mary B. Le Roy;

A bill (S. 388) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the record of Noyes Barber on the rolls of the Navy Department;

A bill (S. 510) granting a pension to John W. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 775) granting a pension to Andrew J. Foust;

A bill (S. 848) granting a pension to Mary J. Eadie;

A bill (S. 916) granting a pension to Mary E. Harney;

A bill (S. 973) granting an increase of pension to Virginia L. M. Ewing;

A bill (S. 1203) granting a pension to Miss Margaret Stafford Worth;

A bill (S. 1256) granting a pension to James A. Myers;

A bill (S. 1732) granting a pension to Nancy A. Thornton;

A bill (S. 1740) granting a pension to Mary J. Welch, an army nurse in the late war;

A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan;

A bill (S. 2043) granting a pension to Edgar M. Cherry;

A bill (S. 2066) placing the name of Elizabeth Domm on the pension-roll;

A bill (S. 2366) granting a pension to Florida Kennerly;

A bill (S. 2644) for the recognition of F. A. Patterson as a captain of the Third West Virginia Cavalry;

A bill (S. 2698) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;

A bill (S. 2832) for the relief of Jesse H. Strickland;

A bill (S. 2859) for the relief of Caroline Baker Stevens, relict of the late Col. Robert J. Stevens, and daughter of the late Col. Edward D. Baker;

A bill (S. 2976) granting a pension to Mary L. Bradley, formerly Mary L. Smith, who served as a nurse in the war of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 3101) granting a pension to Anna Rodgers Macomb;

A bill (S. 3177) granting a pension to Ursula Lucretia Haight;

A bill (S. 3194) granting a pension to Joseph H. Scoopmire;

A bill (S. 3498) granting a pension to G. L. Pease; and

A bill (S. 3840) to remove the charge of desertion against George Feterman.

The result of the vote on the motion to adjourn was then announced; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

HOUSE BILL WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a House bill with Senate amendments of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9486) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, a report of a committee was delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 8491) to provide for the examination and classification of certain mineral lands, and for other purposes, accompanied by a report (No. 2984)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, a bill of the following title was introduced, read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COVERT: A bill (H. R. 11774) for the establishment of a light-house at Orient Point, on the coast of Long Island, New York—to the Committee on Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 11775) for the relief of Larkin Harned—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EWART: A bill (H. R. 11776) to place the name of Noah Harwood on the muster-rolls of Company B, Second North Carolina Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11777) granting a pension to Alfred T. Moreland, of Johnson County, Tennessee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YODER: A bill (H. R. 11778) granting a pension to Joseph Barrow, late private Company G, One hundred and ninety-eighth Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, August 19, 1890.

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

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I present the petition of J. K. Lewis and 32 other citizens of the Territory of New Mexico, praying for the passage of the private land claims court bill. As the bill is pending and has been under consideration, I move that the petition lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I present a petition of the heirs, or those who claim to be the heirs, of Jesse Fish, jr., praying for the confirmation of an alleged Spanish grant embracing the largest part of Anastasia Island, at St. Augustine, Fla. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented the memorial of John D. Henderson and 24 other cigar-manufacturers of the ninth internal-revenue district of Pennsylvania; the memorial of H. F. Affelbach and 24 other cigar-manufacturers of the ninth internal-revenue district of Pennsylvania; the memorial of J. F. King and 21 other cigar-manufacturers of the ninth internal-revenue district of Pennsylvania, and the memorial of H. D. Frey and 25 other cigar-manufacturers of the ninth internal-revenue district of Pennsylvania, indorsing the tobacco schedule of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of G. A. Warren and 64 other residents of Bradford County, Pennsylvania, praying for the prompt passage of House bill 5978, regulating the transportation of liquor in certain cases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HISCOCK presented the petition of Dry Goods Economist, of New York City, N. Y., praying for such legislation as will afford protection to American flax and linen; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4312) to provide American registers for the steamers Stroma and Marco Aurelia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4278) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn., reported it with amendments.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 4332) to prevent the building of houses along certain alleys in the city of Washington, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARBOUR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4333) regulating the rate per annum of telephone service in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 4334) to authorize the building of a bridge at Dardanelle, Ark., across the Arkansas River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. QUAY, as follows:

Resolved, That the following orders be adopted for the government of the Senate during the present session of Congress:

Ordered, 1. That during the present session of Congress the Senate will not take up for consideration any legislative business other than the pending bill

(H. R. 9416); conference reports; general appropriation bills; pension bills; bills relating to the public lands, to the United States courts, to the postal service, to agriculture and forestry, to public buildings; and Senate or concurrent resolutions.

Ordered, 2, That the consideration of all bills other than such as are mentioned in the foregoing order is hereby postponed until the session of Congress to be held on the first Monday of December, 1890.

Ordered, 3, That a vote shall be taken on the bill (H. R. 9416) now under consideration in the Senate, and upon amendments then pending, without further debate, on the 30th day of August, 1890, the voting to commence at 2 o'clock p. m. on said day and to continue on that and subsequent days, to the exclusion of all other business, until the bill and pending amendments are finally disposed of.

For the foregoing stated purpose the following rules, namely, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXV, and XL, are modified.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on this resolution; but I was engaged on public business yesterday, and I wish to be to-day, in regard to matters before a committee of which I am a member. I should prefer to proceed to-morrow morning. I understand that will be agreeable to the mover of the resolution. I ask, therefore, that the resolution may lie over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. QUAY. I have no objection to the resolution going over until to-morrow morning without prejudice, with the understanding that it shall be taken up then in the order it stands to-day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution, then, if there be no objection, will lie over until to-morrow morning, subject to be called up in the morning hour. The Chair hears no objection.

LIQUORS IN THE CAPITOL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be read.

The resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PLUMB was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be directed to make such order as shall wholly prevent the sale or drinking of spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

Mr. BUTLER. I offer an amendment as an addition to the resolution.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the resolution the following:

And that the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make daily inspection and examination of the committee-rooms and other apartments of the Senate wing of the Capitol and report to the Committee on Rules after each of said inspections whether he has found any spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors in the same, or any of them, and that said Committee on Rules shall preserve said reports for the use of the Senate.

Mr. GORMAN. I move the reference of the resolution and the amendment to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BLAIR. I suggest that the mover of the resolution is not present. He may have some preference as to the course it should take.

Mr. BUTLER. Let it lie over until the Senator from Kansas comes in. I am sure he will accept my amendment.

Mr. BLAIR. I should be very sorry to take the time of the Senate with a set speech of four hours in order that ordinary courtesy might be shown to the mover of the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. It would be more regret to the Senate, I think, than it would be to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAIR. I would prefer to listen to the Senator from Wisconsin on the subject. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maryland moves that the resolution and the amendment be referred to the Committee on Rules. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of the mover of the resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it lie over until the Senator from Kansas comes in.

Mr. BLAIR. I am sorry Senators should exhibit such fear of an absent Senator. Evidently they are determined to kill this resolution without a fair hearing and to choke off debate contrary to the rules of the Senate. I do not understand this anxiety to reach the tariff bill. It seems to me that the resolution ought to go over until to-morrow morning at the least, unless the Senator from Kansas should soon come in, and then undoubtedly he would be willing to gratify the anxiety of Senators representing the great Democratic party and have an early disposition of this measure.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests that the resolution and amendment lie over until to-morrow, to be taken up in the morning hour.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that a reference be made as proposed by the Senator from Maryland. If the Senator from Kansas shall come into the Chamber and say he desires a different disposition and desires it to come up to-morrow morning, undoubtedly the Senate would at once unanimously reconsider the reference.

Mr. BLAIR. I object. I would rather exercise my voice a little while than to have this matter so peremptorily disposed of and so unusually disposed of.

Mr. TELLER. Let it lie over.

Mr. BLAIR. That is all I ask.

Mr. GORMAN. I did not observe that the Senator from Kansas

was not in his seat when I made the suggestion, and I of course will withdraw the motion until his return to the Chamber.

Mr. BLAIR. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Then, if there be no objection, the resolution with the amendment will lie over until to-morrow, retaining its place, and subject to be called during the morning hour. The Chair hears no objection.

TRIAL OF LIEUTENANT GUY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] coming over from a former day. The resolution will be read.

The following resolution, submitted yesterday by Mr. PLUMB, was read:

Resolved, That the commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to make forthwith to the Senate a full and complete report, containing copies of all charges and complaints, and by whom made, against Lieutenant Guy, of the police force, and of all testimony and statements taken by or made to said commissioners, or either of them, concerning such charges, and whether said Guy in his trial was informed of all the charges and complaints made against him by any and all persons to said commissioners, or either of them, and, if not, the reason therefor, and what action has been taken in said trial or otherwise concerning said charge.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the resolution ought to go to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TELLER. Let it lie over.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it lie over, as the Senator from Kansas is not present.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the resolution will not go over. It is simply a resolution of inquiry. It has been charged very promptly here that a lieutenant upon the police force has been placed upon trial and has been denied the privilege of seeing or knowing what the charges were; in other words, that it was a star-chamber proceeding; and I think we ought to have the facts in the case.

Mr. SPOONER. I hope the resolution will not be acted upon this morning. It ought to be sufficient ground for laying it over that the mover of it is not present. I should be very sorry to see the Senate make a court of appeals from the trial court for police officials.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not police officials.

Mr. SPOONER. This trial has been proceeding for a great many days. I know nothing about the merits of the case, but every day the newspapers have been filled with testimony, the examination of witnesses, and the cross-examination of witnesses, Lieutenant Guy evidently being represented by counsel before the commissioners, testimony given as to various charges, testimony given in rebuttal, argument of counsel on both sides, and not yet decided; and I certainly should hope the Senate would not interfere with the matter at all in its present status. If after the commissioners shall have passed upon it the occasion seems to exist for a review and the Senate of the United States is a proper body to review it, it will be time to take it up.

I shall certainly move, if the resolution must be taken up to-day and disposed of to-day, that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I think a standing committee ought to consider the subject before this precedent is established and before the Senate enters upon this matter of reviewing a decision of the commissioners in any such case.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator from Kansas is absent, and I suggest that the resolution lie over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the mover of the resolution being absent—

Mr. COCKRELL. One moment, please. The Senator from Wisconsin is mistaken. This is no appeal from a police court. This is not an instruction to a police court. It has nothing on earth to do with it. It is a direction to the commissioners of the District of Columbia, who are acting under the authority of Congress and who constitute practically a bureau—such a direction as we have given to them fifty times, a common, almost monthly occurrence, calling upon the District commissioners for information. Here it is charged that in this trial they have suppressed the charges and have refused to let the defendant, who is placed upon trial, know what they are, and yet they are trying him. Now, is it right to wait until they have passed a star-chamber judgment or is it right to let the people know and let the Senate know whether this is a trial or a mockery?

Mr. SPOONER. I think in view of the fact that the adjudication of the commissioners may result entirely in the acquittal of this official, for aught the Senator knows, it would be very wise in any event to wait until the trial is concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. And then it is beyond the remedy, probably, of Congress, beyond the reach of Congress; and when it is exposed and it is known what kind of proceedings are taking place, it may be there will be some kind of judicial consideration given to the case.

Mr. SPOONER. If any wrong is done by the commissioners to any police official, the publicity which will be given to it will in the end right the wrong. It would be a very remarkable performance, it seems to me, while this matter is under judicial investigation, the result of which no one knows or can know, which may result in an acquittal, that the Senate should adopt a resolution upon such a predicate as this, calling upon the commissioners to send in all the testimony and charges.

I grant the power of the Senate to pass such a resolution, of course, but I hope the resolution will not be passed at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the mover of the resolution being absent, it will lie over without prejudice, to be called up in the morning hour to-morrow morning. The Chair hears no objection.

ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. BLAIR. I present the minutes of a joint hearing of the House and Senate committees upon the alcoholic liquor traffic. I ask that the matter be printed, and later, when we see what the document is, I shall ask an order for extra copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire presents testimony taken before the Committee on Education and Labor relating to the alcoholic liquor traffic, and asks that it be printed. If there be no objection, the usual number of copies will be printed.

Mr. BLAIR. After which, when I see how expensive the document is, I shall ask an order for additional copies.

MARY ELLEN FITZGERALD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1502) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Fitzgerald; which was, in line 5, to strike out "thirty" and insert "eighteen" before "dollars."

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment. The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 116) extending the privilege of the Library of Congress to the members and secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 846) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay and the executors of Donald McKay.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 18th instant approved the act (S. 4225) to amend an act approved August 6, 1888, authorizing the construction of bridges by the Houston, Central Arkansas and Northern Railway Company.

The message also announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 3787) to amend the laws relative to shipping commissions;

An act (S. 3917) to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea;

An act (S. 4207) extending the time of payment to purchasers of land of the Omaha tribe of Indians in Nebraska, and for other purposes; and

An act (S. 2644) for the recognition of F. A. Patterson as a captain of the Third West Virginia Cavalry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Attorney-General, transmitting, in further answer to a resolution of the Senate of the 1st instant, an appeal from the award made by the commissioners for damage growing out of the improvement of the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers in the case of W. E. Goutermont; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in answer to a resolution of the Senate of June 28, 1890, a complete list of all the Spanish and Mexican private land claims now pending before the Department of the Interior; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If there be none, that order is closed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9416.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Rhode Island, the Calendar under Rule VIII being in order, moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9416.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes.

CROW INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. POWER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which has been heretofore partially considered by the Senate, House bill No. 526.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside that he may ask for the consideration of a bill the title of which will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 526) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure and submit to Congress a proposal for the sale to the United States of the western part of the Crow Indian reservation, in Montana.

Mr. ALDRICH. As this bill has been partially considered, I shall not make an objection, if it does not lead to discussion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having been previously read at length, shall it be again read?

Mr. SPOONER. What is the bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be reported by title.

The Chief Clerk read the title of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill having been read at length, the further reading will be waived and the pending amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 7 of the committee's amendment, after the word "portion," it is proposed to insert "of the reservation in Montana;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to appoint a commission consisting of three discreet persons, whose duty it shall be to negotiate with the Crow Indians for a surrender to the United States of all that portion of the reservation in Montana, or so much thereof as they will consent to surrender, which is situated south of the Yellowstone River and west of the divide between Pryor Creek and Clark's Fork River in said State, and to report to Congress the result of any such negotiation. But no agreement for any such surrender shall be valid until ratified by Congress.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FORT DOUGLAS RESERVATION.

Mr. TELLER. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have put on its passage a bill for the right of way across the Fort Douglas military reservation in Utah, for a street railway. It has the approval of the War Department and it will not lead to any debate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside that he may ask the consideration of a bill the title of which will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 4229) granting a right of way through certain lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment; which was, at the end of the bill, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the location and width of said right of way shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and that the privileges hereby granted shall be subject to revocation or such changes as may be required by him, and that said changes shall be made at the expense of the said railway company; also that no stables shall be erected on the reservation, and that no part of this land or right of way shall be used for storage of cars.

So as to make the bill read:

That a right of way is hereby granted to the Popperton Place and Fort Douglas Rapid Transit Company, a railroad corporation duly organized and now existing under the laws of the Territory of Utah, across the Fort Douglas military reservation, by a route surveyed and laid down upon a properly certified map, a copy of which is now on file with the Secretary of War, which location has been submitted to and approved by the post commander and the commander of the department. Said right of way shall not exceed 100 feet in width through said reservation, except where side-tracks, spurs, turn-tables, or stations are located or to be located; and at such points the additional right of way shall not exceed 200 feet on each side of the main track and not exceed 1,000 feet in length: *Provided*, That the location and width of said right of way shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and that the privileges hereby granted shall be subject to revocation or such changes as may be required by him, and that said changes shall be made at the expense of the said railway company; also that no stables shall be erected on the reservation, and that no part of this land or right of way shall be used for storage of cars.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

A bill (H. R. 8584) to increase the pension of Edward Healy;

A bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 11491) for the relief of the estate of Charles F. Bowers; and

A bill (H. R. 6454) to establish a national military park at the battle-field of Chickamauga.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. House bill 9416 is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope now we shall have a vote upon the pending amendment. The paragraph has been under discussion for several days, and I am very anxious that it shall be disposed of.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not hear the Senator.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has repeatedly endeavored to preserve order and requests that Senators will be seated and refrain from conversation. Complaint is made that the proceedings can not be heard.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was making an appeal to the Senate that the vote be taken upon the amendment to the pending paragraph. This paragraph has been under consideration for four days, and I am extremely anxious that greater progress shall be made in the consideration of the bill, and I appeal to Senators to abstain from further discussion upon this paragraph at least, and that we may proceed to take a vote.

Mr. MORGAN. What side of the Chamber do you address that request to?

Mr. ALDRICH. Both sides.

Mr. BLAIR. After the plaintive appeal of the Senator from Rhode Island I shall not ask for the consideration of the army nurses bill this morning; but I desire to say that unless the discussion of the tariff bill is very soon concluded and final action had I shall feel it my duty to move to displace that bill and ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the army nurses bill.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, paragraph 137, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the words "2.10 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent," and to insert after the word "pound," in line 7:

And there shall be paid to the manufacturers of tin-plate in the United States, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a bounty of 1 cent per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just read proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB]. The yeas and nays have not been ordered, as the Senator from Maryland or some other Senator suggested yesterday afternoon.

Mr. McPHERSON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FAULKNER. I desire to ask the Chair whether or not the whole proposition as stated is embraced in the amendment on which we are now asked to vote or whether it only involves the question of the insertion of the bounty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is upon the proposition to change the rate and to provide for a bounty also.

Mr. GORMAN. Let it be read.

Mr. FAULKNER. Can that be divided? If so, I ask for a division of the question?

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, in paragraph 137, line 6, after the word "pay," it is proposed to strike out "2.2 cents," and insert "1 cent," and after the word "pound," in line 7, to insert:

And there shall be paid to the manufacturers of tin-plate in the United States, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a bounty of 1 cent per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was about to say that the first part of this amendment is identically the same amendment that the Senate has already voted upon once. If a division is to be made upon that alone that amendment would not be in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the Senator from West Virginia to demand a division of the question. The Secretary will therefore read the first part of the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the word "pay," in paragraph 137, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "2.2 cents per pound" and insert "1 cent per pound;" so as to make the clause read:

And on and after July 1, 1891, all iron or steel sheets or plates, or taggers iron, coated with tin or lead or with a mixture of which these metals, or either of them, is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, shall pay 1 cent per pound.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would state that this proposition, having once been voted upon and decided in the negative, the question can not be again taken upon it in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. VOORHEES. Then the question will be simply on the allowance of the bounty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Yes; on the question of bounty. The Secretary will report the second clause of the proposed amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. Does the Chair decide that the question can not be taken on the proposition to strike out and must be solely on the insertion of the bounty?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair holds that the amend-

ment is susceptible of the division which has been demanded by the Senator from West Virginia, the first part of the proposition being to reduce the rate and the second to provide for a bounty. The Chair further states that the proposition to reduce the rate has once been negatived in Committee of the Whole, and therefore the question can not be renewed at this parliamentary stage of the proceedings.

Mr. PLUMB. It is not renewed, if the Chair will pardon me, but it is renewed in connection with another proposition, a portion of which is that which has already been voted upon; and the effect of the two, taking the two together, is different. Of course, if the Chair holds that the bounty alone has got to be voted upon after we have put up the duty, I shall withdraw at once. The Chair will readily see that that has the effect of totally preventing the Senate from voting upon a proposition which a number of its members desire to vote upon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is not responsible for the dilemma in which the Senate is placed. He states a parliamentary proposition.

Mr. ALDRICH. I appeal to the Senator from West Virginia—

Mr. PLUMB. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from Kansas can only be withdrawn by unanimous consent, the yeas and nays having been ordered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the proposition is withdrawn. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. PADDOCK. Before the announcement of the withdrawal I was about to appeal to the Senator from Kansas to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. I think no one wants to vote for a bounty in addition to the already enormous duty proposed by the bill as it stands.

Mr. PADDOCK. That is very true. I want to vote for the proposition of the Senator from Kansas exactly as proposed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposition can be renewed in the Senate.

Mr. PADDOCK. Then I give notice that in the Senate I shall move the amendment if the Senator from Kansas does not.

Mr. DOLPH. I wish to raise the point of order, or at least inquire as a point of order, if it is true that the Senate now finds itself in a position that it can not vote upon a part of this proposition. Is the proposition divisible?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. DOLPH. Then we should be in the situation of being subject to a rule by which a proposition is divisible and when once divided one part of it can not be voted upon. It seems to me that if it be true that the Senate is precluded from voting upon a part of the proposition, then it is no longer divisible.

Mr. PADDOCK. I do not know a thing myself about parliamentary law, but as a matter of common sense it would seem to me that it ought to be in order.

Mr. BUTLER. The whole matter can be obviated when the bill gets into the Senate. The Senator will not have the slightest difficulty then in moving the amendment, as I understand the Chair to rule. That is the ruling, that the proposition can be renewed in the Senate, as I understand.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Certainly. The Senator from Kansas has withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to make one parliamentary inquiry or suggestion. I understand the decision of the Chair is that when once a proposition has been voted upon no other proposition adding to the part can be voted upon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair makes no such announcement.

Mr. PLUMB. That seems to be the effect of the decision.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is merely deciding the question before it, and not a hypothetical question that may arise hereafter.

Mr. PLUMB. That is the effect of the decision of the Chair, it seems to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The decision was as to the proposition to amend by changing the rate of duty. The question of the bounty can be voted upon in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Kansas that his amendment presents the question of a bounty, pure and simple. It is not a proposition to strike out; it is not a proposition to change the rate of duty and give a bounty, but it is simply a bounty proposition, as I understand it.

Mr. PLUMB. No; it is not. It is a proposition to reduce the rate of duty as well as to provide for a bounty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. One branch of the proposition of the Senator from Kansas was to reduce the rate of duty from 2.2 cents to 1 cent per pound.

Mr. HARRIS. I had read the printed amendment, and that simply proposed a bounty.

Mr. GORMAN. Of course, the Senator from Kansas having withdrawn his amendment, I do not desire to take an appeal from the decision of the Chair, but I do desire to enter my dissent publicly from the decision as made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is entirely willing, as he has no pride of opinion, that the question shall be submitted to the Senate. It is a matter of entire indifference to the Chair.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senate a few days since voted upon the proposition to strike out 2.2 cents and insert 1 cent, which was voted down.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It was decided in the negative.

Mr. GORMAN. Then the Senator from Kansas offered an entirely different proposition, that is to strike out 2.2 cents and insert 1 cent, and coupled with that the additional provision that a bounty of 1 cent should be offered to the manufacturers of tin-plate. That amendment was unquestionably in order, and the yeas and nays were ordered upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] demanded a division of the question.

Mr. GORMAN. Very good. The Senator from West Virginia demanded a division. The question was divisible; and, the amendment being in order under the rules of the Senate, the Senator from West Virginia had the right to demand a division; and the Senate has the right in my judgment and by the uniform custom of this body to vote upon that division. I suggest to the Chair that probably in the hurry of the moment his decision was made reversing the universal practice of this body.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has no doubt about the correctness of his decision.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the Chair if he holds that the amendment of the Senator from Kansas changing the rate of duty from 2.2 cents to 1 cent and adding the clause giving the bounty was in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it was.

Mr. HARRIS. I think that amendment is clearly in order, and I think the Chair is clearly right upon the proposition that we can not vote again in Committee of the Whole upon the proposition that the Committee of the Whole has once decided, to reduce from 2.2 cents to 1 cent, as an isolated proposition. In other words, the question is not divisible so far as that branch of it is concerned.

Mr. REAGAN. Of course I always listen to the rulings of the Chair with the greatest respect; but when a question is presented to strike out the duty of 2.2 cents a pound and insert 1 cent and to provide for a bounty of 1 cent a pound, and that is the entire proposition, if a division is demanded I suggest to the Chair with great respect, and always doubting my own judgment when it comes in conflict with that of the Chair, that the fact that the amendment heretofore offered in a different form was voted down, the idea of striking out the duty of 2.2 cents comes up, but still it is a part of an entire proposition. It seems to me that if a division is demanded, the question would first have to be taken upon the first part of the proposition to strike out the 2.2 cents as a part of the whole proposition. Of course, if stated nakedly by itself, I should not doubt the propriety of the ruling of the Chair; but it seems to me that the only effect of a division is to reach by two votes that which is authorized to be reached by one vote; and that the vote must be taken with reference to the whole proposition as though a division had not been called for.

Mr. CULLOM. If there is no appeal pending, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

Mr. McPHERSON. I should like to make an inquiry. If I understand aright the committee's amendment in line 7, after the proviso had been agreed to there has been no vote taken yet in Committee of the Whole on agreeing to the text of the bill as amended by the committee; that is to say, there has been no vote taken on paragraph 137 fixing the rate of duty at 2.2 cents a pound.

Before we depart from this paragraph, on a question so important as this, I want to have the decision of the Committee of the Whole upon this rate; and in order that we may meet it, I intend to strike out all in the first line on page 29, commencing after the word "steel" in that line and going down to and including the word "pound," in line 7, the effect of which would be, after July 1, 1891, to put tin-plate on the free-list.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In paragraph 137, on page 29, line 1, after the word "steel," it is proposed to strike out:

And on and after July 1, 1891, all iron or steel sheets, or plates or taggers iron, coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals or either of them is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, shall pay 2.2 cents per pound.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPOONER. I offer an amendment to come in after the word "pound," in the seventh line of page 29, in the one hundred and thirty-seventh paragraph.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after the word "pound," in line 7, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That on and after October 1, 1896, tin-plates and terne-plates lighter in weight than 63 pounds per hundred square feet shall be admitted free of duty,

unless it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the President (who shall thereupon by proclamation make known the fact) that the aggregate quantity of such plates lighter than 63 pounds per hundred square feet produced in the United States during any of the five years preceding June 30, 1896, has equaled one-third the amount of such plates imported and entered for consumption during any fiscal year after the passage of this act, and prior to said October 1, 1896: Provided, That the amount of such plates manufactured into articles exported, and upon which a drawback shall be paid, shall not be included in ascertaining the amount of such importations: And provided further, That wares tinned in the United States and manufactured from black sheets of said weight made in the United States shall be considered tin-plates produced here within the meaning of this provision.

Mr. McPHERSON. It is almost impossible to understand the amendment, as read, in its application to this paragraph. I therefore suggest that this amendment or any other which may be offered shall be printed, and that we pass over the paragraph and proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to this amendment going over until to-morrow morning and being printed if desirable, but I do object, however, to the whole paragraph being passed over.

Mr. CULLOM. You do not want us to discuss this paragraph all the week?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I think the amendment will be easily understood by Senators who will give it attention. The substance of it has been heretofore printed as a proposition intended to be moved by me at the proper time.

The Senate has voted on an amendment to reduce the duty on tin-plate from 2.2 cents per pound to 1 cent. I voted to maintain the duty provided by the bill, on the theory that it was wise public policy, if we could bring it about, to secure the manufacture in the United States of the tin-plates and terne-plates demanded for use by consumers in this country.

I voted for that, knowing that for the time being the duty involved in a sense a tax, though hardly appreciable by individuals, upon the consumers here, and thinking that it was a cheap price to pay if we could thereby secure within a reasonable time the manufacture of tin-plates for our own use within our own borders and by our own labor. But there has been expressed, and seems to be a doubt, as to whether we can make tin-plates of the finer gauges in this country. I am not absolutely certain that we can, in competition with Wales, although I believe it can be done. It has not been done up to this time. Senators on the other side think the present duty is fully adequate and that the failure to engage in the industry is because of our inability to do it on other grounds. My own impression has been that the failure was entirely to be ascribed to the inadequacy of the duty.

The fact remains that, notwithstanding the duty for many years, we are not manufacturing tin-plate thinner than No. 28 wire gauge. Now, for one, while entirely willing to give all needed protection to this industry and all encouragement that we can give to bring about its inauguration and progress in this country, I am not willing to leave it in such shape that we may for the next ten, twelve, or fifteen years be imposing this duty of 2.2 cents per pound on these grades of tin-plate, and at the end of that time be told that the duty was inadequate, and so find ourselves in the same position we are to-day, comparatively with no domestic manufacture of tin-plate of these gauges.

Intending to give all the time that is necessary in order to inaugurate this industry and carry it forward, I have here provided that if within six years, excluding practically this year, as it ought to be, for it is too late to do anything in that direction this year—if before October 1, 1896, there shall not have been manufactured in this country during some one intervening year an amount of tin-plate thinner than what is known as No. 28 wire gauge, equal to one-third of the importation of those gauges during some one year of the five years, thereafter tin-plate of these gauges shall be put upon the free-list. That is all that there is in the proposition.

I have provided that there shall be excluded from the annual computation tin which is admitted to the country and upon which a drawback is paid when it shall have been manufactured into some article of tin for export, thus making it practically free. I have included in the annual computation only that tin which is imported and withdrawn from bonded warehouses for home consumption, to exclude the amount of tin which is sometimes largely imported and kept in bonded warehouses one year, or two years, or three years, and then a part of it exported. I have provided for including in the computation wares made of black sheets of such weight, made here and tinned here. This seems just. All I have intended to accomplish by this amendment is to make these people, who claim they are ready with great capital to engage in this industry and that they can do so successfully, put up their money and go ahead with it, or if, after the lapse of a reasonable time, they shall have failed to do so, to put tin-plate of these gauges upon the free-list.

I am told, and from my investigation I believe it to be true, that these gauges thinner than No. 28 wire gauge and those up to 36 comprise the tin (and the 63 pounds per hundred square feet is the same thing, only it is easier to get at it by the inspectors than by the gauges) and are the gauges or weights used in making tin-dishes, tin-cans for packing and canning purposes, and in making the tin-pails and the man-

ufacture of articles of that character in general domestic use. It excludes, however, generally tin-plate which is made for roofing purposes.

I do not wish the proposition to be understood as being at all unfriendly to the adequate protection of this industry or the encouragement of it, because I am a protectionist, and I prefer that we shall make all we need in this country if we can do so.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, as it seems impossible to lower the duty upon tin-plate and beyond any conjectural possibility that it will be placed upon the free-list, I am disposed to support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. If this outrage is to be mitigated, even in 1896, it is better than to accept the proposition of the Finance Committee with the notification already made to us that additional terror is to be imparted to this bill by a duty of 4 cents a pound upon block-tin.

I read the other day, in the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin, an article from *The American Economist* denouncing this amendment and declaring that its effect would be to absolutely put tin-plate upon the free-list. If *The American Economist*, the highest authority in this country upon protection, is correct, I am heartily in favor of the amendment; but, while, in my judgment, it will not have that effect, it is a mitigation of what I conceive the most gross and palpable outrage inflicted upon the people of the United States in this whole measure.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] yesterday made it so plain that there could be no mistake about it that the course pursued by the Committee on Finance in regard to this duty is utterly inconsistent and indefensible. They have reported to the Senate an increase from 1 to 2.2 cents a pound upon tin-plate without any duty whatever upon block-tin. They increased that duty with the facts before them in regard to block-tin and declared solemnly to the Senate and to the country that this increase of 1.2 cents a pound was all that was necessary. They come in afterwards and put a duty on the raw material of 4 cents a pound, and we know where the inspiration for that increase came from. It was from no additional facts, but it was from the exigencies that arose for controlling the four votes from the two Dakotas.

My friend from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] tells me that I have not read the whole of the amendment. I have not read it at all, but I am alluding to that feature of it which says—and that was the only point discussed by the Senator from Wisconsin—that if in 1896 there should be not as much of this tin-plate manufactured in the United States as is imported, then the duty should be absolutely taken off and tin-plate put upon the free-list.

Mr. SPOONER. The one-third of the importations during any one of the five years.

Mr. VEST. One-third of the whole in any one year of the five. That is different, but I simply wish to state that any sort of qualification or mitigation of this legislation as it is about to be voted by the Senate is, in my judgment, a relief to the people of the United States, and any prospect of putting tin-plate upon the free-list I shall welcome with great avidity, and I fully appreciate what the Senator from Wisconsin has said in regard to the uncertainties that surround this whole subject.

We are now asked to place a duty of 4 cents a pound upon block-tin, and to do it upon the statement of one of the Senators from South Dakota that a large amount of block-tin is already upon the "dump" and ready for use, and that a railroad is about to be constructed to carry it to market, and the additional fact that a company has been organized with \$15,000,000 of capital to go into this business. If that be so, Mr. President, if \$15,000,000 is ready to be invested by capitalists, it seems to me that no additional legislation is necessary upon this subject.

Mr. President, against the assertion of the Senator from South Dakota I put the statement of another Senator of this body, the Senator from California [Mr. HEARST], who is recognized as the best expert miner upon the face of the earth, not only in this country, but anywhere else—the most successful miner. He visited these mines for the purpose of investment, went through them in this very Harney Peak district which is spoken of by the Senator from South Dakota, and he says now, as I am informed, that there is not tin there in sufficient quantities to justify investment.

Mr. GIBSON. Has the Senator seen the opinion of Professor Hall, who is professor of geology in the University of Minnesota?

Mr. VEST. Yes, I have that before me now. Here is that opinion, and I was about to read it:

Professor Hall, professor of geology in the University of Minnesota, visited the Harney Peak district in company with a fellow-geologist and made an examination for no other purpose than to satisfy himself. In a paper read at the December meeting of the Minnesota Academy of Sciences he said that—

"The tin ore of granitic area (i. e., that portion of the Black Hills containing tin at all) would never be found to occur in paying quantities save in occasional "placers" into which the ore of removed areas of granite had been collected, or in occasional lumps of granite having a larger quantity of ore than the average of the granitic mass, this fact (of non-existence in paying quantities) being due to the igneous origin of these rocks and the non-segregated condition of the ore in most masses of the carrying rock."

And yet we are asked in the face of this testimony from the best expert in the United States or in the world on mining, and also from this professor who goes there not in the interest of any company, but

to satisfy himself—we are asked to put 4 cents a pound duty on block-tin, and the people of the United States under this nebulous and uncertain condition of affairs, under this experimental condition, are to pay this duty upon tin-plate of 1.2 cents a pound and added to that the burden that must come from an increase of 4 cents a pound upon block-tin.

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

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. VANCE. I ask the Senator if he has any information—I do not find it in the tables presented to us here—as to the amount of block-tin imported into this country and the amount of additional money the people of the United States will have to pay if the duty is kept at 4 cents a pound.

Mr. VEST. I have the tables here—

Mr. CARLISLE. The Senator will permit me to say that, based upon the importations of tin in the year 1889, if a duty of 4 cents per pound is imposed, as suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, the revenue would be one million three hundred and some odd thousand dollars per annum from that source.

Mr. GIBSON. If the importations continue the same?

Mr. CARLISLE. If the importations continue the same as in the year 1889, which is the only basis we can have for calculation upon this subject.

Mr. VEST. I have addressed myself so far simply to the salient point in the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. As to the details of that amendment in regard to galvanized sheet-iron and the provisions contained in the latter part of the amendment, I do not commit myself, because I have not read them and I could not catch their full meaning as they were read from the desk.

I simply want to emphasize what I have said as to the extraordinary course pursued by the Finance Committee in regard to this matter, who, after declaring to the Senate and to the country that 1.2 cents per pound increase on tin-plate was all that industry demanded, have now supplemented that by a duty of 4 cents per pound upon the raw material, and without any other reason except the demands made upon them, we are warranted in believing, by the Senators from the Dakotas.

As the Senator from Kentucky said yesterday, and it is absolutely unanswerable, they have made some mistake in regard to this matter; either their first proposed legislation of an increase on tin-plate of 1.2 cents a pound was not sufficient or it was sufficient, and, if not sufficient, an increase of 4 cents per pound upon block-tin is absolutely indefensible. They admit that they must have made this mistake, but they give no reason whatever for this extraordinary action.

More than that, the facts do not warrant any cautious and prudent legislator in entering upon this undiscovered and unexplored domain of block-tin and the manufacture of tin-plates in this country upon the facts which are given to the Senate. We know very well that if the manufacturers of galvanized iron at Pittsburgh did not demand all the profit that they get from the tariff duty upon iron-plates they could very easily go into the manufacture of tin-plates. But they want it all. They want the increased duty upon tin-plate so as to keep it out of the country and increase the consumption of their own manufacture of iron-plates, and in either event, whether this duty upon block-tin is placed upon it or not, even with the simple increase of 1.2 cents a pound on tin-plate they know very well that they will force the American people to buy largely of their iron product.

Mr. SPOONER and Mr. BLAIR addressed the Chair.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I rise merely to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question, and then I shall not detain him from the floor. I am not sure that I caught the whole of his amendment, but I understand it to be to this effect, that if in any one year of the five years, excluding the present year, between now and 1896, the American manufacture of tin-plate is not one-third of the foreign importation of any one year, then the duty is by the express provision of law to disappear in 1896 and free trade will be substituted for protection upon this manufacture. Is that so?

Mr. SPOONER. I will answer the question if the Senator is through with it.

Mr. BLAIR. I want to be assured that I understand the Senator's proposition, and then I shall follow it by this suggestion, so that he may meet the whole without my troubling him again. If there be a provision of that kind made, it would seem to me absolutely certain that the English trust, with the entire capital and ability to produce and import tin, will be concentrated in some one year's effort, whether there be consumption corresponding in this country or not, and that there will be such an importation in some one of these years as to utterly drown out the American production; and with a threat of that kind hanging over the effort to establish the industry, it would be utterly impossible to obtain the investment of the first dollar, and so the entire effort to establish the industry must fail.

Mr. SPOONER. Only a moment. The difference in principle between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and myself upon all subjects connected with the tariff is so marked and irreconcilable that I am almost afraid to support the proposition which I make myself if it meets his approval; and if this amendment could have the effect

which he has suggested, I should vote against it if offered by anybody else, and even should repudiate it having offered it myself.

I did not see the article, to which the Senator referred, in the Economist, though I have seen some criticism of this amendment in several so-called protection papers. I think the amendment as I first gave notice of its introduction was justly open to the criticism passed upon it. It gave a much shorter time and required the domestic manufacture to be equal to one-half of the importation. It was early printed to elicit criticism. On reflection there seemed to me to be clearly danger that the amendment drawn in that way would encourage and render it entirely practicable for the tin-plate-manufacturers abroad, by flooding the country with their products for the requisite years to render it impossible for us to make the domestic production equal to one-half of the importation.

I have accordingly changed the amendment so as to provide that it during any one year of the six years after October 1 there shall be produced in this country one-third of the amount of tin-plate of these gauges (none of which are made now) imported and entered for consumption during some one year of the six years, the duty shall remain, and I have otherwise so changed it that I believe the interest is entirely protected, and that it can not discourage the investment of money in this industry. If longer time is required I shall be entirely satisfied if the time fixed by this amendment is extended.

I want to encourage this industry. I believe, Mr. President, in the industrial independence of this country as far as it can be brought about. We import yearly millions upon millions in value of tin-plate. If through this duty we can manufacture it all, no matter if for the time being we pay a higher price for it, if we can supply in our own country our own demand, if we can make our people independent of foreign producers, if we can in that way bring down the price to our people, as we will if we can change the condition which exists to-day and has for years, under which the price of tin-plate is maintained while the price of block-tin has gone down, I am anxious to do it and to help to do it.

But, Mr. President, there is an element of uncertainty about it. No man is able to say here with absolute certainty that in two years or five years we shall be able to manufacture, I do not say tin-plate, but tin-plate of these gauges, thinner than 28. I believe we can; I hope we can. If we can not do it on this duty of 2.2 cents a pound and we could certainly do it on 3.2 cents a pound, I should be willing to vote for it.

The sole object of this amendment is this, that if after a reasonable time, five years, six years, or whatever it may be, it shall be found impossible to manufacture in this country tin-plate of these gauges, we shall give it up. If in six years they can not manufacture one-third of the importation for consumption here under the restriction and limitations of this amendment it is an experiment too expensive to be carried further, and these finer gauges ought to be free. If they can manufacture it, this amendment can do no harm.

If the committee, who in the nature of things are able to master the details of this subject, and who know more about it than those of us who may properly be called laymen in relation to it, are of the opinion that the limit fixed in the amendment is such as to discourage the investment of money in the manufacture of tin-plate and longer time is needed, I should be quite willing to accept a proposition to extend it.

I repeat I am a protectionist, and I would do nothing to discourage the establishment of this industry in this country. But I am not willing that ten, twelve, or fifteen years shall go by with this duty of 2.2 cents per pound on the thinner gauges of tin-plate with none of it manufactured in the United States. No industry and no interest has a right to ask such a thing as that of the people. As I have said before, and that is the object of this amendment, if after giving them a liberal chance and abundant time to start the industry, to put it on its feet, we find it can not be done, then I want to stop this duty.

Mr. BLAIR. If the Senator will allow me, I understand his explanation of the amendment to be this, that if there be any one year during the five years in which the American manufacture is not one-third of the importation—

Mr. SPOONER. No, sir.

Mr. BLAIR. Then—

Mr. SPOONER. If there be in any one year in the six in which the American manufacture is equal to the importation during any one year of the six.

Mr. BLAIR. In his explanation to the Senator from Missouri I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to state it precisely the other way.

Mr. SPOONER. No; the Senator states it just exactly as it is not. The proposition is that if during any one year of the six years the production in the United States equals the importation for home consumption—

Mr. BLAIR. One-third of the importation?

Mr. SPOONER. One-third of the importation, for home use, during any one year of the six, then the duty is to continue.

Mr. BLAIR. That is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. SPOONER. I am quite willing that the proposition shall be printed and should go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that that course be taken. The prop-

osition made by the Senator from Wisconsin is to require a reasonable pledge from the manufacturers of the United States of their good faith in this matter, and I will say for the members of the committee upon this side of the Chamber that in that view they approve of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin. I will say further that I have myself no reasonable doubt that the American producers of tin-plate will manufacture a very much larger proportion in every one of the five years than one-third.

Mr. CULLOM. In view of the remarks of the Senator, it seems to me that the Senate is as well prepared to dispose of this amendment now as it will be at any future time. I submit whether we had not better take a vote upon it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am quite willing unless it leads to prolonged discussion.

Mr. VEST. Since I have heard the explanation of the Senator from Wisconsin, and especially what is said by the Senator from Rhode Island, I want some time to examine this amendment. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.* The Senator from Wisconsin has paid me the very high compliment of saying that his views and mine are utterly irreconcilable upon the tariff. I am very greatly obliged to him for that public declaration. He could pay me no higher compliment than that.

Mr. SPOONER. You are entirely welcome.

Mr. VEST. I simply wanted, as I said before, to emphasize my conviction of the outrage of this whole increase of duty by saying that I will take any sort of modification as a boon compared with the naked deformity of the committee bill as it is now urged upon the Senate.

I want to say further to the Senator from Wisconsin that his modification does not answer the objection made to his amendment in *The American Economist*. He will find that article copied into the *RECORD* a few days ago in some remarks I made upon tin-plate. The salient point in that attack upon the amendment was that if there was a possibility of tin-plate going upon the free-list, as there would have been even if the original amendment had been adhered to, and the American manufacturer could produce in one year one-half of the foreign importation, no American manufacturer would enter upon this venture at all; in other words, that the manufacturer, and this was unquestionably a manufacturer who was indorsed by *The American Economist*, wanted the absolute increase of 1.2 cents without any condition, and I read it in the Senate to show that their object was to put the increase upon tin-plate in order to force the American people to buy their galvanized sheet-iron at Pittsburgh.

At the same time I read extracts from remarks of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who managed the debate in 1888 upon the tariff bill known as the Senate substitute, in which he stated repeatedly that if this increase was made there were forty manufacturing establishments ready to go into the manufacture of tin-plate at once. The Senator from Wisconsin will find that his modification does not remove the objection of these manufacturers; but since the Senator from Rhode Island says it is acceptable to the committee I want time to examine it.

I ask, therefore, that this amendment may go over and be printed, for I was not able to understand all of its provisions.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no objection, I think, on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. Not at all. I said I was entirely willing that it should be printed and go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there any understanding about the time when it is to be considered?

Mr. SPOONER. However, it would be open in the Senate if it were adopted now in committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The understanding being that the amendments of the Committee on Finance should be proceeded with *seriatim*, under that understanding this proposed amendment would not be in order until the bill had been gone through with, except by unanimous consent otherwise.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that it be taken up in the Senate. I suppose it may just as well be considered there.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate any more on this proposition, but I ought not to let some of the assertions made here in this Chamber go into the *RECORD* without contradiction.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that when the paragraph is reached increasing the duty upon block-tin he can then answer the statement which has been made by Senators upon the other side.

Mr. MOODY. Very well; I am perfectly willing to conform with the wishes of the Senator having this bill in charge. I want to put upon record, and I shall at the proper time, abundant proofs that the statements made by Senators here with reference to the production of metallic block pig-tin in this country are not well founded. They have no proof of any kind or character. On the contrary, the proof is abundant here before the Senate, and I have additional proof placing it beyond all sort of question.

A Senator has been quoted here. Now, I do not believe that that Senator authorized any quotation from him, because to my certain knowledge he has not been in that region of country in five years, during which time all these developments of that property and industry have

occurred. Indeed the developments have taken place in much less time than five years. The discoveries have existed for many years, but the developments of that property have all been made practically within the last three years, and most of them within the last two years.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The understanding being that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin goes over, the Chief Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. VANCE. When does the amendment go over to?

Mr. GIBSON. I should like very much to hear the Senator from South Dakota on this subject. He says there is ample proof here that this tin-block exists. We have had no such proof or evidence placed before the Senate.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I will say that when the paragraph relating to block-tin is reached I shall be very glad to give to the Senator and the Senate the information and knowledge that I have upon the subject; and I do not speak merely from information. I do not talk about mining block-tin nor mining tin-plate, nor do I confound tin-plate with block-tin. I understand something about the production of that material. I happen to live in that immediate vicinity, and I have been conversant with these properties ever since they were discovered years ago, and with all their development. I shall be very glad indeed, if I can, to furnish the Senator from Louisiana any information upon the subject either privately or before the Senate when the proper time comes; but the Senator having this bill in charge prefers that I shall delay until that item is reached, and that request of course I willingly comply with.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will proceed. The Chief Clerk read paragraph 138. The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the paragraph, in line 23, on page 29, by striking out after the word "cold-rolled," the words "smoothed only, not polished;" so as to make the paragraph read:

138. Sheet-iron or sheet-steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, 2½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That plate or sheet or taggers iron or steel, by whatever name designated, other than the polished, planished, or glanced herein provided for, which has been pickled or cleaned by acid, or by any other material or process, or which is cold-rolled, shall pay one-quarter of 1 cent per pound more duty than the corresponding gauges of common or black sheet or taggers iron or steel.

Mr. McPHERSON. I want to call attention to paragraph 138, and to the tables that are given here and the unit of value in sheet-iron and sheet-steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name known. It will be seen that the unit of value is 5.9 cents. This is upon what is called Russian sheet-iron, a very expensive material. The majority of the sheet-iron made in this country which is polished, planished, or glanced can be bought to-day for less than 3 cents a pound. Therefore, the rate of duty is anywhere from 80 to 100 per cent. upon this particular character of iron; that is, there is a protection on iron costing from 2½ or 2½ to 3 cents a pound of from 80 to 100 per cent., and that is the special object in making this high rate of duty. I move to strike out the words "and one-half" in line 18, so as to make the duty 2 cents per pound.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, paragraph 138, line 18, strike out the words "and one-half;" so as to read:

Sheet-iron or sheet-steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, 2 cents per pound.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McPHERSON. It will be seen that in line 24 there is an addition of one-quarter of 1 cent a pound put upon iron simply because of the fact that it has gone through a smoothing process, perhaps preparing it better for the application of tin. It is in reality an addition to the sheet-iron which will be used for the purpose of making tin-plates and terne-plates, etc. I only call attention to it. It is hardly worth while to move to strike out anything in this bill, but it seems to me to be extraordinary.

Mr. VANCE. I observe that this is a very large increase; that the iron described in the latter clause of the one hundred and thirty-eighth paragraph, cold-rolled, etc., shall pay one-quarter of 1 cent per pound more duty—

Mr. ALDRICH. In order that the Senate may not be deceived about this, I ask that the provision of the present law be read. It is no increase at all. It is the same rate that is provided in existing law.

Mr. VANCE. Then, Mr. President, the committee, or the expert rather—for I suppose it is all the work of the expert of the committee—has misled the Senate, because the report states that the duty is increased from 39.27 to 61.20 per cent., almost double. I think that the explanation will be found in the law itself. It requires that plate, or sheet, or taggers iron or steel, by whatever name designated, other than the polished, planished, or glanced otherwise provided for, which has been pickled or cleaned by acid or by any other material or process, or which is cold-rolled, shall pay one-quarter cent per pound more duty than the corresponding gauges of common or black sheet or taggers iron or steel; and that common black iron or steel sheet taggers iron, when thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, shall pay 1 cent per pound, which makes 2½ cents a pound,

which, according to the table submitted to us by the expert, with the tacit assent at least of the committee, is an increase of from 39 per cent. to 61 per cent. and a fraction. I should like to know why that is.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have stated a dozen times in the hearing of the Senator from North Carolina that the committee is in no wise responsible for the tables annexed to this report, which were prepared by Mr. Charles H. Evans, who has prepared similar tables for every committee, Democratic or Republican, which has prepared a tariff bill for the last twenty years. The text of the law and of the bill which we propose is what governs in this matter, or should govern, it seems to me very clearly. I will read for the information of the Senator from North Carolina the present law:

Polished, planished, or glanced sheet-iron or sheet-steel, by whatever name designated, 2½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That plate or sheet or taggers iron, by whatever name designated, other than the polished, planished, or glanced herein provided for, which has been pickled or cleaned by acid or by any other material or process, and which is cold-rolled, shall pay one-quarter cent per pound more duty than the corresponding gauges of common or black sheet or taggers iron.

I read from paragraph 152 B of the indexed tariff prepared at the Treasury Department. The Senator can see that there is no change in the rates of the existing law in this paragraph.

Mr. VANCE. Then, Mr. President, I think the other Senators over here, whose early education has been somewhat neglected, have a right to complain that there has been put before us by an expert, or by somebody, a table which is incorrect and which misleads us. The Senate ordered this report to be made and the statement of the reasons in every case why there was a departure from the existing law, whether an increase or a reduction, and that it should state the fact of an increase or a reduction. In accordance with what we supposed was a response to this order of the Senate, these tables were submitted to us by the committee, and being unaccompanied with any report disclaiming responsibility for them, we were authorized to infer that the committee recommended us to abide by them and to accept their statements as correct. Yet here is a statement which makes the change and the increase that I have designated in the face of a foot-note that this is a reduction of one-tenth of a cent per pound on the various forms to correspond with other classes of iron and steel manufactures. If I am wrong I have been led wrong by following this report and these tables submitted to me.

Mr. ALDRICH. In justice to Mr. Evans and for the further information of the Senator from North Carolina, I will say that I suppose he has reference to the item of taggers iron at the foot of the table on page 29. I understand the Senator is referring to that item.

Mr. VANCE. The explanation there given embraces the whole paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the increase to which the Senator refers is upon taggers iron, is it not?

Mr. VANCE. It is upon taggers iron; that is, upon cold-rolled or pickled.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; that is it exactly. That is one of the items alluded to in this table. Now, the present duty upon taggers iron is 30 per cent. ad valorem. That has been increased by the action of the committee and by the action of the Senate in paragraph 136, which has already been adopted, to 1.1, or whatever the rate is upon corresponding gauges of common black sheet-iron or sheet-steel. The increase which the Senator is finding fault with does not occur in the paragraph now under consideration, but was provided for in paragraph 136.

Mr. McPHERSON. You made no increase in paragraph 136 above the existing law—

Mr. ALDRICH. We put in taggers iron—

Mr. McPHERSON. Except to put taggers iron in.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the Senator from New Jersey would have discovered that we put in taggers iron with other grades of common black sheet-iron.

Mr. VANCE. That is another ground of complaint that I think we have a right to make in this case, that the changes come in in a manner calculated to avoid observation and to escape detection. The explanation is given on one page and relates to one paragraph, and the figures show the increase; but the Senator who has the bill in charge now tells us that the real increase took place in another paragraph, where it does not appear at all. Taggers iron was put in, and known to none but those who are acquainted with the methods of proceeding of the manufacturers and of these experts, for the purpose of deluding men whose technical education does not embrace all of these little tricks and contrivances of the trade, in such manner that the ordinary observer can not detect them.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to my friend from North Carolina whether he is not a little unreasonable in requesting that the majority of the committee should furnish the minority of the committee with observation and understanding about a bill which they are supposed to know as much about as any one else. If it came from persons outside of the committee a plea of ignorance would certainly be permissible, but it seems to me that a member of the minority of the committee who has discussed this question upon this floor constantly for the past three or four years should have a reasonable amount of knowledge at least of what the bill contains.

Mr. VANCE. Perhaps. Mr. President, the Senator does not ad-

vert to the fact that the minority members of the committee were not present when this manipulation of the tariff duties was had. It was done in secret, at least it was secret so far as the rest of the committee were concerned and all of the outside world except the beneficiaries of this taxation, who I presume were on hand and telling how it might be done and how it might be done so that it would escape detection. The purpose of the Senate in directing what the committee should do was to furnish this very information, the withholding of which I am now complaining about.

Mr. McPHERSON. I move to strike out the words "one-quarter" and insert "one-tenth." I see that taggers iron has been here put into the different paragraphs in such a way as to increase the protection on that, leading up all the way until we reach the tin-plate industry; and therefore I think that one-tenth of a cent a pound is a sufficient amount of additional compensation for rolling it through a pair of rollers.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In paragraph 138, line 24, strike out "one-quarter" and insert "one-tenth;" so as to read:

Shall pay one-tenth of 1 cent per pound more duty than the corresponding gauges of common or black sheet or taggers iron or steel.

Mr. CARLISLE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island whether he can give the Senate any information as to the additional cost of cold-rolling this iron? As I understand, it is simply put through a pair of rollers.

Mr. McPHERSON. It is smoothed.

Mr. CARLISLE. It is smoothed by passing through a pair of rollers which are run by machinery. Can the Senator give the Senate any information upon that subject? It is proposed to add one-fourth of a cent per pound.

Mr. McPHERSON. Five dollars and sixty cents per ton for simply passing these sheets through rollers by machinery.

Mr. ALDRICH. The fact that with this rate in the existing law considerable importations of cold-rolled and cleaned sheet-iron have been made would be a sufficient answer, if no other were required, to the suggestion made by the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kentucky. I will say that from my information about the cost of the processes included in this paragraph—because the Senator from Kentucky will understand as well as I that it would not do to select the cheapest process of the whole and fix a rate of duty which would be applicable to that alone—the cost of the process involved in this paragraph is at least \$5.60 a ton greater in this country than in Great Britain.

Mr. CARLISLE. Of course I understand it would not do to select the very cheapest process and fix the rate simply upon that; but I understand also that it is not just to put the cheapest process in with the most costly process and put the same duty upon both; and that is what is done here. It is for that reason that I wanted the information in order that a lower rate of duty might be put upon this iron which is perfectly finished by the cheaper process than the rate of duty provided upon that which is perfected by the more costly process.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have a table at my residence which was submitted to the committee by the manufacturers and compared with the statement of the importers upon this subject, which I will submit to the Senate to-morrow morning or at some subsequent time, and which I am sure will satisfy the Senator from Kentucky that this rate is not unreasonable.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to strike out "one-quarter" and insert "one-tenth" in line 24 of page 29.

The amendment was rejected.

The Chief Clerk read paragraph 139, as follows:

139. Sheets or plates of iron or steel, or taggers iron or steel, coated with tin or lead or with a mixture of which these metals, or either of them, is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, 1 cent per pound until July 1, 1891.

Mr. VANCE. I move to strike out the whole of line 8, the words "until July 1, 1891."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina. [Putting the question.] By the sound the yeas have it.

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

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from North Carolina asks that on this question the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal.

Mr. ALDRICH. I appeal to my friend from North Carolina not to demand the yeas and nays upon this amendment. If it should be adopted we should have then two rates upon tin-plate imposed by this bill, one at 1 cent a pound and one at 2.2 cents, and under the similitude clause the 2.2 cents duty would be assessed by the customs officers. There would be no escape from it. So it would not effect the purpose which the Senator has in view. It is simply taking up the time of the Senate in an ineffectual attempt to do something which the Senator has had an opportunity of doing by other and more direct methods.

Mr. VANCE. A favorite specimen of logic in this whole scheme is to raise the duty on one thing and then say that that necessitates the raising of the duty on everything else. So in this case, if we have two rates of duty here, one at 1 cent a pound and one at 2.2 cents a pound, it will necessitate the striking out of the other 2.2.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not necessarily.

Mr. VANCE. I withdraw the call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The Chief Clerk read paragraph 140, as follows:

140. Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, by whatever process made; die blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; steamer, crank, and other shafts; shafing; wrist or crank pins; connecting-rods and piston-rods; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes; saw-plates, wholly or partially manufactured; hammer-molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron-molded steel castings; sheets and plates not specially provided for in this act; and steel in all forms and shapes not specially provided for in this act; all of the above valued at 1 cent per pound or less, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1 cent and not above 1.4 cents per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.4 cents and not above 1.8 cents per pound, eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.8 cents and not above 2.2 cents per pound, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 2.2 cents and not above 3 cents per pound, 1.2 cents per pound; valued above 3 cents and not above 4 cents per pound, 1.6 cents per pound; valued above 4 cents and not above 7 cents per pound, 2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 10 cents per pound, 2.8 cents per pound; valued above 10 cents and not above 13 cents per pound, 3 cents per pound; valued above 13 cents and not above 16 cents per pound, 4.2 cents per pound; valued above 16 cents per pound, 7 cents per pound.

The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the paragraph, in line 20, after the word "less," by striking out "five-tenths" and inserting "four-tenths;" so as to read:

All of the above valued at 1 cent per pound or less, four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in line 22, after the word "pound," to strike out "six-tenths" and insert "five-tenths;" so as to read:

Valued above 1 cent and not above 1.4 cents per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McPHERSON. I desire to offer an amendment to the whole paragraph.

Mr. CULLOM. We had better complete the committee amendments first.

Mr. PLATT. Why not complete the committee amendments?

Mr. McPHERSON. Very well.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in line 25, on page 30, after the word "pound," to strike out "eight-tenths" and insert "seven-tenths;" so as to read:

Valued above 1.4 cents and not above 1.8 cents per pound, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McPHERSON. It will be noticed that this is a paragraph which includes a great many different varieties of manufactures, a great many different shapes and forms of steel and iron. If you will turn to page 31 you will find that there is a jump, for instance, from 4 cents a pound to 7 cents a pound in value, in which the rate of duty imposed there will be equal to \$44.80 per ton on steel valued at \$95.20 per ton. In other words, the stride that they take from 4 cents a pound valuation to 7 cents a pound imposes as great a rate of duty on steel costing 4½ cents a pound as it does upon steel costing 7 cents a pound. The duty is made specific, and it is a sort of drag-net for the purpose of getting the highest rate of duty possible upon the lowest value of goods.

I move to strike out all in that paragraph after the work "act," in line 19, page 30, which describes the articles, to the end of line 14, on page 31, and insert in lieu thereof "35 per cent. ad valorem."

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

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 19, page 30, paragraph 140, after the word "act," strike out down to and including the word "pound," at the end of the paragraph, in the following words:

All of the above valued at 1 cent per pound or less, four-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1 cent and not above 1.4 cents per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.4 cents and not above 1.8 cents per pound, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.8 cents and not above 2.2 cents per pound, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 2.2 cents and not above 3 cents per pound, 1.2 cents per pound; valued above 3 cents and not above 4 cents per pound, 1.6 cents per pound; valued above 4 cents and not above 7 cents per pound, 2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 10 cents per pound, 2.8 cents per pound; valued above 10 cents and not above 13 cents per pound, 3 cents per pound; valued above 13 cents and not above 16 cents per pound, 4.2 cents per pound; valued above 16 cents per pound 7 cents per pound;

And insert in lieu thereof—

Thirty-five per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to ask the Senator whether he means to increase the duty on those articles?

Mr. McPHERSON. It would be an increase of duty, so to speak, on some of the higher grades as they appear here in this table, but taking the whole of paragraph 140, beginning in line 21, five-tenths of a cent a pound, it would be a decrease of duty in the entire paragraph.

Mr. CULLOM. According to this table, the percentage would seem to be 34.36 per cent., 30.41 per cent., 27.09 per cent., and 25.60 per cent. in different items.

Mr. McPHERSON. Very well; I would much rather have it 35 per cent. ad valorem than to have it as it is now, a specific rate of duty. Then we should have some chance to get recompense for reductions in the cost of the articles.

Mr. CULLOM. I simply desired to know whether the Senator wished to increase the duty.

Mr. McPHERSON. My amendment does not increase it.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, in support of the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey and in confirmation of his statement, I have a carefully prepared table showing the effect of the proposed duties upon the articles enumerated in this paragraph, and I find that in every instance they are carefully prepared so as to impose the highest duties upon the cheaper articles, in conformity, I suppose, with the great principle of protection, that "to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have."

I have this statement here, which I ask may be appended to my remarks, but I will not take the trouble or the time of the Senate by reading it at length. I will just enumerate that if the articles herein specified cost as much as half a cent per pound the duty will be 80 per cent. ad valorem, and then increasing until when they get to 1 cent, which is the maximum of that clause, it is 40 per cent., so that the one-half cent a pound article would pay just 100 per cent. more duty than the cent a pound article. Then in the next clause, if it is valued at 1.1 cents per pound, the duty would be 45.45 per cent.; if valued at 1.4 cents per pound, the duty would be 35.70 per cent. Then, again, if the article was valued at 1½ cents per pound, the duty would be 46.66 per cent. If valued at 1.8 cents per pound, the duty would be only 33.88 per cent. If valued at nine-tenths of a cent per pound the duty would be 47.37 per cent. If valued at 2.2 cents per pound, the duty would be only 40.90 per cent. If valued at 2.3 cents per pound, the duty would be 52.78 per cent. If valued at 2.7 cents per pound, the duty would be only 44 per cent.; and if valued at 3 cents per pound, the duty would be only 40 per cent. If, on the contrary, it was valued at 3½ cents per pound, the duty would be 49 per cent. So it runs all the way through. The article in most common use in all of the great industries of the country, the blacksmith shops and the saw-mills, and the home manufactories, and the farm plantation, the cheaper the article the more duty it pays, and the higher-priced the article the less duty it pays. I ask to have this statement which I have summarized inserted as an appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Paragraph 140.

If valued at—	Duty.		If valued at—	Duty.	
	Per pound.	Ad valorem.		Per pound.	Ad valorem.
	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
¼ cent per pound.....	.4	=80	2.8 cents per pound...	1.2	=42.85
½ cent per pound.....	.4	=66.66	2.9 cents per pound...	1.2	=41.38
¾ cent per pound.....	.4	=57.24	3 cents per pound.....	1.2	=40
1 cent per pound.....	.4	=50	3½ cents per pound.....	1.6	=49.23
1.1 cent per pound.....	.4	=44.44	3½ cents per pound.....	1.6	=45.72
1.2 cent per pound.....	.4	=40	3½ cents per pound.....	1.6	=42.66
1.3 cent per pound.....	.5	=45.45	4 cents per pound.....	1.6	=40
1.4 cent per pound.....	.5	=41.66	5 cents per pound.....	2	=40
1.5 cent per pound.....	.5	=38.46	6 cents per pound.....	2	=33.33
1.6 cent per pound.....	.5	=35.71	7 cents per pound.....	2	=28.57
1.7 cent per pound.....	.7	=46.66	8 cents per pound.....	2.8	=35
1.8 cent per pound.....	.7	=43.75	9 cents per pound.....	2.8	=31.11
1.9 cent per pound.....	.7	=41.17	10 cents per pound.....	2.8	=28
2 cents per pound.....	.9	=45	11 cents per pound.....	3.5	=31.82
2.1 cent per pound.....	.9	=42.86	12 cents per pound.....	3.5	=29.16
2.2 cent per pound.....	.9	=40.91	13 cents per pound.....	3.5	=26.92
2.3 cent per pound.....	1.2	=52.17	14 cents per pound.....	4.2	=30
2.4 cent per pound.....	1.2	=50	15 cents per pound.....	4.2	=28
2.5 cent per pound.....	1.2	=48	16 cents per pound.....	4.2	=26.25
2.6 cent per pound.....	1.2	=46.15	17 cents per pound.....	7	=41.17
2.7 cent per pound.....	1.2	=44.44	18 cents per pound.....	7	=38.88
			19 cents per pound.....	7	=36.84
			20 cents per pound.....	7	=35

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON]?

Mr. McPHERSON. This is a very important paragraph, and I am going to call for the yeas and nays on the amendment, because it includes so many articles. It is a sort of drag-net. It sweeps in a great many things here that are coming in at an excessive rate of duty. Therefore I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CARLISLE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. CULLOM (when Mr. FARWELL'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. FARWELL] is detained from the Senate by illness and is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO].

Mr. GORMAN (when his name was called). I am paired this morning with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. McMILLAN]. He is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] for to-day.

Mr. TELLER. My colleague [Mr. WALCOTT] is detained from the Senate by sickness, and is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA].

Mr. BLAIR (after having voted in the negative). My colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is detained by sickness, and is paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BLODGETT]. I am paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], and vote only to make a quorum. If my vote is not necessary, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. GIBSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN]. I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana withdraws his vote.

Mr. TURPIE (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], and therefore withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana withdraws his vote.

Mr. BATE. I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. COKE. My colleague [Mr. REAGAN] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER]. If my colleague were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DANIEL (after having voted in the affirmative). I beg leave to withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia withdraws his vote.

Mr. BLAIR. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. PASCO. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. CALL] is absent and is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. MANDERSON. I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. BATE. My colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is out for the moment. He is paired, however, with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], but at the instance of his colleague I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MANDERSON. My vote seems to be needed to make a quorum and I will take the liberty also of voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO. I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] that by transfer of pairs, so that my colleague [Mr. CALL] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] will stand paired, we can both vote. If that be satisfactory to him, I will vote "yea."

Mr. PETTIGREW. I vote "nay."

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

YEAS—20.			
Barbour,	Colquitt,	McPherson,	Ransom,
Berry,	Eustis,	Morgan,	Vest,
Butler,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Gray,	Plumb,	Walthall,
Coke,	Jones of Arkansas,	Pugh,	Wilson of Md.
NAYS—26.			
Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Manderson,	Sawyer,
Allen,	Everts,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Blair,	Hale,	Moody,	Stockbridge,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Paddock,	Teller,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Pettigrew,	Wilson of Iowa.
Dixon,	Hiscock,	Platt,	
Dolph,	Hoar,	Quay,	
ABSENT—38.			
Allison,	Davis,	Ingalls,	Sherman,
Bate,	Dawes,	Jones of Nevada,	Squire,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Kenna,	Stanford,
Bloodgett,	Frye,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Brown,	George,	Morrill,	Turpie,
Call,	Gibson,	Payne,	Vance,
Carlisle,	Gorman,	Pierce,	Washburn,
Casey,	Hampton,	Power,	Walcott.
Chandler,	Harris,	Reagan,	
Daniel,	Hearst,	Sanders,	

So the amendment was rejected.

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

141. Wire rods: Rivet, screw, fence, and other iron or steel wire rods and nail rods, whether round, oval, flat, square, or in any other shape, in coils or otherwise, not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, valued at 3½ cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, valued at 3 cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That all iron or steel rods, whether rolled or drawn through dies, smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island, who has charge of the bill, to an invidious distinction, as I think, which he will find in line 20, compared with line 23. In speaking of the round wire rods the cost value here is fixed at 3½ cents per pound. In speaking of the flat, with longitudinal ribs for fencing, it is valued at 3 cents a pound. That which is manufactured flat with longitudinal ribs is the higher cost product of the two, and hence should not be limited here to the lowest cost value. Therefore, I move to insert in line 23, after the word "three," the words "and one-half;" so as to make the limit of value 3½ cents a pound in each case. I understand that this flat rod with longitudinal ribs, which is manufactured solely for fencing and can be used for no other purpose, costs from \$10 to \$11 per ton more than the round wire rod. The round wire rod can be used for all purposes for which wire is used. The flat rod can only be used for the manufacture of fencing. If the Senator from Rhode Island will consent to insert after the word "three," in line 23, the words "and one-half;" it will be nearer a just relation of the two products.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 23, paragraph 141, after the word "three," insert the words "and one-half;" so as to read:

And iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, valued at 3½ cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. MCPHERSON. This amendment makes the limit of cost uniform as to both rods and imposes the same duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will not be adopted. It will simply be to reduce the duty on an article which is used by a single concern in the State of New Jersey, who have a patent upon their process.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I am very glad to receive the answer from the Senator from Rhode Island exactly in that form. He says it is only used in the State of New Jersey. It is true there is an establishment in New Jersey manufacturing this fencing material, which is different from the common barbed-wire fence, which I understand to be an industry of the State of Rhode Island very largely, and interested to some extent in competition with that industry.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is entirely mistaken. There is not a pound made in the State of Rhode Island of either.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Very well. There have been during the past year imported by these gentlemen engaged in this industry in New Jersey something like 2,500 tons of this material. They have been trying for the past five years to secure some manufacturers in this country who would manufacture the material, promising to pay the foreign price, plus the duty, in case any manufacturer in this country would agree to manufacture it. Nobody has undertaken to do it. Therefore, they have been unable to do anything else except to purchase it abroad. It is their raw material. Now, there is a proviso at the end of this paragraph which, if rigidly applied, will really and absolutely prevent this material from coming in at all except at a rate of duty of about \$50.40 per ton. In other words, I can call it by no other name than a conspiracy to stop the manufacture of this particular kind of wire fencing, which is used by almost all the farmers of this country who desire a less savage fence than the barbed-wire fence.

I have here, furnished me by the parties engaged in this manufacture, a sample of the material. [Exhibiting.] That is the material as it is imported. It is taken and split in two in this way [indicating] and then twisted. The result is that it offers no very savage barb to the animal that comes in contact with it. It is more an admonition than anything else in the way of a fence. It is sold in large quantities, as is witnessed by the fact that last year they sold 2,500 tons of it or more. It is sold for a higher price than the barbed-wire fence, and therefore it does not come in competition with the barbed-wire fence at all. It can not be sold for the same price. The material costs \$10 per ton more than the material of the barbed-wire fence. Now let me read the proviso to which I have referred:

Provided, That all iron or steel rods, whether rolled or drawn through dies smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

This sample I have is smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, and under this proviso it could be classed and made dutiable as wire. It would come in then at a rate of duty of \$50.40 per ton instead of \$13.44 per ton, as would the wire rod which now goes into the manufacture of the barbed fence.

I do not think the Senator from Rhode Island means to absolutely destroy this industry, which is one so important to the farming element in this country, particularly those who are raising fine cattle or

fine horses, and who can not afford to have their animals tied up, as it were, in a barbed-wire fence and in that way cut all to pieces.

I should like to send to the desk and have read a statement made to me by a manufacturer of this fencing which I should like to have put in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, as he tells the story more plainly than I can.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection. Does the Senator desire to have it read?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Yes, sir.

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

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TRENTON, N. J., June 7, 1890.

DEAR SIR: The pending tariff bill, section 151—wire rods—imposes a duty of six-tenths of a cent per pound on the several kinds of rods mentioned smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, valued at 3½ cents per pound or less, while on "iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing," the rate being the same (six-tenths cent), the maximum value is fixed at 3 cents per pound. May I ask you to call the attention of the Finance Committee of the Senate to this discrimination, and that you use your influence to have the value fixed at the same rate in both cases? The reasons being as follows:

1. "Iron and steel with longitudinal ribs" are used in this country for the manufacture of fencing, and for no other purpose. The classification was first made in the tariff act of 1883, the rate being fixed at six-tenths of 1 cent; prior to that time the duty had been 30 per cent. under the miscellaneous classification.

2. Assuming the actual value to be 3½ cents per pound in either case, the duty as proposed on round rods would be \$13.44 per ton, while on the fencing strips it would be \$35.28 under the miscellaneous clause, at 45 per cent. This, as you will perceive, would be a very great hardship; in fact, it would probably be fatal to the interests of this company. Moreover, if there is to be discrimination the fencing strips should be fixed at the higher value, because they cost fully \$10 per ton more than round rods; and while they are used, as before stated, solely for the manufacture of fencing, round rods are used for the manufacture of wire of every description.

But a still more serious defect in the section referred to is the proviso, namely, that "all iron or steel rods, whether rolled or drawn through dies smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, shall be classed and dutiable as wire." It is hardly conceivable that this proviso could be held to apply to the fencing strips—flat with longitudinal ribs—referred to, for they have a distinct classification in the same section. Still, there is a possibility that confusion and trouble might result from the proviso unless the fencing material with longitudinal ribs is specially exempted, for this material is usually of No. 18 or 19 wire gauge, and should it be held to come within the application of the proviso, it would be taxed as wire "smaller than No. 16, and not smaller than No. 25, wire gauge," the rate being 2½ cents per pound, or \$50.40 per ton.

I need not assure you that such a construction of the proviso would entirely annihilate our business; at the same time it could by no possibility be of advantage to any existing interest, because the fence strips with ribs are not made in this country. We have at all times been ready and anxious to have them manufactured here, and to that end have negotiated with many establishments, but none have been willing to undertake it, there being no use for the strip save for fencing, and the demand for that purpose being limited because of the lower price of barb-wire fencing.

Our trade is already at a serious disadvantage because of the higher cost of our material as compared with wire rods from which barb-wire is manufactured, the present cost of wire rods being \$41 to \$42 per ton, while the ribbed strips cost \$54 to \$55—the cost of the finished product, fence, differing accordingly. The discrimination above referred to, in either case, would extinguish it entirely.

Should there, in your judgment, be any doubt as to the exemption of our strips from the proviso recited, I beg that you will urge an amendment, say by inserting, after the word "rods," the words "other than iron or steel with longitudinal ribs for fencing."

Respectfully yours,

HENRY C. KELSEY.

Hon. JOHN R. MCPHERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, whenever I come to a schedule or a paragraph in a schedule in this bill which does not make a discrimination against the articles most in use by the common people and in favor of the highest priced articles, I shall pause and make a note of it and let the Senate know. In this case, in the first article enumerated, the unit of cost is 1.4 cents per pound and the duty is 39.38 per cent. The amount imported is 180,000,000 pounds and upward. In the next item which follows it, the unit of value is 2.4 cents a pound, just 1 cent more, almost double, and the amount imported was 723 pounds. One hundred and eighty million pounds, used by the common people of the country, are taxed 39.38 per cent., and 723 pounds, used by some few individuals for ornamental purposes perhaps are taxed 25.53 per cent.; and that is the way it runs. Whenever I reach a schedule where the articles used by the rich are taxed highest, I promise to pause and let the Senate and the country know it.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island in regard to this item, if the articles provided for in this paragraph are the rods from which fencing wire is manufactured.

Mr. ALDRICH. The wire rods provided for in this paragraph are the rods from which fencing wire is drawn or rolled.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Are they manufactured at all in the United States?

Mr. ALDRICH. Very largely.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island what is the present duty upon No. 6 wire rods?

Mr. ALDRICH. The present duty upon No. 6 wire rods, under the construction of law given by the Treasury Department, is 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. I thought so.

Mr. ALDRICH. They are not specified in the existing law at all, by an omission in the act of 1883.

Mr. CARLISLE. Does that include also all the rods under No. 6 wire gauge.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no, only No. 6. By an omission in the act of 1883 No. 6 wire gauge wire rods were not named. There was no rate of duty given to them at all, and they have come in as manufactures of steel not otherwise provided for.

Mr. CARLISLE. This proviso is—

Provided, That all iron or steel rods, whether rolled or drawn through dies, smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

What is the duty now under existing law upon these rods?

Mr. ALDRICH. Smaller than No. 6?

Mr. CARLISLE. Smaller than No. 6. I have not the law before me.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a quarter of a cent per pound higher than the rate proposed in this bill. They are provided for in the next paragraph under the head of wire, and a comparison of the rates will be found in the table at the top of page 32.

Mr. CARLISLE. The lowest rate there given is 1½ cents a pound, and this is only six-tenths of a cent per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is on wire; not on wire rods, but on wire.

Mr. CARLISLE. But if it is smaller than No. 6, it must be classed as wire under the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the existing law. Under the existing law rods smaller than No. 6 pay duty as wire.

Mr. VEST. But what I want to call attention to is that these tables here show no increase of duties. They show 39.38 and 25.53 per cent. under existing law, and the same rates under the House bill and under the Senate bill. As I understand the operation of the amendments of the clause, No. 6 wire rods now pay by existing law under the construction of the Department 45 per cent. ad valorem. Under this proposed legislation they would pay six-tenths of 1 cent a pound, or 54 per cent. ad valorem, which is an increase. Wire rods smaller than No. 6, classed as wire, pay 1½ cents per pound under this bill, instead of six-tenths of a cent per pound. In other words, the duty is more than doubled. That is my construction of this present legislation, and yet to look at these tables there appears to be exactly the same duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand the Senator to say that the duty is doubled on wire rods?

Mr. VEST. I understand that it is on wire.

Mr. ALDRICH. On wire?

Mr. VEST. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not by any manner of means.

Mr. VEST. I will ask the Senator if wire that is smaller than No. 6 does not pay under this proposed legislation 1½ cents a pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does.

Mr. VEST. Does it not pay under existing law six-tenths of a cent per pound?

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon, it pays 1½ cents a pound under existing law. We have reduced the rate of duty one-quarter of a cent.

Mr. VEST. On less than No. 6?

Mr. ALDRICH. On wire smaller than No. 6 wire gauge.

Mr. VEST. If that is true, of course the Senator is right, and if I am right of course it is not true. If it is six-tenths of a cent a pound under existing law, then it is an increase, but, whatever that may be, the Senator certainly does not pretend that there is not any increase on No. 6.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not made any statement of that kind.

Mr. VEST. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is an increase based on the unit of value of the imports of 1888, and possibly of 1889. It depends entirely upon the value of importations from Europe whether it is an increase or not.

Mr. VEST. Of course we have nothing else to go upon except the valuation of the imports.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will furnish the Senator with the quotations of the present price in a moment. Of course, if wire rods are worth \$30 per ton in Great Britain, at 45 per cent. ad valorem the duty would be \$13.50 a ton. It would be a little more than six-tenths of a cent per pound. If less than \$30 per ton, the ad valorem rate would be less than the specific rate which we fix.

Mr. VEST. The Senate ought to understand—and it is hopeless for us to do anything except to bring the facts before the country—that no industry in the United States has made more rapid progress than that of wire rods. I have before me a statement which I used in the last tariff debate in 1888 from the New Haven Wire Company, which I shall not make any apology for having read at the desk. It contains all the facts in regard to the wire-rod manufacture, stated much more accurately and succinctly than I can hope to do, and I will ask the Secretary to read it. It brings out in strong relief the fact that the number of manufactories in the United States of wire rods has greatly increased; that the importation has greatly decreased, and that year by year the manufacturers are becoming more able to compete with the foreign importers and are to-day absolutely commanding the manufacture. Still we are asked to make this increase, admitted to be an increase, when it has, as I think, protection enough.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The article referred to will be read, if there be no objection.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ARGUMENT OF THE NEW HAVEN WIRE COMPANY.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., August 6, 1888.

To the Committee on Finance, United States Senate:

On behalf of the New Haven Wire Company, which is compelled to buy its raw material in the shape of wire rods either of American or foreign mills, and of about twenty other wire mills similarly situated, I respectfully ask that the duty on fence and rivet wire rods of either iron or steel, when valued at 1½ cents per pound or less, be fixed at four-tenths cent per pound. The larger wire mills roll their own rods, but prefer to sell the product of their rod trains in the shape rather of finished wire than of rods; so that those wire mills which have no rod trains are forced to pay high prices for their American rods or use the foreign. In either case the price is determined by the cost of the foreign rods here, so that a reduction in duty would inure to the benefit of all these wire mills, whether they use foreign or domestic material. These mills employ more labor than all the rod trains in the country, and have a capacity to produce more than half of the wire which the country consumes. Under the tariff of 1883 their business has continually suffered at the hands of the mills rolling their own rods, and they now need protection, not against foreign competition, but against the high charges of the American rod mills.

By the act of 1883 the duty on steel rods was fixed at six-tenths cent per pound on No. 5 and larger sizes. Although there had been some rods smaller than No. 5 imported, yet the bulk of the rods were No. 5 and larger, and no specific provision was made for any smaller size. Such sizes, therefore, came in under the "omnibus clause," as "manufactures of steel not otherwise provided for," at 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Prior to the act of 1883 all steel rods had come in under the omnibus clause at 30 per cent. The specific duty of six-tenths cent per pound was fixed by Congress after a careful hearing of all the parties in interest, and was then the equivalent of 35 per cent. Soon after the passage of the act, however, the foreign values of Bessemer material fell, so that the ad valorem equivalent of six-tenths has never been less than 45 per cent., but has at times equaled 60 per cent., and is now about 55 per cent. Coincident with this fall in values came an improvement in the processes of rolling rods abroad, by which a No. 6 rod could be furnished at about the same cost as a No. 5, and the bulk of the importations for the past four years have been of No. 6. These have, as stated above, come in at 45 per cent., which is at the present time about one-half cent per pound.

The request of Mr. George T. Oliver, of Pittsburgh, speaking on behalf of his company and other American rod-makers, that the duty on all sizes of rods should be fixed at six-tenths cent per pound is therefore in substance a request that the present rates of duty should be advanced on the bulk of the importations from 45 per cent. to 55 per cent., an increase of about nearly 25 per cent.

The consumers of wire rods, on the other hand, maintain that not only is there no propriety of making any such advance, or, indeed, any advance, but that the present rate of duty might be reduced without in any way crippling the American rod mills. The present cost of American billets in Pittsburgh is \$28 to \$28.50 per ton; of wire rods, \$41 to \$41.50. It is not disputed that a modern Garrett train employing twenty-five or thirty men has turned out 75 tons of rods in eleven hours, and at a cost, making all proper allowances, of not exceeding \$8 per ton. Assuming that its annual production was only half that (or 75 tons daily when running double time), the margin of profit would exceed \$100,000 per annum; so that the train would nearly pay for itself during the first year.

This clear margin of \$5 per ton is due to the present tariff; for, while the American mills now sell the greater part of the rods used in the country, they hold the price just below the cost of foreign rods with duty and inland freight added, and the cost to the consumer is thus dependent closely on the duty. As the labor cost of each ton of rods thus rolled is less than \$3, the need of any increase of the duty in order to protect the laborer is not clearly seen.

It is not necessary, however, to base any argument on estimates of the cost of rolling rods in this country. While all such estimates may be disputed, it can not be denied that the great increase in the number and capacity of rod mills in this country since the enactment of the tariff of 1883 would not have taken place if there was not a handsome margin in the business, and a margin furthermore that was large enough to stand some reduction in the tariff rate. In 1883 steel rods were rolled at not more than five or six mills, and the total capacity did not greatly exceed 50,000 tons annually. There are now nine rod mills in operation, and another building, with an aggregate capacity of about 250,000 tons per annum.

The proportion of their product to the imports has steadily increased, so that it to-day is more than half of the entire consumption of the country. (The importations of wire rods during the first six months of 1887 were 69,432 tons; of 1888, 38,916 tons.) Surely an industry that has made such rapid strides under the present tariff does not need any further legislative help, nor is it in a position where reasonable reduction of the duty will inflict irreparable disaster on it.

If the present duty on wire rods were halved, while the duty on billets is unchanged the Pittsburgh rod mills could still sell their rods at a profit and keep foreign rods out of that market; while at the same time the seaboard wire mills, which are prevented by inland freights from using American rods and are compelled to pay the present duty on their foreign rods, would have some hope of life. It does not seem unreasonable, therefore, to ask that a beginning in the reduction of duty should be made, and four-tenths of a cent per pound is certainly an ample protection for the American rod mill.

The fluctuations in the price of rods have resulted in such variations of the ad valorem rate of any specific duty that such a method of fixing the tariff should not be longer followed. No one will pretend to say that Congress, when it fixed the duty in 1883 at the specific equivalent of 35 per cent., contemplated that within four years that specific duty would by the mere fall in prices rise to 60 per cent. The market values of these rods are well known both abroad and here. There is no chance for any evasion of the tariff, as the records of the custom-houses show; and it is submitted, therefore, that the will of Congress will be better observed throughout all future fluctuations by making the duty ad valorem than by adhering to a specific duty. If the latter method is, however, preferred, it is suggested that ample protection to the American rod mills and some share of the necessary reduction demanded by the condition of the American wire mills will be secured by making the duty four-tenths of a cent per pound on all sizes of wire rods.

This is a higher rate ad valorem than was contemplated by Congress in fixing the act of 1883, and leaves the American rod mills with about one-half of their present margin of profit.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

THE NEW HAVEN WIRE COMPANY,
By SAMUEL A. GALPIN, Receiver.

Mr. VEST. That is a valuable contribution to this debate, for the reason that it comes from a New England manufacturer, and not from any of the free-trade Western Democrats who have been so often denounced on this floor by the protectionists. If there has been any decline in this industry that statement ought to be made and substantiated on this floor. On the other hand, I have accurate information to the effect that this wire-rod industry is flourishing at the present time in the United States. The establishment of the Oliver Steel Works

at Pittsburgh now employs 6,000 hands and is in an exceedingly prosperous condition to-day. The articles that are controlled and affected by this tariff duty under the first division of this clause enter into the every-day use of all the farmers in the West.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] has called attention to the enormous disparity between these articles, between the material that goes into these articles, as to importation and those mentioned in the latter portion of this clause, and it therefore becomes of the utmost importance that the Senate should distinctly understand what is to be the effect of this legislation. We have no explanation on the part of the Committee on Finance specifically as to any of these provisions, and I am compelled, unless evidence is brought to the contrary, to accept the statements of the New Haven Wire Company as absolutely true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). Is the Senate ready for the question on the amendment?

Mr. CARLISLE. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 23, after the word "three," it is proposed to insert "and one-half;" so as to read:

And iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, valued at 3/4 cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. McPHERSON. I had hoped that the Senator from Rhode Island, in view of the fact that the round wire costs from forty-two to forty-three dollars a ton and the ribbed wire from fifty-four to fifty-five dollars a ton, would allow the limit to be the same in both cases, 3 1/2 cents a pound. If a trust should be formed and none of the wire with longitudinal ribs could be purchased at all except from the trust, it would have the effect of closing up the shops; or if the appraiser should so decide it would be compelled to pay the increased price under the proviso which would bring the duty up to over \$50 a ton and which would also have the effect of closing up the establishment. I hope there will be no objection made by the Senator to inserting the words "and one-half" after "three."

Mr. ALDRICH. After all the allusions which have been made on the other side of the Chamber to trusts and monopolies, and the effect which these combinations have upon the public interests I am very much surprised that the Senator from New Jersey should appeal to this side of the Chamber for a special bounty or relief to an industry which is controlled by one party who manufactures goods under a patent. It strikes me that there is a slight inconsistency in the ground the Senator is now taking from what he has been taking on other items in this bill.

Mr. McPHERSON. How do I appeal for a bounty? I have stated to the Senator that this article costs \$55 a ton, while the wire costs \$42 a ton. Both of them are for the manufacture of fencing wire, which goes into the use of the farmers all over this country. I have stated that in a certain condition of circumstances those who manufacture the longitudinal wire could not purchase the material unless the limit should be increased.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator's statement is true that wire rods only cost \$55 a ton on the other side of the water, that is certainly less than 3 cents a pound, which is \$67 a ton, and his institution is not harmed by this change.

Mr. McPHERSON. I shall contend no longer, but let the vote be taken.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill how the duty proposed by the committee on fence wire compares with that proposed by the Mills bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. The next paragraph fixes the duty upon fencing wire, so called, and the duty which we recommend is \$5.60 per ton, or a quarter of a cent a pound less than the rate fixed by the Mills bill.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McPHERSON. Now, Mr. President, in order that there may be no mistake whatever as to the intention of the committee, I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a single question. If this material which enters into the manufacture of the longitudinal ribs for fencing should be below No. 6 wire-gauge, as it is, would not the effect be to bring it under the dutiable clause of wire between No. 16 and No. 26 wire-gauge?

Mr. ALDRICH. My own impression is that it would not. Being specially enumerated under another rate, I think that would be the rate which the customs officers and the courts would decide to be the proper rate to be applied to the article.

Mr. McPHERSON. Then the Senator has no objection to a proviso being put in which will make plain exactly what he intends to do. Let me ask, then, that after the word "rods," in the last line on page 31, you insert these words:

Except flat with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing.

That will settle the whole matter. There could be no such thing then as bringing it under a higher tariff rate, but if the Senator will look at lines 17 and 18, page 31, paragraph 141, he will find these words:

Wire rods: Rivet, screw, fence, and other iron or steel wire rods, and nail rods, whether round, oval, flat, square, or in any other shape, in coils or other-

wise, not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, valued at 3/4 cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The proviso of course applies to that whole section. The wire may be in any form whatever. Unless, therefore, these words are put in, the proviso so qualifies it that this kind of fencing material may be kept out unless it pays \$50.40 duty per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the gauge?

Mr. McPHERSON. Somewhere between No. 16 and No. 26. It would come in then at 2 3/4 cents a pound, which would be equal to an absolute prohibition, and the industry here might just as well close up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from New Jersey to propose an amendment?

Mr. McPHERSON. I propose to amend the proviso by inserting, after the word "rods," "except flat with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing."

Mr. ALDRICH. I am willing that the amendment should be put in on page 31, by inserting after the word "fencing," in line 23, the words "not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge."

Mr. McPHERSON. How can we do that? I am informed that this ranges anywhere between 16 and 26.

Mr. ALDRICH. If it is thinner than No. 26, it ought not to be admitted here.

Mr. McPHERSON. Then let it be manufactured here. The parties who are manufacturing this fencing do not care whether it is imported or manufactured here. They prefer to have it done here, and Mr. Kelsey has stated in his letter that he had applied to all the manufacturers in this country and asked them to manufacture the product here, and that he would give them the foreign quotations of value plus the duty imposed upon it under the new tariff, and he would take the whole product, but they refused to do it. Therefore he can do nothing else but to import, and if it is the intention of the committee to say that this particular kind of fencing shall be kept out you may do it by leaving the proviso as it is.

Mr. ALDRICH. The serious objection which I have to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, and a very serious one, is that under that provision all kinds of flat strips of steel would be admitted. How is the customs officer to know whether the thing is to be used in the manufacture of fence wire or not? There is no limit as to price. There is no way by which the customs officer can determine as to the natural uses of the wire or of the flat strips, and under this all sorts of extraordinarily high-priced articles of steel would come in.

Mr. McPHERSON. You have already done that in the paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have not.

Mr. McPHERSON. You have used the term "for the manufacture of fencing," and you allow wire to come in at six-tenths of 1 cent per pound for the manufacture of fencing.

Mr. ALDRICH. But we have put a limitation as to price. I think myself the whole paragraph ought to be stricken out. I do not think that this concern for which the Senator from New Jersey is so eloquently pleading ought to be treated differently from anybody else. It is an anomaly in the law which ought not to be there, and I shall object as strenuously as I can to adding further protection to this one establishment in New Jersey.

Mr. McPHERSON. Then the Senator proposes to make up a bill in which he advertises to the world and to the farmer that he proposes to give him cheap fence wire, and fixes the rate of duty at six-tenths of 1 cent a pound. It is proposed that the farmer shall take his choice between the barbed fence and that which is less savage; and the Senator brings in a proviso which may absolutely remove one of them from competition and the one which is the most expensive and most costly. I do not believe that side of the Chamber would be willing to destroy this industry simply by inserting a proviso which undoes all that is done in the body of the paragraph, for I take it that that will be the effect of this proviso. I have made my amendment so that the proviso will read:

Provided, That all iron or steel rods except flat with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, etc.

Upon that question I ask for the yeas and nays:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 25, in paragraph 141, after the word "rods," it is proposed to insert "except flat with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing;" so as to read:

Provided, That all iron or steel rods except flat with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, whether rolled or drawn through dies smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon the proposed amendment the Senator from New Jersey asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLISLE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. PIERCE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. KENNA's name was called). I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. KENNA] is necessarily detained from

the Senate by reason of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. VOORHEES (when his name was called). I inquire whether the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS] has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is not recorded.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am paired with him, and consequently withhold my vote.

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON]. I do not see him in the Chamber and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am regularly paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and he was present at the time the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] left, and I am paired with him, telling him at the same time that I would provide a pair in the event that the Senator from Iowa was absent. I forgot this morning that the Senator from Iowa was absent, and I will now transfer my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], and I will observe my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. HOAR. I will take the responsibility of absolving the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] or the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] from any pair with my colleague [Mr. DAWES] on this vote, as I suppose it is necessary that he should vote to make a quorum. I am quite sure my colleague would not object.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to inquire if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS] is recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is recorded in the affirmative.

Mr. PADDOCK. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. GORMAN. I am usually paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], but, under the arrangement as to the transfer of pairs, I am now paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] for the day, but as his colleague [Mr. HOAR] has desired that I shall vote on this question, I will vote, but hereafter will consider my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] as standing without announcing it on every vote.

Mr. BLAIR. I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS], who is absent, I understand is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES]. We have arranged that the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS] should stand paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Indiana and myself will be at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. VOORHEES. I vote "yea."

Mr. MANDERSON. Is the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] recorded as voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He is not recorded.

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

Mr. CASEY. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. PIERCE] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE].

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 25; as follows:

YEAS—21.			
Barbour,	Daniel,	Hampton,	Reagan,
Bate,	Eustis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Vest,
Berry,	Faulkner,	McPherson,	Voorhees.
Butler,	Gibson,	Morgan,	
Coke,	Gorman,	Pugh,	
Colquitt,	Gray,	Ransom,	
NAYS—25.			
Aldrich,	Dolph,	Jones of Nevada,	Sawyer,
Allen,	Edmunds,	Moody,	Squire,
Blair,	Evarts,	Paddock,	Stockbridge,
Cameron,	Frye,	Platt,	Teller,
Casey,	Hawley,	Plumb,	
Cullom,	Higgins,	Power,	
Dixon,	Hoar,	Quay,	
ABSENT—38.			
Allison,	Farwell,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Blackburn,	George,	Morrill,	Turpie,
Blodgett,	Hale,	Pasco,	Vance,
Brown,	Harris,	Payne,	Walthall,
Call,	Hearst,	Pettigrew,	Washburn,
Carlisle,	Hiscock,	Pierce,	Wilson of Md.
Chandler,	Ingalls,	Sanders,	Wilson of Iowa,
Cockrell,	Kenna,	Sherman,	Wolcott.
Davis,	McMillan,	Spooner,	
Dawes,	Manderson,	Stanford,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VEST. In line 21, on page 31, I move to strike out the word "six," before the word "tenths," and insert "five," and in line 24, the same amendment, to strike out the word "six," before the word "tenths," where it occurs in that line, and insert "five." I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, line 21, paragraph 141, it is proposed to strike out "six-tenths" and insert "five-tenths," and in line 24, to strike out "six-tenths" and insert "five-tenths;" so as to make the clause read:

141. Wire rods: Rivet, screw, fence, and other iron or steel wire rods, and nail rods, whether round, oval, flat, square, or in any other shape, in coils or otherwise, not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, valued at 3½ cents or less per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, valued at 3 cents or less per pound, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLISLE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. PIERCE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea." After this I shall simply withhold my vote without making any further announcement of the pair.

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I repeat the announcement of my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON] and withhold my vote.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. VOORHEES. With the understanding that the pair between myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS] may be transferred, so far as he is concerned, to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I was requested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL], who was called from the Senate a few moments ago, to announce his pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. TURPIE. I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. COCKRELL. I will announce my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who is necessarily detained from the Senate Chamber by important business. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 16; as follows:

YEAS—19.			
Barbour,	Colquitt,	Hampton,	Ransom,
Bate,	Eustis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Reagan,
Berry,	Faulkner,	McPherson,	Vest,
Butler,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Voorhees.
Coke,	Gray,	Pugh,	
NAYS—16.			
Aldrich,	Dixon,	Higgins,	Platt,
Allen,	Dolph,	Hiscock,	Sawyer,
Casey,	Evarts,	Hoar,	Squire,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Moody,	Teller.
ABSENT—49.			
Allison,	Edmunds,	Mitchell,	Stanford,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Blair,	Frye,	Paddock,	Stockbridge,
Blodgett,	George,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Brown,	Gorman,	Payne,	Vance,
Call,	Hale,	Pettigrew,	Walthall,
Cameron,	Harris,	Pierce,	Washburn,
Carlisle,	Hearst,	Plumb,	Wilson of Iowa,
Chandler,	Ingalls,	Power,	Wilson of Md.
Cockrell,	Jones of Nevada,	Quay,	Wolcott.
Daniel,	Kenna,	Sanders,	
Davis,	McMillan,	Sherman,	
Dawes,	Manderson,	Spooner,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum having voted, the Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BATE (when Mr. HARRIS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is not very well, although he has been here this morning. He is absent temporarily.

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. KENNA's name was called). I desire to make the same announcement I have heretofore made with reference to my colleague [Mr. KENNA], that he is detained from the Senate by illness.

The roll-call having been concluded, the following Senators were announced as having responded to the call:

Aldrich,	Carlisle,	Dixon,	Frye,
Allen,	Casey,	Dolph,	Gibson,
Barbour,	Cockrell,	Edmunds,	Gray,
Bate,	Coke,	Eustis,	Hale,
Blair,	Cullom,	Evarts,	Hampton,
Butler,	Davis,	Faulkner,	Hawley,

Higgins, Hiscock, Hoar, Jones of Arkansas, McPherson, Manderson,	Moody, Paddock, Pettigrew, Platt, Power, Pugh,	Quay, Reagan, Sawyer, Squire, Stockbridge, Teller,	Turpie, Vance, Vest, Voorhees, Wilson of Iowa.
---	---	---	--

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to paragraph 141. The Secretary will call the roll upon agreeing to the amendment.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCKRELL (when his name was called). I am paired, as heretofore announced, with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], but at the instance of his colleague [Mr. WILSON], in order to make a quorum, I vote "yea."

Mr. GORMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAVES].

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

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). Under the terms of my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON] I feel authorized to vote if my vote is necessary to make a quorum. I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If my vote is necessary to make a quorum, I shall cast it; otherwise not.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. SPOONER (after having voted in the negative). I am paired generally with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL], who is not in the Chamber and has not voted. I observe that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. With the consent of the Senator from North Carolina I will transfer the pairs so that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL] will be paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] and the Senator from North Carolina and myself will be at liberty to vote.

Mr. VANCE. That is satisfactory.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. VANCE. I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS. My colleague [Mr. WASHBURN] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON].

The result was announced—YEAS 22, NAYS 27; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Barbour, Bate, Butler, Cockrell, Coke, Daniel,	Eustis, Faulkner, Gibson, Gray, Hampton, Jones of Arkansas,	McPherson, Paddock, Plumb, Pugh, Ransom, Reagan,	Turpie, Vance, Vest, Voorhees.
---	--	---	---

NAYS—27.

Aldrich, Allen, Blair, Cameron, Casey, Cullom, Davis,	Dixon, Hiscock, Edmunds, Frye, Hale, Hawley, Higgins,	McPherson, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, Moody, Platt, Power, Quay,	Sawyer, Spooner, Squire, Stockbridge, Teller, Wilson of Iowa.
---	---	--	--

ABSENT—35.

Allison, Berry, Blackburn, Blodgett, Brown, Call, Carlisle, Chandler, Colquitt,	Dawes, Everts, Farwell, George, Gorman, Harris, Hearst, Ingalls, Kenna,	McMillan, Manderson, Mitchell, Morgan, Morrill, Pasco, Payne, Pettigrew, Pierce,	Sanders, Sherman, Stanford, Stewart, Walthall, Washburn, Wilson of Md., Wolcott.
---	---	--	---

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill at the beginning of paragraph 142. The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in line 7, to strike out the word "gauge."

The amendment was agreed to.

When the Chief Clerk had completed the reading of paragraph 142, Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, it seems to me as though we had reached the time when possibly something could be done in reducing the duty on wire. The duty has been extravagantly high throughout all the tariffs of which I have had any knowledge, and it is no less high in the present tariff bill.

I see no way, as the bill is made up, that it is possible to have imposed an ad valorem duty instead of specific without a reconstruction of the whole schedule from beginning to end. Therefore I shall try to get some reduction in the specific rates of duty that are here proposed, assuming that the committee have made, in their estimation, a well proportioned bill. I shall therefore move the reduction of an equal amount on each one of the gauges in paragraph 142.

So I move, in lines 5 and 6, to strike out the words "and one-fourth cents" and insert "cent;" so that it will read "1 cent per pound."

On "smaller than No. 10 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge," in line 8, I move to make it 1½ cents per pound, instead of 1¼ cents per pound.

In lines 10 and 11 I move to strike out the words "and one-fourth;" so that it will read "2 cents per pound."

In line 12 I move to strike out the word "three" and insert "two and three-fourths."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendments will be stated and will be treated as a single amendment, if there be no objection.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lines 5 and 6, paragraph 142, strike out the words "and one-fourth cents" and insert "1 cent;" so as to read "1 cent per pound."

In line 8 strike out the words "three-fourths cents" and insert the word "cent;" so that it will read "1 cent per pound."

In lines 10 and 11 strike out the words "and one-fourth;" so that it will read "2 cents per pound."

In line 12 strike out the word "three" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two and three-fourths;" so that it will read "2¼ cents per pound."

Mr. CARLISLE. Mr. President, this is a paragraph which covers a great number of articles, and I have not had time to arrange the matter so as to state briefly its effect upon the duties, but I can indicate some of the increases made.

It was said in the report made to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Ways and Means:

In wires of all descriptions there has been a reduction of one-fourth of a cent per pound.

That statement is not correct, even upon the face of the paragraph as it stands in the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the House committee had reference to ordinary plain wire.

Mr. CARLISLE. I will read the statement again:

In wires of all descriptions there has been a reduction of one-fourth of a cent per pound.

If the committee meant to confine itself to plain wires, as suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, it was certainly very unfortunate in the use of the language which I have read from the report: Instead of being a reduction of one-fourth of a cent per pound upon wires of all descriptions, this paragraph makes an enormous increase of duties upon no less than twenty-two different classes of wires embraced in it, not directly by fixing the duties in the text of the paragraph which enumerates the articles themselves, but by a proviso which is inserted at the close of the paragraph in these words:

Provided further, That all iron or steel wire valued at more than 4 cents per pound shall pay a duty of not less than 45 per cent. ad valorem, except that card wire for the manufacture of card clothing shall pay a duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, Mr. President, as I have said, the effect of this proviso is enormously to increase the duty upon no less than twenty-two classes of wire enumerated in this paragraph. For instance:

Wire made of iron or steel not smaller than No. 10 wire gauge, 1½ cents per pound.

The present duty is 1½ cents per pound; so this is in fact a reduction of one-fourth of a cent per pound.

But the next clause provides that on wire "smaller than No. 10 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, 1¼ cents per pound" shall be paid, and this upon the face of the paragraph appears to be a reduction in the rates of duty, but the present equivalent ad valorem upon that class of wire is only 11.53 per cent, and the proviso which I have read raises it to 45 per cent. ad valorem, four times the present rate.

In the next clause, which embraces wire "smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26 wire gauge, 2½ cents per pound," it appears also upon the face of the paragraph to be a reduction of one-fourth of a cent per pound, whereas in fact it is an increase of from 17.67 per cent. to 45 per cent. ad valorem.

The next clause is:

Smaller than No. 26 wire gauge, 3 cents per pound.

This does not even purport to be a reduction from the present rates of duty.

Then we have the proviso:

That iron or steel wire covered with cotton, silk, or other material, and wires or strip steel, commonly known as crinoline wire, corset wire, and hat wire, shall pay a duty of 5 cents per pound.

This, upon the face of the paragraph, appears to be a reduction from 6 cents per pound on one class, 6½ on another, and 7 cents per pound on another to 5 cents per pound, while in fact it is an increase of duty from 11.10 per cent. to 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Then comes the next proviso:

And provided further, That flat steel wire, or sheet steel in strips, whether drawn through dies or rolls, untempered or tempered, of whatsoever width, twenty-five-one-thousandths of an inch thick, ready for use or otherwise, shall pay a duty of 60 per cent. ad valorem.

This is not noted in the tables reported by the committee at all.

It is not necessary to read the next proviso.

The next one after that is:

That iron or steel wire cloths and iron or steel wire nettings made in meshes

of any form shall pay a duty equal in amount to that imposed on iron or steel wire used in the manufacture of iron or steel wire cloth or iron or steel wire nettings, and 2 cents per pound in addition thereto.

This also appears to be a reduction, but under the proviso it largely increases the rates of duty upon three classes of these articles.

There shall be paid on iron or steel wire coated with zinc or tin or any other metal (except fence wire and iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs, for the manufacture of fencing) one-half of 1 per cent. in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made.

This purports to be a reduction from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound on the first class; from 2½ to 2¼ cents per pound on the second class, and from 3 cents to 2¾ cents a pound on the third, which is a reduction of one-fourth of a cent a pound all through on the iron wire.

But when we come to steel wire, galvanized, we find in this paragraph an apparent reduction of one-fourth of a cent per pound, when in fact there is an actual increase from 19 per cent. to 45 per cent. under the proviso which is inserted at the end of this paragraph; and in the next class there is a like increase from 13.11 to 45 per cent. under this insidious proviso.

And so, if I were disposed to consume the time of the Senate, I could go through the whole paragraph and show, as I have said, upon twenty-two classes of these articles, embracing nearly all kinds of wire and articles made from wire, an increase of duty, sometimes to more than four times the present rates. And yet it is said by the committee of the House of Representatives, and it appears here upon the face of the tables, and upon the face of the paragraph itself as it stands without reference to the proviso, that there is a decrease!

Mr. VEST. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky if it is not true that there is an increase upon all but four of these grades?

Mr. CARLISLE. On all but four or five. I have had no time to analyze it carefully; perhaps five or six.

Mr. VEST. I made it four. I had an expert to examine. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the explanation of all these paragraphs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CARLISLE. Yes.

Mr. VEST. It is true, the Senator from Rhode Island says, this was done by an expert, and that the committee had nothing to do with it. But under the resolution of the Senate, asking the committee to explain these pages, they adopted the statement of the expert and it is their report. Here is their report:

This is but a slight change from existing rates and is a reduction on some of the lower grades.

And yet the truth is that I make it four, the Senator from New Jersey six, and the Senator from Kentucky five, I believe.

Mr. CARLISLE. I said "five or six."

Mr. VEST. There is an increase and a large increase upon forty-odd of them, and yet that is the report of that expert upon that state of the case.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky that it was my purpose to offer to amend the bill so as to make reductions of these specific rates as we go along through this paragraph, because I saw no use of applying the ad valorem rates to them, and then move to strike out the proviso entirely at the end of the section.

Mr. CARLISLE. But, Mr. President, as it stands now, with this proviso, there is an ad valorem rate of duty fixed upon nearly all these classes of wires of 45 per cent.

Now, I suggest, Mr. President, that if it was the purpose of the Committee on Finance to increase the rates of duty upon all these classes of wire, the fair way to do it would have been to put it on the face of the paragraph itself, and not have in the paragraph and in the tables figures which upon their face show a reduction, and then at the end of the paragraph have a proviso which makes an enormous increase, and report to the Senate that this is "but a slight change from existing rates and is a reduction on some of the lower grades."

It is true that it is a reduction on a very few of the lower grades, but a large increase, not justifiable or attempted to be justified by the committee, upon, as I have said once or twice before, twenty-two classes of this wire. If this committee desires the Senate to have accurate information upon that subject, I repeat, it ought to have put these rates of duty in the paragraph and in the tables, so that everybody could see them, and not raise them in this indirect and insidious way by inserting a proviso at the end of the paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not quite understand what the Senator from Kentucky means by "this insidious way of inserting a proviso at the end."

Mr. CARLISLE. I will state what I mean.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Kentucky will excuse me, I should like to complete my statement.

The proviso is there in plain, set terms, so there can be no misunderstanding about its purpose. It provides that the duty upon wire valued at 4 cents per pound and above shall not be less than 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, I will suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that the real question before the Senate in this connection is, or should be, not whether

the effect of this provision will be to increase the duties upon some grades of iron or steel wire, but whether the rates proposed by the committee are excessive.

It is true that upon all ordinary kinds of iron or steel wire the paragraph proposes a reduction in rate of one-fourth of a cent a pound, or \$5.60 per ton. For instance, take the fence-wire which is used very largely in this country. The price of this wire to the American purchaser is only 2½ cents a pound, and of course the foreign price would be less than 4 cents. All kinds of Bessemer steel wire, all kinds of open-hearth steel wire, and all forms of iron wire, except the very finest, would be valued at less than 4 cents a pound.

The committee propose, and I think every Senator will see the justice and equity of the proposition, that wires worth to-day 25, 26, 45, 47, or 48 cents per pound—and I have taken these prices at random—should pay a rate of duty equal to that imposed upon other manufactures of iron and steel.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] and every Senator on that side of the Chamber voted for a proposition to impose a duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem upon bar-iron. If that was a proper rate to impose upon bar-iron, certainly 45 per cent. is not excessive upon these finer forms of the manufactures of iron and steel.

The general clause of this schedule imposes a rate of duty of 45 per cent. upon all manufactures of iron and steel not specially enumerated, and I have yet to hear one reason suggested by any Senator on the other side why the articles provided for in this paragraph, including, as I have already stated, the very finest kinds, or crucible-steel wire, should not pay a rate of 45 per cent.

Mr. CARLISLE. I supposed when a proposition was made to impose a tax upon the people, directly or indirectly, or to increase a tax, that the onus was upon the proposers of that tax to show why it should be done, and not upon the opponents of the measure to show why it should not be done.

This proposition is to increase the duty over the present rates in some cases 300 per cent., and in many others 200 per cent., and in a large number 100 per cent., and the Senator calls upon us to show why it should not be increased. We call upon him to tell us why it should be increased, and especially why, if an increase is necessary, it should be made in this indirect way.

And in this connection I will tell the Senator what I mean when I call this an insidious proviso. If the Committee on Finance had put into this clause a provision that all these wires should pay 45 per cent. ad valorem it would have reduced the duty on quite a number of classes of wire; but by saying simply that no one of them shall pay a less rate than 45 per cent. ad valorem it leaves the existing higher rates upon those which now bear higher rates, and brings the lower ones up to 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, if the Senator believes that 45 per cent. ad valorem is necessary and is sufficient, say so in the paragraph, and that will bring down some of these classes of wires from the rates now proposed to be established; for instance, galvanized wire made from steel will pay, under this paragraph, over 61 per cent. ad valorem. Your 45 per cent. does not apply to that, but would apply to it if it paid now only 25 per cent. and would raise it to 45.

The next class, galvanized wire made of steel, pays, under this bill, 46.43 per cent., and the next class, 49.48. It is not proposed to bring them down to 45 per cent., but to have all the others brought up to 45 per cent. and leave these where they are.

Therefore I said it was an insidious proviso which does not, in the first place, accomplish what at first glance everybody would suppose it did, that is, to impose a rate of 45 per cent. upon these wires, but leaves the higher rates, those which are above 45, and affects only those now below 45 per cent.

I say again, if the Senator from Rhode Island thinks that 45 per cent. is a sufficient rate of duty, let us say so on the face of the bill, and not raise those which have been 10, 11, 15, and 20 per cent. under the existing law to 45 per cent., and leave all the higher classes to stand as they are. I can see no necessity for this increase of duty and the Senator has stated none.

They are the rates of duty imposed by the existing law, under which, so far as I know, the manufacturers of these articles have prospered to a reasonable degree at least. There was no complaint made by anybody within my knowledge before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, or before the Committee on Finance of the Senate in regard to the existing rates of duty upon these classes of wire. They have been increased gratuitously by the committee, not even upon the demand of interested parties, not even at the suggestion of anybody, manufacturers or consumers, and no reason is stated here for it.

On the contrary, the Senator who advocates it calls upon us to state the reason why it should not be done. These are the rates which were fixed by the Republican tariff act of 1883, after a full investigation of this whole subject by the Tariff Commission, composed largely, if not entirely, of the advocates of a protective system, and after a full investigation by the Committee of Ways and Means of the House and by the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and they have stood as a part of your law for seven years without complaint from any quarter as far as I know. And yet, without any explanation, without demand, the

duties are to be increased, and we are asked to state the reason why it should not be done.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, one would infer from the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky that to suggest any increase of the present rates of duty was a crime. The Senators upon the other side are perfectly willing to reduce the existing rates of duty when it serves their purpose or when they think they are too high. But when rates are confessedly too low it is reprehensible in the highest degree for any one to suggest that they should be increased.

The Senator says that no man has asked for an increase of duty. Why, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] asked the other day why we had advanced the duty upon cotton-ties, when no one had asked for the increase, and the same question is asked now. I answered that Senator to the best of my ability, and I will repeat the answer now. It is the duty of the Committee on Finance, as I understand it, to present to the Senate a schedule of rates which in their opinion is proper and equitable, and not to simply formulate the demands of either importer or manufacturer. If you intend to have all rates equally protective it is necessary, that the rates may be harmonious, that they shall have a proper relation to each other, from the crudest to the finest products.

The articles in this schedule range in value from the iron ore, that is worth from \$2 to \$10 per ton, to the finest watch-springs, worth many dollars per pound, which are provided for in this paragraph, and it is necessary, if all this vast range of important industries are to be fairly treated, that the duties upon each sustain a proper relation to each other, and it was with this purpose in view that the committee (without regard to suggestions made by interested manufacturers or by interested purchasers as to what rate of duty should be fixed) suggested the rate which has been so severely criticised.

Now, I say to the Senator from Kentucky that when it is ascertained that rates of duty are imposed upon the expensive manufactures enumerated in this paragraph, which are only equivalent to 7.33, 10.63, or 11.10 per cent. ad valorem, it should not require any special effort to convince Senators that these rates are inadequate and unjust.

The Senators on the other side are apparently quite willing to impose 60 per cent. upon iron ore, pig-iron, and iron in bars, and upon various cruder forms of iron and steel, but when the finer forms are reached, those upon which the most labor is required, then they insist that we shall maintain present rates of 8 to 10 or 12 per cent., and also insist that we are put upon the defensive if we propose to establish rates equivalent to those proposed upon other manufactures of iron and steel.

Now, if it is the purpose of Senators to place prohibitory duties upon all the cruder forms of manufacture and to allow foreign manufacturers to sell us all the finer forms by putting the rates so low that it would insure importations for the benefit of their friends, the importers—if, I repeat, this is their purpose, they should declare it courageously and manfully. Do not say to us, because we have fixed a rate of duty of 45 per cent., a rate less than the average rate of this whole schedule, upon these costly manufactures, that we are doing something criminal and something that requires explanation to the American people.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, at every step in this bill the Senators upon this side of the Chamber have resisted increases of duty on the lower grades, and the higher grades, and all the grades in the bill. We have persistently and consistently fought every increase at the expense of the consumers of the country. And yet the Senator from Rhode Island undertakes to defend this monstrous increase, for which he can find no reason whatever except his idea of a symmetrical tariff bill; he undertakes to defend it upon the ground that we upon this side have permitted these further increases to be made. It is not true, Mr. President, and we now have a look at this monstrous system in its naked deformity, stripped of all pretense that it is anything else than an out-of-hand piece of spoliation of the people of the United States.

We have come at last to the point where the Senator has no reason except that because we have done this in other places we must do it here in order to preserve the harmonious relations of this bill, the symmetry of this tariff bill as proposed by the Committee on Finance! Why, Mr. President, from the beginning of this false statement by this expert that there has been no increase, through all the steps of the taxation contained in this clause, we have shown that there has been an increase without any reason whatever, and the Senator is now driven to the resort of saying that it is necessary to preserve the symmetrical relations of one part of this bill with another!

What is the result of the Senator's statement? We know very well that in any article of crude material there will be found different kinds of manufacture. Take leather, for instance. After the hides have been prepared as leather, you find the manufactures of boots and shoes, satchels, and harness, and all the different kinds of leather manufacture. According to the Senator from Rhode Island, if you make an increase on any one of them you must then blindly make an increase upon all in order to preserve the symmetrical relations of tariff taxation!

Suppose the manufacturers of saddlery were making enormous fortunes and the manufacturers of boots and shoes were not. According to the Senator from Rhode Island, if there was an increase upon leather

or an increase upon any of the other articles in which leather is used for manufacturing purposes, there must be an increase in saddlery in order to preserve the symmetrical relation of the tariff!

We are to go blindly, without cause, to increase taxes when they are not demanded, when there is no other reason for it except the symmetrical relation which is adopted by the Committee on Finance!

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, the public will take notice that the Committee on Finance can find no reason for this increase except that, in their opinion, the present rates are unjust, and therefore they ought to be increased! If so, then I presume they ought not to be ashamed to increase them directly, instead of saying, after assigning a duty to each classification of these wires, many of which are below 45 per cent.—instead of assigning to each one a duty which would bring it up to 45 directly, so that the public could see and the plainest minds could comprehend what they were doing, and so Senators on this side would know what they were doing, they take the indirect method of saying in a proviso that all wires, iron or steel, valued at not less than 4 cents a pound shall pay a duty of not less than 45 per cent.

That is the indirect way of doing it, and the general reading public would not comprehend, having no tables before them, whether there had been any increase at all; and the deception is further carried out by a foot-note, given by the committee by way of explanation, that—

This is a slight change from the existing rates, and a reduction in a few of the lower grades;

Whereas it is a great change in existing rates in more than forty odd of the entire number of kinds of wire specified, and a very slight reduction in only a few of them. The truth is the reverse of what we might infer from this equivocal statement of the committee.

We, on this side of the Chamber, are constantly twitted, Mr. President, with being friends of the importers, and we are called upon to say why we resist these reductions as the friends of the importers. Why, Mr. President, there is nobody on this side who is a friend to the importers. Our clients are not the importers. Our clients are the great consuming public, the American people; the clients of that side of the Chamber are the manufacturers; and it will not do to attempt to narrow the issue in that way, to attempt to narrow the number and the character of the people and the interest that we represent here (which is that of the great American public), to compare with the half dozen or the handful of manufacturers of iron wire.

Mr. BLAIR. I should think your clients had better change their attorneys if they want to get their rights.

Mr. VANCE. That may be so. If our clients could come here and consult with us, as they come and consult those on that side of the Senate; if our clients, the great consumers, the American people, could come here into these antechambers and corridors, and could exclude the manufacturers and the majority of the committee, and could post us upon these classifications, it might be that we could succeed in reducing some of these duties in an indirect and a secret manner, as they have succeeded in increasing the duties in that indirect and secret manner. But that is not possible, sir.

The great public can not be here. The great public of consumers have no experts to send here to manipulate the tariff bill. They depend upon the justice, the intelligence, and the patriotism of American legislators, and I fear, sir, that they will be disappointed every time that they have that expectation. Especially do they labor under the disadvantage that they have not been informed as to the manner of making these changes; that they have not been informed as to the necessity of the changes being made, and that those upon whom is devolved the duty of furnishing the information have deceived them by making a representation here that is not, apparently at least, in accordance with the facts. Therefore they can not expect to hold their hands in legislating in this way with the chosen recipients of the benefits of this taxation who have the field all to themselves and have the technical knowledge of their own business which it is impossible for others to acquire.

If the Senator says the burden of proof is on this side, and that those who entertain the opposite doctrine should show the reason why an increase should not be made, the ordinary rules of proof in every court of justice will be set at naught and changed. The purpose of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] was to furnish this very information, for the want of which we are now floundering frequently in the dark. The report which has been made here, in quite a number, if not a majority, of the cases where there have been changes, says "no data," and therefore there are no means of telling whether it is an increase or not.

There is no information given to us anywhere, before the committee or by the report of the Finance Committee, why this increase should be made. We are all working in the dark. We are all floundering for the want of proper information, except that portion of the Finance Committee that has been in close consultation with the manufacturers themselves, and who know precisely what they want and the best way to obtain that which they do want without letting the great bulk of the American people know what they are after.

Mr. McPHERSON. Mr. President, I wish, sir, to enter my protest against this kind of proceeding any longer. For one, I do not sympathize with any ambition, whether it be upon this side of the Chamber

or that side, which undertakes to censure the Senator from Rhode Island or any of the members of the Committee on Finance who were engaged in the preparation of this tariff bill. I am quite sure that neither the Senator from Rhode Island nor any member of the committee had very much to do with it. The tariff bill was made up by the beneficiaries themselves, and the result was handed to the committee for the purpose of explaining it to the country and sustaining it before the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that there is not one particle of truth in that statement in regard to any paragraph of the bill.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It is a well known fact, sir, that not one individual other than the manufacturers themselves, so far as the public knows, had a chance to appear before that committee. They came there and they were heard by the committee in respect of these paragraphs and schedules. The general public, the consumers, were not invited there, and therefore they had nothing to do with making up the bill.

Now, I find no fault with the committee. The Senator from Rhode Island, for whom I have a great deal of sympathy to-day, seems to be all alone. Three of his associates upon the committee have apparently escaped, and the only one who is present with him is speechless. Now, I find no fault, as I say, with this paragraph. It is exactly like the rest of the paragraphs of the bill. The paragraph itself states in express language what it means. There has been no concealment on the part of the committee, so far as I have been concerned, for I have read the paragraph through from beginning to end.

When I see that upon certain qualities and kinds of wire a duty of 11, 12, or 15 per cent. is interposed and when I find a context in the way of a proviso which imposes a duty of 45 per cent., I know what it means. Therefore, Mr. President, I intend at first to move to amend each particular paragraph and each particular grade of wire as we pass along. I then intend to move to strike out the provision *in toto*, so as to leave that exactly as the committee left it, less the proviso. That is all, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, it being an important paragraph, I propose to ask for the yeas and nays so far as I have moved to amend, which is down to line 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon the several amendments proposed by the Senator from New Jersey, which, for the purpose of voting, are treated as one amendment, the Senator from New Jersey demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. MCPHERSON. And further, Mr. President, I wish to give notice that it is my intention to move to strike out the proviso, so that when Senators vote upon my amendments now they will understand that they are voting with the understanding that I intend as well to move to strike out the proviso.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope that the Senator from New Jersey will include that in this present motion.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I can not, because I have three or four other motions to make concerning this paragraph.

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

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE].

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

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

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

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. PASCO. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. CALL] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. GIBSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN], and therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. EVARTS. I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I should like to inquire whether his vote is recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. His vote is not recorded.

Mr. EVARTS. Then I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from New York that I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], and that if he

desires it we may transfer our pairs, so that the Senator from New York and I can both vote.

Mr. EVARTS. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. HARRIS. I vote "yea."

Mr. EVARTS. I vote "nay."

Mr. COCKRELL. As heretofore announced, I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALISON], but in pursuance of what his colleague stated to me awhile ago, and in order to make a quorum, and as it will not change the result, I vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER. I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL].

Mr. WALTHALL. I see that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has entered the Chamber, and therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. SPOONER. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 27; as follows:

YEAS—17.

Barbour,	Coke,	McPherson,	Walthall,
Bate,	Eustis,	Pugh,	Wilson of Md.
Berry,	Gray,	Reagan,	
Butler,	Hampton,	Vest,	
Cockrell,	Harris,	Voorhees,	

NAYS—27.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Sawyer,
Allen,	Edmunds,	Jones of Nevada,	Spooner,
Blair,	Evarts,	Moody,	Squire,
Cameron,	Frye,	Paddock,	Stockbridge,
Casey,	Hawley,	Platt,	Teller,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Power,	Wilson of Iowa.
Dixon,	Hiscock,	Quay,	

ABSENT—40.

Allison,	Dawes,	Kenna,	Plumb,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	McMillan,	Ransom,
Blodgett,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Sanders,
Brown,	George,	Mitchell,	Sherman,
Call,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Stanford,
Carlisle,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Hale,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Colquitt,	Hearst,	Payne,	Vance,
Daniel,	Ingalls,	Pettigrew,	Washburn,
Davis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Pierce,	Wolcott.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to offer an amendment: In line 17, on page 32, to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "four;" so as to read "4 cents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the amendment be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the beginning of line 17, on page 32, strike out "five" and insert "four;" so as to read, "4 cents per pound."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then I move to amend, in line 22, page 32, by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting in lieu thereof "forty;" so as to read: "40 per cent. ad valorem."

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of line 22, page 32, strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to read:

Shall pay a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. In line 9, page 33, I move to strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one and one-half;" so as to read "1 cents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 9, page 33, after the word "and," strike out "two" and insert "one and one-half."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. In line 17, page 33, I move to strike out the word "one" and insert "one-half."

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 17, page 33, strike out the word "one" and insert in lieu thereof "one-half;" so as to read "one-half cent per pound."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. On page 33, line 20, I move to strike out "two" and insert "one and one-half."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now, Mr. President, we have reached the proviso to which I intended to offer an amendment calculated to reduce the ad valorem rate of duty from 45 per cent. to 25 per cent., and upon that question I shall ask for the yeas and nays, because that is the vital question of the whole paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 24, page 33, after the word "than," it is proposed to strike out "forty-five" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to read:

Shall pay a duty of not less than 25 per cent. ad valorem, except that card wire, for the manufacture of card clothing, shall pay a duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Clerk correctly understand the Senator from New Jersey that his amendment is to reduce the rate to 25 per cent. ad valorem?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Twenty-five. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

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

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER]; and while I am on the floor I will inquire whether the name of the junior Senator from West Virginia was recorded as having voted during the last roll-call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk informs the Chair that he is not so recorded.

Mr. QUAY. I was under a misapprehension. The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. GIBSON. I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN]. I withhold my vote. I make this announcement of my pair for the day.

Mr. BATE. I desire to state that Mr. FAULKNER, of West Virginia, was called out of the Chamber a short time ago.

Mr. HARRIS. In order to make a quorum, though paired, I have the authority to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. COCKRELL. I previously announced my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], but, for the purpose of making a quorum and as it does not change the result of the vote, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 27; as follows:

YEAS—19.

Barbour,	Coke,	Harris,	Vest,
Bate,	Daniel,	McPherson,	Voorhees,
Berry,	Eustis,	Morgan,	Walthall,
Butler,	Gray,	Fugh,	Wilson of Md.
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Reagan,	

NAYS—27.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Sawyer,
Allen,	Edmunds,	Jones of Nevada,	Spooner,
Blair,	Ewarts,	Mitchell,	Squire,
Cameron,	Frye,	Moody,	Stockbridge,
Casey,	Hale,	Paddock,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Platt,	Wilson of Iowa.
Dixon,	Hiscock,	Plumb,	

ABSENT—38.

Allison,	Farwell,	McMillan,	Sanders,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Blodgett,	George,	Morrill,	Stanford,
Brown,	Gibson,	Pasco,	Stewart,
Call,	Gorman,	Payne,	Turpie,
Carlisle,	Hearst,	Pettigrew,	Vance,
Chandler,	Higgins,	Pierce,	Washburn,
Colquitt,	Ingalls,	Power,	Wolcott.
Davis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,	
Dawes,	Kenna,	Ransom,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANCE. I move to strike out the whole of paragraph 143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 143, as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

143. No allowance or reduction of duties for partial loss or damage in consequence of rust or of discoloration shall be made upon any description of iron or steel, or upon any article wholly or partly manufactured of iron or steel, or upon any manufacture of iron and steel.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, I do not profess to be familiar with the methods of importation and with the accidents and losses that are necessarily attendant upon it; but it seems to me that that paragraph can have no effect in the world except to discourage importations, which means that we proclaim to the world, by that paragraph and by similar ones in other schedules, that we do not want anybody at all to trade with us; that we want foreigners to bring nothing here, and that if they should come with a cargo and should be so unfortunate as to have it damaged in any way by the perils of the sea no allowance will be made therefor; and although the damage may be anything short of total loss of the goods, and if that which remains is not worth the duty, yet the importers have got to pay those duties or throw the goods away or take the damaged goods back. That is a repulsion of trade. It exhibits an unfriendly spirit, the spirit of the Dark Ages, which discourages trade and intercourse between nations; and the more that the goods of foreign countries are discouraged by this means from coming here, the less we shall be able to sell of our own products. Consequently the injury will fall ultimately upon our own people, who are not permitted to exchange.

I think it is so contrary to the spirit of the age and to the civilization of the times that it should not stay upon the statute-book; and if a man should bring a cargo of goods which he had the misfortune to have greatly damaged and proposed to sell them in the market for what they would bring the loss should be taken off the value estimated upon the goods when they were assessed for duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senate ready for the question on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina, to strike out the whole of paragraph 143?

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, as follows:

144. All metal produced from iron or its ores, which is cast and malleable, of whatever description or form, without regard to the percentage of carbon contained therein, whether produced by cementation, or converted, cast, or made from iron or its ores, by the crucible, Bessemer, Clapp-Griffiths, pneumatic, Thomas-Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin, or open-hearth process, or by the equivalent of either, or by a combination of two or more of the processes, or their equivalents, or by any fusion or other process which produces from iron or its ores a metal either granular or fibrous in structure, which is cast and malleable, excepting what is known as malleable-iron castings, shall be classed and denominated as steel.

145. No article not specially provided for in this act, wholly or partly manufactured from tin-plate, terne-plate, or the sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel herein provided for, or of which such tin-plate, terne-plate, sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel shall be the material of chief value, shall pay a lower rate of duty than that imposed on the tin-plate, terne-plate, or sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel from which it is made or of which it shall be the component thereof of chief value.

The Committee on Finance proposed, on page 35, to strike out paragraph 146, in the following words:

146. On all iron or steel bars or rods of whatever shape or section, which are cold-rolled, cold-hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, there shall be paid one-fourth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act; and on all strips or sheets of iron or steel of whatever shape, other than the polished, planished, or glanced sheet-iron or sheet-steel hereinbefore provided for, which are cold-rolled, cold-hammered, blueed, brightened, tempered, or polished by any process to such perfected surface-finish, or polished better than the grade of cold-rolled, smooth only, hereinbefore provided for, there shall be paid 14 cents per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act; and on steel circular saw-plates there shall be paid 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate provided in this act for steel saw-plates.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

146. On all iron or steel bars, rods, strips, or steel sheets, of whatever shape, other than the polished, planished, or glanced sheet-iron or sheet-steel hereinbefore provided for, and on all iron or steel bars of irregular shape or section, which are cold-rolled, cold-hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, there shall be paid one-fourth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act; and on steel circular saw-plates there shall be paid 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate provided in this act for steel saw-plates.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I wish to propose an amendment. In line 3, page 36, I move to strike out "one-fourth" and insert "one-tenth," so as to read: "shall be paid one-tenth of 1 cent per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCPHERSON. In line 5, I move to insert the words "one-half of" before "one;" so as to read:

And on steel circular-saw plates there shall be paid one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate provided in this act for steel saw-plates.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to strike out and insert.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read paragraph 147, as follows:

MANUFACTURES OF IRON AND STEEL.

147. Anchors, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, mill-irons and mill-cranks of wrought-iron, and wrought-iron for ships, and forgings of iron or steel, or of combined iron and steel, for vessels, steam-engines, and locomotives, or parts thereof weighing each 25 pounds or more, 1.8 cents per pound.

Mr. VANCE. In the paragraph preceding, which was passed over in such a hurry, I see that there is an increase of duty upon saw-plates of which circular saws are made. I should like to know what the necessity for that increase is. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island who has the bill in charge why that increase is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the Senate will return to that paragraph. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey was to make it one-half a cent per pound, in line 5, instead of 1 cent per pound, which was disagreed to.

Mr. VANCE. Then I beg pardon. We were proceeding so rapidly that I did not keep up.

Mr. ALDRICH. What was the question asked by the Senator from North Carolina? I did not understand him.

Mr. VANCE. I ask the reason for the increase in the duty on saw-plates, of which circular saws are made?

Mr. ALDRICH. This duty is the same as the present law.

Mr. VANCE. It is put down in the table of the expert as an increase.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will read the present law, for the information of the Senator:

And on steel circular-saw plates there shall be paid 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate provided in this act.

Mr. VANCE. Then the expert has misinformed us. I looked at the result of his exposition, and not at the original law.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is safer to look at the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph 147 has been read.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think that 1.8 cents per pound is a pretty heavy rate of duty to impose upon anchors and all sorts of mill machinery. I see the rate of duty is 34.56 per cent. I move to strike out "eight-tenths" and insert "five-tenths."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, on page 36, after the word "and," strike out "eight" and insert "five;" so as to read "1.5 cents per pound."

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 148, as follows:

148. Axles, or parts thereof, axle-bars, axle-blanks, or forgings for axles, whether of iron or steel, without reference to the stage or state of manufacture, 2 cents per pound: *Provided*, That when iron or steel axles are imported fitted in wheels, or parts of wheels, of iron or steel, they shall be dutiable at the same rate as the wheels in which they are fitted.

Mr. VANCE. In line 17, on page 36, I move to strike out "2 cents" and insert "1½ cents;" so as to read "1½ cents per pound."

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

The amendment was rejected.

Paragraph 149 was read.

The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the paragraph by inserting after the word "anvils" the words "or parts thereof," and to strike out after the word "two" the words "and one-half;" so as to make the paragraph read:

149. Anvils or parts thereof of iron or steel, or of iron and steel combined, by whatever process made or in whatever stage of manufacture, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANCE. I move to amend the paragraph in line 24, on page 36, by striking out the word "two," and inserting "one and one-half;" so as to read "1½ cents per pound."

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 150, as follows:

150. Blacksmiths' hammers and sledges, track tools, wedges, and crowbars, whether of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. VANCE. I move to strike out in line 2, on page 37, "and one-fourth;" so as to read "2 cents per pound."

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 151. The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the paragraph on page 37, line 3, after the word "tubes," by striking out the word "or," and in the same line, after the word "pipes," striking out the word "or;" so as to make the paragraph read:

151. Boiler or other tubes, pipes, flues, and stays of wrought-iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANCE. In line 4, on page 37, I move to strike out "and one-half," so as to read "2 cents per pound."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill as follows:

152. Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, or bolt-blanks, and finished hinges or hinge-blanks, whether of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

153. Card-clothing, manufactured from tempered steel wire, 50 cents per square foot; all other, 25 cents per square foot.

Mr. VANCE. A paragraph which was passed over recently provided that all articles made from wire, sheet-iron, etc., should not pay a less rate of duty than the material out of which it is made. In that item the card wire out of which card-clothing is made is 35 per cent., and this provision here is that it shall pay 25 per cent. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if the effect of that will not be to increase the duty upon all other card-clothing than that which is made out of steel-tempered wire.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not understand the question of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. VANCE. I say that in one of the paragraphs which we passed over to-day—I do not now recur to it—there is a general provision that no article made out of iron wire, sheet-steel, or iron sheets should pay a less rate of duty than the duty imposed on the material out of which it is made. I ask the Senator if the effect of this paragraph would not be to increase the duty on wire card-clothing to 30 per cent. instead of 25 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is 25 cents a square foot.

Mr. VANCE. The untempered wire is 50 cents per square foot. The tempered steel wire, card clothing, and all other is 25 cents per square foot. Now, would not that increase the duty under the general clause providing that the duty on all articles shall be at least as high as that on the raw material out of which they are made?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know of any such paragraph in the bill. I do not quite understand the Senator, whether he thinks the rate will be more than 50 cents a square foot.

Mr. VANCE. Let it be passed over; I will not take the time of the Senate. I will hunt up the paragraph and call it to the attention of the Senator.

Mr. McPHERSON. If the Senator will turn to page 34—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire further delay?

Mr. VANCE. No, sir; let the paragraph be passed over, and I will call the Senator's attention to it again.

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

154. Cast-iron pipe of every description, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. McPHERSON. I wish to call attention to paragraph 154. This is a most important paragraph. Cast-iron pipe, the simplest form of manufacture in the world, is to pay a duty of nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound. It seems during the year 1889 less than 1 ton of it was imported—2,140 pounds. The unit of value is given at 6.3 cents per pound. That certainly would mean some of the finer grades of iron pipe of smaller sizes, used by plumbers, unquestionably, for plumbing uses, and would have no relation whatever to the larger sizes of iron pipe which are used for extensive water works and for conduits for water. That kind of iron pipe, as I am informed, sells all the way from 2 to 3 cents a pound. It is proposed here to insert a duty of nine-tenths of a cent a pound, which would be equal to \$44.10 a ton.

For great establishments, great water-works, great public works that are going on all over the country, in which the pipe by contract is delivered at from 2½ to 3½ cents a pound, a duty of nine-tenths of a cent a pound is absolutely prohibitory.

I move, in order that there may be some competition in that line of goods, that the duty, instead of being nine-tenths of a cent a pound, be made seven-tenths of a cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out, in line 11, page 31, the word "nine" and insert "seven;" so as to read:

Seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 155, as follows:

155. Cast-iron vessels, plates, stove-plates, andirons, sad-irons, tailors' irons, hatters' irons, and castings of iron, not specially provided for in this act, 1.2 cents per pound.

Mr. McPHERSON. I move to reduce that duty. I move to strike out "and two-tenths cents," in line 15, on page 37, and to insert "cent;" so as to read:

One cent per pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment. The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 156, as follows:

156. Castings of malleable iron, not specially provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. McPHERSON. I move, in line 18, on page 37, before the word "cents," to strike out "three-fourths" and insert "one-fourth;" so as to read: "1½ cents per pound."

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 157. The Committee on Finance proposed to amend the paragraph by striking out, after the word "tinned," the word "three" and inserting "two and one-half;" so as to make the paragraph read:

157. Cast hollow-ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 2½ cents per pound.

Mr. McPHERSON. I move to strike out "and one-half;" so as to leave the duty 2 cents per pound.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read paragraph 158. The Committee on Finance proposed, in line 2, on page 38, after the word "pound," to strike out "but no chain or chains of any description shall pay a lower rate of duty than 45 per cent. ad valorem;" so as to make the paragraph read:

158. Chain or chains of all kinds, made of iron or steel, not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, 1.6 cents per pound; less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 1.8 cents per pound; less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANCE. I move to strike out, in line 25, on page 37, "and eight-tenths cents" and insert "cent;" so as to read "1 cent per pound." This is a duty on trace-chains, as I understand, the chain which goes with the plow, which is the foundation of all prosperity and has to pay for all these things that are enumerated here; and I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from North Carolina moves to amend the paragraph as stated, and asks that on this question the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal.

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

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER].

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON]. He is not in the Chamber, and unless it should become necessary for me to vote to make a quorum, I shall withhold my vote.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] that, as I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] and he with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], we transfer our pairs and vote.

Mr. QUAY. That is satisfactory, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRIS. I vote "yea."

Mr. QUAY. I vote "nay."

Mr. BLAIR. Has the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] voted? The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. He is not recorded.

Mr. BLAIR. I withhold my vote.

Mr. EDMUNDS (after having voted in the negative). I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] has not voted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. He is not recorded.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Assuming that there is a quorum, I withdraw my vote, as I am paired with him.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A quorum is not yet recorded.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then I will let it stand.

Mr. BLAIR. I can vote for the purpose of making a quorum, and I vote "nay."

Mr. COCKRELL. Paired as I am with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], yet at the instance of his colleague I will vote if agreeable—it will not change the result—to make a quorum. I vote "yea."

Mr. EUSTIS. I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK].

Mr. MANDERSON. I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. BLAIR (after having voted in the negative). I desire to withdraw my vote, if there is a quorum without it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. A quorum is recorded.

Mr. BLAIR. I withdraw my vote then.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire withdraws his vote.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 26; as follows:

YEAS—18.

Bate,	Colquitt,	Jones of Arkansas,	Turpie,
Berry,	Daniel,	McPherson,	Vest,
Butler,	Gray,	Morgan,	Walthall.
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Ransom,	
Coke,	Harris,	Reagan,	

NAYS—26.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hiscock,	Sawyer,
Allen,	Edmunds,	Hoar,	Spooner,
Cameron,	Everts,	Jones of Nevada,	Squire,
Casey,	Frye,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Cullom,	Hale,	Moody,	Teller.
Davis,	Hawley,	Platt,	
Dixon,	Higgins,	Quay,	

ABSENT—40.

Allison,	Eustis,	Manderson,	Sanders,
Barbour,	Farwell,	Morrill,	Sherman,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Paddock,	Stewart,
Blair,	George,	Pasco,	Stewart,
Blodgett,	Gibson,	Payne,	Vance,
Brown,	Gorman,	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Call,	Hearst,	Pierce,	Washburn,
Carlisle,	Ingalls,	Plumb,	Wilson of Iowa,
Chandler,	Kenna,	Power,	Wilson of Md.
Dawes,	McMillan,	Pugh,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read paragraph 159. The Committee on Finance proposed in line 19, page 38, before the words "four dollars," to strike out "more than," and, after the same words, to insert "or more;" so as to make the paragraph read:

Cutlery:

159. Pen-knives or pocket-knives of all kinds, or parts thereof, and erasers, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, valued at not more than 50 cents per dozen, 12 cents per dozen; valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding \$1.50 per dozen, 30 cents per dozen; valued at more than \$1.50 per dozen and not exceeding \$3 per dozen, \$1 per dozen; valued at more than \$3 per dozen, \$2 per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the above, 50 per cent. ad valorem. Razors and razor-blades, finished or unfinished, valued at less than \$4 per dozen, \$1 per dozen; valued at \$4 or more per dozen, \$1.75 per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the above razors and razor-blades, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to put in the RECORD a table which will show the large increase proposed in this bill upon the lower grade of knives, the least costly goods, pen-knives, pocket-knives of all kinds. I ask the attention of the Senate to the fact that the compiler of the table on page 38 has seen fit not to give us any ad valorem rate of duty there at all. The existing law imposes 50 per cent. ad valorem, and as it has not been carried out in this table we are not told what the proposed ad valorem rate of duty will be with this compound duty here proposed. I therefore wish to put in the RECORD exactly what it will be.

The table referred to is as follows:

Paragraph.	Rates of duty under—		Increased ad valorem rate.	
	Existing law.	H. R. 9416 and Senate.		
159	50 p. ct.	Pocket-knives:	74 per cent.	
		12 cents per dozen and 50 per cent.		From 80 per cent. to 116.66 per cent.
		50 cents per dozen and 50 per cent.		From 83 per cent. to 100 per cent.
160	35 p. ct.	\$1 per dozen and 50 per cent.	From 70 per cent. to 100 per cent.	
		\$2 per dozen and 50 per cent.		
		Razors:	Finished, from 41 per cent. to 63.33 per cent.	
		\$1.75 per dozen and 30 per cent.	Unfinished, from 59 per cent. to 80 per cent.	
		35 per cent.	Razor blades, from 59.17 per cent. to 96.66 per cent.	

Mr. MCPHERSON. As the compiler of the comparative statement on page 38 leaves the space where the ad valorem percentage ought to be in blank, it becomes necessary to supply that information from actual invoices of goods imported in 1889 and calculate the percentage in conformity to the proposed tariff:

Pocket and pen knives.

Valued at—	Proposed duty.	Equal to—
		<i>Per cent.</i>
\$0.50 per dozen.....	12 cents per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem.....	74.00
0.75 per dozen.....	50 cents per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem.....	116.66
1.00 per dozen.....do.....	100.00
1.25 per dozen.....do.....	90.00
1.50 per dozen.....do.....	80.00
2.00 per dozen.....	\$1 per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem.....	100.00
2.50 per dozen.....do.....	90.00
3.00 per dozen.....do.....	83.33
4.00 per dozen.....	\$2 per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem.....	100.00
5.00 per dozen.....do.....	90.00
6.00 per dozen.....do.....	83.33
7.00 per dozen.....do.....	78.50
6.00 per dozen.....do.....	76.66
8.00 per dozen.....do.....	75.00
9.00 per dozen.....do.....	72.22
10.00 per dozen.....do.....	70.00

From the above it will be seen that the cheaper quality, worth 75 cents per dozen, pays an ad valorem duty of 116 per cent., the dearer qualities, worth ten times the amount, namely, \$7.50 per dozen, pay only 76.66 per cent. ad valorem.

Besides, this system of complex duties, part ad valorem and specific, is just the system that plays in the hands of persons disposed to be dishonest. A knife costing abroad 52 cents per dozen, the proposed duty on which is 50 cents per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem, ought to pay 76 cents duty. All a dishonest importer need do is to invoice the knife at 50 cents per dozen or 2 cents less than his cost, and he pays a duty of 12 cents per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem, or 37 cents, instead of 76 cents, which an honest importer must pay. No appraiser can properly appraise a difference of 2 cents on a dozen of knives.

A knife costing abroad \$1.54 per dozen, the proposed duty on which is \$1 per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem, equal to \$1.77: A dishonest importer need only invoice this knife at \$1.50 per dozen, or 4 cents per dozen less than actual cost, and he pays a duty of 50 cents per dozen and 50 per cent. ad valorem, or \$1.25 instead of \$1.77.

Razors: The proposed duty on all razors, finished, valued at less than \$4 per dozen, is \$1 per dozen and 30 per cent. ad valorem; hence razors valued at \$3 per dozen will have to pay \$1.90, or 63.33 per cent. etc.

As the comparative statement, page 38, does not contain the percentage ad valorem, it becomes necessary to use invoices of razors received in 1889 and 1890:

Razors, finished.

Valued at—	Duty.	Equal to—
		<i>Per cent.</i>
\$3 per dozen.....	\$1 and 30 per cent.....	63.33
\$4 per dozen.....do.....	55.00
\$5 per dozen.....	\$1.75 and 30 per cent.....	65.00
\$6 per dozen.....do.....	59.17
\$7 per dozen.....do.....	55.00
\$8 per dozen.....do.....	51.88
\$10 per dozen.....do.....	47.50
\$15 per dozen.....do.....	41.60

Here, again, the cheaper goods, at \$3 per dozen, when finished, pay 63.33 per cent. ad valorem, and razors worth five times that amount, \$15 per dozen, of the finest and dearest quality, fit for a king, pay only 41.60 per cent.

But this is not all. Razors "unfinished" pay the same duty of \$1 and \$1.75, respectively, and 30 per cent. ad valorem, and as the comparative statement is silent on the percentage it becomes again necessary to use invoices, etc.

Razors, unfinished.

Valued at—	Duty.	Equal to—
		<i>Per cent.</i>
\$2 per dozen.....	\$1 and 30 per cent.....	80.00
\$2.50 per dozen.....	do.....	70.00
\$3 per dozen.....	do.....	63.33
\$4 per dozen.....	do.....	50.00
\$5 per dozen.....	\$1.75 and 30 per cent.....	65.00
\$6 per dozen.....	do.....	59.17

From the above it will also be seen that unfinished razors valued at \$2 per dozen pay 80 per cent. ad valorem, while razors, unfinished, at \$6, worth three times as much, and on which workmanship has advanced at least twice or even three times as much as on the \$2 per dozen razors, the duty is only 59.17 per cent. It seems as if the framers of this tariff bill have determined not only to deceive the laboring classes, but have also offered a bounty of percentage on goods further advanced in workmanship, but still unfinished. Again, razor-blades, finished, valued at \$2 per dozen, pay \$1 per dozen and 30 per cent. ad valorem, equal to 80 per cent., while the finished, valued at \$6 per dozen, pay only 59.17 per cent.

Now, I intend to offer an amendment. On page 38, I move to strike out all of the paragraph after the word "manufactured," in line 7, down to and including the word "above," in line 16.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, after the word "manufactured," in line 7, down to and including the word "above," in line 16, as follows:

Valued at not more than 50 cents per dozen, 12 cents per dozen; valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding \$1.50 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen; valued at more than \$1.50 per dozen and not exceeding \$3 per dozen, \$1 per dozen; valued at more than \$3 per dozen, \$2 per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the above.

Mr. McPHERSON. It will leave the paragraph then to read:

Pen-knives or pocket-knives of all kinds, or parts thereof, and erasers, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 50 per cent. ad valorem. Razors and razor-blades, finished or unfinished, valued at less than \$1 per dozen, \$1 per dozen; valued at \$4 or more per dozen, \$1.75 cents per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the above razors and razor-blades, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, I move to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-five;" so as to make it read, "45 per cent. ad valorem."

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

The SECRETARY. In line 16, on page 38, strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-five;" so as to read, "45 per cent. ad valorem."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, these increases of duty upon pocket cutlery seem to be based upon a table that was furnished by the American manufacturers. In 1888 the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] alluded to a table, which I had never seen and which had never been seen at that time by the importers, and stated that the prices paid in the foreign market both for labor and for the materials used in the manufacture of cutlery were so entirely out of proportion to what was charged in the United States as to make an increase of duty under the act of 1888 absolutely necessary.

He also stated that it was very remarkable that the importers had never denied any of the statements made in that table and that no Senator upon this side of the Chamber had denied them. A sufficient explanation and answer to the Senator's statement is simply in the fact that that statement was never seen by any Senator upon this side of the Chamber, nor was it ever seen by any importer of cutlery. It seems to have been used before the Committee on Finance by the American manufacturers, but its existence was never made known to any opponent to the increase of duties upon cutlery.

Mr. A. H. Saxton, president of the Hardware Association, secured a copy of this table which had been used for the purposes I have named, after the debate had concluded in 1888, and he then went to Europe and priced the duplicates in the European market, in the German market, which is the lowest upon cutlery, so as to secure the real foreign price upon identical knives, the prices of which had been stated by the American manufacturers to the Committee on Finance in 1888. He then secured the affidavits of dealers in cutlery both in Chicago and St. Louis as to the American selling price, and these tables which I have before me now and which can be found in the protest of the Hardware Association of the United States and in the testimony taken before the Ways and Means Committee, exhibit in the strongest light

absolute truth as to this cutlery interest and the basis upon which this increase of duty is now placed.

In the protest the American importers say, after giving this table:

It must be borne in mind that the foreign cost, with duty and charges added, represents the cost of the goods laid down at the port of New York, and that the importer must add his profit to such cost before they can come into competition with the domestic article. It will be observed that out of nineteen samples corresponding with the descriptions named in the American manufacturers' table, without adding anything for importers' commission or profit, nine patterns figure out a higher cost than the American selling price; eight patterns figure slightly lower, and two patterns figure substantially the same. It will therefore be readily seen that if the importer should add 10 per cent. to his cost for profit it would bring an average price considerably higher than the domestic makers are asking for their goods.

It must be understood we are simply now combating the erroneous statements made by the domestic manufacturers, on which they claimed an advance of duties.

Take Senator PLATT's argument from this manufacturers' table of relative cost (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 20, 1888, page 1022) and see how it works out with actual facts, facts that can not be controverted. He takes a 4-inch iron-lined jack-knife, wood covering, one blade, and says (quoting from the table in question): "This knife costs in Germany 56 cents, in England 91 cents, and in America \$1.90," and then quotes the labor cost in Germany "at 35 cents, in England at 70 cents, and in America at \$1.42." Now turn to Table A, and take knife 253c—

That is the knife [exhibiting]; a common jack-knife, with a wood handle, the commonest article that is manufactured either abroad or here in the way of a jack-knife—

take knife 253c, which is the exact description as the above knife referred to, and it is found that this knife costs in Germany \$1.10 instead of 56 cents, and that this knife in like quality and description can be purchased from the American manufacturers at \$1.50, though the manufacturers' table makes it cost to produce \$1.90, and, further, that after this same knife has become subject to the present duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem and other usual charges necessary to land it in this country it costs the importer \$1.75, or nearly 17 per cent. more than the selling price of the American knife of same grade, so that the importer to compete with the American manufacturer on this knife must sell it at 20 per cent. less than cost. This showing makes it quite unnecessary to comment on the labor argument of Senator PLATT in this connection. There are plenty of other cases in this table in the same boat.

Mr. President, I have here all these nineteen samples, which were said by the American manufacturers to cost certain prices abroad and to be sold for certain prices in the United States, and in every instance they have falsified the actual facts.

I have here the affidavit of Mr. Morton, of the Simmons Hardware Company, the largest establishment in the West, in which he gives the prices at which the American manufacturers had placed these same goods, and that affidavit shows beyond any question that they most deliberately changed the facts in order to suit the argument that they were then making in support of this increase of duty.

They have also stated, and the Committee on Finance reiterates the statement, that their industry has been destroyed by the importers, and they have given a garbled statement to show that importations had increased from year to year, when the facts warrant but one statement, and that is that importations have decreased and that in certain articles of cutlery the American manufacturers command the market.

It is true, and it will always be true, notwithstanding any tariff duty in this country, that there are certain grades of cutlery which have never been reproduced in the United States. There are articles of cutlery that are sold upon the brand, that command a higher price than any other in the market, and always, in my judgment, will command those prices. There is the Rodgers cutlery knife, the Wostenholm knife, made in England, and we have never been able to approximate to those knives, nor have the Germans. There is the Wilson butcher-knife, which the American butcher will have if it takes one-half of his yearly proceeds, because he is bound to have it. We can not produce such a knife; and butchers say that it is absolutely necessary to them in their business. In the common knives used by children, and the cheapest articles that sell from 20 to 40 cents a gross, the Germans can beat the world, for they have cheaper labor, but in the middle class of cutlery the American manufacturers are holding their own to-day.

Mr. President, one of these manufacturers, Mr. Charles M. Landers, appeared before the committee, and you will find his testimony on pages 77 and 78 of the testimony taken before the Ways and Means Committee. If you read that testimony you will find that he deliberately stated that the American manufacturers of cutlery are being forced into bankruptcy by the foreign competition, that they can not live under the present rates of duty. Now, I happen to have a publication on the hardware question, which is sent to me regularly for some reason, and there I find this statement; this gentleman swore before the committee that he is a member of the firm of Landers, Frary & Clark, and that he is losing money every day:

Landers, Frary & Co.—

Says the editorial—

are now kept very busy supplying their Western customers with their superb cutlery. They were compelled during the spring to employ about two hundred new hands, to be able to keep up with the demand for their well famed goods.

And here is the pauper, emaciated, starving, compelled to have an increase of duty; famine stares him in the face; the workmen are to be discharged and American workmen are to haunt the streets and become tramps upon the highway. But it happens here that in an article in a public journal devoted to the hardware trade is the absolute

refutation of all such statements, and so far from this industry being destroyed, as the committee say, by foreign competition, it is now in a flourishing condition, and day by day, in a great many grades of cutlery, commanding the market.

There is a large increase of duty in this bill upon butcher-knives such as are made in the United States. I happen to have before me *The Engineering and Mining Journal*, giving the export price with the discount on American cutlery and especially upon butcher-knives and table cutlery, in which I find as to Tommins & Adams, a jobbing-house in New York which sells the goods both of foreign and American manufacture:

Tommins & Adams's knives, table: Japanned-iron handles, \$10.70 per gross pairs.

And so on, and so on; "celluloid handles, discount to the foreign trade, 25 per cent." That is to say, these gentlemen who are going into bankruptcy can sell to the people abroad, in South America and elsewhere, for 25 per cent. less than they do to American citizens.

Here are butcher-knives, cocobolo handles, 4-inch, 4½-inch, 5-inch, 5½-inch, 6-inch, 6½-inch, 7-inch, 8-inch, 9-inch, 10-inch, 12-inch, etc. It gives the price on each of them.

Discount 25 and 10 per cent.

Then here are shears and scissors.

Discount, japanned, 60 per cent.; nickel, 45 per cent.

And so on.

If I had the strength and the Senate the time, I could read page after page showing all these articles are carried abroad and sold in the foreign market from 25 to 60 per cent. less than is charged the American consumer, and yet we are told that we must increase the duties, and the doors of the Committee on Finance are open to these manufacturers, but closed against the importers as public enemies, almost *hostes humani generis*.

Mr. President, if you will turn to the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, you will find that Mr. A. H. Saxton, president of the Hardware Association, was treated as if he were a dishonest man, who had no right in that committee, and when he undertook to read his tables the chairman of the committee said, "Sir, you are taking up too much time; leave your tables here and have them printed." And finally the Democratic members of the committee protested in the name of common decency against such treatment, and said, "This man has a right to be heard; you have heard the other side and now you should hear him." And the chairman of the committee continued to interrupt him, as any one can see by reading the testimony, and treated him exactly as a calaboose lawyer would have treated a witness in a police court whom he believed to be committing perjury.

What was this man doing? He was exercising the common right of an American citizen to defend his legitimate occupation; a man of as high character as any manufacturer in this country, and if it is attacked his character can be easily established. My friend from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] asks me if he is an importer? Yes, he buys American goods and foreign goods. He sells, as he testifies himself, more American manufactured goods than those that come from abroad; but he was opposed to this duty; he thought that the existing duty was sufficient. He denied the statement that there was an increase of importations from year to year, and he proved beyond the scintilla of a doubt that that manufacturers' table was garbled and false from beginning to end, and I can go through the items here and show it. I know Mr. Morton, of St. Louis, of the Simmons Hardware Company. There is not a more reputable man living, and he states emphatically what these men offered these goods to him for.

Mr. PLATT. What men?

Mr. VEST. The American manufacturers; and here is Mr. Morton's affidavit, if the Senator from Connecticut has any interest in the matter, showing what they offered these identical goods for, and yet they made another and far different statement from what they made in their reply to Mr. Morton. They could not shake him. Their reply was that they did not mean the Simmons Hardware Company. They did not refer to them when they stated these prices were garbled as stated in the affidavits, and that they were simply based upon the sales of job lots, as they call them, and not in the regular course of business, and the correspondence can be produced here between Mr. Morton and these gentlemen afterwards, in which they apologize, and state emphatically that they did not mean him; that their reference was to other people entirely.

This increase is not at all as large as was the rate in the bill of 1888, but it is an increase of 100 per cent. In 1888 the committee increased the duty in a good many instances 300 per cent. But there is no necessity for this increase; it comes off the common people of the United States, and it is not demanded in order to protract the existence of any of the American manufacturers, and the evidence in any court of justice would substantiate the fact that these tables were garbled for a selfish purpose.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I do not rise to reply especially to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], but for special reasons I desire to make a few brief observations this evening on the general question.

The tariff question is one which affects the business life of the people of the whole country. I believe in a protective tariff. I believe that in a great degree the unparalleled growth and development of the wealth of this country are due to the protective-tariff system. I believe that much of the comfort which the masses of the American people enjoy over and beyond that enjoyed by the masses of the people of other countries is due to our protective system.

Shall the system be maintained? This was the question in the great political campaign of 1888, and undoubtedly will be in the campaign which is to come in 1892. In the campaign of 1888 the tariff system was assaulted with great vigor. It was defended with equal earnestness and power. The people decided in favor of protection.

Mr. President, the Republican party stands on solid ground. We are in the footsteps of the fathers of the Republic. We stand where Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Clay, and Webster stood. The Republican party is in line on that question with the earlier statesmen of the nation, under whose guidance it has become so great and its people have prospered.

The tariff reformer, so called, says that protection does not protect; that the protective tariff injures instead of benefiting the laboring man, the manufacturer, the general interests of the country. We say that it benefits all interests and all industries and all classes. They say it injures everything except the specific thing protected. We say that the history of the country shows that under the influence of low or non-protective tariffs mills and factories have been closed, labor has been cheapened, idleness has been enforced, and that under protective tariffs mills, factories, and mines have been worked, labor has been better paid and in greater demand.

We say that under protective tariffs the people have been more prosperous, times have been better, there has been more work, wages have been higher, there has been more development of the resources of the country, more wealth has been added to the aggregate wealth of the nation than during any other periods in our history. If this is so, what more need be said to show the folly of free trade and the soundness of the protection doctrine?

The tariff reformers say that a protective tariff is robbery; that it robs Peter to pay Paul; that it makes the millions poor to enrich the few; that it increases the prices of the articles protected, and closes the foreign markets against us; that a protective tariff builds up monopolies and breeds trusts which become oppressive to the people.

We say that a protective tariff robs no one, but, on the other hand, prevents the people of other countries from robbing us. We say to the manufacturer and merchant of England, or any other foreign country, "You can not bring your goods here to sell in competition with ours unless you pay into our Treasury for the privilege a duty on such articles as we manufacture and deem wise to protect." Why should we not say so? They have no interest in America or its people, commercially speaking, except as they can make money out of us. Commerce and markets are not governed by sentiment, but by conditions which touch the pockets of the people.

The idea that the tariff is a robbery is based on the idea that a tariff on any particular article benefits no one except the person or the corporation making it; that a tariff on steel rails benefits no one but the owner of the mill and the rails; that a tariff on nails benefits no one except the manufacturer of nails; that a tariff on carpets and calicoes and other goods benefits no one except those who make them, and that all our factories and mills would be built and operated and the production of rails and nails and carpets and all our manufactures would proceed prosperously and well without a protective tariff. We say that they would not, and that experience has shown it.

I say that there is scarcely a mill or factory running to-day which does not benefit the whole country. I supplement that statement by saying that there would not be a mill or factory in operation in this country engaged in the production of an article in which there is competition with the manufacturers or producers in other lands were it not for our protective-tariff system unless the conditions were greatly in our favor. I ought to qualify that possibly by saying that if any of them were in operation it would be because the condition of things in this country would enable them to hire labor at cheaper rates than they are doing to-day. Hence, instead of making the millions poorer, the building and operation of every mill and factory add to the general wealth, and also in a greater or less degree benefit everybody who does anything or has any interest in the country.

The foundation of every Democratic or free-trade argument is the same; they are based upon the same assumption as that of the late President, Mr. Cleveland, in his somewhat famous message of December, 1887, that our tariff laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties.

That is the declaration; that is the substratum declaration of every tariff reformer, uttered in concise language by the late President of the United States, and all who discuss the subject take it as the foundation of their attacks upon the protective-tariff system. If the declaration is not true, then the whole free-trade structure falls to the ground.

The history of the country shows conclusively, it seems to me, that

the effect of protection in this country has been to reduce prices, and that, too, when the tariff duty was prohibitory as to importations in some cases.

There is nothing consumed by the farmers of this country which is not cheaper under our protective system than under tariffs for revenue only or free trade, except those articles which are not sufficiently protected or which for physical reasons can not be manufactured in this country.

The theory of tariff reformers is that if the ports of this country were opened and the productions of other peoples could come in free it would cheapen the price of such articles to the consumers.

Grant that it would for a time, ultimately the effect would be to break down our industries, and then the prices of goods would go up.

It is clear—

Says the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE], in an article written by him—

that the purchaser and consumer of an imported article must pay not only the original cost abroad and the whole amount of the duty, but also the profits of the dealers on that cost and the duty, and it is equally clear that this enables the domestic manufacturer of the same kind of article to add the whole or at least a large part of the duty to the price of the article.

Mr. President, an importer of an article to this country, if a duty is imposed, must pay that duty, be it large or small, before his goods can come in competition with those of American production, but what do statistics show as to the effect of the tariff on the prices of protected manufactures? For instance, take steel rails. The price of steel rails in the United States in 1889 was \$29.25 per ton. During the same period the price of steel rails free on board ship at English ports was \$24.57, according to the weekly reports from London, and it has been stated that there is very little difference in the price between the two countries now.

Now, according to the Senator from Kentucky, the price in the United States demanded by the manufacturer of steel rails under our protective tariff would be, say, \$24.57, plus \$17, the duty, making the price of steel rails \$41.57 in this country. Instead of this, the price last fall was \$29.25, only \$4.68 per ton more than the price in England.

The conditions of the manufacture of rails and other forms of steel are very different in America from what they are in England. In England the mills are all, or mainly, on tide water. The ore, which is mainly Spanish, is brought to the furnace in ship-loads at a total cost, laid down at the furnace, of far less than what the American furnaces pay for the freight on their ore, to say nothing of the cost of the ore. The ore is smelted with coal mined within a very few miles, on which the transportation is a mere trifle; and when done, the steel is at tide water ready for the cheapest possible transportation to any part of the world. Thus the cost of assembling the materials is little or nothing.

Capital can be had in England for building works and operating them at rates that are here unknown. It would be a safe estimate that during the period since Bessemer steel was first made their interest charges have been certainly less than half, probably not more than one-third, of those of the American manufacturers. The wages paid in the English mills are far less. Sir I. Lowthian Bell, probably the most distinguished authority in England on iron and steel, in his recent very exhaustive work on the subject of iron and steel manufacture, estimates them at about half.

In America, the chief source of Bessemer ore is Lake Superior, 400 miles from the nearest and 900 miles from the farthest American mill. Bessemer steel is practically all made with coke, which is made 500 miles from Chicago, where more steel rails are made than in any other city, perhaps, in the world. With the advantages in favor of England in freight and low wages so heavily against us, we could never have begun the competition with England in the manufacture of steel rails without a duty to protect the beginning.

The Bessemer process had been known several years before the first works were built in America. The first attempt to make steel at Wyandotte, Mich., failed, and the works were torn down. When sufficient protection was finally granted the manufacture began, and the table of prices shows the result. Protection in America reduced the price in the United States and in England, too. That is the natural result and what protectionists always claim. The fact that we made here in America almost 16,000,000 tons of steel rails from 1867 to 1888, inclusive, and in 1887 more than all the rest of the world combined, instead of going to England for them, has been the greatest factor in reducing the price in England as it has been reduced.

The effect of such an increase in the demand on their market if rails had not been made in the United States can be imagined from the fact that within the last year a demand from other countries, without any demand at all from the United States, increased the price of steel rails in England from \$20 to \$35 a ton, and rails have been sold in England and in Pennsylvania at about the same price. In spite of a very brisk demand all last fall and winter and a large advance in the cost of pig-iron and ore, our mills have advanced their price but slightly. Instead of putting "the price up \$17 higher than it is abroad and still monopolizing the home market," as so confidently predicted, these American

monsters, or robbers, as my friend from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] would call them, are foregoing the privilege of robbing the people of \$17 per ton on the 2,000,000 tons which will be probably made in 1890.

What a magnificent showing, Mr. President. No steel rails manufactured in this country before 1867. Twenty-five hundred tons only in 1867. One million five hundred and fifty-two thousand tons in 1888. One hundred and sixty-six dollars per ton in currency in 1867, \$29.25 in currency or gold in 1889, and all this reduction with a protective tariff in force which has been denounced loud and long. What is said of the manufacture and sale of steel rails in this country may as truly be said of hundreds of other manufactures.

It is no answer, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] says, that the price of tin-plate has also been reduced without protective duties. Tin-plate is only steel or iron plate. The very thin wash of tin on it is very trifling compared to the steel, and the same causes which have reduced rails and all forms of steel have reduced tin-plate. When the contest came between us and the English, and the domestic competition was increased by the tariff, millions of money and the best technical and administrative skill in the world were brought to bear on the problem of making iron and steel more cheaply. To compensate for our duty the English had to reduce labor to the lowest limit and make every possible saving in the manufacture.

In America we had the natural disadvantage of long distances, with higher labor and interest charges. The first we have tried to overcome by fleets of steel barges on the lakes, carrying thousands of tons of ore, and by building railroads into the very mines themselves, with ore docks where the largest ships are loaded in a few hours. It is the development of the steel industry and the possibilities in its manufacture which have cheapened it so much in price. The reduction in the price of steel rails has reduced the price of barbed wire, and replaced the old iron nail with the steel nail, which is not only much better but cheaper.

Mr. President, we are all equally interested in a fair and correct solution of the tariff issue, and no man in its discussion should attempt to cloud the issue with any effort to work on ignorance and suspicion by trying to make class distinctions and persuading one portion of the community that there is another portion trying to rob them.

The United States has gone forward in the development of the arts, sciences, and manufactures, and in the development of our resources generally, and as a people we are a factor in giving direction to the business of the world. To-day we could compete in the markets of the world in most of the manufactures of this country, and in many of our manufactures could take possession of all the markets if our labor were put on the same level with that of England and other of the old countries. We prefer that our labor shall be well paid, even at the expense of being undersold in the markets of the world on some of our goods.

As Mr. Gladstone says, we are a world unto ourselves, and labor is better rewarded in this country than in Great Britain. The struggle is to keep it so. And the question of to-day of free trade or protection might be, putting it another way, a question of well paid or pauper labor. Humanity requires that the wages of the mechanic and the laboring man and woman shall be maintained, and if possible increased; the good of society and the state requires that the labor of this country shall be well paid.

The argument is advanced by free-traders or tariff-reformers that if the United States abolished its protective tariff our exports would be largely increased; in other words, that our protective tariff restricts, to a large extent, the exportation of our products. Nothing could be more preposterous.

By way of illustration I will take one article, and give the facts concerning it—that of raw cotton. We export more raw cotton by several times than any other agricultural product. In 1859, before the adoption of our protective system, we exported 73.24 per cent. of the total production and imports.

In number of pounds we exported 1,836,738,676 pounds, out of a total production of 1,892,664,987 pounds, and a total importation of 743,500 pounds. The exports of raw cotton for 1888 constituted 65.73 per cent. of the total production and imports. While in percentage, apparently, our exportations have decreased, when we consider the increased production in 1888, it will be seen that our exports of raw cotton have materially increased.

In 1888 we exported 2,264,669,933 pounds and produced 3,439,172,391. From 1859 to 1888 our exports of raw cotton have increased annually, except during the years of the civil war and the depression of trade that followed. Instead, therefore, of the tariff restricting exports, in this instance, and this is only one of a great number, the exportations have increased wonderfully since the adoption of our protective system.

In wheat and corn the "markets of the world" in 1840 took about 2 per cent. of our entire products, and the home market 98 per cent.; in 1850 the "markets of the world" 1.9 per cent. and the home market 98.1 per cent.; in 1860 the "markets of the world" wanted only 1.8 per cent. and the home market 98.2 per cent., and in 1870 the "markets of the world" had increased to 3.5 cent. and the home mar-

ket to 96.5 per cent.; since then the "markets of the world" have averaged annually about 5 to 6 per cent. of what our own population has consumed.

As a matter of fact our home market consumes about 33 per cent. of all the cotton produced, 94 per cent. of all the cereals, 87½ per cent. of all the hogs and hog product and a much larger per cent. of its other meats, 50 per cent. of its tobacco, and about 35 per cent. of its petroleum.

The production of cotton has increased since the war from 1,480,244,604 pounds to 3,444,669,933. We retained for consumption in 1888, 1,180,345,135.

I think it safe to say that before the war the total production of cotton never reached an aggregate of 2,000,000,000 except in 1860, when it exceeded that amount, aggregating 2,275,000,000. We are now consuming annually in our own cotton mills almost equivalent to the total annual production of cotton during the decade ending in 1860, and more than the annual production of the decade of the decennial period ending in 1850. The amount consumed in the American cotton mills last year exceeded by 100,000,000 pounds the average annual product of the five years immediately succeeding the war.

Mr. President, no market is so reliable as the home market. The more nearly the industries of this country can be so diversified that the productions of the agriculturist may be consumed by those engaged in other industries the better for him and the country generally.

Our farm products in 1886 were valued at \$3,700,000,000. Of this amount there was exported \$370,000,000 worth, or exactly 10 per cent. The 90 per cent. consumed at home is more than double the total imports of every kind into Great Britain in the same year. Add to the farm products the manufactured goods sold and consumed at home, say \$5,000,000,000, which is a low estimate, and the total is \$8,330,000,000, which amounts to more than the total imports of all the countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, North and South America, and the islands of the sea, which, according to the American Almanac for 1888, are given as \$7,569,000,000. Of what value, therefore, are the foreign markets in comparison with our home market?

But, Mr. President, what about the charge that our protective system destroys our foreign trade? We hear this talk constantly as an argument against protection. How much has it been broken down by this robber tariff, as it is so glibly called by its enemies? The census of 1860 showed the value of the property of the country to be \$14,000,000,000, exclusive of what was then called slave property. This was the total result of the labor and savings of the people from the time the British colonists landed in 1607 down to 1860, as I believe Mr. Blaine stated it in 1884. After twenty years, and by the census of 1880, the property of the country amounted to \$44,000,000,000. The population in that time increased 60 per cent. and the property increased in value 214 per cent. Thirty billions of dollars were added to the wealth of the country in twenty years—\$125,000,000 per month.

The total value of our imports and exports of merchandise for the year ending June 30, 1890, amounted to \$1,647,192,014, an increase of one hundred and fifty-nine and a half millions. The ocean trade of this country with other countries has doubled, it is stated, in twenty years. The exports of the last fiscal year amounted to \$857,856,159; the imports, to \$789,335,855, showing a balance in our favor of sixty-eight and a half millions in round numbers. This is better than having it against us, and it is doubtless a surprise to our Democratic friends that it should be so. In the last twenty-one years the movement of trade has been in our favor, the total amount of exports over imports being twelve hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars. Now, Mr. President, our trade with foreign nations having gone on under our protective system from year to year until the year just closed shows that it was greater than ever before. It will continue to grow in volume and value.

Our Democratic friends say that the prices of all the principal agricultural products which the farmer sells at home are fixed in the free markets abroad, where he sells his surplus, while the prices of the articles he has to buy are fixed in protected markets here. The price of agricultural products, like everything else, is largely governed by the supply and demand, and if the demand in foreign countries is great and the supply of the product is limited the price will be fixed accordingly. The farmers of this country will get just as much benefit from the scarcity of the product as those of any other country.

The important fact for the farmer is to know that he can find a market for his property somewhere, the nearer home the better, transportation being eliminated from the question if the market is at his door. In these days of unrest, in which a readjustment of conditions between capital and labor is under consideration by everybody engaged in business or public affairs, it is our duty to examine these great economic questions in the light of what is best for the great body of the people who labor. The laborer is worthy of his hire; work and good wages are to be kept constantly in view and plenty of work and good wages can not be secured if our mills and factories are not protected, but left to struggle with the mills and factories run by the cheap labor of other countries.

There is another suggestion which I desire to make in connection with the operation and business of the great manufacturing establish-

ments of the country which bears on the question of labor. I find a paragraph cut from a paper published some time ago, which states that the freight traffic in 1887 of one single steel company, according to Poor's Manual, equaled the entire traffic of the States of North and South Carolina and Mississippi. The mill is said to have furnished 226,364,997 tons moved one mile. By their operation labor finds employment in securing and transporting materials to the mills, in the mills, and in taking the product from the mills. I ask to insert this extract in the RECORD:

A SINGLE STEEL COMPANY FURNISHES MORE FREIGHT THAN MANY STATES.

A single Pennsylvania Bessemer steel company furnished freight traffic in 1887 equal to 226,364,997 tons moved 1 mile. To give a better idea of the immensity of this traffic, we present a table showing the number of tons of freight moved 1 mile in certain States in 1886, according to Poor's Manual:

Texas.....	539,407,578	North Carolina.....	72,828,927
Alabama.....	365,625,026	Arkansas.....	89,463,502
Georgia.....	345,339,893	Oregon.....	87,838,013
Iowa.....	322,416,911	Florida.....	49,735,047
Louisiana.....	262,206,081	West Virginia.....	47,791,962
Vermont.....	226,958,239	Mississippi.....	28,867,722
Connecticut.....	225,276,508	New Hampshire.....	81,565,584
Maine.....	176,108,517	Rhode Island.....	18,688,314
South Carolina.....	126,140,374	Delaware.....	20,856,982
Colorado.....	225,380,399		
One Pennsylvania steel company.....	226,364,997		

Think of it—a single Pennsylvania steel company furnishes more freight traffic than either of thirteen States named in the table!

This article shows the amount of traffic of a number of States, and the one manufacturing establishment referred to furnished the transportation companies more business than any one of the thirteen different States which are named and more than three or four of certain of the States combined.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to refer to a document which I received to-day showing the amount of labor that is given to the laboring people by the operation of our railroads, and these great industries have to depend upon the transportation lines of the country. This is an advance copy of the Statistics of Railways in the United States, furnished me only to-day, from which I read the following extract:

MEN EMPLOYED ON RAILWAYS.

The property above described gives employment to 704,743 workers, most of whom are men. It is a safe estimate to say that, independently of stockholders, the railway industry of the United States provides a living for 3,000,000 persons, or about 1 in 22 of the total population of the country.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to say that if any economic system should be adopted in this country which would result, peradventure, in the closing of these great mills and factories, the railroads, the transportation lines, would be reduced to such extremities as that much of the labor now employed by them would have to be dispensed with.

There is another item I find in glancing over this document which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate in connection with the railroad subject:

The number of passengers carried by the railways of the United States during the year ending June 30, 1889, was 472,171,343; the aggregate number of miles traveled was 11,553,820,445. This shows an average journey of 24.47 miles for each passenger. Passenger train mileage for the same period was 277,240,804, from which it appears that the average number of passengers in a train, on a basis of which passenger rates must ultimately be adjusted, was 42.

The number of tons of freight carried by the railways of the United States during the year ending June 30, 1889, was 539,639,583; the aggregate number of ton miles was 68,727,223,146. This shows an average haul of 127.36 miles for each ton of freight. The freight-train mileage for the same period was 383,200,573, from which it appears that the average number of tons carried by a freight train, which is conceded to be an important factor in adjusting rates, was 179.35.

I refer to these statistics to show the vast business which is carried on in this country, largely the result of the keeping alive of these great manufacturing interests of the country scattered over it from one end to the other.

Mr. President, I desire to give some statistics showing the quantity of corn, wheat, iron ore, pig-iron, and coal in this country.

The corn crop of the United States in 1888 was 2,000,000,000 bushels, or 56,000,000 tons.

The wheat crop, 500,000,000 bushels or 15,000,000 tons.

The iron ore produced in the United States in 1888 was 12,000,000 tons; the pig-iron produced in the United States was 7,500,000 tons.

The coal production was: Bituminous, 94,937,666 net tons; anthracite, 43,538,080 tons; making a total of coal of 138,475,743 tons; and of this total over 12,000,000 tons is produced in Illinois. Let me recapitulate:

	Tons.
Coal.....	138,475,743
Corn.....	56,000,000
Wheat.....	15,000,000
Iron ore.....	12,000,000
Pig-iron.....	7,500,000

In quantity the production of coal, that great product which warms the homes, runs the machinery, and produces the motive power of the world, takes the lead, and corn, that other great product of the farms of this country, comes next.

I will ask, Mr. President, to insert some statistics, showing the

amount of corn, wheat, and hay raised in Illinois, beginning with 1867, and also showing the acreage and value:

Year.	CORN.		
	Acreage.	Production.	Home value.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1867	4,583,655	109,091,000	74,281,880
1868	3,928,742	134,863,000	57,776,090
1869	5,237,068	121,500,000	69,255,030
1870	5,720,965	201,578,000	70,482,300
1871	5,310,469	203,391,000	65,085,120
1872	5,468,040	217,628,000	52,230,720
1873	6,830,714	143,634,000	45,962,880
1874	7,421,055	136,573,000	74,804,240
1875	8,163,265	280,000,000	93,200,000
1876	8,920,000	223,000,000	65,130,000
1877	8,965,517	250,000,000	75,400,000
1878	8,337,000	225,932,700	56,483,175
1879	8,920,600	312,221,000	96,788,510
1880	8,840,180	240,452,896	86,563,043
1881	9,096,600	176,783,000	102,505,140
1882	7,914,042	182,336,900	85,698,343
1883	8,151,463	203,786,500	81,514,600
1884	8,151,563	244,544,000	75,808,640
1885	8,559,036	268,998,000	75,319,440
1886	8,559,036	209,818,000	65,043,580
1887	7,847,915	141,080,000	57,842,800
1888	7,788,790	278,060,000	80,637,400
1889	8,022,454	259,125,000	62,190,063

Year.	WHEAT.		
	Acreage.	Production.	Home value.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1867	2,456,140	28,000,000	55,160,000
1868	2,483,478	28,560,000	34,272,000
1869	2,607,142	29,200,000	29,192,000
1870	2,259,583	27,115,000	25,488,100
1871	2,050,081	25,216,000	29,754,880
1872	2,042,231	24,711,000	30,394,530
1873	2,104,963	28,417,000	31,258,700
1874	2,619,304	30,122,000	25,904,920
1875	2,600,000	27,300,000	24,843,000
1876	2,520,430	23,440,000	21,798,200
1877	2,000,000	33,000,000	34,320,000
1878	2,325,000	31,620,000	23,715,000
1879	2,400,900	44,896,830	49,039,600
1880	3,650,225	60,958,757	57,910,819
1881	3,285,200	26,822,000	32,722,840
1882	2,956,000	52,302,900	44,980,494
1883	2,115,000	22,150,000	20,378,000
1884	2,790,900	32,374,000	20,395,620
1885	1,255,905	10,683,000	8,653,230
1886	2,015,400	27,562,000	19,017,780
1887	2,425,092	36,891,000	25,802,700
1888	2,449,343	33,556,000	31,207,080
1889	2,375,863	38,014,000	26,609,666

Year.	HAY.		
	Acreage.	Tons.	Dollars.
	<i>Acres.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1867	1,778,000	2,667,000	25,942,910
1868	1,905,000	2,667,000	26,670,000
1869	1,761,006	2,800,000	27,636,000
1870	1,605,932	1,895,000	20,352,300
1871	1,403,053	1,828,000	18,471,900
1872	1,428,888	1,929,000	18,267,630
1873	1,880,000	2,350,000	20,562,500
1874	1,860,417	2,232,500	23,418,925
1875	2,226,277	3,050,000	29,676,500
1876	2,500,000	3,500,000	23,380,000
1877	2,460,000	3,936,000	23,104,320
1878	2,370,000	3,531,300	18,150,882
1879	2,188,843	2,648,500	24,869,415
1880	1,790,021	2,595,530	21,072,675
1881	2,472,856	3,214,713	36,647,728
1882	2,744,870	3,439,743	30,269,738
1883	2,944,870	4,270,062	30,957,950
1884	2,875,000	4,025,000	25,116,000
1885	3,306,250	4,298,125	31,591,219
1886	3,372,375	4,513,031	28,883,398
1887	3,406,099	2,724,879	28,039,005
1888	3,303,916	4,625,482	35,893,740

I also ask to insert a statement showing the number of farm animals in the State of Illinois for the years 1860, 1870, 1880, and 1890:

Number of farm animals in the State of Illinois.

Year.	Horses.	Mules.	Milch-cows.	Oxen and other cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
1860	563,736	38,539	522,634	1,061,179	769,135	2,502,308
1870	853,738	85,075	640,321	1,075,265	1,568,286	2,703,343
1880	1,023,082	123,278	865,913	1,518,409	1,037,073	5,170,266
1890	1,123,973	109,947	1,072,473	1,713,966	688,387	5,433,250

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], in a very able speech a few days ago, argued strongly in favor of a reduction of

the duty on iron ore. I listened to that honored Senator with interest and was greatly impressed by his ability, and at the same time his devotion to the interests of the people of his own State in the first place, and then with what shrewdness he appealed to the country, and especially to the Senators representing the Atlantic States, in favor of either free raw materials or very low duties.

That distinguished leader of his party knows that free raw materials in this country means free trade all along the line, and he suggests to the people on the Atlantic coast that it would be exceedingly desirable to them, and I have no doubt it would be, if the mills along the border of the Atlantic Ocean could get free raw material, for they would have an advantage naturally over the manufacturers in the interior of the country; and so the Senator from Maryland, ambitious to build up this now young but great manufacturing establishment here near the city of Baltimore, suggests that we ought to have reduced rates of duty on iron ore so as to give that mill in the first instance an advantage over the mills at Chicago and at other places in the interior of the country.

I desire to say to him that while I appreciate his disposition to defend the interests of his own particular locality and admire the shrewdness with which he suggests to the people along the Atlantic coast that it would be to their interest to have a reduction of the duties on raw materials and on iron ore, when the time comes that raw materials are put upon the free-list you will find that the beginning of the end has come in the way of maintaining a protective tariff. The men who are engaged in the coal mines, in the iron mines, and mines of all sorts and in all localities, will insist upon having some protection to them as well as to those who may happen to be engaged in the mills.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the honorable Senator and his friend, Mr. Bent, have put their heads together to secure an advantage over all other such establishments in the United States and thereby build up the greatest concern in this or any other country. The ambition is laudable, but no legislation should be permitted which would build up one and destroy another. His establishment now has, in my judgment, a little advantage over its competitors.

I call attention to a clipping from a paper printed, I believe, in 1888, showing some facts in relation to the ore tonnage of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the location and per cent. of American ores used in this country. I will read it as a matter of information:

In a paper read before the Franklin Institute, Mr. John Birkinbine, speaking of the 13,063,439 tons of iron ore consumed in this country last year, stated that it equaled nearly 50 per cent. of the entire freight traffic of the Pennsylvania Railroad and its branches for the year, and its mining, loading into cars, and transportation employed over 50,000 men, besides leading to a decided development in the manufacture of such mechanical appliances as hoisting engines, pumps, air-compressors, and rock-drills used in getting the ore.

The principal localities—

And this is what I desire to read especially—

The principal localities contribute to our ore supplies as follows:

	Percentage of total output.		Percentage of total output.
Lake Superior region	37	Ohio	3
Foreign ores	9	New Jersey	4
Alabama, estimated	5	Virginia	4½
Cornwall Ore Hills, Pennsylvania	6	Missouri	3½
Lake Champlain district	6	Salisbury region	1
Tennessee, estimated	5	Georgia, estimated	1

But, as the ores vary in the percentage of iron they contain, the contributions to our supply of iron are estimated as below:

	Percentage.		Percentage.
Lake Superior ores	44	Tennessee ores	4
Foreign ores	10½	Missouri ores	3½
Lake Champlain ores	6½	Virginia ores	3
Cornwall ores	5	Ohio ores	2½
Alabama ores	5	Salisbury region	1
New Jersey ores	4½	Georgia ores	1

This 13,000,000 tons of ore, with the coal, coke, and limestone required to reduce it to pig-iron, gives the railroads not less than 20,000,000 tons of freight, which is almost one-half the tonnage of the corn crop and is one-third more than the wheat crop of the entire country. This, when converted, makes 7,000,000 tons of pig-iron, a very large portion of which is transported long distances over the railroads. This pig-iron in turn is made into over 6,000,000 tons of cast-iron, wrought-iron, and steel.

I give these statements, Mr. President, to show how people are employed and to show that without these great industries idleness and want would overtake millions of people who are now at work and who with their families are prosperous and happy. All can not be farmers in this country. The farmer is the last man who ought to encourage more to engage in the business; they want consumers of agricultural products, diversity of industry.

Mr. President, I do not desire to see any policy adopted in this country which will result in securing the ores from a foreign country. The mill referred to by the honorable Senator from Maryland, located upon the margin of the country, has its mines now in Cuba and supplies itself with imported ore, and while we have nothing to say against that, I do not desire to see a policy adopted which will drive the mills into one section of the country and result in the importation of ores from other countries instead of using the ores of America, for, as everybody knows, we have an abundant supply within our own limits.

Suppose any policy should be adopted in this country which would

result in closing up the mills of the United States, what would be the result? What would become of these millions of men who are trained in the mills, in the mines, and in the factories, who would be turned out upon the world with no qualifications for any other duty, who would have to drift upon the farms and live as best they could? If they became good farmers and producers, what would be the result? The result would be that the production of agricultural products would be still greater, and the consequence of that would be what we have seen a little of this year on account of the great corn crop in the West.

We find that our farmers in that section have had great difficulty to get such prices for their product as they thought they ought to have and as would be remunerative to them.

That is all I desire to say on the general subject, but I wish to say a few words more a little more pertinent directly to the bill under consideration.

The charge has been made here and made over and over again that this was a bill of increase and nothing else substantially; that it was higher than any bill heretofore presented, higher than the bill we had two years ago, and that it was substantially the McKinley bill, so called, which passed the other branch of this Congress.

I have run over the bill as best I could and I admit, in advance, that it is exceedingly difficult to find out exactly what the rate is upon anything looking upon the tables or facts as given there; but, assuming that in the main they are correct, I find a large number of reductions.

The fact is in general that there are ninety-four paragraphs, as I find, in which there are reductions below the McKinley bill, so called, and in many instances below the present law, and each paragraph, as we all know, comprises a number of items.

Then I find that in the free-list there are 291 paragraphs, 37 of which are put upon the free-list by the bill as reported from the Senate committee. So the reductions in this bill as reported from the Senate committee and the free-list amount to a much larger number of paragraphs than those of the increases.

Mr. President, while I do not stand here to commit myself to each of the provisions of the bill, I favor it generally and intend to vote for or against the various provisions of the bill as my judgment dictates. I am speaking now, however, of the general tenor of the bill and of the false accusations, as I think, on the part of those opposed to the measure as reported by the Finance Committee, because, as a matter of fact, there is a large number of reductions. I will read some of them.

Take the chemical schedule, for instance.

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

Acids:

1. Acetic or pyroligneous acid, not exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 1½ cents per pound; exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 4 cents per pound.

On first grade, reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law; on second grade, reduction of 6 cents per pound from existing law.

6. Tannic acid, or tannin, 50 cents per pound.

Reduction of 50 cents per pound, both from existing law and McKinley bill.

12. Blue vitriol, or sulphate of copper, 2 cents per pound.

Reduction of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

14. Borax, crude, or borate of soda, or borate of lime, 3 cents per pound; refined borax, 5 cents per pound.

Reduction on refined borax of 2 cents per pound from existing law. No change in other classes.

15. Camphor, refined, 4 cents per pound.

Reduction of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

17. Chloroform, 40 cents per pound.

Reduction of 10 cents per pound from existing law.

25. Ethers sulphuric, 40 cents per pound; spirits of nitrous ether, 25 cents per pound; butyric ether and all fruit ethers, oils, or essences, \$2.50 per pound; ethers of all kinds not specially provided for in this act, \$1 per pound.

First class, reduction of 10 cents per pound from existing law; second class, reduction of 5 cents per pound from existing law.

So I might go through with this list, but I fear it would consume too much time.

Mr. PLATT. Insert it in your remarks.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know whether I ought to ask to have it inserted in the RECORD or not. I will do it, however, if it is agreeable to the Senate. While I do not vouch that the list is correct, because it seems to be a difficult thing to find out exactly what the facts are unless you take the present law and compare it with the items in the reported bill, yet I assume that the expert who has had charge of this subject time out of mind has tried to be fair about it, and in the main perhaps has arrived at as correct conclusions as almost anybody else could have done. These are the reductions.

REDUCTIONS.

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

Acids:

1. Acetic or pyroligneous acid, not exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 1½ cents per pound; exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 4 cents per pound.

On first grade, reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

On second grade, reduction of 6 cents per pound from existing law.

6. Tannic acid or tannin, 50 cents per pound.

Reduction of 50 cents per pound both from existing law and McKinley bill.

12. Blue vitriol, or sulphate of copper, 2 cents per pound.

Reduction of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

14. Borax, crude, or borate of soda, or borate of lime, 3 cents per pound; refined borax, 5 cents per pound.

Reduction in refined borax of 2 cents per pound from existing law. No change in other classes.

15. Camphor, refined, 4 cents per pound.

Reduction of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

17. Chloroform, 40 cents per pound.

Reduction of 10 cents per pound from existing law.

25. Ethers sulphuric, 40 cents per pound; spirits of nitrous ether, 25 cents per pound; butyric ether and all fruit ethers, oils, or essences, \$2.50 per pound; ethers of all kinds not specially provided for in this act, \$1 per pound.

First class, reduction of 10 cents per pound from existing law. Second class, reduction of 5 cents per pound from existing law.

28. Glycerine, crude, not purified, 1½ cents per pound. Refined, 4½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

31. Iodine, resublimed, 30 cents per pound.

Reduction of 10 cents per pound from existing law.

32. Iodoform, \$1.50 per pound.

Reduction of 50 cents per pound from existing law.

33. Licorice, extracts of, in paste, rolls, or other forms, 5 cents per pound.

Reduction of 2½ cents per pound from existing law and 1 cent per pound from McKinley bill.

34. Magnesia, carbonate of, medicinal, 4 cents per pound; calcined, 8 cents per pound; sulphate of, or Epsom salts, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Reduction of 1 cent per pound from existing law on first class. Reduction of 2 cents per pound on second class from existing law. Reduction of two-tenths cent per pound from existing law on third class.

35. Morphia, or morphine, and all salts thereof, 50 cents per ounce.

Reduction of 50 cents per ounce from existing law.

36. Alizarine assistant, or soluble oil, or oleate of soda, or Turkey red oil, containing more than 50 per cent. of castor oil, 40 cents per gallon; all others, 15 cents per gallon.

Reduction of 40 cents per gallon from existing law on oils containing more than 50 per cent. of castor oil.

37. Castor-oil, 50 cents per gallon.

Reduction of 30 cents per gallon from existing law.

39. Cotton-seed oil, 10 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds weight.

Reduction of 15 cents per gallon from existing law.

40. Croton-oil, 30 cents per pound.

Reduction of 20 cents per pound from existing law.

Paints, colors, and varnishes:

48. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, \$1 per ton; manufactured, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Reduction on unmanufactured of \$1 per ton from McKinley bill. Slight increase over existing law.

53. Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths not specially provided for in this act, dry, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; ground in oil, 1½ cents per pound.

Reduction of 50 per cent. from existing law on dry ochers and umbers.

54. Ultramarine blue, 4½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

55. Varnishes, including so-called gold size or japan, 35 per cent. ad valorem; and on spirit varnishes for the alcohol contained therein, \$1.32 per gallon additional.

Slight reduction from existing law.

58. Whiting and Paris white dry, one-half of 1 cent per pound; ground in oil or putty, 1 cent per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law on whiting ground in oil.

Lead products:

61. Acetate of lead, white, 5½ cents per pound; brown, 3½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

72. Nitrate of potash or saltpeter, refined, 1 cent per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

76. All medicinal preparations, including medicinal proprietary preparations, of which alcohol is not a component part, and not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Existing law has two rates, 25 and 50 per cent. Senate bill makes one rate, 25 per cent. Reduction of 25 per cent. from existing law on some classes.

79. Santonine, and all salts thereof containing 80 per cent. or over of santonine, \$2.50 per pound.

Reduction of 50 cents per pound from existing law.

81. Bicarbonate of soda or supercarbonate of soda or saleratus, 1 cent per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

87. Strychnia or strychnine, and all salts thereof, 40 cents per ounce.
Reduction, 10 cents per ounce from existing law.

88. Sulphur, refined, in rolls, \$8 per ton; sublimed, or flowers of, \$10 per ton.
Reduction of \$2 per ton from existing law on refined sulphur and \$10 upon flowers of sulphur or sublimed.

Stone:
120. Burr-stones manufactured or bound up into mill-stones, 15 per cent. ad valorem.
Reduction of 5 per cent. from existing law.

121. Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than 1 inch wide, nor less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick, eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; round iron not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, and square iron not less than three-fourths of 1 inch square, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound; flats less than 1 inch wide or less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick; round iron less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter; and square iron less than three-fourths of 1 inch square, 1 cent per pound.
Reduction of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound from existing law on higher grades.

122. Round iron, in coils or rods, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, and bars or shapes of rolled iron, not specially provided for in this act, 1.1 cents per pound: *Provided*, That all iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig-iron, except castings, shall be rated as iron in bars, and be subject to a duty of eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and none of the iron above enumerated in this paragraph shall pay a less rate of duty than 35 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided further*, That all iron bars, blooms, billets, or sizes or shapes of any kind, in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel, shall be subject to a duty of not less than \$22 per ton.
Reduction of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound from existing law on higher grades.

123. Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, T-columns and posts or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain or punched, or fitted for use, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound.
Reduction of thirty-five-one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

124. Forgings of iron or steel, or forged iron and steel combined, of whatever shape, or in whatever stage of manufacture, not specially provided for in this act, 2.3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That no forgings of iron or steel, or forgings of iron and steel combined, by whatever process made, shall pay a less rate of duty than 45 per cent. ad valorem.
Reduction of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

125. Railway-bars, made of iron or steel, and railway-bars made in part of steel, T-rails, and punched iron or steel flat rails, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.
Reduction from \$17.92, \$20.16, and \$17 per ton to \$11.20 from existing law, and one-tenth of 1 cent per pound from McKinley bill.

126. Sheets of iron or steel, common or black, including all iron or steel commercially known as common or black taggers iron or steel, and skelp iron or steel, valued at 3 cents per pound or less: Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge, 1.1 cents per pound; thinner than No. 25 wire gauge, 1.4 cents per pound; corrugated or crimped, 1.4 cents per pound: *Provided*, That all common or black sheet-iron or sheet-steel not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge shall pay duty as plate iron or plate steel.
Reduction of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

127. All iron or steel sheets or plates, and all hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, excepting what are known commercially as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, and hereinafter provided for, when galvanized or coated with zinc or spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of those metals, shall pay one-half of 1 cent per pound more duty than the rates imposed by the preceding paragraph upon the corresponding gauges, or forms, of common or black sheet or taggers iron or steel.
Reduction of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound from existing law on galvanized.

128. Sheet-iron or sheet-steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, 2½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That plate or sheet or taggers iron or steel, by whatever name designated, other than the polished, planished, or glanced herein provided for, which has been pickled or cleaned by acid or by any other material or process, or which is cold-rolled, shall pay one-quarter of 1 cent per pound more duty than the corresponding gauges of common or black sheet or taggers iron or steel.
Reduction of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound from existing law on the various forms.

129. Wire: Wire made of iron or steel not smaller than No. 10 wire gauge, 1½ cents per pound; smaller than No. 10 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, 1½ cents per pound; smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 25 wire gauge, 2½ cents per pound; smaller than No. 25 wire gauge, 3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That iron or steel wire covered with cotton, silk, or other material, and wires or strip steel, commonly known as crinoline wire, corset-wire, and hat-wire, shall pay a duty of 5 cents per pound: *And provided further*, That flat steel wire, or sheet steel in strips, whether drawn through dies or rolls, untempered or tempered, of whatsoever width, twenty-five-one-thousandths of an inch thick or thinner (ready for use or otherwise), shall pay a duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem: *And provided further*, That no article made from iron or steel wire, or of which iron or steel wire is a component part of chief value, shall pay a less rate of duty than the iron or steel wire from which it is made either wholly or in part: *And provided further*, That iron or steel-wire cloths and iron or steel wire nettings, made in meshes of any form, shall pay a duty equal in amount to that imposed on iron or steel wire used in the manufacture of iron or steel wire cloth, or iron or steel wire nettings, and 2 cents per pound in addition thereto.
There shall be paid on iron or steel wire coated with zinc or tin or any other metal (except fence-wire and iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs, for the manufacture of fencing) one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made; on iron-wire rope and wire strand, 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made; on steel-wire rope and wire-strand, 2 cents per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which they or either of them are made: *Provided further*,

That all iron or steel wire valued at more than 4 cents per pound shall pay a duty of not less than 45 per cent. ad valorem, except that card-wire for the manufacture of card clothing shall pay a duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem.
Reduction on some of the lower grades.

146. On all iron or steel bars, rods, strips, or steel sheets, of whatever shape, other than the polished, planished, or glanced sheet-iron or sheet-steel hereinbefore provided for, and on all iron or steel bars of irregular shape or section, which are cold-rolled, cold-hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, there shall be paid one-fourth of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act; and on steel circular-saw plates there shall be paid 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate provided in this act for steel saw-plates.
Slight reduction from existing law.

MANUFACTURES OF IRON AND STEEL.

147. Anchors, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, mill-irons and mill-cranks of wrought-iron, and wrought-iron for ships, and forgings of iron or steel, or of combined iron and steel, for vessels, steam-engines, and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing each 25 pounds or more, 1.8 cents per pound.
Reduction of two-tenths of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

148. Axles, or parts thereof, axle-bars, axle-blanks, or forgings for axles, whether of iron or steel, without reference to the stage or state of manufacture, 2 cents per pound: *Provided*, That when iron or steel axles are imported fitted in wheels, or parts of wheels, of iron or steel, they shall be dutiable at the same rate as the wheels in which they are fitted.
Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

149. Anvils, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, or of iron and steel combined, by whatever process made, or in whatever stage of manufacture, 2 cents per pound.
Reduction of one-half cent per pound from McKinley bill.

150. Blacksmith's hammers and sledges, track tools, wedges, and crowbars, whether of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.
Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound from existing law.

151. Boiler or other tubes, pipes, flues, and stays of wrought-iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.
Reduction of one-half of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

152. Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, or bolt-blanks, and finished hinges or hinge-blanks, whether of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.
Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound from existing law on bolts.

154. Cast-iron pipe of every description, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound.
Reduction of one-tenth of a cent per pound from existing law.

155. Cast-iron vessels, plates, stove-plates, and irons, sad-irons, tailors' irons, hatters' irons, and castings of iron, not especially provided for in this act, 1.2 cents per pound.
Reduction of one-twentieth of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

156. Castings of malleable iron not especially provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.
Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound from existing law.

157. Cast hollow-ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 2½ cents per pound.
Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law and from McKinley bill.

158. Chain or chains of all kinds, made of iron or steel, not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, 1.6 cents per pound; less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 1.8 cents per pound; less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 2½ cents per pound.
Slight reduction from existing law on heavier chains.

162. Files, file-blanks, rasps, and floats, of all cuts and kinds, 4 inches in length and under, 33 cents per dozen; over 4 inches in length and under 9 inches, 75 cents per dozen; 9 inches in length and under 14 inches, \$1.30 per dozen; 14 inches in length and over, \$2 per dozen.
Reduction from existing law.

Nails, spikes, tacks, and needles:
167. Cut nails and cut spikes of iron or steel, 1 cent per pound.
Reduction of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound from existing law.

169. Wire nails made of wrought-iron or steel, 2 inches long and longer, not lighter than No. 12 wire gauge, 2 cents per pound; from 1 inch to 2 inches in length, and lighter than No. 12 and not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, 2½ cents per pound; shorter than 1 inch and lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, 4 cents per pound.
Reduction in wire nails from 4 cents per pound in existing law to 2, 2½, and 4 cents per pound.

170. Spikes, nuts, and washers, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, of wrought iron or steel, 1.8 cents per pound.
Reduction of two-tenths cent per pound from existing law.

171. Cut tacks, brads, or sprigs, not exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand, 2½ cents per thousand; exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand, 2½ cents per pound.
Slight reduction.

175. Railway fish-plates or splice-bars, made of iron or steel, 1 cent per pound.
Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound from existing law.

178. Screws, commonly called wood-screws, more than 2 inches in length, 5 cents per pound; over 1 inch and not more than 2 inches in length, 7 cents per pound; over one-half inch and not more than 1 inch in length, 10 cents per pound; one-half inch and less in length, 14 cents per pound.
Slight reduction on largest sizes. Slight increase on smaller sizes.

179. Wheels, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 2½ cents per pound; and ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 1½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That when wheels or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them, the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately.
Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound.

MISCELLANEOUS METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF.

180. Aluminum or aluminum, in crude form, alloys of any kind in which aluminum is the component material of chief value, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 15 per cent. from McKinley bill.

181. Antimony, as regulus or metal, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound. Slight reduction.

Copper:

185. Copper imported in the form of ores, one-half of 1 cent per pound on each pound of fine copper contained therein.

Reduction of 2 cents per pound from existing law and three-fourths of 1 cent per pound from McKinley bill.

186. Old copper, fit only for remanufacture, clippings from new copper, and all composition metal of which copper is a component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound.

Reduction of 2 cents per pound from existing law and three-fourths of 1 cent per pound from McKinley bill.

187. Regulus of copper and black or coarse copper, and copper cement, 1 cent per pound on each pound of fine copper contained therein.

Reduction of 2½ cents per pound from existing law and three-fourths of 1 cent per pound from McKinley bill.

188. Copper in plates, bars, ingots, Chili or other pigs, and in other forms, not manufactured, not specially provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.

Reduction of 2½ cents per pound from existing law and three-fourths cent per pound from McKinley bill.

195. Lead in sheets, pipes, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire, 2½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

197. Nickel, nickel oxide, alloy of any kind in which nickel is the component material of chief value, 8 cents per pound.

Reduction of 7 cents per pound from existing law and from McKinley bill.

Zinc or spelter:

205. Zinc in blocks or pigs, 1½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound from McKinley bill.

207. Zinc, old and worn out, fit only to be remanufactured, 1½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-fourth cent per pound from existing law.

SCHEDULE D.—WOOD AND MANUFACTURES OF.

209. Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building wharves, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 10 per cent. ad valorem from existing law.

210. Timber, squared or sided, not specially provided for in this act, one-half of 1 cent per cubic foot.

Reduction of one-half cent per cubic foot from existing law.

211. Sawed boards, plank, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, white wood, sycamore, white pine and bass-wood, \$1 per thousand feet board measure; sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this act, \$2 per thousand feet board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided, there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished, 50 cents per thousand feet board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, \$1 per thousand feet board measure; and if planed on two sides, and tongued and grooved, \$1.50 per thousand feet board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing and grooving: *Provided*, That in case any foreign country shall impose an export duty upon pine, spruce, elm, or other logs, or upon stove bolts, shingle wood, or heading blocks exported to the United States from such country, in excess of the duty fixed in this act upon the sawed lumber manufactured from logs of the kinds heretofore mentioned, then the duty upon the sawed lumber herein provided for, when imported from such country, shall remain the same as fixed by the law in force prior to the passage of this act.

Reduction of \$1 per thousand feet from existing law on white pine and sawed lumber.

223. All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and shall pay duty as follows, namely: All sugars above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard of color, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound. All sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall pay a duty of six-tenths of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That if an export duty shall hereafter be laid upon sugar or molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, such sugar or molasses so imported shall be subject to duty as provided by law prior to the passage of this act.

Reduction on sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16, 2½ cents per pound from existing law; above 16 and not above 20, 2.4 cents per pound from existing law; above 20, 2.9 cents per pound from existing law.

246. Rice, cleaned, 1½ cents per pound; uncleaned rice, 1 cent per pound; paddy, three-quarters of 1 cent per pound; rice-flour, rice-meal, and rice, broken, which will pass through a sieve known commercially as No. 12 wire sieve, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Reduction on rice, cleaned, of three-fourths cent per pound from existing law and one-half cent from McKinley bill; uncleaned rice, one-half cent per pound from existing law and one-fourth cent per pound from McKinley bill; third class, reduction of three-fourths cent per pound from existing law and one-fourth cent from McKinley bill; and last class, reduction of 4.76 per cent from existing law.

224. Sugar-candy and all confectionery, including chocolate confectionery, made wholly or in part of sugar, valued at 12 cents or less per pound, and on sugars after being refined, when tintured, colored, or in any way adulterated, 5 cents per pound.

Under existing law there are two classes, one at 5 cents per pound and one at 10 cents per pound. Senate bill makes a uniform duty of 5 cents per pound, a reduction of 5 cents per pound from existing law on some classes.

Seeds:

269. Castor beans or seeds, 32 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.

Reduction of 18 cents per bushel from existing law.

259. Cider, 5 cents per gallon.

Reduction in equivalent ad valorem rate of 2.27 per cent. from existing law.

294. Nuts of all kinds, shelled or unshelled, not specially provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

306. Dandelion-root and acorns prepared, and other articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee, not specially provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.

Reduction of one-half cent per pound from existing law.

308. Starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, fit for use as starch without further process of manufacture, 2 cents per pound.

Reduction in ad valorem equivalent of 13.97 per cent. from existing law.

309. Dextrine, burnt starch, gum substitute, or British gum, 1 cent per pound.

Reduction of 1 cent per pound from McKinley bill.

311. Spices, ground or powdered, not specially provided for in this act, 4 cents per pound; sage, 3 cents per pound.

Reduction of 9.75 per cent. in ad valorem equivalent on spices; sage now free.

342. Tow, of flax or hemp, \$10 per ton.

Reduction of \$15 per ton from McKinley bill.

345. Cables, cordage, binding-twine, and twine, composed wholly of manila or sisal-grass, 1½ cents per pound; cables and cordage, made of hemp, 2½ cents per pound; tarred, 3 cents per pound.

Reduction from 3, 2½, and 3½ cents to 1½ cents per pound from existing law upon cables, cordage, and twine.

348. Bags for grain, made of burlaps, 2 cents per pound.

Reduction of duty from existing law.

349. Bagging for cotton, gunny-cloth, and all similar material suitable for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, flax, jute, or jute butts, valued at 6 cents or less per square yard, 1.3 cents per square yard; valued at more than 6 cents per square yard, 1.5 cents per square yard.

Reduction one-half of present rate of duty.

356. All manufactures of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, or of which flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at 5 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued above 5 cents per pound, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 11 per cent. ad valorem from McKinley bill and slight reduction from existing law.

417. Gunpowder, and all explosive substances used for mining, blasting, artillery, or sporting purposes, when valued at 20 cents or less per pound, 5 cents per pound; valued above 20 cents per pound, 8 cents per pound.

Reduction from 6 to 5 cents and from 10 to 8 cents upon existing law.

418. Matches, friction or lucifer, of all descriptions, per gross of one hundred and forty-four boxes, containing not more than one hundred matches per box, 10 cents per gross; when imported otherwise than in boxes containing not more than one hundred matches each, 1 cent per one thousand matches.

Believed to be slight reduction.

420. Feathers and downs of all kinds when dressed, colored, or manufactured, including quilts of down and other manufactures of down, and also including dressed and finished birds suitable for millinery ornaments, and artificial and ornamental feathers and flowers, or parts thereof, of whatever material composed not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Slight reduction. Undressed feathers now dutiable at 25 per cent. ad valorem are placed upon the free-list.

423. Hair, human, if clean or drawn, but not manufactured, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 10 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.

425. Hair, curled, suitable for beds or mattresses, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 10 per cent. ad valorem from existing law.

Leather and manufacturers of:

431. Bend or belting leather and sole-leather, and leather not specially provided for in this act, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 5 per cent. ad valorem from existing law.

444. Plush, black, known commercially as hatters' plush, composed of silk, or of silk and cotton, and used exclusively for making men's hats, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Reduction of 15 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.

I have another table, giving the increases, the increases being largely on agricultural products, and I desire to read some of them for the purpose of calling the attention of the Senate to them. Take, for instance, live-stock:

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

Animals, live:

232. Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Increase upon existing law of 50.07 per cent. ad valorem.

233. Cattle, more than one year old, \$10 per head; less than one year old, \$2 per head.

Increase of 41.94 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.

234. Hogs, \$1.50 per head.

Increase of 25.68 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.

- 235. Sheep, \$1.50 per head.
Increase of 30.30 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.
Breadstuffs and farinaceous substances:
- 237. Barley, 25 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Increase of 15 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 238. Barley-malt, 40 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.
Increase of 20 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 239. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 2 cents per pound.
Increase of 1½ cents per pound upon existing law.
- 240. Buckwheat, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Increase of 22.47 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.
- 241. Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.
Increase of 5 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 242. Corn-meal, 20 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
Increase of 10 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 243. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 2 cents per pound.
Now free. Senate bill places a duty of 2 cents per pound on it.
- 244. Oats, 15 cents per bushel.
Increase of 5 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 245. Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound.
Increase of one-half cent per pound upon existing law.
- 249. Wheat, 25 cents per bushel.
Increase of 5 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 250. Wheat flour, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 5 per cent. upon existing law.
- Dairy products:
- 251. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.
Increase of 2 cents per pound upon existing law.
- 252. Cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Increase of 2 cents per pound upon existing law.
- 253. Milk, fresh, 5 cents per gallon.
- 254. Milk, preserved or condensed, including weight of packages, 3 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 8 cents per pound.
Increase of duty upon existing law.
- Farm and field products:
- 255. Beans, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Increase in equivalent ad valorem rate of 14.80 per cent. upon existing law.
- 256. Beans, pease, and mushrooms, prepared or preserved, in tins, jars, bottles, or otherwise, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 5 per cent. ad valorem upon existing law.
- 257. Broom-corn, \$8 per ton.
Now free.
- 260. Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
Now free.
- 261. Eggs, yolk of, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 5 per cent. upon existing law.
- 262. Hay, \$4 per ton.
Increase of \$2 per ton upon existing law.
- 264. Hops, 15 cents per pound.
Increase of 7 cents per pound upon existing law.
- 266. Pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease, dried, 15 cents per bushel; split pease, 50 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, 1 cent per pound.
Increase upon existing law.
- 267. 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.
Now free.
- 268. Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.
Increase of 10 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 270. Flaxseed or linseed, poppy seed, and other oil seeds, not specially provided

- for in this act, 25 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; but no drawback shall be allowed on oil-cake made from imported seed.
Increase of 5 cents per bushel upon existing law.
- 271. Garden seeds, agricultural seeds, and other seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 20 per cent. upon existing law.
- 272. 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.
Increase of between 10 and 15 per cent. upon existing law.
- 273. Vegetables in their natural state, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 15 per cent. upon existing law.
- 274. Straw, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Now free.
- 275. Teasels, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Now free.
- 278. Fish (imported otherwise than in barrels or half-barrels) smoked, dried, salted, pickled, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, or otherwise prepared for preservation, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
A portion of this paragraph is now on the free-list.
- 279. Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half of 1 cent per pound; herrings, fresh, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.
A portion of this paragraph is now on the free-list.
- 280. Fish in cans or packages made of tin or other material, except anchovies and sardines, and fish packed in any other manner, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 3.55 per cent. upon existing law.

FRUITS AND NUTS.

- Fruits:
 - 282. Apples, green or ripe, 25 cents per bushel.
Now free.
 - 283. Apples, dried, desiccated, evaporated, or prepared in any manner, and not otherwise provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.
Now free.
 - 284. Grapes, 60 cents per barrel of 3 cubic feet capacity or fractional part thereof; plums and prunes, 2 cents per pound.
Large increase upon existing law.
 - 285. Figs, 2½ cents per pound.
Increase of one-half cent per pound upon existing law.
 - 287. Raisins, 2½ cents per pound.
Increase of one-half cent per pound upon existing law.
 - 289. Fruits preserved in their own juices, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Increase of 10 per cent. upon existing law.
 - 292. Filberts and walnuts of all kinds, not shelled, 3 cents per pound; shelled, 6 cents per pound.
Increase upon those shelled of 3 cents per pound upon existing law.
 - Meat products:
 - 295. Bacon and hams, 5 cents per pound.
Increase of 3 cents per pound upon existing law.
 - 296. Beef, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.
Increase of 1 cent per pound upon existing law.
 - 298. 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.
Increase upon existing law.
 - 300. Poultry, live, 3 cents per pound; dressed, 5 cents per pound.
Increase upon existing law.
- I will also insert a table giving the duties collected under these various paragraphs for the fiscal year 1889, where practicable, the estimated duties under the bill as reported from the Finance Committee, on the basis of the importations being the same as for the last fiscal year, and the increase in duties.

Increase of duties in agricultural schedule.

Articles and rates of duty.	Duties under present law.	Estimated duties under Senate bill.	Increase in duties.
232. Horses and mules, \$30 per head: <i>Provided</i> , That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent. ad valorem.....	\$429,302.90	\$4,504,030.00	\$1,074,727.10
233. Cattle, more than one year old, \$10 per head; less than one year old, \$2 per head.....	108,552.94	336,186.00	227,633.06
234. Hogs, \$1.50 per head.....	954.16	2,179.50	1,225.34
235. Sheep, \$1.50 per head.....	337,834.48	598,359.00	260,524.52
237. Barley, 25 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.....	1,130,692.52	2,826,731.31	1,696,038.79
238. Barley malt, 40 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.....	30,033.39	60,076.78	30,043.39
239. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 2 cents per pound.....	1,441.49	5,765.96	4,324.47
240. Buckwheat, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.....	2,546.98	8,274.10	5,727.12
243. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 2 cents per pound.....	Free	208,280.04	208,280.04
244. Oats, 15 cents per bushel.....	2,232.44	3,348.66	1,116.22
245. Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound.....	9,573.22	19,146.39	9,573.17
250. Wheat flour, 25 per cent. ad valorem.....	1,160.97	1,451.21	290.24
251. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.....	3,630.27	5,475.40	1,845.13
252. Cheese, 6 cents per pound.....	327,792.53	491,688.79	163,896.26
255. Beans, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.....	75,980.23	264,312.44	188,332.21

Increase of duties in agricultural schedule—Continued.

Articles and rates of duty.	Duties under present law.	Estimated duties under Senate bill.	Increase in duties.
257. Broom-corn, \$8 per ton.....	Now free.....	No data.....	
260. Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.....	Now free.....	\$796,032.50.....	
262. Hay, \$4 per ton.....	\$210,744.04.....	421,488.08.....	\$210,744.04
264. Hops, 15 cents per pound.....	326,446.42.....	612,087.00.....	285,640.58
266. Pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, 40 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease, dried, 15 cents per bushel; split pease, 50 cents per bushel of 60 pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, 1 cent per pound.....	10,547.60.....	17,198.96.....	6,651.36
267. 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.....	Now free.....	64,752.56.....	
268. Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.....	132,507.82.....	220,846.25.....	88,338.43
270. Flaxseed or linseed, poppy seed and other oil seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 25 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; but no drawback shall be allowed on oil-cake made from imported seed.....	674,822.03.....	843,527.55.....	168,705.52
271. Garden seeds, agricultural seeds, and other seeds, not specially provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.....	37,497.74.....	74,995.48.....	37,497.74
272. 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.....	231,078.08.....	325,997.60.....	91,919.52
273. Vegetables in their natural state, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.....	43,737.75.....	84,344.39.....	40,606.64
274. Straw, 30 per cent. ad valorem.....	Now free.....	8,676.30.....	
275. Teasels, 30 per cent. ad valorem.....	Now free.....	692.70.....	
278. Fish (imported otherwise than in barrels or half-barrels), smoked, dried, salted, pickled, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, or otherwise prepared for preservation, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, one-half of 1 cent per pound.....	95,103.32.....	336,972.57.....	241,869.25
230. Fish in cans or packages made of tin or other material, except anchovies and sardines, and fish packed in any other manner, not especially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.....	25,223.27.....	28,611.08.....	3,387.81
234. Grapes, 60 cents per barrel of 3 cubic feet capacity or fractional part thereof; plums and prunes, 2 cents per pound.....	543,404.49.....	1,018,336.59.....	474,932.10
235. Figs, 21 cents per pound.....	209,906.74.....	262,383.43.....	52,476.69
237. Raisins, 21 cents per pound.....	687,870.02.....	859,832.53.....	171,962.51
239. Fruits preserved in their own juices, 30 per cent. ad valorem.....	60,445.98.....	90,638.97.....	30,222.99
295. Bacon and hams, 5 cents per pound.....	5,442.60.....	13,696.50.....	8,163.90
296. Beef, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.....	2,155.73.....	4,311.45.....	2,155.73

While some Senator has stated that all this is an attempt to pull the wool over the farmers' eyes, as I believe the honorable Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] said, by increasing the duty upon agricultural products, the fact is that the record shows that millions upon millions in value of property such as is enumerated in the agricultural schedule has been imported into this country, and that the duties, taking the basis of importations of last year and assuming that the same amount will be imported under this bill, would make a difference of \$6,067,907.41.

So the record shows that the farmers are interested in a protective tariff upon the products which they produce, and that if those products are imported into this country to that extent, it interferes with the prices of the articles which they have to sell, and protection should be given to them as we are disposed to give it to the manufacturing industries of the country.

I did not anticipate consuming one-half the time I have in discussing the question, and beg pardon of the Senate for doing so.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. McPHERSON. Upon that question I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now let the amendment be read.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 38, line 7, in paragraph 159, after the word "manufactured," it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "fifty," in line 16, as follows:

Valued at not more than 50 cents per dozen, 12 cents per dozen; valued at more than 50 cents per dozen and not exceeding \$1.50 per dozen, 50 cents per dozen; valued at more than \$1.50 per dozen and not exceeding \$3 per dozen, \$1 per dozen; valued at more than \$3 per dozen, \$2 per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the above, 50.

And in lieu thereof to insert "45;" so as to read:

Pen-knives or pocket-knives of all kinds, or parts thereof, and erasers, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. McPHERSON. This is a reduction in duty from the present rate, 50 per cent., to 45 per cent.; and, in order that there may be no unnecessary delay, I am perfectly willing to make my amendment also apply to the razor part of that paragraph, and have the vote taken upon both propositions at once.

On line 17, after the word "unfinished," I move to strike out down to the end of the paragraph and insert "45 per cent. ad valorem."

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

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 159, on page 38, line 17, after the word "unfinished," it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "thirty," in line 22, as follows:

Valued at less than \$1 per dozen, \$1 per dozen; valued at \$1 or more per dozen, \$1.75 per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the above razors and razor blades, 30.

And in lieu thereof to insert "45 per cent. ad valorem;" so as to read:

Razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the question will be taken upon the two amendments together, and the yeas and nays will be considered as ordered upon both.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, I rise simply to express my unqualified admiration for the consistency of the authors of this bill in maintaining the highest rates of duty upon the cheapest articles and the

lowest rates of duty upon the highest-priced articles. That is a system which has some foundation, I suppose, and it is pursued with a persistency and consistency which are entitled to the admiration of the world, and I hope will receive it.

Here are knives costing 2 cents, and the duty on them is 100 per cent. On a knife costing 4 1/2 cents the duty is 150 per cent.; on a knife costing 74 cents per dozen—which is about 6 cents apiece—the duty is 190 per cent.; on a knife costing \$1.58 a dozen the duty is 113 per cent.; on a knife costing \$3 per dozen the duty is 117 per cent.; on a knife costing \$5 a dozen the duty is 100 per cent.; on a knife costing \$6 per dozen the duty is 90 per cent.; on a knife costing \$7 per dozen the duty is 83 per cent.; on a knife costing \$8 per dozen the duty is 75 per cent.; on a knife costing \$9 per dozen the duty is 72 per cent.; and on a knife costing \$10 per dozen the duty is 70 per cent.

So you see, sir, that a boy who has only 5 cents to buy a knife has no business being poor, he ought to have a dollar; and a man having plenty of money in his pocket to buy a fine knife, costing \$10 per dozen, is let off cheap by the Government in consideration of the success which he has had in life in accumulating property which enables him to buy high-priced goods. This schedule illustrates that glorious principle of American legislation very thoroughly and effectually!

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I desire to insert in the RECORD, in reply to what the Senator from North Carolina has just said, a table which shows the actual duty. I do not know what the Senator read from, but many of the items which he read to-day are very much higher than they are under this bill. I noticed as he went along, for instance, that he gave the duty on a knife which cost \$3 a dozen as something over 100 per cent., when, in fact, it is now 83 per cent.

Mr. BUTLER. Where does the Senator get that table from, if I may inquire?

Mr. PLATT. It is a table which has been furnished me by parties who are interested in this business. It speaks for itself, and anybody who understands mathematics can see whether it is correct or not. I will have it inserted in the RECORD, so that everybody can see whether it is correct or not.

The statement is as follows:

Statement showing an average duty of 73 per cent.

Cost per dozen.	Proposed duty.	Per cent.	Cost per dozen.	Proposed duty.	Per cent.
\$0.18.....	\$0.21	117	\$2.75.....	\$2.37	86
.24.....	.24	100	3.00.....	2.50	83
.36.....	.30	83	4.00.....	4.00	100
.42.....	.33	79	5.00.....	4.50	90
.50.....	.37	74	6.00.....	5.00	83
.52.....	.76	146	7.00.....	5.50	79
.74.....	.87	118	8.00.....	6.00	75
.86.....	.93	108	9.00.....	6.50	72
1.00.....	1.00	100	10.00.....	7.00	70
1.12.....	1.06	95	11.00.....	7.50	68
1.22.....	1.11	91	12.00.....	8.00	67
1.36.....	1.18	87	13.00.....	8.50	65
1.50.....	1.25	83	14.00.....	9.00	64
1.58.....	1.79	113	16.00.....	10.00	63
1.82.....	1.91	105	18.00.....	11.00	61
2.25.....	2.12	94			
2.50.....	2.25	90	156.92.....	115.05	*73

*Average duty.

Average duty: First class, 87 per cent.; second class, 93 per cent.; third class, 94 per cent.; fourth class, 68 per cent.

Mr. CARLISLE. Will the Senator allow me to inquire whether the table he now presents to the Senate takes any notice of the increase of duties on account of the passage of the act known as the customs administrative act?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly, it does not, and there is no occasion, in my judgment, for taking any particular notice of that, because the coverings and packages in which foreign knives are enveloped are paper, and of very small value, not affecting the question of duties at all, or very slightly affecting the question of duties; at any rate there is not so much to be gained in that direction as there is to be lost on an advance of duties upon materials which must be purchased from abroad by the manufacturers of these knives, as, for instance, in the making of a pearl-handled knife the duty is now 40 per cent. on the pearl of which the handles are made, and in some other respects I think the duty has been raised. So I am sure that the additional duty which they will have to pay under this new bill will more than compensate anything which they might gain by reason of the packages being counted.

Mr. CARLISLE rose.

Mr. PLATT. If the Senator will permit me I wish to say one word more. I do not believe from the best attention and observation which I have been able to give to this matter—and I have given it a good deal of study—that any man or any boy who buys a knife in this country will have to give 1 cent more for his knife with this increase of duty than he gives now. All there would be about it would be that the foreign knife, which the Senator from North Carolina says costs 2 cents a boy with 5 cents can buy. So he can, but he pays somebody 150 per cent. profit. He will be able to buy as good a knife for 5 cents as he is able to buy now, but he will not pay the middleman as much profit though the knife will have to be sold at the same price. I do not believe that this increase of duty will add to the cost of the knife to any consumer in the United States.

I ought to say a word more while I am up, and that is this: It is all very well to go into figures and say this knife can be bought abroad for that price or in this country for this price. We should never get through with that contention. But there is one thing which is indisputable, and that is that the manufacturer of pocket cutlery in this country is steadily going to the wall, and that speaks more and louder than the affidavit of any man as to what he can buy a foreign knife for or a similar knife in America. These manufacturers are steadily going to the wall, and I should like in this connection to read a letter, received from a man who has just become interested in the cutlery business and has not been before any committee. He is not a manufacturer, but he has got some of this property on his hands and he has begun to learn the situation of one of these concerns which has not already failed, and I think it expresses this whole matter in so simple and direct a way that I ought at least to read this letter. It is from a physician in Thomaston, Conn., and the knife company to which he refers is not put among the list of a large number of knife companies which have failed during the past few years and since the passage of the tariff act of 1883.

But I want to say something in reply to what was said by a Senator on the other side about manufacturers driving down to their factories in their carriages and displaying their diamond shirt-studs and all that sort of thing. He will not find any of those manufacturers in the pocket-cutlery business. The description of the tin-can-makers in Delaware by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS], in which he referred to the small concerns and the hard-working character of the persons who are engaged in that business, would apply, and apply more strongly, to these pocket-cutlery manufacturers than to the tin-can-manufacturers. They are people of small capital. One of them states now, in a letter which I thought I had in my pocket, that he knows them all, and that not one pocket-cutlery establishment in the United States has declared a dividend in the last three years, and not one has earned it, and that of those concerns which make pocket cutlery only one branch of their business not one of them has earned a profit on that branch of the business. Now I want to read the letter to which I referred awhile ago. The writer says:

THOMASTON, CONN., June 6, 1890.

DEAR SIR: The statements as put forth by the importers of cutlery and reported by the papers are totally false.

It is not necessary for me to tell you that, however, for, living in Connecticut, as you do when at home, you are already aware of the fact I mention. There is not a cutlery concern in the State to-day making expenses in that line exclusively, while many of them have gone out of existence entirely. It can not be said that they have done so from mismanagement, for among the long list that have disbanded one can pick out the names of many who have been very successful in other lines.

The American Knife Company, which my family have on their hands, was managed by two very shrewd and sharp managers, yet in spite of their best efforts it ran behind until to-day a capital of \$65,000 is wiped out and the company nearly \$30,000 in debt.

I am now interested, Messrs. Morse and Pierpont being both dead, in saving something from the wreck if I can.

If the cutlery schedule as made up is passed, the industry will again be put on its feet and Connecticut be once again heard from in that line of manufacturing; if it does not pass, I predict that four years hence there will not be one-third of a dozen concerns in the State in the business.

We in Thomaston, representing one of the biggest companies in the State in that line, are waiting patiently the result of the vote, and if not passed will be

obliged to close out, losing all of the capital and about one-third of the notes, the best we can figure.

If those men will take a trip through the State we can convince them of that fact pretty quick.

The above are facts that can be testified to and you are at liberty to use the above as you wish. I have the honor to remain,

Your obedient servant,

G. D. FERGUSON.

Senator O. H. PLATT, Washington, D. C.

I submit that that is a fair and honest statement of a man who has not come before the committee and has not come before Congress, but has come to have the property of a pocket-cutlery concern upon his hands, or has come to be interested in it, and there is not a man in Connecticut, or New York, or Ohio, who knows anything about this business, who would not recognize the justice as well as the plain, simple truth of that letter.

That is all I desire to say.

Mr. CARLISLE. The Senator from Connecticut has repeated the statement made so frequently upon the floor of the Senate during the progress of this discussion, that the proposed increase of duty would not increase the selling price of the article to the consumer. In view of this statement and its frequent repetition here, I have been much perplexed to know for what purpose these manufacturers are demanding the increased duty. I am wholly unable to understand why this gentleman, whose letter has just been read by the Senator from Connecticut, desires to have the duty upon pocket cutlery increased, unless it is to enable him to get a better price for his product; in other words, how it will enable him to carry on his business more successfully than he carries it on now if he be compelled hereafter to sell his product for the same price he sells it now.

Moreover, everybody concedes, I believe, that the Government does not require the revenue to be derived from this increased taxation upon cutlery. There must be some reason, therefore, for the proposition to increase the duty.

What is that reason? I have understood always that the manufacturers desired these increases of duties because they supposed it would make their business more profitable, but I have not been able to understand how their business can be made more profitable unless they can sell their products at a higher price than they are now selling them for; and yet we are told day after day that while the Government does not need the revenue and while the imposition of the revenue will not help any manufacturer by enabling him to sell his products for a higher price than he now sells them, yet we must go on increasing duties. What for? I repeat the question.

Undoubtedly, Mr. President, the imposition of this higher rate of duty upon pocket cutlery will at least afford the manufacturers of that article in this country the opportunity to charge to their customers a higher price, and unless they desire to take advantage of that opportunity, I submit they can have no interest whatever in the increase. If they are to go on hereafter selling these articles at the same price at which they sell them now, or at a lower price, and do not produce them more cheaply than they produce them now, I can not see how they are to be benefited by the increase, and, surely, it will not be contended by the Senator from Connecticut or any other Senator that the imposition of an increased duty upon the finished product will reduce the cost of production, unless it reduces the cost of the raw material or the wages of labor, and no Senator upon that side will contend for a moment that it will do either.

Therefore the manufacturer, after this increase has been made, will stand in the same position he stands now with regard to the cost of his production, unless it be increased, as the Senator has said, by the imposition of an increased duty upon pearl, which is used in the manufacture of some classes of these knives, and still the Senator says the manufacturer will sell the article at the same price or at a lower one. In other words, his cost of production is to be increased by this imposition of duty upon a part of his raw material, and there is to be an increased duty upon his finished product to keep out competition from abroad, and yet he is to sell his article at the same or at a lower price and make more money than he makes now, and his industry, which is now languishing and about to become extinct, is to be revived by the passage of a law making his production cost him more and under which he sells his product for no higher price!

I confess, Mr. President, that I am wholly unable to understand the philosophy of this proceeding. I am wholly unable to understand, for instance, how the farmer who is not making any money now by the sale of his corn and wheat and other agricultural products could be benefited by the imposition of a duty upon those articles unless it enabled him to sell them at a higher price. But, certainly, if it affords him the opportunity to sell for a higher price, and thus make a profit where he is now sustaining loss, he will sell at a higher price, and so will the manufacturer in this country.

I submit that Senators on this side can not be deceived by the repetition of this statement, that the increase of duty will not increase the price of the article. It is done for that very purpose and for no other, for, if that is not the purpose, it can be of no possible benefit to any manufacturer.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I think I can show even the Senator from Kentucky how this duty will help the American manufacturer

without increasing the cost to the consumer. I will take a knife which costs per dozen 36 cents abroad. The present duty is 50 per cent. That is 18 cents. - That, added here, makes the cost of the knife here 44 cents. The Senator from Kentucky knows that that knife is sold to the boy or to the man in a Kentucky town for 10 cents. There is not any question about it. I do not want to repel the idea that the manufacturer is not a robber; I do not want to go into that; but there is somebody else who makes more money out of that knife than any manufacturer in this country makes out of any article, and that is between the importer and the retailer.

Of course, the retailer in Kentucky is not going to buy an American knife that he can not make as much profit on. He is going to buy a foreign knife, which, I undertake to say, is by no means the equal of the American knife, which, as compared with the corresponding style of American knife, is simply trash and a cheat every time it is sold; but if the retailer can make more profit on that knife than he can on an American knife, which may be sold for 10 cents and be a better knife, the foreigner is going to get the work to do and the American producer is not. There is not going to be any difference in price to the consumer.

The price of knives of a certain style is just as much regulated and graded as the prices of cigars. You get the cheapest-priced knife at retail at 5 cents, the next at 10 cents, and from that you jump to 20 and 25 cents, and so on. Knives better than the foreign knives will be produced in this country and sold to the consumer as cheap as the same kind of knife is sold now, and he will have a better knife; but the manufacturer will make very little, and the middle-man, the jobber, or the retailer will not make as much as they do now upon the foreign trash.

I think I have shown the Senator from Kentucky, if he desires honestly to see how it can be done and how it will be done, that such a thing is possible as the increase of a duty without adding to the price to the consumer.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, knives are made of iron, steel, wood, ivory, and bone, and, with the exception of ivory or pearl or something of that kind, are purely an American product. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], in the remarks which he made a little while ago, intimated that America can not compete with foreign manufacturers in making knives, that they labor under some great disadvantages. If there is anything in the world with respect to which we can compete, it is in the making of cutlery. We have the raw material here, and we fairly compete to-day in the making of good cutlery, though our manufacturers are pressed to the wall, I grant, because of insufficient protection.

We have been told by the other side, by at least one Senator, that they do not represent the foreign importers. Mr. President, they represent the foreign importers upon this question and they represent the foreign manufacturers and the foreign laborers distinctly.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has referred to the frauds which are practiced in respect to these knives. The reputation of American cutlery to-day in respect to most of the grades stands higher than does the reputation of the cutlery which is imported here. Foreign merchants and importers are accustomed to have American trade-marks or names stamped upon the cutlery which they put upon the market and sell as American manufacture; otherwise they would not compete with the American knives.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] does not know where this price is to be reduced, although he has attended all the hearings of the Committee on Finance and of the Committee on Ways and Means, which have been investigating this question, and undoubtedly has heard all this testimony, when it was proved beyond question—

Mr. ALDRICH. I was about to suggest to my colleague on the committee that, not satisfied with that, the minority of the committee on the part of the Senate have given several private hearings to the importers, and have had their testimony printed at the expense of Congress.

Mr. CARLISLE. What was the Senator's statement? I should like to hear the statement about the minority of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was two years ago, before the Senator became a member of the Senate.

Mr. CARLISLE. I knew there had been no private hearings by the minority since I became a member of the Senate.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from New York permit me a moment?

Mr. HISCOCK. Yes.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Rhode Island refers to some hearings that were had by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] and myself.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. VEST. That testimony was printed with the consent of the majority of the Finance Committee and put in their hands.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. Was there anything surreptitious about that?

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not say there was.

Mr. VEST. Then the statement has no effect whatever.

Mr. HISCOCK. No, there was not anything surreptitious about it; but on this question the Senator from Kentucky, after all the investi-

gations which have been had, should be advised. I say it was proved beyond any question, and the evidence was not contradicted, that there was a cheat and a fraud; that foreign knives were labeled with the names of American makers or of American firms, and their names stamped upon the blades, and those knives were put upon the market here to compete with good American cutlery, and sold up to the price or a little below the price, perhaps, at which the American manufacturers could put their goods upon the market. They did not have to meet honest competition from importers, but they had to meet this fraudulent device. Therefore I say the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] was right when he declared that to the boy who buys his knife, or for whom a knife is bought, and puts it into his pocket, you may put on this tariff or keep it off, and there will be no difference in the price of the knife that he buys, but there will be a difference, an advance in the value of the knife that he puts in his pocket.

This investigation has run over two years or more, and the facts which I am stating have been advertised to the world for two years or more, and they have passed unchallenged and uncontradicted.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me to make a statement?

Mr. HISCOCK. Certainly, with great pleasure.

Mr. VEST. I say emphatically that those facts were challenged in this Chamber, and that I produced here two years ago the absolute stamps and labels that were used by the manufacturers in Connecticut of English brands of knives, with the lion rampant upon them and with the words "Cutlers to the Queen."

Mr. PLATT. That is true, but it was also stated at that time that a single cutlery establishment in Connecticut at one time, and for a short period and on a few goods, did do that thing which they never ought to have done, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. VEST. Now, I make another assertion, which I think every Senator who was a member of the Senate at that time and who has paid any attention to the debate will admit to be true: That after this very same statement was made, which is repeated now by the Senator from New York and on which there has been no additional testimony taken since I produced here the statement of the importers—and they have repeated the same thing in the last hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee—to the effect that when they had knives manufactured abroad the importers put their own brands upon them, as they had a right to do, and never used the brands of anybody else without authority (which was the substance of the statement made by the Senator from New York). And I assert more than that; as the Senator has said that I made a statement here that we could not compete with foreign cutleries, I distinctly stated that as to the Rodgers and Wostenholm knives we could not produce and never had produced such knives in this country, and therefore they command a price which is far beyond anything else. There is a knife [exhibiting] that I bought at the Senate stationery-room for \$2.50. It is a Rodgers knife. I could buy that same knife of an American establishment—not as good material, but the same-looking knife—for one-half the money, but it is the Rodgers name upon it that sells it and that always will sell it, and it is the same way with the Wostenholm knife.

Mr. HISCOCK. On this question it is always easy in refuting a question for a Senator to do it, based upon some letter which he has received or some fact which has come into his possession, which has not stood the test of examination. The matter of the frauds which have been perpetrated has been investigated by committees; that is, the frauds I have indicated here have been investigated in committee, and they have passed unchallenged, with these importers upon the stand fully advised of the charges which were made against them. The retail prices at which they sold their goods appeared in the testimony which has been taken, and when you have traced one of those cheap knives through to the pocket of the purchaser at retail, you find that he gave for it all that a good American knife would have cost.

As to the statement which the Senator from Missouri has made, that American cutlery can not compete with good English cutlery, I must say that the Senator is not well advised on that question. We can compete with it, and we do compete with it.

A statement was made here some time ago that the Sheffield Company had announced that they were through contributing to the support of the American Government in the knives and the cutlery that they were sending to this country. Outside of frauds which may be perpetrated in the way I have described, there is no trouble, equalizing conditions with a very moderate tariff, in American manufacturers of cutlery competing with the German, the Belgian, and the English manufacturers.

There is no chance in respect of cutlery to cry "Trust!" "Trust!" We have heard upon the other side about the ingenuity of the American manufacturer. The American manufacturer of cutlery is scattered throughout New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and other States. The proprietorship in these different establishments is small, that is, so far as the capital is concerned, and it is scattered throughout nearly half of the Northern States, the manufacturing States, with no possible chance for combination.

How often have we heard it said upon the other side that American machinery was the best machinery in the world; that American me-

chanics were the best mechanics in the world, possessing more ingenuity and with the power to apply their labor more advantageously than foreign mechanics, and yet that it is a fact with respect to cutlery that we can not compete to-day with the foreign manufactures. The tables settle that.

In 1882 \$1,462,500 worth of cutlery was imported. In 1889 \$2,006,175 worth of cutlery was imported here. In 1882 the total American product was \$1,320,090; and in 1889 it had decreased to \$730,000. This tells the story. It is all contained in that statement, with what I have said before. With the raw material in abundance, a class of goods not difficult to make, with the best mechanics or as good mechanics as there are upon the face of the earth, with the industry scattered through a dozen States, the importations here prove that we can not compete with the foreign manufacturers under the duty which is now imposed by law; and what shall we do? It is equally well established that you may add this duty, and to the consumer, the final purchaser, the one who uses the knife, there will not be a farthing added to its cost.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, as the tables which I submitted were challenged by the Senator from New York, I propose to give my authority, and I ask to have it inserted. It is only a brief table. I read from the hearing before the Committee on Finance by the Hardware Association of America, the protest of the Wholesale Hardware Association addressed to the chairman of the Finance Committee, and the accompanying tables were submitted by those gentlemen, one of which I ask to have published.

I have been a little astonished, Mr. President, though I have no right to be, at the peculiar logic which this discussion has brought out. We are told that when a foreigner brings goods to this country he pays the duty on them, and that it does not raise the price that is paid by the consumer, but, on the contrary, the higher that duty is the cheaper the domestic goods will become. The Senator from Connecticut says that many of these knife industries are now about to go to the wall for want of a higher duty, which, being translated into the vernacular, means that they are about to perish for want of a cheaper price for the product which they have to sell.

Knives costing 52 cents a dozen, for instance, abroad, which they are manufacturing in competition, they could not make any money on; they are about to go to the wall because the price of the foreign article, which competes with them, is 52 cents per dozen plus 50 per cent., or 26 cents duty, total 78 cents a dozen. Now, they are about to go to the wall at that price, but if we will make the duty 150 per cent. on the same article, which this bill proposes to do, then the price of the domestic article, according to the logic, will be beaten down to about 45 cents per dozen, whereupon the manufacturers may come away from the wall and make money. That is the logic.

The manufacturer is about to perish, in other words, for the enactment of a law which will lower the price of his goods. It seems that he is forbidden now by law to sell as low as he pleases. He can only sell at a cheap price when the law permits him to do so. The imposition of a duty will do him no good because it will not increase the price, and therefore he is perishing for the want of something that will do him no good.

Such logic, sir, may pass in the immediate precincts of a lunatic asylum or perhaps in Connecticut. It certainly will not pass among any people accustomed to the use of human reason whose judgment is not warped by their personal interests. If the duty would do no good in the way of raising the price, reasonable men will always inquire how it would do the manufacturers any good, for with this article, with this peculiar character of knife, costing 52 cents per dozen, I see that the foreign importations are about 50 per cent., or one-half of the whole consumption of that class of articles, and if the American manufacturer is losing money and supplying one-half the market at 52 cents a dozen, I can not see for the life of me how he could make money by supplying the whole market at less than 52 cents a dozen.

I have heard, indeed, of a man who apologized for selling so cheap. He declared that the suit of clothes he was selling to the customer was just \$2 below cost on every suit, and the only way he managed to keep alive was by having a very large trade; otherwise he would certainly perish. [Laughter.]

Now, it seems to me that the protectionists ought to blow hot or blow cold and keep at it. If they will come up like men and admit that the tariff is a tax, and that a duty imposed upon the foreign article permits them to add something to the price of the article which they make at home, and ask for it for that reason, within bounds, and subject to the necessities of the Government, I am always willing to concede it. But when they undertake to make me believe that the foreigner pays the duty, and that the duty when added to the price does not increase the cost of the article, and that, on the contrary, the higher the tax you place on an article the cheaper it gets, and that men can not live by manufacturing articles at 52 cents a dozen, but can live when the price is below that, it is a little too great a strain upon my credulity. I resist it because I do not believe in the logic by which the claim is supported. I resist it because it is an attempt to take money out of the pockets of my people on false pretenses.

I send to the desk and ask that the table which I have marked be inserted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator desire to have it inserted in the RECORD or read at the desk?

Mr. VANCE. Let it be inserted. I mean an extract from it, one of the tables; I do not mean the whole of them.

The table referred to is as follows:

Table showing the present and proposed rates of duty on pocket knives.

Foreign cost per dozen.	Proportion of imports.	Present duty (50 per cent. ad valorem).	Proposed duty.	Increase of proposed duty over present duty.	Proposed duty ad valorem.
	<i>Per cent.</i>			<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
\$0.24.....	17½	\$0.12	\$0.24	100	100
0.52.....	50	0.26	0.76	100	150
0.74.....		0.37	0.87	135	160
1.00.....		0.50	1.00	100	100
1.22.....		0.61	1.11	80	91
1.58.....	30	0.79	1.79	125	110
1.82.....		0.91	1.91	110	105
3.00.....		1.50	3.50	133	117
4.00.....		2.00	4.00	100	100
5.00.....	2½	2.50	4.50	80	90
6.00.....		3.00	5.00	66	83
7.00.....		3.50	5.50	57	78
8.00.....		4.00	6.00	50	75
9.00.....		4.50	6.50	45	72
10.00.....		5.00	7.00	40	70

Figured out at the proper proportion of imports for each grade the duty is over 110 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I have here a letter from the governor of the State which I have in part the honor to represent, who is himself a manufacturer and in his own life has illustrated the best that American institutions can produce, and who as a business man is as thoroughly acquainted with the principles and the practical working of a protective tariff as any man within my knowledge. He is engaged in this particular business of manufacturing cutlery, and I have here, as I was saying, a short letter from him bearing upon this particular paragraph of the bill, which I will read to the Senate. It is addressed to my colleague, who, as we know, is absent on account of ill-health and who undoubtedly if present would present it himself. It has been in my possession for some time and I now give it to the Senate. It is dated at Antrim, May 17, 1890, and addressed to my colleague:

ANTRIM, N. H., May 17, 1890.

DEAR SIR: In the campaign of 1888 I spoke with Hon. O. C. Moore at Lebanon, N. H., on the tariff question.

I took a table-knife with me and held it in my hand, and I said 'tis steel of which that knife was made would have cost, in 1860, 10 cents in gold per pound, and must be imported from England, as it was not made in this country; that the price continued the same for many years, or until some years after the war. The price of gold, however, went up so high that we were obliged at one time to pay in American currency 25 cents a pound for this same steel, though it was regularly 10 cents a pound in gold. Then the tariff made it a little higher.

The result was that steel industries commenced in this country, and although our people did not understand the business and could not make first-class steel in the beginning, yet the price being so high they could sell it at a large profit. The result was that Pittsburgh sprang up like a mushroom in the night, and the steel industry grew wonderfully for a few years, until finally our people could make all the steel needed. And their competition with each other was so great, their study of the business was so earnest, that they not only could make steel as good as it could be made in any other part of the world, but also could make it so cheap that now I buy this steel, or steel of equal quality to that which cost 10 cents per pound before the war, for less than 3 cents per pound.

If it had not been for this great stimulus of our American steel industry caused by the high price of gold and the tariff, there is every reason to suppose that we should to-day be paying the same price that we paid in 1860.

I said the Republican idea of the tariff was to admit without duty all such things as we needed and could not produce or find in this country.

We use considerable block-tin, and, in accordance with this idea, block-tin comes in free, because, until recently, no tin mines had been discovered. We use, also, for common table cutlery, wood called cocobolo, which grows in Central Africa, and ebony, which grows in Madagascar and South America in large quantities. Neither of these woods can be found within the limits of the United States; consequently, carrying out the same idea, our tariff laws, as they now stand, admit these woods free of duty.

Steel, block-tin, and wood compose most of the stock in the manufacture of table cutlery; consequently, if we had absolute free trade to-day, we could scarcely save anything in the purchase of the stock of which these goods are made.

In 1872, when I commenced the manufacture of cutlery, the prices were just about two and one-half times what they are to-day.

If you make the tariff law so that duties on cutlery are so high that nothing can be imported of the kind, the price of table cutlery would not advance materially within the next twelve months in this country, while after that, with the competition which would be stimulated by our increased business here, the price would gradually begin to decline. We should discover new methods of manufacture and be able to save largely in the labor cost of our goods, and within ten years I verily believe we should be able to produce cutlery in this country and compete in the markets of the world, and still maintain our present labor prices.

Mr. GIBSON. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question right there? The writer of that letter says, if we increase the rates of duty on this cutlery even to the point of prohibition, the effect will not be to increase the price of the cutlery in the markets of our country. If that will not be the case, why should we increase the duty?

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator has not quite caught the expression used in the letter. The writer says:

If you make the tariff law so that duties on cutlery are so high that nothing

can be imported of the kind, the price of table cutlery would not advance materially within the next twelve months in this country, while after that, with the competition which would be stimulated by our increased business here, the price would gradually begin to decline.

The increase of duty in this paragraph is not asked for the purpose of reaching the point of prohibition; he alludes to that only for the purpose of illustration. But this increased protection is asked in order to produce the proper development of the industry here, not to prohibit the introduction of a foreign article during that period, while the evolution is going on in our own country, so that while that process is going on, until we reach the point where we can manufacture to the extent of the entire demand of our own country, the consumer can receive the article at the present or a slightly increased price; he goes on to say, "while after that," although not greatly raised for the present even, the condition of the industry being such now—

While after that, with the competition which would be stimulated by our increased business here, the price would gradually begin to decline. We should discover new methods of manufacture, and be able to save largely in the labor-cost of our goods, and within ten years I verily believe we should be able to produce cutlery in this country and compete in the markets of the world, and still maintain our present labor prices.

At present, however—

And here comes the fact—

At present, however, with our labor twice or three times as high as it is in Germany, we can not meet the competition outside of this country.

At least two-thirds of the cost, to-day, of the table cutlery is the manual labor employed in the production.

For the interest of the consumer, of the dealer, and of the manufacturer and the laborer, I hope you will do all you can to maintain the present cutlery schedule as reported in the McKinley bill.

I learn that some dealers in the West and manufacturers in New York are using every effort to reduce, if possible, this cutlery schedule.

Do not be deceived. We only ask protection sufficient to enable us to furnish to our own people the \$1,000,000 worth or so of cutlery that is now annually imported from foreign countries.

Truly yours,

D. H. GOODELL.

Hon. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER, Washington, D. C.

I should like to have the letter inserted in the RECORD. I do not desire to consume the time of the Senate. I think an emphatic, condensed statement of that kind is much better than any I could make myself.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this question at this late hour, but I want to put in the RECORD a statement to go with the statement of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] about the failure on the part of our people to make good knives, etc. I find in the testimony taken before the British commission in 1886 that there was considerable testimony given as to the Sheffield manufactures. It was declared there that there were some kinds of cutlery that we had succeeded in making superior to anything that they had made in that country, and especially that was true of a class of scissors that we make in this country. It was also complained that there had been great frauds committed by manufacturers in using bad steel and cheap steel which they had improperly marked. I only want to read a brief statement from one of the witnesses, or rather a brief statement that follows the testimony:

Mr. Wardley at the close exhibited some specimens of table-knives, several of which were marked "shear-steel" (which brand of steel would cost £45 per ton), and several were marked "warranted cast-steel" (which would cost, say, £32), when in reality they were all made from Bessemer, which would not cost more than £10 per ton. Mr. Wardley subjected these specimens to a test, and proved that for all practical purposes where evenness of temper and a keen cutting edge is required this class of goods is useless. He also showed some samples where the bolsters, instead of being forged from the solid, were composed of a soft metal and run onto blades fayed from common sheet-steel scrap; these also had marks upon them which he thought should only be on genuine articles. Mr. Wardley also showed samples of handles purporting to be ivory and superior in quality, and he asked one of the commissioners to set fire to one of these handles, which he did with a match, thus showing the falsity of the article.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I think there is no line of business in this country in which there is so much old-line fraud and lying as there is in the cutlery business. There are sold in this country some thirty or forty different knives with names on them implying that they are made in the United States. We had some of the guilty men in the Finance Committee room one day, and the only escape one of them could make from it was by saying what the Senator from Missouri has repeated for him, that he sent over there and had his knives made in Germany, and he had a right to put any name on them he pleased. He was not a knife-maker here, he was simply an importer, and he told the knife-maker in Germany, where the workmen get about 40 cents a day, to put on the knives "New England Cutlery Company," "Columbia Cutlery Company," "Granville Cutlery Company;" I do not know how many of them there are now. They are made by workmen working at starvation prices and made out of cheap material, and it ought to be a penitentiary offense to sell them anyhow, most of them.

That is the way many people get an idea that we do not make a good knife in America. I do not know a concern in our State—others can speak for themselves—that makes any knives of that description, and I will find for the Senator from Missouri a knife just as good as that Rodgers knife he held up. The Rodgers deserve their name. Their good reputation is a dividend, and they deserve it. So does Wostenholm also. But I will give the Senator a knife from Connecticut with

which he may shave himself for the rest of the season, or a pen-knife, or a pocket-knife.

Our men will be glad to be protected in an honest name. They will make a knife and put upon it the genuine name of the company or place or both, and they will fight for that name. A leading case in the English reports is where a foreigner bears the title of a Connecticut manufacturing company, the Collins Ax Company. They sued the English manufacturer for putting "Collins" upon their axes, even the small word "Collins," and, all honor to the British court, they gained their suit after a long struggle. There are as many manufacturers in Connecticut in proportion to population and I think really more than you will find anywhere else who have made their fight for the name, for the man who starts to go in a business and stays in it knows that if the article he makes is always of high excellence by and by it will be, as I said, a dividend; he can sell for 6 per cent., or 5 per cent., or 10 per cent. higher than anybody else. That is the sort of knife we want to make.

By the way, the Senator from North Carolina wanted to know how it was that higher duties brought about lower prices and how a high tariff could bring us lower prices. That is a perpetual mystery to him. Now, the fact is that the manufactures of the United States as a rule, by and large, are cheaper than they were at the close of the war. Are they not? Are not the great mass of articles that men use cheaper than they were before the war? The great mass of articles that the farmer buys, all his manufacturing implements of all sorts, the carpenter's tools, tools of every trade, whatever you want, are a great deal cheaper and the price has been steadily going down.

Mr. GRAY. All over the world.

Mr. HAWLEY. All over the world to some extent, but more markedly in the United States than anywhere else. The foreigner sees it because he says the Yankee never undertakes to manufacture a thing without getting up a newer process. That is true. You enact this duty upon tin-plate and you will not see probably 100 pounds of it made as they make it in Europe now, by going around and clumsily dipping the plate into pickle two or three or four times. You will soon find a machine that will travel those plates through from one bath after another. You will find it done by machinery. You will find the process improved and the price of your tin brought down. The Yankee contractor never undertakes to make 10,000 of anything in the world without having ten or fifteen or twenty workmen in the shop, all the while studying as to how they can do it better and cheaper.

In the great Colt establishment it was a humming hive of invention there for ten or fifteen years. All that time when the company were making tens and tens of thousands of pistols they used to sublet the job to contractors, among them, say, 10,000 barrels, 10,000 guards, 10,000 triggers, 10,000 hammers, etc., to a mechanic, and give him bench-room and power, and he getting so much apiece for them by the ten thousand spent his days and nights studying as to how he could get 20 per cent. more out of a certain machine in a day. The consequence was that nothing in the shop staid the same for three months at a time, and after a while they had the best arms-manufacturing machinery in the world.

The concern in my own town has sold to the German Government \$3,000,000 worth of arms-making machinery because it was not only the best kind of machinery, but because it was the best made. They made many improvements there. Their reputation is very high. They can charge more. It is known all over Europe. In the language of the Englishman, the American invents as the Greek sculptures or the Italian paints. It is genius; and we have had the great statesmanship and common sense to foster all this by an admirable patent law, which has been cheap as dirt compared with the patent laws of foreign countries.

Now, give us a chance. Put up a fence for a time; keep out not a legitimate competition. I do not care if the margin is so close that some of the foreign goods get in, perhaps so much the better; but it is no fair fight when people are compelled to work for 10 or 15 or 20 cents a day in other countries. I hold it is worth while that we should establish those industries in this country.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Connecticut, if he will permit me, says keep up the fence for a time. Has he ever undertaken to indicate how long that time is to be?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes, I can go around the country and find fences taken down. I find there has not been a tariff enactment since the war that has not put additional articles on the free-list.

Mr. VANCE. What has been put upon the free-list that is manufactured in this country?

Mr. HAWLEY. I can find some articles, I suppose, by looking at it. I should think I might from the length of the free-list.

Mr. VANCE. I should be very glad to see anything put on the free-list that competes with anything manufactured in this country.

Mr. HAWLEY. One partial answer to some things that have been stated is the fact of which I am just now reminded, that as we invent these improved machines they steal them abroad or buy them, and then set their men at work for 40 or 50 cents a day making the article. Of course that is not exactly a fair competition. We have brought down the price of articles all along the whole line, notoriously, for example, in Bessemer steel, where the moment we began to make it our men began

to improve in the processes—all the iron manufacturers know it perfectly well—and they have been improving the whole line of work. Now, here is The London Ironmonger of April 2, 1889:

Many classes of cutlery wages are deplorably low, about 25 per cent. less than a fair average.

London Ironmonger of October 26, 1889:

Six dozen can be made in a day of fourteen hours, and the workmen receive 2s. net for a day of fourteen hours.

Sheffield Independent of March 16, 1889:

Pocket-knife grinders are working a full week for 15s.

The Lords Committee has been taking the evidence of men and women employed at Cradley Heath and Haiesowen, the chain and nail districts, respectively. The evidence is in harmony with all that has been said about the hard-worked and badly paid men and women of the Black country.

I find, however, some men can earn 15s. per week by working long hours, but I venture to say not for seventy-four hours per week, as do some spring-knife cutlers in Sheffield, whose wages are but 13s. 6d. per week.

That table-knife makers are working full time for 14s. per week.

That some are working without a fan to carry off the injurious bone dust, which depresses the spirit and makes the condition of employment almost unbearable.

That the spring-knife cutlers (*vide* report Wadsley cutlers' meeting) are working sixty hours per week for 10s. and 12s.

That many table-blade grinders are only earning 14s. and 15s. per week.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, the position the Senator from Connecticut says this country is in is a good deal like that of the bully who was boasting of his manhood, that he could just whip all creation; he could strike harder blows and he could strike more of them; he could scratch and he could gouge; he could bite worse than any human being upon the face of the earth, and he never had met his match yet or a man who could stand before him. Or, like the old Irish widow, who was groaning over the death of her husband who had been blown up by a keg of powder in a mine, and after conjuring him and the story of his lovely domestic qualities, she dried her tears and said: "Divil a man could ever stand before him in the mine. Surely, God Almighty had to take advantage of him with a keg of powder." [Laughter.] And yet, although these countrymen of his are so full of invention, and so full of skill, and so full of energy, and so full of industry, and can beat all the workmen of the world, he says, "Put up the fence; do not let them come in, if you please; keep them off; I could whip them until their mummies would not know them when brought home on a shutter, but do not let them come in; keep the peace; put up that fence."

Ah, Mr. President, it is child's play to talk that way. The question is not what American skill and genius and invention can do. They are unrivaled before the world. But the question is shall this great and magnificently organized country for human labor and for human production acknowledge its inferiority with the same breath with which it claims its superiority and beg that the pauper of Europe and his production should be kept away, that he should have a fair field for awhile? They never will mention a time when they are willing to let the fence down. They have been talking that for one hundred years, since the time this Government was born. Since American political society was organized they have been talking about that good time coming when we should be independent of all the world and be able to set everybody at defiance. That time was coming, but it never came. Like to-morrow, it is always in the future.

They want these duties raised now to 150 per cent., some of them, none of them to less than 70 per cent. upon cutlery. When they want the duties raised they say they must have the tariff. When they want to boast of the ingenuity and the skill and the invention of their people, they say those have made prices low. Now, either the high duties have made everything low or they have not, one or the other. If they have made everything low, then I do not wish to hear any more of the boasting about the superiority of Americans. If the inventions of science, if the skill of our people and the genius and the energy of our people have made prices low, then let us stand by that and have no more to say about the tariff. We certainly can not logically claim that both have been the cause.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, what sort of a country does the Senator want to have this to be anyhow? I do not know what his theory is. Those gentlemen have a certain advantage of us on the other side. There are protectionists all around among them, pretty nearly straight-out protectionists. There are men who believe in a revenue tariff with incidental protection. There are men who believe in a little protection for their particular localities and none elsewhere; and then there are free-traders among them. But there is not a man among them who will draught a full tariff bill and offer it here and say that that is the Democratic idea, for he does not know what that idea is. It is a little different from the one we propose; that is all.

Nearly every whine and cavil and growl and fault that they have had over our bill here could have been applied to the Mills bill itself, because that had big duties. It left a great many duties as they were; the changes were trifling; in some it clipped off a toe-nail here or something of that sort and called it a reform bill. They said it was because they could not do any better at the time; but I should like to have some man draw one and then hang it up for a specimen of what they would do if they had absolute power.

Their argument is substantially this—it can not be avoided—that if

anybody in God's world can make anything cheaper than it can be made here, it is our duty to buy it. Now, if there is a meaner word in the English language than the word "cheap," I do not know what it is. It is mean and nasty, the word "cheap" is. Cheap labor means cheap clothes, cheap food, cheap lodging, cheap morals, and cheap human devils. That is what cheapness means. Are we to have it? Break down your barriers. You do not want the Chinaman in here; you have forbidden him; but now carry your machines abroad, and they will go by and by to the Chinaman and he will work for 4 or 5 cents a day with these magnificent American machines, and then he will come with ship-loads of stuff to sell at less than Europeans or Americans or anybody else.

Let the Chinaman come, then. That is the Democratic doctrine, is it? If it is not, I do not know what is. You do not want poor foreign laborers coming over here. You are passing statutes here, I consider dirty statutes some of them, to keep men out. Here is a man in Europe now who is a good tradesman, a good mechanic, and he knows he can come here and get \$50 a month at his trade. He makes a bargain with any one of you gentlemen to come here and he comes here.

Is not that a pretty good kind of an immigrant? But you keep him out, and we bring in ship-loads of men who do not know what they can do or what they are going to do, and they come in free. You had better let the laziest and lousiest of all come here free, because he would learn after awhile; and it would be better than life in his own country, where he works for next to nothing, than to send his goods here free. Yet you would take the tariff off and let those cheap goods come in. Is that your logic? What is your tariff to be and what sort of a country do you want to have, anyhow? You talk about the British tariff. I have found but one man on that side who had pluck enough to say that was a model tariff, and that was my friend from North Carolina, and he thought that was the best tariff there was going.

Sir, the Lord Almighty gave us within this country almost everything. I loathe the old Chinese-wall humbug. Sir, build it, and build it a hundred miles high, and we shall live within it fifty years and come out rich and fat and happy. You will not have much coffee or much tea; you will not have much silk goods; but there is nothing mechanical, nothing essential to human happiness, progress, and prosperity that we would not be able to make within that time. Shut Great Britain up for six months and half her people would be in the grave. And yet you think the same economic system is good for the two countries.

Great Britain by her own statistician says that she has to bring in 93 per cent. of her raw material from abroad. The same statistician in the same paragraph says America gets the same figure of raw material from within her own bounds; and yet gentlemen argue from the British tariff to ours. The Englishman could not live a week under our tariff, and therefore having cut his tail off or it having been cut off by nature, he wants us to cut ours off also. He can not raise half enough to feed him. Ninety per cent. of his materials he gets from elsewhere. He has to be fed by commerce; he has to live by commerce; and so what he has to do he thinks other people ought to do. He goes around the world with his ships bullying and annexing and controlling little nations, inferior peoples, everywhere expanding his territory, or as one of their statesmen said, "John Bull thinks he is increasing his glory by increasing his burdens; he is undertaking to cultivate patches all over the world where his Lancaster men can sell goods." That is what "John Bull" thinks, and the drum that accompanies the sun around the world is the drum of commerce, the drummer. That is the statesmanship of Great Britain.

They have to live so. On the other hand we have to live in the other direction. If we obey the plain intimation of what is the will of the Almighty in giving us these possibilities, it is our duty to cultivate them. Says one of these Englishmen—they occasionally let slip the truth when they are arguing about this country—speaking of the United States and its glory and progress and material possibilities, "Blessed is the nation that is self-contained and need not be always asking what other peoples are doing." We can be self-contained, and there was no more glorious vision ever placed before a statesman than the vision of what these United States shall be under such a policy as the Republican policy in all matters of justice and of material progress such as this country will be, with a variety of industries. The diversification of industry is absolutely essential to the moral and mental health, and prosperity as well, of the country.

The country that is all farmers is behind the world. Surely there is not enough to develop all there is in the man there. Find a purely agricultural country, and you always find one which is unfortunate in many respects. Take some of your Western States, where all you have to do is to plow and to sow corn and wheat and gather corn and wheat, to raise some beef and raise some pork. That is substantially all you have got to do; unless you go to work under the tariff and establish industries among yourselves there, the whole family is not at work half the year. What is to be done in winter but take care of your cattle and horses, etc.? You do not spend the winter in manufacturing your implements of agriculture, as they used to do in New England, making plows and rakes, and all that; no, you can buy them or anything you want with a few bushels of wheat. Your wheat and your corn and your herds of

bees will buy all you want. You raise them. What do you do with your winter months? Are your boys all fitted just for farming and nothing else? Are they all made like the ten million rakes they turn out from the factory?

No, sir; three-quarters of the boys in your houses do not like it and want to get away. Where do they go? Onto another farm? No; by and by one of them gets down into a factory somewhere and looks into the door on great steam engines and hears the roar of machinery and it is a trumpet to him. He says, "Dad"—and the old dad did not think he was worth raising before—"I know where I am going;" and by and by he is a first-rate mechanic and perhaps the owner of a factory. Another boy, where there is a diversified industry, finds another work to do, and another, another; and all trades of all kinds are open to the men of all possibilities; and the consumer and producer are brought door to door, and that whole social and material organization becomes like one grand organ, where every pipe is there and every pipe has its use.

That is the result of a diversified industry. You can not have a good people without it, and you can not have a prosperous people without it. The infinite rot of the glories of commerce I am tired of. What good is there to carry a thing 3,000 miles to get it turned over into another thing to bring 3,000 miles back to the man who made the first thing?

But it is quite wrong, they tell us, to have both operations performed in the United States. Why, there are two changes, two complete transformations of capital when the original thing is sold as a raw material and as a finished product; one man turns it over to some neighbors in a neighboring establishment and it comes out a finished product with another operation—two uses of capital. "White wings of commerce" and all that sort of thing; they are beautiful if you can not get along without them, but what this world has been trying to do for the last hundred years is to get rid of transportation.

The genius of the world has been devoted to the escaping from this calamity of commerce; I would rather use the word "transportation." All the hens cackle when there is an improvement in railway engineering or in steam-ships, a little less coal, a better grade, different kinds of boiler of some sort or other, an improvement in the track, and every successive improvement, little in itself, is heralded as an especially good thing. What comes of it? By and by, instead of 2 cents a ton a mile for freight it is a cent, and then it is a half a cent, and now it is down to four mills. What does that do? The place that was a thousand miles from New York is then 250 miles from New York, is it not, so far as dollars are concerned? Instead of running even the 250 miles to do the transformation of those products made within your own neighborhood and town, these changes at short range were going on, and this blessed thing of transportation, this glorious thing called, yes, transportation, commerce—it would be commerce then from hand to hand—this glorious beauty, this desirable thing, toting about, would be practically eliminated out of civilization.

Mr. VEST. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he voted for the bill to subsidize ships?

Mr. HAWLEY. I believe I did, with great pleasure. We have got to trade with some one and got to trade a good deal, thanks to free-traders; and besides there are some things we can not produce, and we are very glad to get them, and some people want to go traveling, and I am glad to give them an opportunity to go in American ships also. But the gentleman can not deny that it is an improvement not to carry a bag to the mill with a stone in one side and grain in the other, and yet that is the upshot of unnecessary commerce; it amounts to that. It is two payments for freight when neither is necessary. The duty of these United States is, with malice towards none and charity for all, to see if we can not produce within our own lines everything that everybody wants, and so the producer and consumer shall be hand to hand, and so the man, whatever he does, shall find that he will have something to do in some chorus of industry. That is what we ought to make out of this country.

Now, either say yes or no; say "protection" or say no "protection." I dislike the half and half business any how. The man who says he is for a revenue tariff with incidental protection yields the whole principle. Do not be a coward about it. He yields the whole principle. Incidental protection, half and half, an inch of protection when another inch will be life and half an inch is death—that is the sort of thing. Be one thing or the other, I say. Yes, incidental protection is incidental robbery (thank you, Mr. JONES), and incidental small profit follows.

So, practically, you are for protection as a reasonable protection. I do not want an unreasonable one. I criticize this bill as we go along, from paragraph to paragraph, and I am glad to hear some of you do so, and I think I shall vote for some changes. I think, perhaps, some clauses I would have drawn differently; but if you agree that it is not a crime to take care of your own household, then you need not quarrel about the duties too closely, one way or another. You will get along with perfect harmony if your heart is right on that subject; and if you want to have an America worth inhabiting you will not have any difficulty.

Mr. VANCE. I have listened with great interest to the Senator

from Connecticut, and I have been enlightened in many respects. He told us, among other things, that he despised cheap things; that cheapness was meanness and nastiness—badness, nastiness—and yet he has just been boasting how the genius of this country had made things cheap, and that all the genius of Connecticut, I am to understand, is directly in the direction of nastiness and meanness; the genius of this country tends that way, and the eloquence of her statesman is heard here for the purpose of advocating meanness and nastiness. I had a sort of suspicion of that, but I was too polite to say so.

Mr. President, when an orator undertakes to put Senators on this side, who are in favor of as free trade as the necessities of the Government will permit, in the position of believing that no manufactory whatsoever could flourish without the imposition of high duties, he yields the whole question. His whole argument assumes that if the policy of the Democratic party was to prevail there would not be a factory in the United States. His whole argument assumes that, from the very nature of manufacturing in America, the operator can not be satisfied with the price which is fixed by the normal demand for the article, but that it must be enhanced by artificial laws, which, strange to say, these artificial laws do not enhance according to their doctrine, when he must know that the greatest manufacturing nation of this world or of any other world that we have any knowledge of is a country that has absolute free trade in regard to manufactured products.

Mr. HAWLEY. Then I understand the Senator to repeat, as he did awhile before, that the British tariff brings the greatest prosperity to the country. I want him to stick to that and put it in the next platform.

Mr. VANCE. The British tariff, as far as I remember what it is, is one that is imposed upon articles which yield revenue to the Government, and not revenue for private parties. The protective tariff of Republican politicians in the United States is one which yields private profit and revenue for the pockets of the operators, and not for the Treasury, and that your own Supreme Court has said is not legislation, but it is robbery under the forms of law; and for once I agree with that Republican Supreme Court.

If we had a tariff levied upon those things which our people consume that did not compete and if we had a tariff levied upon the incomes of your millionaires and they were made to pay to the support of the Government in proportion to their property which is protected by the Government, we should come nearer having a perfect financial system than we have here now by the distance which is between the heavens and the earth. That is my opinion about a tariff.

But I was going on further to say that in pursuit of the idea that cheapness was nastiness and meanness, I had discovered from the eloquent speech of the Senator from Connecticut the secret of the imposition of the highest duties on the cheap articles and the lowest duties on the high-priced articles. I have found now why it is that American Senators in the nineteenth century, in the midst of our civilization, in the midst of the humanitarian sentiment of Christianity that pervades us all, would let in the crêpe silk shawl of the millionaire's wife at 50 per cent. duty and put 115 per cent. upon the coarse wools that wrap the poor man's wife and protect her from the cold; and it is that cheap wool is mean and nasty. That is the secret of it, I suppose.

I have shown in the course of this debate, or attempted to show upon every schedule, that the same policy was pursued. The little boy with his Barlow knife has to pay nearly twice as much per cent. as the gentleman who, like the Senator from Missouri, displayed a two dollar and a half Rodgers knife. He did not want to carry a cheap and nasty knife, but the little fellow has to carry a 10 cent Barlow, and the Government comes down upon him because Senators on that side despise cheapness; it is mean; it is nasty.

Well, Mr. President, it is a matter of taste. It can not be called a matter of political economy, for there is no economy in it. It is a perversion of every principle of justice and humanity upon which this bill is framed.

I believe, sir, that is all I want to say.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina knows perfectly well what I meant by "cheap and nasty." I meant a country where people live as his slaves used to live and as slaves live abroad now. I meant a country where people are much better off than they were, who get 20 cents a day and live in hovels and have imperfect clothing and no schools, perhaps, at all. There is a cheap country, is it not? Can not the poor man live cheaply there? No doubt he can. What his neighbor makes for 20 cents he can buy cheaply, and the result of it is a wretched country. The word "cheap" has been misused and abused until it gives to one an idea of the most unfortunate and degraded people.

There is nothing cheaper in the world than can be found in China, and yet probably there is no degradation in the world that equals it. There may be nothing cheaper, perhaps, unless it be in Africa, where it does not take any work at all to live, where you may lie on your back and eat the fruit that drops from the tree. Is there a cheap country anywhere that is a desirable country, that you think is a happy country socially? Not one.

The Senator speaks of the British tariff. This is not the time for that. It may be that I shall make another day's work of that. The

whole British organization is obliged to take money out of the people after the fashion of a poll-tax, man by man. The British tariff is only on four classes of articles, leaving out gold and silver plate, which is a small matter here. It is on the liquors, and on the tobaccos, and on the coffee, and on the tea, and the duty is the same. It is not an ad valorem duty, it is a specific duty, and the poor man uses just about as many pounds of tea and as many pounds of coffee and about as many pounds of tobacco as the rich man.

The rich man will smoke \$2 a pound tobacco and the poor man will smoke 25 cents a pound tobacco, and each will pay his 10 or 15 cents duty, or much higher than that. It is 10 cents on tea. So, as nearly as they can make it, it is a poll-tax. In the same manner there is a revenue upon liquors, etc. The rich people do not pay anything, I tell the Senator from North Carolina, for buying silks or tapestries or embroideries.

Mr. VANCE. They make them pay an income tax?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes; that is the only case where they aim to get something out of the rich man. But, as I say, that is too much of a temptation. I can not go into it now.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to give a notice. I desire to have printed for the information of the Senate two amendments which I propose to offer to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], which I desire to give notice of now, and have them printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be received, if there be no objection.

Mr. BLAIR. Let them be read.

Mr. HOAR. One of them is a substitute for which I gave notice the other day.

COURTS IN MISSOURI.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. VEST. I anticipate the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island, and I ask him to let the tariff bill be laid aside for a moment until I can report a bill which I am compelled to ask the passage of this afternoon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for that purpose.

Mr. VEST. I am authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary to report a bill favorably; and I desire to say a word in regard to the exigency of its passage.

It is a bill entirely local, in regard to holding a term of the Federal court in October in Kansas City or in Springfield, Mo., and unless the bill is passed now it will create great confusion and delay. The bill was drawn at the instance of the judge of the court and I ask for its present consideration.

The bill (S. 4335) to change the time of the sessions of the circuit and district courts for the western district of Missouri was read the first time by its title.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside that the bill just reported from the Committee on the Judiciary may be considered. It will be read at length for information, subject to objection.

The bill was read the second time at length, and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

CHARLES F. BOWERS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 5th instant (the House of Representatives concurring) I return herewith the bill (S. 1293) entitled "An act for the relief of Charles F. Bowers."

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, June 6, 1890.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This message has been lying on the table. The bill to which it refers was defective in containing no provision for an appropriation, and a bill upon the same subject has been passed containing the clause that was omitted. If there be no objection, the Chair will direct the signature of the President of the Senate to be erased, and the bill will then be returned to the House of Representatives. The Chair hears no objection.

STEAMERS STROMA AND MARCO AURELIA.

Mr. GIBSON. I ask leave to call up a bill reported from the Committee on Commerce by the chairman of the committee this morning, with a recommendation that it pass. It is a bill to provide a register for the steamers Stroma and Marco Aurelia. These two steamers were wrecked in the Gulf of Mexico and they were repaired at the expense of more than two-thirds of their value, and under the law would be entitled to this register from the Treasury Department, but they were wrecked more than three miles from the shore, and therefore it requires an act of Congress, which is recommended by the Committee on Commerce. I ask for the present consideration of the bill, which is Senate bill 4312.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4312) to provide American registers for the steamers Stroma and Marco Aurelia was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

THE REVENUE BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9416) to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the pending amendment, is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, August 20, 1890, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, August 19, 1890.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The letter of the Secretary of the Interior embodied in Executive Document No. 457 was sent to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, but should have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as it relates only incidentally to invalid pensions. In the absence of objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ANN BRYAN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, returning, in compliance with the concurrent resolution of the House of the 23d instant, the bill (H. R. 5702) granting a pension to Ann Bryan.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

PRIVILEGES, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the resolution (S. R. 116) extending the privileges of the Library of Congress to the members and secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up this resolution for present consideration, as the House committee has reported a similar resolution in identically the same terms.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library be authorized to extend the use of the books in the Library of Congress to the members and secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission resident in Washington, on the same conditions and restrictions as members of Congress are allowed to use the Library.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I am also authorized by the committee to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after the word "Commission," in the fourth line, the words "and the Chief of Engineers of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army."

The amendment was adopted.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

The title was amended to conform.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 8584) to increase the pension of Edward Healy;

A bill (H. R. 10726) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 11491) for the relief of the estate of Charles F. Bowers.

FOG-SIGNAL, BOOTH BAY HARBOR.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3064) to establish a fog-signal at

or near Cuckold's Island, at the entrance to Booth Bay Harbor, otherwise known as Townsend Harbor, Maine, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read at length.
Mr. DINGLEY. This is recommended by the Light-House Board, and unanimously by the Committee on Commerce. This is on a dangerous reef.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me state to the gentleman that this is on a dangerous reef, where there have been already three shipwrecks. The Light-House Board are anxious for its construction, and I hope the objection will be withdrawn.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is this classed among the indispensables?
Mr. DINGLEY. The Light-House Board called my attention to it again on yesterday because of the fact that a shipwreck had but recently taken place there, and it is regarded as absolutely necessary for the safety of commerce on that coast. I hope the objection will be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.
NATHANIEL M'KAY ET AL.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate bill (No. 846) for the relief of Nathaniel McKay and the executors of Donald McKay was passed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it in order to raise the question of consideration against the motion?

The SPEAKER. It is not.
Mr. SPRINGER. Why?
The SPEAKER. Because it is a motion to lay on the table and is on a privileged motion.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the question of consideration can be raised against any privileged motion, even against the right of a member to his seat. Does the Chair hold that it can not be done now?

The SPEAKER. It can not be done.
Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a question of order. We are absolutely unable to hear what is going on. The Chair has not stated the proposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman moves to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate bill for the relief of Nathaniel McKay was passed.

Mr. ROGERS. Now we understand what it is.
Mr. THOMAS. It is Senate bill 846.

Mr. SPRINGER. And I have endeavored to raise the question of consideration, but the Speaker holds that it can not be raised against this motion.

Mr. DOCKERY. Against this bill.
Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, against this bill. I suppose against any other bill it could be raised.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The question was taken.
Before the announcement of the result,
Mr. THOMAS demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 93, nays 79, not voting 155; as follows:

YEAS—93.

Adams,	Dalzell,	Lawler,	Russell,
Allen, Mich.	Dingley,	McCormick,	Sawyer,
Anderson, Kans.	Dorsey,	McDuffie,	Soull,
Atkinson, Pa.	Dunnell,	McKinley,	Simonds,
Baker,	Evans,	Moffitt,	Smyser,
Banks,	Farquhar,	Moore, N. H.	Stockbridge,
Bartine,	Flick,	Morey,	Stone, Ky.
Bayne,	Funston,	Morrill,	Sweney,
Belknap,	Gear,	Morse,	Taylor, E. B.
Bingham,	Gest,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, Tenn.
Boothman,	Grosvenor,	O'Donnell,	Thomas,
Brosius,	Hall,	O'Neil, Mass.	Thompson,
Buchanan, N. J.	Hansbrough,	O'Neil, Pa.	Turner, Kans.
Burrows,	Haugen,	Osborne,	Vandever,
Burton,	Henderson, Ill.	Owens, Ind.	Waddill,
Butterworth,	Henderson, Iowa	Payson,	Walker,
Caldwell,	Hermann,	Pennington,	Wallace, N. Y.
Cannon,	Hill,	Post,	Wiley,
Carter,	Houk,	Quinn,	Williams, Ohio
Chenatham,	Kennedy,	Raines,	Wilson, Wash.
Cogswell,	Ketcham,	Ray,	Yardley.
Conger,	Kinsey,	Reed, Iowa	
Cornell,	Lacey,	Rowell,	
Cummings,	Laidlaw,		

NAYS—79.

Bankhead,	Carlton,	Forman,	Lane,
Barwig,	Caruth,	Forney,	Lanham,
Bland,	Cheadle,	Goodnight,	Lester, Ga.
Bliss,	Chipman,	Grimes,	Lewis,
Blount,	Clarke, Ala.	Hatch,	Maish,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Clements,	Hayes,	McClammy,
Brickner,	Constock,	Haynes,	McClellan,
Brookshire,	Cooper, Ind.	Heard,	McCreary,
Brown, J. B.	Culbertson, Tex.	Henderson, N. C.	McMillin,
Brunner,	Dibble,	Hitt,	McRae,
Bunn,	Dockery,	Holman,	Mills,
Bynum,	Ellis,	Kerr, Iowa	Montgomery,
Candler, Ga.	Fithian,	La Follette,	Moore, Tex.

Morgan,
Norton,
Oates,
O'Ferrall,
Paynter,
Price,
Reilly,
Richardson,
Rogers,
Rowland,
Sayers,
Skinner,
Springer,
Stewart, Tex.

Stockdale,
Stone, Mo.
Struble,
Tarsney,
Tillman,
Turner, Ga.
Venable,
Wheeler, Ala.
Wike,
Wilkinson,
Williamus, Ill.
Wilson, Mo.
Wilson, W. Va.

NOT VOTING—155.

Abbott,	Crisp,	Lee,	Rusk,
Alderson,	Culbertson, Pa.	Lehlbach,	Sanford,
Allen, Miss.	Cutcheon,	Lester, Va.	Scranton,
Anderson, Miss.	Dargan,	Lind,	Seney,
Andrew, Miss.	Darlington,	Lodge,	Sherman,
Arnold,	Davidson,	Magner,	Shively,
Atkinson, W. Va.	De Haven,	Mansur,	Smith, Ill.
Barnes,	De Lano,	Martin, Ind.	Smith, W. Va.
Beckwith,	Dickerson,	Martin, Tex.	Snider,
Belden,	Dolliver,	Mason,	Spinola,
Bergen,	Dunphy,	McAdoo,	Spooner,
Biggs,	Edmunds,	McCarthy,	Stahlnecker,
Blanchard,	Elliott,	McComas,	Stephenson,
Boatner,	Enloe,	McCord,	Stewart, Ga.
Boutelle,	Ewart,	McKenna,	Stewart, Vt.
Bowden,	Featherston,	Miles,	Stivers,
Brewer,	Finley,	Milliken,	Stump,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fitch,	Morrow,	Taylor, Ill.
Brower,	Flood,	Mudd,	Taylor, J. D.
Browne, T. M.	Flower,	Mutchler,	Townsend, Colo.
Browne, Va.	Fowler,	Nute,	Townsend, Pa.
Buchanan, Va.	Frank,	O'Neill, Ind.	Tracey,
Buckalew,	Geissenhainer,	Outhwaite,	Tucker,
Bullock,	Gibson,	Parrett,	Turner, N. Y.
Campbell,	Gifford,	Payne,	Van Schaick,
Candler, Mass.	Greenhalge,	Peel,	Vaux,
Caswell,	Grout,	Perkins,	Wade,
Catchings,	Hare,	Perry,	Wallace, Mass.
Clancy,	Harmer,	Peters,	Washington,
Clark, Wis.	Hemphill,	Phehan,	Watson,
Clunie,	Herbert,	Pickler,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cobb,	Hooker,	Pierce,	Whiting,
Coleman,	Hopkins,	Pugsley,	Whithorne,
Cooper, Ohio	Kelley,	Quackenbush,	Wickham,
Cothran,	Kerr, Pa.	Randall,	Willcox,
Covert,	Kilgore,	Reyburn,	Wilson, Ky.
Cowles,	Knapp,	Rife,	Wright,
Craig,	Lansing,	Robertson,	Yoder.
Crain,	Laws,	Rockwell,	

So the motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.
The following pairs were announced from the Clerk's desk:
Until further notice:
Mr. EWAET with Mr. STUMP.
Mr. VAN SCHAICK with Mr. PARRETT.
Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. COTHRAN.
Mr. ARNOLD with Mr. MAGNER.
Mr. SCRANTON with Mr. STAHLNECKER.
Mr. PETERS with Mr. MANSUR.
Mr. GROUT with Mr. FITCH.
Mr. COOPER, of Ohio, with Mr. MAISH.
Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. HERBERT.
Mr. RANDALL with Mr. SPINOLA.
Mr. THOMAS M. BROWNE with Mr. WASHINGTON.
Mr. BAKER with Mr. ELLIOTT.
Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts, with Mr. STEWART, of Georgia.
Mr. DE HAVEN with Mr. BIGGS.
Mr. WILSON, of Kentucky, with Mr. PERRY.
Mr. SPOONER with Mr. DARGAN.
Mr. MCKENNA with Mr. CLUNIE.
Mr. TAYLOR, of Tennessee, with Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana.
Mr. BELDEN with Mr. FLOWER.
Mr. FRANK with Mr. DICKERSON.
Mr. DE LANO with Mr. DUNPHY.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. RUSK.
Mr. STEPHENSON with Mr. DAVIDSON.
Mr. LIND with Mr. PIERCE.
Mr. NUTE with Mr. BARNES.
Mr. STEWART, of Vermont, with Mr. BLANCHARD.
Mr. PERKINS with Mr. KILGORE.
Mr. SMYSER with Mr. SENEY.
Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CANDLER, of Georgia.
Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. GEISSENHAINER.
Mr. ATKINSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. ALDERSON.
Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, except the Atkinson railroad bill.
Mr. MILLIKEN with Mr. ABBOTT. Mr. MILLIKEN reserves the right to vote to make a quorum and the right to vote on the original-package bill.
Mr. BECKWITH with Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. CULBERTSON, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. VAUX.
Mr. HARMER with Mr. LEE.
Mr. BELKNAP with Mr. ANDERSON, of Mississippi.
Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan, with Mr. COBB.
Mr. BOWDEN with Mr. MCCARTHY.
Mr. BROWNE, of Virginia, with Mr. LESTER, of Virginia.
Mr. MCCOMAS with Mr. GIBSON.
Mr. MORROW with Mr. WHITHORNE.
Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR with Mr. YODER.

Mr. LAIDLAW with Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi.
 Mr. BREWER with Mr. HOOKER.
 Mr. GIFFORD with Mr. HARE.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. MCADOO.
 Mr. TUCKER with Mr. GREENHALGE.
 Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. WILEY.
 Mr. COLEMAN with Mr. MARTIN, of Texas.
 Mr. BERGEN with Mr. HEMPHILL.
 Mr. MILES with Mr. KERR, of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SNIDER with Mr. BOATNER.
 Mr. CLARK, of Wisconsin, with Mr. COWLES.
 Mr. CRAIG with Mr. OUTHWAITE.
 Mr. LODGE with Mr. ANDREW.
 Mr. PAYNE with Mr. BUCHANAN, of Virginia.
 Mr. SMITH, of West Virginia, with Mr. BULLOCK.
 Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado, with Mr. ENLOE.
 Mr. REYBURN with Mr. TRACEY.
 Mr. CUTCHEON with Mr. MUTCHLER, on all political questions, for this day.
 Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. SHIVELY, on this vote.
 Mr. STIVERS with Mr. COVERT, on all political questions, until Friday next.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ALIEN LAND-OWNERS.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes. The Clerk will state the pending question.
 Mr. CARTER. In the absence of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], who is particularly interested in the pending bill, I would ask that it be passed without prejudice. [Cries of "Regular order!"]
 Mr. SPRINGER. What do I understand is the order of business?
 Mr. CARTER. The bill pending at the close of the last morning hour was the bill introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], having in view the repeal of the alien land law in so far as that law applies to the ownership of land in the Territories.
 Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. What is the bill before the House? It seems to me that the question should be stated.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Montana [Mr. CARTER] give the number of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. The question should be stated before debate begins. We ought to have the bill read.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been read once and has been partly debated.

Mr. SPRINGER. When was that done?

The SPEAKER. During the last morning hour.

Mr. SPRINGER. It has been so long since we had a morning hour that I had forgotten about it.

The SPEAKER. It has been quite a long while. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Therefore I call for the reading of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. I have sent for a copy of the bill. Mr. Speaker, on the 31st of July, 1886—

Mr. SPRINGER. What date does the gentleman state?

Mr. CARTER. On July 31, 1886—

Mr. SPRINGER. Was that the last time we had a morning hour? [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman was in the House at that time, and I presume he is the best witness on that subject.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from Montana permit me to suggest that the gentleman from Illinois has been absent so much of late that his inquiry is excusable? [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. On the 31st of July, 1886, the bill relating to alien land-owners in the Territories passed the House. It was sweeping in its terms. Only ten minutes were allowed for debate. The bill as it passed the House read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no non-resident, alien, or foreigner, nor any—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4654) to amend chapter 340, United States Statutes at Large, volume 24, Forty-ninth Congress, and to promote and encourage mining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana will proceed.

Mr. CARTER. The bill sought here to be amended is not the bill which was originally passed by this House. The House bill was very hastily passed, after very slight consideration, and was thereafter amended in the Senate. The reading of the report followed the reading of the bill, and this report constituted the principal basis upon which the House acted at that time.

Mr. Speaker, July 31, 1886, the bill relating to alien land-holders in the Territories passed the House. It was sweeping and illiberal in its terms. Only ten minutes were allowed for debate. The bill as passed read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no non-resident, alien, or foreigner, nor any resident, alien, or foreigner who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, nor any corporation or association, where at most one-tenth of its stock or right of property is owned or controlled by aliens or foreigners, shall acquire or own, hold, or possess, by right, title, or descent accruing here-

after any real estate in any of the Territories of the United States: *Provided,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the real estate necessary for the construction and operation of any railroad.

The reading of the report followed the reading of the bill, and from that source we secure all obtainable light on the motives which actuated the House in passing it. A careful perusal of that report, which will be found extended at large in the RECORD (volume 82, page 7830), discloses solicitude for the preservation of the agricultural lands of the Territories for citizens of the United States. Agricultural lands are expressly mentioned as the portion of the public domain sought to be protected by Congress from alien ownership. Every argument advanced in favor of the bill was clearly and distinctly applicable to farming lands alone. Even to extend the logic of the report to grazing and timber lands would be forced construction.

Beyond agricultural, timber, and grazing lands it is clearly evident the committee had not explored in seeking to determine the possible effects of the measure. With justifiable earnestness the committee emphasized the duty of the Government to its people in preventing the acquisition of title to large tracts of farming lands by alien land-lords. To the end that the danger in this direction might not be underestimated the report specifically points out certain alien individuals and corporations as alleged owners of tracts of land in this country, varying in extent from 5,000 to 3,000,000 acres, and aggregating over 20,000,000 acres in all. To this is added a supplemental statement to the effect that smaller holdings not specifically enumerated would, if considered, make the grand aggregate sum up over 30,000,000 acres.

In passing, I may cite as a somewhat strange and not wholly insignificant fact that the report does not show that one acre of land in any Territory was held by any alien or foreign corporation, except as to one land grant held by the Holland Company in New Mexico. The alien holdings, as far as the report shows, were in Texas, Florida, Mississippi, Arkansas, Kansas, Wisconsin, and West Virginia. To these and other States the bill was not made to apply. It seemed entirely agreeable to pass a law prohibiting the investment of foreign capital everywhere except in the districts of the voting members. This probably accounts for the limited attention given the bill at the time it passed.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] offered an amendment when the bill was under consideration, extending its operations to the States, which amendment was very promptly voted down. But with the wisdom of the bill or the general limitations to its operations as to the property it was intended to control, we are not concerned at this time. I believe, as applied to agricultural, grazing, and timber lands, it was a wise law when amended by the Senate and finally enacted, but I insist that mines of gold, silver, lead, tin, cinnabar, or copper were not in contemplation at the time the law was passed, and this view the report clearly and unmistakably sustains.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CARTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. OATES. I understand from a member of the Committee on Rules, to which I sent a resolution some time ago, that they are in favor of fixing a date for the consideration of a bill which is now upon the Calendar, reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, to regulate this matter, or, rather, to prohibit the holding and owning of land by aliens in the United States. It is not an absolute prohibition, but rather a regulation of that matter. Would it not be better to postpone this, as we hope to have the other measure considered at an early day, and then consider the whole question together?

Mr. CARTER. I am not satisfied that a postponement of this matter would be at all wise, for the reason that in the consideration of the bill to which the gentleman refers I am satisfied that the question of excluding mining property in the States from its operation will be duly considered when that bill comes up. As I understand the gentleman's proposition, it is not to repeal or modify or in any manner to dispose of existing law, but to extend its operation.

Mr. OATES. One other question.

Mr. CARTER. Permit me. In the pending bill we did not interfere with the existing law in so far as it relates to agricultural lands, timber lands, or any lands that could, under existing law, be acquired in broad areas; but we do insist that foreign capital should not be discouraged or prohibited from seeking investment in the precarious industry of developing mines in this country, and that objection would obtain against the bill introduced by the gentleman as well as to existing law?

Mr. OATES. The bill, as I understand it, is to allow foreigners, aliens, to invest their money in mines and mining operations.

Mr. CARTER. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. OATES. Is not the evil of which you complain the fact that the law against aliens is held to operate only in the Territories, and not in the States, and that thereby it discriminates against the mining industries of the Territories? Is not the purpose of your bill to prevent that discrimination?

Mr. CARTER. That is the objection we have to it—that it discriminates against the mining industries of the Territories.

Mr. OATES. If there was a general law extending to the States as well as to the Territories, would not that to a great extent relieve the evil of which you complain, if it be an evil?

Mr. CARTER. Inasmuch as the bill proposed by the gentleman, the consideration of which is contemplated in the near future, does not amend this defect in the existing law which we here seek to remedy, we can not comprehend how deterring the present consideration of this bill will in any way tend to remedy the defects, since his proposed bill does not reach them, and therefore we prefer to have a vote upon this bill.

Mr. OATES. It would be open to amendment and the whole question would be open to the House.

Mr. CARTER. We present this bill on its merits.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Before the gentleman resumes the thread of his argument I desire to ask him a question. From his opening sentences, I understand him to favor the repeal of the law so far as it applies to mining property. Would not the effect of such a repeal be to make it possible for English capital, you may say, or foreign capital, to own every lead mine in the United States or any other character of mine?

Mr. CARTER. In reply to that, I will suggest that for a century prior to the enactment of this law the privilege stood wide open to foreigners to invest. The history of that century shows that the financial results were not commensurate with the investments made by foreigners in that class of mining property.

Mr. HAUGEN. The property will always be subject to legislation here, anyhow.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. That would be the effect of it. Such a state of affairs could exist if the bill were passed that you are now advocating.

Mr. CARTER. Such a state of affairs would have existed if the commercial conditions were favorable prior to the passage of the law of 1886.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. There is an English lead syndicate, the gentleman knows, and if this bill were passed would it not be possible for them to buy up every lead mine in the United States?

Mr. CARTER. If they were willing to pay all the mines are worth, I presume it would be possible.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. And to close them up.

Mr. CARTER. Not necessarily; that is commercially impracticable.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. But it is possible, is it not?

Mr. CARTER. It is commercially impossible, that is all.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. But under this law is it not legally possible?

Mr. CARTER. Under this proposition it would be rendered possible if men from everywhere having capital to invest in the precarious work of developing mines in the country with their capital should choose to do so. That is all.

Mr. HAUGEN. English capital is now buying up the milling interests and the breweries.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; but they are not securing all the mines, even in the States.

Mr. OATES. I understand the gentleman to contend that the existing law applies to the State of Montana.

Mr. CARTER. It does not apply. The purpose of the committee is to relieve the struggling Territories which have not yet been admitted to the Union from the incubus of this law and its unjust discrimination.

Mr. OATES. The law ceased to operate in Montana as soon as it was admitted into the Union.

Mr. CARTER. That is true of every State admitted.

The history of the bill and proceedings in the Senate and House, subsequent to its passage, leaves no room to doubt that mines such as the pending bill proposes to exempt from its operation were not taken into consideration when the law was passed, and that if the subject had been considered the desired exemption would have been made in the act itself.

The original act was approved March 3, 1887, and on the same day Congress adjourned *sine die*. During the first session of the next, the Fiftieth Congress, no less than seventeen bills were introduced in the two Houses of Congress looking to the amendment, repeal, or modification of the law.

Senate bill 1176 was fully discussed and passed by that body early in the first session of the Fiftieth Congress. It was almost identical with the pending bill. The fact that the bill passed the Senate would in itself ordinarily constitute sufficient evidence of the intent of that body at the earliest date possible to remedy the defect in the law which had been passed the last day of the preceding session. But in order to emphasize the theory that it was not originally intended to prohibit the investment of foreign capital in the development of American mines, it is but necessary to cite the language of the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS] in commenting on this bill, introduced to amend the law in substance as we propose to amend it here to-day. Mr. EVARTS had participated in the passage of the original alien act, and in favoring the passage of a bill to amend it so as to exempt mining properties, he said:

Mr. President, I have no amendment to propose; but as to the situation now before the Senate in regard to the bill itself, I have this to say, that in my judg-

ment the whole subject of the encouragement or toleration of investments by foreigners in mining operations is a subject entirely apart and remote from the question of allowing the ownership of soil by foreigners here. Whatever may be the proper policy in regard to either of these heads, they do not fall within the same considerations or the same motives that should lead to the adoption of the one or of the other.

The bill which passed and became a law last year was intended to prevent foreigners from becoming owners of real estate in this country; and the principal interest at which this legislation was aimed was in regard to the breadth of agricultural ownership, for but little interest, I think, was ever felt in the question whether a foreigner should or should not be the owner of a house and lot or of a store and lot in one of the cities within the Territories where he was either to pursue his trade or to house his family.

With this legislation as covered by this intent and interest of excluding foreigners from becoming owners of our soil, it does not seem to me that the matter now in hand was ever purposely included within that legislation; and as the whole project now is to extricate ourselves from that unintended entanglement, I can see no reason for insisting upon it in its present place in that legislation unless by itself as a new matter of legislation we should think it was desirable and valuable to our policy and our citizens.

I think the matter of foreign capital and foreign owners of that capital being introduced into the development of mines and bringing out from the earth in its rocky beds commodity of service in trade and human use belongs really not to a question of real estate and of foreign participation in the ownership of the soil of a country, but falls within the head of trade, and nothing but trade.

We all know that there is no considerable area of land involved in any of these mines—I think I am right in saying in all of them put together in these Territories or in the States themselves. They have not to do with the ownership and partition and distribution and sale of the soil of the country. It is nothing but an adventure in the nature of trade by capital and skill producing valuable results. That foreigners come here has no more to do with their becoming owners of our land than if we ourselves in the Eastern States put in capital of that kind in developing the mines in the Territories or in the Western States. Whatever it be, it is not inveighed against at all if exercised on the part of our citizens, I will agree; and it is the same operation for foreigners as it is for Eastern capitalists. They go there to aid in developing the industry and the wealth and the filling up of the population of the new Territories and of the Western States; that is what the foreigners do, and that is all they do, and they do not enter into an exclusion of agriculture or a wide occupation of it by any of our citizens.

Neither is this ownership permanent. Being directed, as I have said, to the sole purpose of developing this industry, this investment and all share and participation by foreigners disappear when the mine is exhausted. All agree that the land, the *pedis possessio* for the purpose of carrying on this mere trading operation, the development of local interest, is all obliterated the moment the mine is exhausted; nobody remains the owner of it or cares further what is the possession or *pedis possessio* of the land. When your own States, holding the same position to developing their industries, filling up their population, enriching their communities, adopt, encourage, and invite from foreigners a complete enjoyment, and so a complete and full enterprise and action within the State, am I not right in saying that in the Western Territories, where mines are to be developed and where there is much jealousy that agricultural land shall not be opened to monopoly by foreigners, we should allow them to encourage absolutely as their policy this acceptance and hospitality of foreign capital in developing their local interests?

I believe I am right in saying that every State having the same relation to mining that the Territories have and that the United States has towards them in governing them well, as a State policy invites and desires a full development of these interests by capital from foreigners. Why is it, then, that the United States, under a fancied analogy, should be a meaner nursing mother of these local interests than the State governments are within their territory and dominion over the same subject? Why is it that in this period of nascent growth of the Territories this or that interest of the United States should step in and chill, and check, and thwart, and denounce a local industry upon some mere wide and general theory of uniformity with regard to aversion to foreigners owning lands here?

This clear and forcible statement of the case but truthfully narrates the history of the bill. It was not intended that the mining interests in the Territories should be discouraged by prohibiting capital wherever found from being encouraged to invest in the development of the mines and employment of labor, the building of roads, the payment of taxes, and the general increase of Territorial wealth. As I have heretofore stated, the fact that Mr. EVARTS gave full expression of the views of a majority in the Senate is borne out by the fact that the bill he then advocated passed that body and was thereafter referred to the Committee of Public Lands in this House.

That committee after deliberation made a favorable report, and that report, emanating from the identical committee which had recommended the passage of the original law at the preceding session of Congress, bears additional testimony as to the accuracy of the position here taken, that the original bill was intended to apply exclusively to agricultural lands. Indeed, the report of the Public Lands Committee, presented in this House by Mr. HERMANN, constituted in itself a powerful argument in favor of the then pending bill and equally applicable to the bill now under consideration. I quote from the report (No. 3014, first session Fiftieth Congress):

An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the report of the committee to whom was referred the bill passed by the Forty-ninth Congress, which said bill is sought to be amended by the bill H. R. 1937, shows that the reasons leading to the passage of what is known as the alien land act were based upon the fact that large areas of agricultural lands were being purchased and held by aliens, to the great detriment of the bona fide settlers and against the interests of the American citizen.

The reasons leading to this wise legislation regarding agricultural lands can not apply to the mineral lands named in the accompanying bill, for the following reasons:

1. Under existing laws no mining claim can exceed in dimensions a parallelogram 1,500 feet long by 600 feet wide.
2. No claim can be located or any title thereto acquired until the discovery of a vein or lode of rock in place bearing some one of the metals named in this bill.
3. Such veins are usually found at great distances from each other, and no considerable holding of the public lands can be had under the existing mining laws.
4. Mineral is usually found in land absolutely worthless for any other than mining purposes, and it is uniformly true that such lands (differing in this re-

spect from agricultural lands) do not enhance in value by lapse of time, but are worthless after the mineral in them has been exhausted.

5. The act amended by the present bill is unjust and discriminates against the residents of the Territories by denying to them rights and privileges freely enjoyed by the residents of neighboring and adjoining States.

The committee can see no reason for this discrimination. The locators and owners of these mining claims are usually poor men, who only seek a foreign market when no money can be obtained at home; and the question of obtaining capital abroad has often been of vital importance where the owner of such claim is in debt for preliminary work on his property, and if he fail to acquire capital from some source his property must be abandoned, his workmen thrown out of employment, and he, if not ruined, must lose the labor of years.

Under the present law he can not mortgage his mining claim to any foreign corporation or person, and is left to the mercy of the American corporation, which will probably refuse to lend, in order to purchase at an outrageously inadequate price. The individual miner in a Territory should be accorded the same rights and privileges which persons and corporations in the States freely enjoy. He should have the right to go abroad, as United States railroad companies and other corporations do, to the cheapest money market, and by so doing manage to retain a larger interest in the property that has cost him years of toil.

Owing to depressed trade, or to greater attractions of other enterprises less hazardous in their nature, periods frequently occur, of years' duration, when it is impossible to get money in any part of the United States for new mining enterprises, and during such period there is much curtailment of labor and much sacrifice of the laborers' interest if the needy owner be refused the right to appeal to capital wherever it can be found. Capital in the United States commands now, and will for years command, a rate of interest on safe security too high to induce its generous outlay in hazardous mining enterprises.

It is not generally known that to develop a limited portion of one lode—to provide the necessary timbers, hoisting works, reduction works, pumps, horses, tools, etc.—requires from \$250,000 to a sum aggregating millions, as in the case of the Anaconda mine in Montana, the Clifton mine in Arizona, and various others that have been called to the attention of the committee.

Discarding all unprofitable purchases by foreign capital, and considering only the most profitable purchases made by it, we find that at least nine-tenths of the money extracted from the mine is employed in the payment of wages, purchase of machinery, stores, and supplies, all of which goes to the American laborer, manufacturer, and farmer.

Since the passage of the alien act English capital for investment in mines has been driven from our country into Mexico, the British colonies, and South Africa, to the great detriment of the American manufacturer and laborer.

The law as it existed before the passage of the alien land act was well guarded against monopolies of mines. In fact, physical conditions prevent such possibility. Former legislation in regard to mines was satisfactory. Under such laws foreigners could only acquire mines after the American citizen had acquired title from the Government by issuance of patent. There was then no provision against purchase by an alien. There was no grievance in that respect, but, on the contrary, the law was beneficial to the mining Territories. There was grievance against the acquisition of any large tracts of agricultural lands in the Territories by foreigners.

Mr. PAYSON. I will say to the gentleman that that was not a unanimous report. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and myself both opposed it in committee and on the floor of the House.

Mr. CARTER. There being no minority report, I took it for granted that the report was unanimous.

Mr. PAYSON. We did not present any written statement of the views of the minority.

Mr. CARTER. Very well; I am governed by the record.

Later in the session, this bill was offered for consideration by Mr. HERMANN, on the report, a portion of which I have read, and the RECORD (volume 19, page 6758 of the Fiftieth Congress) indicates most clearly that no objection existed to the passage of the bill. When recognition was accorded Mr. HERMANN, it appeared that under the peculiar conditions existing at the time one minute remained for the consideration of the measure, and on suggestion of Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama, that the bill could not be passed within one minute, the House adjourned, under a special rule, until 11 o'clock the following day.

During the same session of Congress, on House bill 1937, Mr. O'FERRALL, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, in Report No. 703, recommended the passage of a bill identical with the one here presented, in language equally strong and emphatic. Mr. O'FERRALL concludes his able report in the following language:

The amendment sought in the present bill simply places a citizen of a Territory on an equal footing with a citizen of a State. The above report may be summarized as follows:

1. Employment of foreign capital in mines has not led, and can not lead, to any permanent holding of real estate by foreigners.
2. The mining area occupied by foreigners is very small and can never be larger.
3. That foreign capital has assisted the poor mine-owners at times, when but for such assistance the mines would have ceased operation and labor been thrown out of employment.
4. That its investment has given employment to many laborers at large prices and has proved beneficial to both the American laborer and manufacturer.
5. Foreign capital thus employed develops measurably the mining resources of our country, furnishes employment to many American laborers and the maintenance of many needy families.

For the reasons above stated your committee report the bill favorably and recommend that it do pass, with the following amendment: Strike out the words "mining claims," in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the words "of gold, silver, lead, tin, cinnabar, and copper."

From these unanimous expressions in both the Senate and the House, given by three distinct committees at the next Congress immediately following the passage of the law we seek to amend, it is manifest beyond question or doubt that the Representatives and Senators who participated in the passage of the law clearly conceded that its operation was never intended to apply to the class of mining properties specified in the pending bill, but upon the contrary that the operations of the measure as passed were understood to apply to the ownership of agricultural lands and to that class of lands exclusively; and when it was found that the measure had broader application than was contemplated

at the time of its passage and that such breadth of application worked hardship and injustice upon a large and worthy class of American citizens, efforts were speedily made, as the reports indicate, in both branches of Congress, to remedy the evil which had been inflicted. The failure of the repealing bill to receive consideration in the House during the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, led the Senate at the second session of that Congress to pass the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining be instructed to ascertain and report to the Senate at the beginning of the next session of Congress the number of aliens, foreign companies and corporations owning or working mines in the Territories of the United States, together with the length of time they have been so engaged, the amount of capital invested by them in mining operations, as near as practicable, the amount of dividends paid, and the amount of money expended by them in such mining operations, and what effect the owning and operating of mines by aliens, foreign companies and corporations has had upon the growth and prosperity of the Territories; and for that purpose the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may hold its sessions at such times and places as it may deem proper, and employ such clerical assistance as may be necessary. The expense of such investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

In obedience to this resolution the Committee on Mines and Mining caused an investigation to be made in all the Territories of the United States for the purpose of collecting the information required. A competent and trustworthy man visited all the Territories, except Alaska, and obtained as accurate information in regard to the subjects of inquiry as could possibly be collected. His report is full and exhaustive, and concludes with the following statement of fact found on pages 6 and 7 of Report No. 2690, second session, Fiftieth Congress:

Many a now prosperous mining camp would still be a wilderness had it not been for foreign capital. As large capital is required in the development of mines, foreign capital is sought for because it is cheaper, more plentiful, and more available than home capital. I found the universal sentiment throughout the Territories to be against the present alien land law so far as it applies to mines, and without exception everybody favors its speedy repeal in this respect, which action would be hailed by the people of the Territories with delight.

The railroads throughout the Territories assert that 75 per cent. of their freight comes from the mines, and that since March, 1887, when the alien land law went into effect, they have experienced some loss in their carrying trade.

The restriction of 20 per cent. ownership has induced aliens to sell out their interests, to the great detriment of the Territories, and with the proceeds thus realized they have invested largely in mines in the States, where no discrimination is made against aliens. Foreign capital has not only aided in developing the mines, but roadways have been built with money contributed by aliens, thus improving in a general way the surrounding country. The sale of mining machinery in some places in the Territories has declined since the alien land act was passed.

With the repeal of the restriction in this act in regard to the holding of mines by aliens, thousands of people would find profitable employment where now only hundreds are benefited. In the operating of mines of ever so much richness by far the larger part of the earnings is retained in this country. Prior to the passage of the alien land act large smelting works were erected by the aid of foreign capital, but owing to the present restrictions several of these smelters are now idle.

The progress of the Territories has been materially checked by the restriction of the use of foreign capital. A large number of enterprises have been abandoned and several mining camps ruined.

The employment of foreign capital in the mines has not led, and can not lead, to any large holding of real estate by foreigners, because a mining claim is limited in area by law, a single claim being only 1,500 feet in length by 600 feet in width, and besides the veins or lodes are usually found at great distances from each other. All mines require an extensive outlay at the start, hence large capital is absolutely necessary to develop the same, and as the risks are great foreign capital should be allowed to flow freely into the mining enterprises in the Territories.

Thus, sir, we have the concurrent testimony of three committees of this House, two committees of the Senate, a special investigation, and the passage of the desired amendment through the Senate, all in favor of the passage of the pending bill.

Taking all this concurrent testimony into account and giving due consideration to the economic questions and the principles of national policy involved, we must confess that through inadvertence a mistake has been made, and that duty commands us to correct it.

I think no reasonable man can resist the conclusion that the bill we seek to amend was not intended to apply to the character of property mentioned in the pending bill, and I am satisfied that a further investigation of the question will lead to the further conclusion that a great wrong was perpetrated upon the miners of the Territories in extending the operations of a measure which could in no sense prove beneficial to them, and has, as a matter of fact, proven a very serious detriment.

The very arguments used by the committee in favor of the passage of the alien bill, and those arguments were able, favoring the application of the law to agricultural lands, may be justly used to support our proposed amendment. Permanent homes for American citizens can, as the report suggests, be secured on our agricultural lands. On the contrary, only a temporary home can be found on a mining claim, and no home at all can be sustained there unless by a large investment of capital in development and machinery.

The report declares that "the question as to how cheap homes for the poor can best be secured will soon be upon us." I call your attention to the fact that the question as to how to furnish honest laborers with steady employment at just compensation is not soon to be, but it actually is upon us. Shall we allow petty provincial prejudice to limit the avenues wherein labor may be profitably employed in this country?

The original report declares that agricultural lands are becoming more valuable year by year, and that, "tempted by the promise sure to be realized of immense profits as well as the absolute security of the in-

vestment, these lands, by devious methods in many cases, have been secured in great areas and holdings by capitalists and corporations, foreign as well as domestic." If the committee had intended to make that sentence apply to mining property, intelligent amendment would make it read: "Tempted by the promise of immense profits, rarely ever realized, as well as the absolute uncertainty of the investment, these mines are secured for hard cash by capitalists and corporations, foreign as well as domestic, and never can be secured in large areas."

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to go over the report of July 31, 1886, on which the bill was passed. I assert that every reason assigned by the report of the committee for the passage of the bill is contradicted by the plain facts, when the attempt is made to torture the report into a defense of the opposition to our proposed amendment of that bill. Gentlemen who have given thoughtful consideration to the character and history of our mines and the economic questions involved in the permanent settlement of our agricultural regions can not hesitate in drawing a distinction to admit the policy of prohibiting alien holdings in agricultural districts, while at the same time inviting cheap capital from anywhere and everywhere to invest in the temporary and hazardous business of developing the mines and furnishing employment to people who would otherwise be crowded into other avenues of labor to compete with and to cheapen the rewards of toil.

No abuse has ever arisen in the mining Territories to justify the restrictions placed upon the miners by this law. The most profitable mining ever done on this continent was conducted in California, Idaho, Nevada, Colorado, and Montana, before the passage of any law by Congress providing for the sale or ownership of gold, silver, or any of the mines referred to in the pending bill. The miners convened in orderly gatherings and enacted rules and regulations so just, wise, and appropriate that in 1866 Congress accepted the prevailing miners' rules as the basis of the mining code of the country. That code, with slight modifications, has continued as the law to this day and is rated the world over as in principle the best system yet devised to encourage the development of mineral resources. This magnificent statute is but the crystallized wisdom and experience of the Western miners as expressed in their primitive councils and courts.

This system of law devised by the pioneer miners in the rugged mountain glens of the West has challenged the admiration of statesmen and jurists on two continents. The law gives the exclusive right to citizens, or those who have declared their intention to become such, to explore the public domain for hidden treasure and to locate, when found, placer deposits not exceeding 20 acres, or lode claims not exceeding 1,500 feet in length along the vein or lode, with surface ground 600 feet in width.

Title can not pass from the Government to the claimant until he has performed at least \$500 worth of work, and valid title can not vest in an alien until the Government has issued letters patent to the claim. When this patent issues the mine is the well earned property of the individual. What has it cost him? In the majority of cases you can never know.

If you would comprehend even in a remote degree the serious import of this question you must follow the stout-hearted and hopeful man, who, leaving anxious and tender ones behind, goes forth to prospect and labor alone for days and weeks, perchance for months and years, on the bleak and storm-swept mountain side in quest of nature's well concealed prize. Often sick at heart and sorely disappointed, he gives up the chase and returns to the home he left, there to start life anew in some other direction. Sometimes hope unfulfilled goes out with life in the miner's camp, far from home and its reassuring love; but with the pathetic we can not dwell now. Once in a hundred cases a promising lead is discovered. By working for wages a month the discoverer supports himself with plain food for the few months succeeding, and thus continues to work until the necessary labor has been performed to entitle him to patent. He often borrows the money to pay survey and Government fees, and in course of time secures a patent.

Now, his years of labor are bound up in that patented mine. What has he secured? Not a fortune, but a fair chance to secure a competency, if the law will permit him to sell that which he has become the owner of. He can not eat the ore; he can not raise wheat or vegetables on the claim, which is likely to have its rock-bound surface covered with snow for nine months in the year. He has not the capital to develop the property and put it on a profit-paying basis. He has merely found a place where the investment of from fifty to two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in labor and machinery on a very limited area, on a mountain side or summit, may result in profit to the investor. It is not by any means certain that the original investment will ever be returned, but the prospect may be tempting. The miner has years of ceaseless effort, of unremitting toil, bound up in the claim. To be permitted to sell to the best possible advantage is the privilege he asks.

The purchaser can not acquire a permanent holding, because every pound of ore taken out brings him that much nearer the end of the pay streak, and when that is exhausted the property is valueless. Be the purchaser domestic or alien, home labor must be, always has been, always will be employed in building the machinery, sinking the shafts,

running the drifts, hoisting the ore, and running the mill or smelter. At this point the law of which we complain says, the miner who has become the owner of a mine which he must sell to realize anything out of it must enter a limited market, where rates of interest are ordinarily so high that capital is with reluctance induced to embark in any enterprise attended with hazard. What is the result? The mining industry in the Territories languishes because of inadequate capital.

Greater still is the injury to the individual miners who are compelled to offer their hard-earned mining properties on the market. Should one of these struggling prospectors write to the generous gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], saying: "I have been working hard on a lead in Arizona for ten years. There is a large amount of ore in sight, but it is low grade and will not stand transportation charges, and therefore works must be erected near the mine to reduce the output on a large scale. I am compelled to sell an interest in the property, because I am unable, single-handed, to build the works, and I want to realize a little ready money to educate my growing family. Will you invest a few dollars and induce a few of your wealthy friends to invest in this venture so as to help me out?"

The gentleman from Indiana would probably say that as a Congressman he had nothing to invest and that he could not advise his friends to go into any uncertain, wild-cat mining speculation. It would be well enough should he stop at that; but he goes beyond and says to the man: "You must not sell that property to any but an American citizen or a domestic corporation." In short, sir, this dog-in-the-manger policy gives the 2 per cent. a month American capitalist dominion over the struggling mine-owners of the Territories and forbids competition with them.

As applied to mines the law should be entitled "An act granting exclusive monopoly to domestic capitalists over the mining interests of the Territories." The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] were members of the Public Lands Committee, which, through the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN], reported so strongly in favor of a like amendment of this law. I leave them to explain their positions as best they can. As to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO], I must confess no little surprise. He is exceedingly anxious that the products of foreign labor should be allowed to freely compete in this country with the handiwork of our laboring citizens. He could look with perfect composure on the prospect of foreign labor and capital securing long-coveted profit at the expense of our own laboring poor, but he is not willing that American capital should be thrown into free competition with other capital in our Territories.

Nearly half a century of experience in mining gold, silver, cinnabar, lead, and copper in the Territories before this prohibition was placed on the miners fails to disclose any justification for the gentleman's position. He is fortified behind a vaporish, provincial sentiment and there seeks to defend injustice while vainly struggling to conceal inconsistency. The people of the Territories have petitioned, memorialized, and prayed for the passage of this amendment. They are American citizens, and while the colleague of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] has suggested the startling fact that a Territory is not a State, he must remember that the garb of American citizenship entitles a man to consideration anywhere and particularly in this House of Representatives. The debt this nation owes to its pioneers is second only to the debt it owes the citizen soldiers who preserved its unity.

The men who, at the peril of their lives, have planted the standard of civilization in the haunts of the savage should not be denied a hearing in this body; nor should they be made the victims of an unjust discrimination such as the existing law imposes. Who seeks to deny to these citizens of the Territories the sacred right of home rule? It is none other than the genial gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO]. He is the same gentleman who has so often on this floor vociferously announced himself in favor of home rule for Ireland. I do not doubt his sincerity on the Irish home-rule question, but if true to his position of hostility to citizens residing in our Territories he would be opposed to home rule if he were in the English Parliament. Those who know nothing and care less about the struggling miners and prospectors who are engaged in building up Territories in the West will oppose the amendment.

While opposing it, they must concede that where 5 per cent. profit on the money invested by foreigners returns across the water, 95 per cent. remains with the American laborer and manufacturer of mining machinery. To all argument the reply is made, let the mines remain undeveloped until American capital succeeds in the work. To the men who through toil and privation have laid bare the secrets of the mountains, you say "Stop! Wait until an American capitalist thinks proper to come to your aid. If, while waiting, death overtakes you, well and good. Your disappointment concerns not the older States. Generations unborn will reap what you have sown."

This cruel doctrine, which would repress individual effort by denying its rewards, can not be founded on sound policy or good morals. To the citizens of mining States, the law does not apply. Why discriminate against the equally worthy and intelligent citizens of the Territories? Let those who desire to give an undue advantage to American capital over the struggling, toiling citizens of the Territories

vote against the proposed amendment. Those who are opposed to robbing toil of its best obtainable rewards will support the committee.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was up some time ago I took occasion to animadvert on some features of it which I thought were hurtful, and which I thought constituted sufficient reasons why it should not be enacted into a law. I deem it proper, however, this morning, for the purpose of emphasis, to call attention to the law which it proposes to abrogate, and proposes to abrogate in its most valuable features. That law will be found on page 476, 24 Statutes at Large. It is entitled "An act to restrict ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens," etc.

The first section of the act prescribes that aliens shall not acquire lands in the Territories or in the District of Columbia. It also prescribes that no corporation one-twentieth of the stock of which is owned by foreigners shall acquire lands or interests in lands in the Territories or in the District of Columbia. It further prescribes that no corporation shall acquire more than 5,000 acres of land and that railroads and corporations of that kind shall be restricted in their holdings to the amount of land which is necessary for the purpose of carrying on their business.

This bill proposes that the foregoing restrictions—that is, the restriction on alien ownership by individuals, on alien ownership controlled by corporations, and on the capacity of corporations of any kind to take more than 5,000 acres—shall not apply to mines of gold, silver, lead, tin, cinnabar, or copper, or any mining interest therein. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it proposes to abolish all these restrictions, these safeguards which, in consonance with the spirit of the age and with the great demand of the people of this country, have been thrown around the public lands in the Territories and all land in this District. And it proposes not only to abolish these safeguards, but to abolish them in those particulars in which they are most important, to destroy their guardianship over our mines, over our precious and useful metals, and to lay those treasures open not only to alien ownership, but to the most unrestricted and, as experience has proved, the most oppressive corporate ownership.

If the original act was right the present bill is wrong. If at the time that act was passed (in the Forty-ninth Congress, I believe), there was a necessity for legislation of that kind, I think I may safely say that the history of the country since, the trend of events in this country since, demonstrates that that legislation is even more necessary now than it was then. I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that there is not a meeting of the Farmers' Alliance, there is not a meeting of Grangers, there is not a meeting of a labor organization from one end of this country to the other, from which a demand does not go forth, not for the repeal of this legislation, but for stricter legislation in the same direction. The demand literally is: "American lands for American homes;" and, in the same connection and in some respects paramount to that, is the demand that our own people shall govern the corporations which carry on business in the country.

I, sir, am in sympathy with the demand to make these laws more stringent. I have no hesitancy in saying that we have the constitutional power to forbid any alien owning an inch of American soil; that under the Constitution there can be no doubt that Congress may prohibit every alien from becoming a landed proprietor, not only in the Territories and in the District of Columbia, but in every State of the Union. I will not go into a lengthened argument on the subject, but I predicate this proposition upon sure and safe constitutional grounds, upon our control of our relations with foreigners, upon our responsibility to other nations for the treatment of foreigners here, upon our responsibility to the States themselves for the status and the conduct of foreigners in this country, upon the treaty-making power, upon the naturalization power, upon all the powers which are inherent in a nation which bears full international relations to other nations. I say I will not enter upon that subject at length. I simply state the position which I take in regard to it.

We are told, sir—and this bill is urged upon that ground—that this measure will be a great benefit to the mining Territories. Are gentlemen so sure of that? Is there any certainty that the policy foreshadowed by this bill will inure to the benefit of these Territories? Is it certain that it is to their true advantage, the true happiness and prosperity of their people, that we shall encourage the building up of gigantic corporations in their midst which will own the soil and control the sources of wealth, and, above all, gigantic corporations owned and controlled largely by foreigners, who owe no allegiance to our country and who have no interest in the welfare of our citizens?

Sir, there is such a thing as "making haste slowly;" and the true interest of the Territories as well as the true interest of the people of all the States is to prepare for the day when we may have a homogeneous people, a true American race, which shall be self-contained, self-governing, and self-equipped for all the purposes alike of political power and the transaction of business.

I can not dwell too strongly, however, upon the inopportune of this legislation. It comes at a time when from one end of the land to the other the cry is many voiced for more homes for the people. It comes at the very instant, as it were, when out of the 64,000,000 of

our people the great mass of them, so far as we may judge by the demand, are opposed to legislation of this kind. It can not be possible, Mr. Speaker, that all these millions of American people, the farmers and the workmen of this country, the more thoughtful and philanthropic of our people—I will go further and say the more patriotic of our people—can be mistaken about this.

It can not be possible that a new discovery has been made in the Territories on this subject. It can not be possible either—at least it ought not to be—that the necessities of a few men in the Territories, anxious for sudden wealth, anxious for the speculation which would follow the passage of this bill, should override this well ascertained, this decided opinion of the American people on this subject. That opinion is wholesome. It is truly American; it is patriotic, and it will ill become this House, Mr. Speaker, to repress it or to deny it by repealing the one act which, while it does not go far enough, is at least a step in the direction of that opinion.

I have called attention to the various provisions of the act to be repealed, so that the country and every member here may know exactly what this bill means. It means the undoing of this wholesome legislation. It means flying in the face of this wholesome public opinion. It means the setting back of the progress of sentiment and the progress of action upon this question of alien ownership of land and alien control (so far as the ownership of lands and the control of corporations may permit) of the affairs of this country. Corporations are part of the governing power. They act for the Government in a variety of matters. They own franchises and are very close to the people in the business of life.

Their owners ought to be in full sympathy with our wishes, and certainly subject to the evils which wrong policies impose on peoples. They ought to be so mixed in the general interests that self-protection shall make them patriotic. We can not expect this of foreign corporations. Yet the great argument in favor of the bill is that it will enable aliens to invest capital, own lands, and govern great corporations. Such a policy is wrong in the States and wrong in the Territories. It is wrong everywhere.

Mr. CANNON. I rise to make a privileged report.
The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. PAYSON). Sixty minutes have elapsed since the commencement of the morning hour, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CHIPMAN. I reserve the residue of my time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. I rise to a privileged question—to present a report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order. My point is that under the rules sixty minutes do not constitute the morning hour; that it does not expire by reason of the expiration of sixty minutes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The rule provides that the morning hour at the expiration of sixty minutes is liable to interruption by a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. But, besides that, the Chair is of opinion that it may be interrupted by a privileged question; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] states that he rises to present such a question, a report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The morning hour may be interrupted by a motion to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of an appropriation bill, but the other exception stated by the Chair is not given in the rules.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. But the gentleman will remember that there is another rule which provides that reports from the Committee on Rules shall always be privileged and in order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But not to the interruption of this business—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair disagrees with the gentleman; otherwise it would be impossible for a privileged report to get in so long as any gentleman claimed the floor on the business of the morning hour.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The point I make is that you can not take a gentleman off the floor in this way at the expiration of sixty minutes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks this report is in order. Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. You can not take a gentleman off this floor unless by virtue of some rule. Now the presentation of a privileged matter of business does not give to him who seeks to bring it in the right to interrupt the gentleman on the floor. But when there are persons seeking recognition then the Chair must recognize him who comes with a privileged motion. Now, the morning hour having run sixty minutes, the gentleman who has been occupying the floor can be interrupted in one way, that is by a motion to go into Committee of the Whole on an appropriation bill; but he can not be taken off the floor by a privileged matter except a conference report.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the position of the gentleman from Kentucky, but would call his attention to clause 51 of Rule XI, which provides that—

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on

the matters herein stated, namely, the Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

The gentleman from Illinois now presents such a report from the Committee on Rules. Of course the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHIPMAN], who was addressing the House in the morning hour, will be entitled to his time when this matter of business shall come up again in regular order, which will be in the next morning hour.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I should not have yielded under any circumstances for the gentleman from Illinois to take the floor if I had not understood that the morning hour was concluded.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is the judgment of the Chair, and the Chair so holds, that the report submitted by the gentleman from Illinois is in order.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I wish the record to show that I only yielded to the interruption on the understanding that the morning hour had expired.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the gentleman. His right to the remainder of his hour will not be prejudiced by this interruption. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for a report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will read.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom were referred the accompanying resolutions of July 23 and July 29, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to report the following resolution as a substitute therefor, with the recommendation that it do pass:

Resolved, That Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday, August 19, 20, 21, and 23, and Tuesday and Wednesday, August 26 and 27, after sixty minutes of the morning hour, be fixed for the consideration in the House, first, after the adoption of this order, of Senate bill 3714, the agricultural college aid bill, on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered after two hours; and that, after the disposition of said bill, on the remainder of said days the House shall proceed to the consideration of bills reported by the Committee on Agriculture: First, to the consideration of Senate bill 2594, inspection of meats for exportation, on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered after two hours; and that after the disposition of said bill the House proceed to the consideration of House bill 11568, defining lard, etc., on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered at 4 o'clock p. m., Saturday, August 23; and that on Tuesday, August 26, the House shall proceed to the consideration of House bill 5353, defining options, etc., on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered on Wednesday, August 27, at 3 o'clock p. m.; and that on August 20, 21, 23, 26, and 27 the House shall meet at 11 o'clock a. m.; said order to be subject to the consideration of general appropriation bills and conference reports thereon.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to have a vote by unanimous consent, and if not I will ask the previous question.

Mr. BLAND. Why not strike out meeting at 11 o'clock? There is no necessity for that.

Mr. DUNNELL. None whatever.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, there is a good deal of necessity if gentlemen will examine the scope of these orders. The morning hour is reserved each morning, not to be interfered with, and as that is the case—

Mr. BLOUNT. Before the debate proceeds you had better take the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. By unanimous consent I ask that the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I object. I think that there are so many things in that order we should vote down the previous question. We may want to make some changes in the order.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I understand that this order excludes all conference reports except on appropriation bills?

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that the order provides as follows—

Mr. DINGLEY. Let it be read again.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent that the order be again read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, it will be again read.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. FRANK. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRANK. Must this report be accepted or rejected as a whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It must, if the previous question shall be ordered by the House.

Mr. FRANK. And there is no way of obtaining a separate vote on the several distinct propositions it embraces?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair sees none.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Before the previous question is ordered I demand a division of the vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the judgment of the Chair that can only come after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That was my opinion, but the Speaker of the House decided exactly the reverse on a recent occasion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The present occupant of the chair is not familiar with the precedent, but is of the opinion that the division can only come after the previous question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The Chair has put it better than I did in the argument on the occasion to which I have referred; but the Speaker had the last say and decided that the words of the rule, that a demand for a division must be submitted "before the question is put," meant that the demand should be made before the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks that the language of the rule cited by the gentleman refers to the parliamentary status of the question, and not to the ordering of the previous question, which is incidental only to the main question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That was my opinion also, but I submit the question now because I do not want to prejudice the right to demand a division.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will hold that the demand can be submitted at a later stage.

The question now is on the demand for the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Before the question is submitted I want to make a statement by consent.

Mr. ADAMS. Before my colleague proceeds allow me to ask him a question? How many appropriation bills are there in conference?

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not want this debate, Mr. Speaker, to preclude the debate following the ordering of the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I hope not.

I will state to my friend from Illinois, in answer to his question, that the sundry civil bill is still in conference; a little later on, I suppose, the deficiency bill will be in conference; and there is also a bill in conference for additional force in the Pension Office.

Mr. SAYERS. What about the river and harbor bill?

Mr. CANNON. Not a general appropriation bill.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. To whom does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. CANNON. To neither just yet.

Mr. SAYERS. I only want to ask this question: Whether this rule cuts out the consideration of the river and harbor bill?

Mr. CANNON. It does.

Mr. McCOMAS. I desire to ask the gentleman to add a word—

Mr. CANNON. Well, I can not yield now. Will gentlemen have the kindness to allow me to make a statement?

Mr. McCOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed I think perhaps I can save a number of questions. Then I will answer all questions with the greatest of pleasure, provided they are pertinent.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I hope we may have order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois will suspend until order is restored. Gentlemen in the aisles will take their seats.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the last three months many gentlemen upon both sides of the House, especially the Committee on Agriculture, have been pressing for the reporting of an order similar to this which has now been reported. It has not been possible, in justice to the committees of the House, as was believed by many, to report this order until now.

The order provides that, in the event of its adoption, we shall proceed to consider first what is known as the agricultural aid bill, the bill that passed the Senate, sometimes known as the Morrill bill, which has been reported favorably from the Committee on Education to the House, and which provides for the aid with which gentlemen are familiar to the various agricultural colleges in the respective States. Gentlemen who desire this order (and I think that includes the majority on both sides so far as we could tell) thought that sixty minutes would probably be enough; but after full consultation the terms of the order were made to provide that the previous question shall be ordered upon that bill at the end of two hours; and, as I may say, anticipating a question from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], that would be the previous question upon the bill and amendments in parliamentary degree, as I understand it, and as was intended.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman pardon a moment's interruption? Will this order, if adopted, prevent the Committee on Rivers and Harbors from making a report on the Senate amendments to the river and harbor bill?

Mr. CANNON. I will come to that in a moment. The order provides that the remainder of these days, that is, commencing to-day, Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday next, and Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, shall be devoted to the Committee on Agriculture after the morning hour. The order provides for a morning hour each morning. The rule provides first for the consideration of the Senate bill known as the meat-inspection bill, a bill that is represented by the Committee on Agriculture as of very great importance, as affecting both our home and our foreign commerce in connection with meats and provisions. The previous question is ordered upon that bill, in the event that the order is adopted, after two hours.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before the gentleman goes any further I wish to interrupt him to make this suggestion. The debate under the rule after the previous question is ordered, is twenty minutes on either side, unless there has been debate preceding that.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I do not desire to make any point about that.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman will understand that all I desire is to reserve equality in debate.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This is a proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then I hope that there will be, as a part of that unanimous consent, an understanding that there shall be equality in the time allotted for debate before as well as after the ordering of the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. I have not yet moved the previous question. I have the power to do it, but I have no desire to cut off the debate.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But the gentleman from Illinois did move the previous question.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let us have some understanding about the division of time.

Mr. CANNON. I am perfectly willing that there shall be twenty minutes on a side under the rules.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not understand the rule as the gentleman does. He is debating this question now and occupying time, and we ought to be allowed to occupy an equal amount of time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to state that the parliamentary condition is this: The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] demanded the previous question. The question was stated by the Chair. Pending the putting of the question the gentleman from Illinois desired permission to make a statement. The Chair stated that this proceeding is by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] made the suggestion that if these observations should proceed they ought not to interfere with the debate allowed under the rule, and the Chair stated that right would be reserved. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is proceeding by unanimous consent pending the statement by the Chair to the House of the demand for the previous question.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the debate to go on by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; then I will withdraw the demand for the previous question; and I suppose now I have the floor.

Mr. CRAIN. Before the gentleman from Illinois takes his seat I wish he would answer the question that I propounded.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The demand for the previous question is withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if I can be permitted, I will complete my statement in a moment with reference to this matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us understand before the gentleman proceeds as to the division of time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if I have the floor I will hold it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order. It is too late for the gentleman to withdraw the demand for the previous question. He having demanded the previous question, and then by an understanding with the House having gone on and made an agreement that the debate should not be cut off—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the rule provides that the demand for the previous question may be withdrawn before it is acted upon.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Ah, but the point I make is that it was acted upon to this extent, that an agreement was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the debate which should occur after the previous question should not be interfered with by this preliminary debate, and therefore the gentleman can not withdraw the demand for the previous question and cut off that subsequent debate without the unanimous consent of the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman may withdraw his demand for the previous question, and that has been done. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. I want to know what the rights of the minority are as to debate, as to the division of time, the demand for the previous question being withdrawn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will hold that the situation is that the matter may be debated until the previous question is moved—if it shall be moved; the Chair is not advised that it will be—and until it is moved of course the ordinary parliamentary situation would control. Debate would run until either the previous question was moved and ordered by the House or until debate should be exhausted with reference to it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that either before or after the previous question, as he chooses, the same time for debate shall be given to that side as I shall consume, either by my yielding to him such time as I may myself give him out of my hour, or by unanimous consent after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman proposes to have all the debate prior to the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. You may have the same time before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then, as I understand the suggestion of the gentleman, it is that he wants to take a given time before the previous question is voted upon. I am quite content to allow the gentleman to go on with such time as he thinks is necessary to explain the order, provided that the understanding be arrived at that this side of the House shall have the same amount of time.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, let that be the understanding.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman so much time as I shall consume out of the hour.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not want it out of the time of the gentleman. The rule allows time.

Mr. CANNON. I will let the gentleman have time out of my hour.

Mr. BLOUNT. Before the gentleman goes on, let us have an understanding about this debate.

Mr. CANNON. I have said to the gentleman, so that he can not misunderstand me, that I will yield to him out of my hour as much time as I take myself.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask the Speaker if that is the only right this side has in relation to debate on this question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia that under the rules the first gentleman recognized is entitled to an hour, and then, after he shall have concluded, unless the previous question is ordered, another gentleman will be recognized for a like period. The present occupant of the chair will recognize another gentleman without stating whom he would recognize.

Mr. BLOUNT. Unless the gentleman demands the previous question. Now, Mr. Speaker, there will then have been debate, the gentleman from Illinois taking the hour; would not that take it out from under the operation of the rule that provides for debate after the previous question has been ordered, because the rule provides that when there has been debate further debate is not in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That provision of the rule would have to apply to the parliamentary condition.

Mr. BLOUNT. Therefore, the gentleman would destroy the effect of the rule and confine the right of this side to the time of the majority.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Precisely.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is the opinion of the Chair?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Precisely.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if my friend from Georgia will indicate how much time he wants to have, I can yield to him.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I will say thirty minutes.

Mr. CANNON. That would leave me no time in this matter. I will yield twenty minutes. That is as much as would come afterwards.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman propose to take twenty minutes afterwards?

Mr. CANNON. I do not propose to use more than twenty minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. In all? I have no objection to an equal division of the time.

Mr. CANNON. I will equally divide the time.

Mr. BLOUNT. Counting all this as part of your time?

Mr. CANNON. I hope this will not come out of my time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It all comes out of the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have not taken much of it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I have the floor.

Now, I want to say in explanation of this order that next Friday is not included in the order. The House can do what it chooses on Friday next, under the rules, in the event that the House adopts this order. I want to say further that the terms of the order do not cover next Monday, but do cover the order that after the morning hour on Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday of this week and Tuesday and Wednesday of next week, the session commencing at 11 o'clock, in the event that the order is adopted, and the only business that is in order is the consideration of these bills from the Committee on Agriculture, except conference reports on general appropriation bills.

Now, the gentleman asks if the river and harbor bill would be included. In my own opinion it would not. The river and harbor bill can be reported on Friday next or Monday next, in the event that the order is adopted.

Mr. CRAIN. Do you say it will be or can be?

Mr. CANNON. I did not say it would be, but said it could be.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Could it not be reported in the morning before the morning hour, as it is privileged?

Mr. CANNON. It is very likely it could be, being a privileged matter, but I do not undertake to say that it could be so reported and considered.

Now, I believe I have said all I want to about this matter at this time. The order has been carefully considered on the resolutions that were sent to the committee, after the fullest consultation with the Com-

mittee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education, and very largely with the membership of the House upon both sides of the House, and after taking the consensus of opinion as diligently as it could be taken the Committee on Rules report this order back for consideration.

Mr. McCOMAS. With respect to next Friday. I see next Friday is not in this order, and the consideration of bills under the Bowman act as to war claims would not be interfered with.

Mr. CANNON. Next Friday is not interfered with by this order, nor next Monday.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to know if the gentleman from Illinois would be willing to permit an amendment to be offered which would allow the Butterworth option bill, as it is known, to be considered in advance of the compound-lard bill?

Mr. CANNON. In reply I will state that the Butterworth option bill, in the event this order is adopted, will be considered on Tuesday and Wednesday, and that in the mean time these other bills that have been mentioned will be considered.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman a question, as I was not in when the order was read. Does it include the consideration of each of these bills within this time?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Now, how much time have I consumed?

Mr. ENLOE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois one other question, if he will permit me, before he takes his seat. I would like to know if he would be willing to amend this order so that, in the event the consideration of the Butterworth option bill is defeated on account of want of time, we may extend the time for two more days, so as to consider that bill.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the Butterworth option bill will be taken care of if this order is adopted and we proceed to business under it. Next Tuesday and Wednesday are set apart for that bill, and the previous question is to be considered as ordered. The gentleman need have no fear about the Butterworth option bill. If he wants to pass it and if this House wants to pass it, the way to do it is to adopt this order.

Mr. ENLOE. I do not think that is correct unless you give ample time, because you have placed it at the tail end, where it may be defeated for want of time.

Mr. CANNON. The Butterworth option bill is placed by this order where it will be out of the power of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], or those who may sympathize with him to filibuster to prevent its consideration.

Mr. ENLOE. No man can beat the gentleman from Illinois in filibustering, when it comes to the use of his tongue and the consumption of time.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. My friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] understands that any privileged report may be made during the morning hour in the days covered by this order.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. So that the river and harbor bill, being privileged, may be reported whenever it is ready.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN. Why is the river and harbor bill excluded from this order?

Mr. CANNON. It is not excluded.

Mr. CRAIN. I understood the gentleman to say a few minutes ago that it was excluded.

Mr. CANNON. How much time have I used, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Twenty minutes.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether there is any reason why even now, as the order stands, we should not add after "general appropriation bills and conference reports thereon" the words "and the consideration of the river and harbor bill."

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes.

Mr. FARQUHAR. What is the objection?

Mr. CANNON. I will tell my friend. The object of the committee in reporting this rule is to have a rule that will secure the consideration of these bills of national importance between this time and Wednesday of next week, leaving all of next Friday and all of next Monday and the morning hours intact for such other business as the House may want to do.

Mr. HERMANN. Is not the river and harbor bill a bill of national importance?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; but the river and harbor bill has got legs enough to take care of itself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. And to include the river and harbor bill would mean to defeat these agricultural bills.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Now, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. CRAIN. Before the gentleman takes his seat will he do me the courtesy, as I have asked him a courteous question in a courteous manner, to let me know which statement I am to take as correct, that the river and harbor bill is included in this order or that it is excluded?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is as good a parliamentarian as I am, and probably better, but—

Mr. CRAIN. I know my own opinion; I want yours.

Mr. CANNON. In my opinion, the river and harbor bill, being

privileged, could be reported back to the House and placed upon the Calendar.

My opinion is that on Friday or Monday, if it suited the House, they could proceed to consider the river and harbor bill, but, as I understand it, the time, with the exceptions I have stated, is to be devoted to the consideration of the four bills named. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment—

Mr. CANNON. I do not yield for that purpose. [Laughter.] Gentlemen may laugh, but I am entitled to the floor for an hour, and before that time expires I will test the sense of the House on ordering the previous question. If it suits the gentleman from Georgia to take twenty minutes of my time I shall be glad to yield it to him.

Mr. BLOUNT. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether it would not suit him to let the House vote upon this proposition—

Mr. CANNON. I do not yield for an amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. It is to insert, after the words "general appropriation bills," the words "and the river and harbor appropriation bill."

Mr. CANNON. No, sir; I do not yield for that.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman object to letting the House vote upon the proposition?

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire to modify the order in that respect.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois, as the Chair understands, yields twenty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] for debate only.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLOUNT. That means that I am to control the twenty minutes, for I may not want to use it all.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he will agree to strike out the word "thereon"?

Mr. CANNON. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. FARQUHAR. "General appropriation bills and conference reports thereon." If that word "thereon" is stricken out, we shall have an open field and there can be no question about the matter.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to the gentleman that I will not agree to that, for the reason that the sundry civil bill, which is in conference, may possibly be ready within the time named and that is a great money bill. This order has been fully considered, and, if gentlemen will take it and study it and discuss it amongst themselves, they will see that if we are to pass the important measures to which it relates and take care of other important legislation the order can not be modified with safety; at least that is my opinion.

Mr. BLOUNT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take judgment *pro confesso* against the Committee on Rules, because this order is itself a confession that they can not "do business" under the rules. About the only business we have done during the present session, except under these special orders reported by the committee, has been done during the last six or seven days when we have gone to and cleared up the Speaker's table and done other things of that sort. But we now have an order in which the committee confess that under the rules we can not do anything.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also to invite attention to the fact that in this order (the execution of which is to consume pretty much all of the balance of the session, unless the indications are entirely deceptive) there ought to be some disposition made of the direct-tax bill. Why, sir, here is my friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] connected with this great exposition out in Illinois, the World's Fair; and the newspapers tell us he has come back here to get some restriction taken off the legislation on that subject so that the preparations for the World's Fair may proceed.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Will you allow me to correct you, my friend?

Mr. ROGERS. Do not take my five minutes.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. You must not rely upon the newspapers. If you believed all they say about me or if I believed all they say about you, neither of us would have a good opinion of the other. [Laughter.] I am not asking anything of the kind which the gentleman states.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know, if I could get an honest expression of opinion, what the gentleman thinks about himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Well, I have not quarreled with myself this morning.

Mr. ROGERS. I hold in my hand passages from the debate on the direct-tax bill in the last Congress. The newspapers tell us the gentleman has come back here to get rid of some restrictions in the World's Fair bill. This sum of a million dollars, or thereabouts, which the State of Illinois would receive under this direct-tax bill would be a very great help to the enterprise, if the direct-tax bill could only be passed under this special order.

And the thing which astonishes me most is that, though of all the bills which commanded consideration during the last Congress there was not, in the opinion of the Republican minority, a solitary one that

rose in prominence to equal the direct-tax bill and although the Senate bill on this subject is numbered, I believe, 173 on the Calendar, no man on either side of the House during this session, except myself, has ever suggested that we ought to take up the direct-tax bill; and I am one of the most uncompromising opponents it has or ever had. [Laughter.]

What is the matter with you? Why do you not embrace this bill in your order? I would like to call attention to some remarks made at the last session by my friend from Ohio over there [Mr. GROSVENOR], always good natured, of course, in connection with the direct-tax bill:

These motions may be indefinitely extended—

Alluding to the parliamentary filibustering in the last Congress—and I give notice now that if that ruling is applied, if God spares my life and if I can get members of the minority to stand with me, this proceeding will be resorted to upon questions that will affect the majority most materially. * * * It is a step towards a complete and just reunion of the hearts of the people of this country.

How I do reciprocate and respond to that sentiment of the gentleman from Ohio [laughter]; and, responding to it, I stand here to-day to ask the House of Representatives in the interest of good feeling between the two great sections of this country and in the interest of the World's Fair, which was to "unite the blue and the gray, the North and the South, the East and the West," that they vote down this demand for the previous question and include this direct-tax bill under this general order.

But I get no sympathetic response from the gentleman from Ohio. What change has come over the spirit of your dreams? Has the direct-tax bill no charms for you now that the responsibility of legislation is upon you?

The gentleman from Ohio did not stand alone. The present Speaker of the House led that fight; and I have here also the remarks of my friend from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN]. Let us look for a moment at the remarks first of the Speaker, of which I read a portion the other day. Here they are, from the RECORD, Fiftieth Congress, page 2702:

Mr. REED. It is the desire on this side to allow ample opportunity for discussion, if after that we can have a vote upon the bill. * * * I ask unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered at 4 o'clock, and that the vote be then taken upon the bill. * * * It is well to be frank and we all know what we desire. There is no objection on the part of the friends of this bill to any discussion which can be deemed reasonable on the part of those who are opposed to it if at the end of that time we can come to a vote. * * * We, on our part, desire to give an opportunity for discussion to any extent which gentlemen may deem satisfactory within reasonable limits, but we desire also the passage of the bill, and we do not wish to have it obstructed by dilatory motions or maneuvers. * * * I think we [to Mr. OATES] understand each other, and we can very easily test the question.

Mr. REED then moved the previous question, and that brought on the "deadlock," during which Mr. REED led the forces of those that were so anxious to pass the direct-tax bill. (See pages 2710, 2711, etc.)

Mr. REED said again (page 2776):

I want the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] distinctly to understand that this side is willing to allow a 15 minute debate that any reasonable man can ask for on the other side, and every opportunity for amendment which the rules of this House will allow. All we ask is that after the matter has been thoroughly debated to the full satisfaction of everybody on the other side, and after every amendment has been offered which ingenuity or the good wishes of anybody can originate, then we shall have a vote on the bill.

Again he said (page 2776):

Mr. REED. Because your conduct is such that it is necessary you should commit yourselves in order to give us the assurance.

And again (page 2788):

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] has so frankly said, I desire to say to him, as a matter of constitutional law, that under the Constitution of the United States the majority of the House of Representatives is competent, so far as the House is concerned, to decide what amendments it will adopt, what amendments it will reject, what bills it will refuse to pass, and my proposition, the proposition of gentlemen who are in favor of this bill, will simply execute that constitutional right. Under the Constitution legislation is the result of the action of a majority, not the result of a yielding of 166 members of the House to 62 members upon a question which the House is perfectly competent to deal with.

And again he said:

It seems to me that this proposition is so clear that it can not be misunderstood. If any [amendments] shall be adopted, then the matter will go into conference; if none of them shall be adopted, then the bill will pass as it stands, and will pass by virtue of having a majority of the Representatives of the people of the United States in favor of it. [Applause.]

Page 2859:

Mr. REED. The trouble is not a lack of a quorum; it is a lack of behavior.

The Speaker now makes no provision for the majority, his own party, to pass the bill he professed so earnestly to desire to pass in the Fiftieth Congress.

See what my friend from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] said (RECORD, Fiftieth Congress, page 2661). After explaining the facts relating to the tax act of 1861, and showing the amount remaining uncollected from fourteen States and Territories, he arraigned every Southern State for its non-payment and added that—

The table from the Treasury Department is the strongest argument which can be presented showing the inequalities of this collection—

And that—

The performances on this floor yesterday and to-day are significant and merit notice.

The persistent effort yesterday to defeat the proposition setting apart time for the consideration of this bill was led by a gentleman from Alabama, * * * and voting with him were almost exclusively gentlemen from the States yet in arrears, and it really seemed that the greater the arrears the more persistent the activity in opposition. * * *

Mr. Chairman, there is no "section" in this measure. There is no politics in it. There is one simple, straightforward proposition to do justice to all, so far as the principal paid is concerned, and I am amazed at the fierce opposition it encounters. From whence comes that opposition?

Whence comes the opposition now?

Sir, I caught an idea the other day from a Republican paper published up in Michigan. It said that the minority had filibustered in years gone by, and that to prevent that the majority had placed larger power in the hands of the Speaker, and, continued the editor:

Behold the Speaker himself has become the chief offender, he now prevents the consideration of all business that does not suit him.

Why is it that you gentlemen who were keen as a brier in the last Congress to pass this direct-tax bill and bring about this "reunion of hearts," of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] then spoke so plaintively—why is it that some one of you can not be heard to ask that this measure be inserted in this order, so as to adjust this old account, of the existence of which you complained so seriously in the last Congress.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ROGERS. I wish I had time to give the residue of these quotations. I think I ought to take advantage of the precedent set a few days ago by my friend from Illinois and print them in the RECORD. I will do so.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the proposition in this order is to take up, not one bill for consideration and determination, involving amendments and debate, but a series of bills the consideration of which will run through several weeks. This House, for a series of days or even weeks, without having heretofore considered these several measures, is to be directed in advance, without the reading of a single one of the bills, without the benefit of the discussion of a single one of them; is to be directed in advance what consideration and what opportunity of amendment shall be had upon them. They are important measures, one relating to agricultural colleges throughout the country, the one relating to the inspection of meats, the lard bill, all matters of great importance to the people. There is also the bill relating to dealing in options. All of these things are brought in under this order from the Committee on Rules, and a restriction placed upon the time, that is to say, upon the opportunity to amend or debate the same. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the House in its character of a deliberative body is degenerating below common respectability.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has stated that so far as bills coming from the Committee on Agriculture were concerned that committee had been consulted about it. I presume that the majority members of the committee were consulted; but I am quite sure that some of the minority members of the committee are utterly opposed to this order. I know that they are opposed to the consideration of some of these bills which are fixed by this order; and so we have this condition of affairs: That, so far as compliance with the wishes of the minority of the committee is concerned, like the views of the minority members of this House on all of these questions, they are utterly ignored, and the dictum of the Committee on Rules is to take the place of the rules themselves and of the judgment of the House on these great questions.

Now, sir, it transpires that the committee have refused to allow the matter of the river and harbor bill to be considered at all. They have taken a number of days to be occupied by this order, and the river and harbor bill is specially excluded. It certainly is a matter of great national importance. What reason can there be for it? Why may it not occupy a portion of the time? Why may not the previous question be voted down on this order, and an amendment inserted allowing the river and harbor bill to be brought in and considered, and if that shall contract the time for debate on the other propositions, why not allow a further amendment to be offered as to these bills, giving longer time for debate and amendment or so much time as may be taken up with the river and harbor bill? I can conceive of no superiority in any of these measures over the river and harbor bill. To my mind it is a far more important bill than any other measure included in this order.

I am opposed to the order, therefore, because it annuls and is intended to annul the rules of the House for debate and amendment on all these questions; and running through days and weeks it binds the House to a strict consideration of special measures where there is no opportunity for debate and no opportunity for amendment, to the exclusion of other and more important matters. I favor voting the previous question down for the additional reason that it is proper and important to accompany the resolution with a provision for the consideration of the river and harbor bill, which is of much interest to every section of the country, more interesting and more important to the Representatives on this floor than any other bill now pending; and I trust, therefore, the previous question will not be ordered, but that we may incorporate the river and harbor bill, or change the length of time for debate and order the previous question on any one of these measures as we may see fit, so as to give ample opportunity for discussion and amendment.

I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee has ten minutes yielded to him.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, one who looks at the special order that we are now asked to adopt, and who appreciates that which is to come immediately after it or which will take effect as an order after the execution of the present one (a provision giving two days to the Committee on Labor), and who will at the same time reflect about the lateness of this session and the length and magnitude of the river and harbor bill, must conclude that if this order be adopted that bill is in great peril.

The order submitted now proposes to give two hours to-day to the consideration of the agricultural college bill, the previous question to be considered as ordered at the expiration of the two hours' debate. Then two hours to be given to the meat inspection bill, and the previous question ordered and a vote taken on that. To-morrow, Thursday, and Saturday the time is to be devoted to the lard bill. Monday, if I remember correctly the provision of the rules, is the day for the consideration of District of Columbia business, of which it was deprived on the last day, and we are not to presume that it will be again deprived of it. Next Tuesday and Wednesday, the 26th and 27th of August, are to be devoted to the options bill. Thursday and Saturday of that week we propose to give to the Labor Committee. Then we are in this condition of affairs: We are brought to the 1st of September, for all we can now see, with a bill involving \$24,000,000—the river and harbor bill—that has always aroused antagonisms in this House, still not considered.

Now, I will state to the House as my candid opinion that, if the previous question is ordered here and the special order is made excluding from consideration the river and harbor bill, there is danger that that bill will fail; and gentlemen need not be surprised if that should be the result.

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

Mr. McMILLIN. With pleasure.

Mr. OATES. Is my friend able, as a member of the Committee on Rules, to say whether there is any reason, coming from that committee, why the bill known as the alien land bill—the resolution to fix a day introduced by myself more than a month ago has been disregarded, has been excluded from this order?

Mr. McMILLIN. I am not able to state. I think it should be considered.

Mr. OATES. For the consideration of that bill there is a great demand from all parts of the country.

Mr. McMILLIN. Unfortunately my friend from Georgia, Colonel BLOUNT, and I are not members of the majority of the Committee on Rules, and hence can not control its action.

Mr. CANNON. I can give the gentleman the reason.

Mr. McMILLIN. Well, I prefer the gentleman would take his own time for that and not consume mine, as mine is very limited.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

Mr. McMILLIN. Now, I have thought it proper to make this statement concerning the peril of one of the greatest and most important bills before the House, and to notify gentlemen, so that if they adopt the previous question and force this order upon the House to the exclusion of the consideration of all other business, if they commit the House to the consideration of these bills to the exclusion of the river and harbor bill, in view of the consequences from that action which I have suggested and the peril in which it places the river and harbor bill, they do it with their eyes wide open. I favor the consideration of all measures looking to the improvement of drooping agriculture. But I would not like to endanger the only means the farmers have of getting their products to market cheaply.

It is true that Fridays are not provided for in this resolution. But is it to be presumed that after having taken eighteen Fridays away from the Private Calendar we are still going to inflict that wrong upon the claimants of this country, who now have over one thousand bills on that Calendar? For one, I say no; it ought not to be so if it is so. Now, as to these measures, here is the agricultural college aid bill, which provides for the appropriation of millions of dollars. When the original grants to these colleges were made they were made to the States and left to State control; but this grant is proposed to be given coupled with a condition; and the Secretary of the Interior is the judge of the fulfillment of the condition upon which the States may take these sums of money. That much for the importance of that bill. That is to be "shuffled off" at the end of two hours. I think it should be amended. It should never be left discretionary to Cabinet officers to determine whether or not the money shall be paid over. State officers should not have to report to him. Then the meat inspection bill is to come on, and it is to have two hours only.

The lard bill is to have three days and be passed. It is a strange spectacle that the Congress of the United States is going to legislate as to what men shall eat. We are proposing to legislate hogs' fat into the people. We are caught in the performance of saying that the American people shall not eat anything but that which the Lord said none of his people should eat. [Laughter.] We are striving to im-

prove on the Lord, it seems. [Laughter.] This is the way these things come along. Butter came two years ago and demanded protection against hogs' lard; and now the hog has wallowed his way to Washington and is rubbing his rusty sides against the corners of the Capitol and grunting out his appeal that he shall be protected against cotton-seed oil. [Laughter.] So it goes; and this all to be done by special rule; all to be done at the peril of exceedingly important measures; all to be done at the peril of a bill which appropriates twenty-odd millions of dollars for rivers and harbors that have had nothing appropriated to them for two years.

For one I do not believe it best to proceed in this way. My opinions on this subject are too well known to require amplification. It looks to me that it is time for the House of Representatives to act as if it felt that it was able to take care of itself without a guardian *ad litem*, taking its business up and disposing of it in a business-like way.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Georgia has one minute yet remaining.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I desire to offer the following amendment if the previous question shall be voted down. The amendment is to include the river and harbor bill in the order.

Mr. McMILLIN. As among the things that may be excepted from the operation of this rule.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment may be read for information.

Mr. BLOUNT. No, I just announced it. I do not care to have it read. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] desires to announce an amendment, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. CRAIN. It is the same amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman three minutes. I would yield five if I could. I have but ten minutes remaining, and I have promised to yield to two or three others.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois has twenty minutes yet remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] five minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. This is the "equal division" that we were told about.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to interfere with the division of time.

Mr. CANNON. Gentlemen upon the other side claim their time, and therefore I can not keep my word to others to whom I promised to yield, if I yield to the gentleman from Missouri more than three minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. I claim my time, if I can get it by claiming it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] give his attention? The gentleman from Illinois consumed twenty minutes in opening. The opposition have had twenty minutes in reply. Out of the hour the gentleman still retains twenty minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; but I want to be fair to the gentlemen on the other side. If I take ten minutes I feel that I ought to allow the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] ten minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think so.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield now to the gentleman from Georgia eight minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] may be allowed to proceed now.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection.

Mr. HATCH. I will be glad to take the floor at any time that I can get it.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HATCH. I want to say a word to this side of the House—

Mr. CANNON. My friend, as I know, wants to save me trouble, and I would be glad if he would give me back those three minutes. I will give the time to him a little later.

Mr. HATCH. I will yield it with pleasure.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which concurrence was requested, the bill (H. R. 11439) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment, in which concurrence was requested, the bill (H. R. 526) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure and submit to Congress a proposal for the sale to the United States of the western part of the Crow Indian reservation in Montana.

The message further announced that the Senate agreed to the amendments of the House to the bills (S. 1502) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Fitzgerald, and the bill (S. 3127) amending an act entitled "An act to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled 'An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, to said port of Lincoln.'"

The message further announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3163) to reorganize and establish the customs collection district of Puget Sound.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a bill (S. 4229) granting a right of way through certain lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CANNON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON].

Mr. FUNSTON. Mr. Speaker, nine months of this session have passed. The Committee on Agriculture have faithfully attended to their duties. They have conceded to other committees of this House time for the consideration of other measures, and now, when the resolution is brought before this House for the taking up of agricultural measures, we find gentlemen on the other side of the House endeavoring to weight down the resolution with other matters in order to drive us from the field. I want to say to you, gentlemen of the river and harbor bill, if you knock out the Agricultural Committee at this time we will knock the river and harbor bill so high that you will never see it again. [Laughter.]

It seems to me that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], in view of the general uprising in their own States, should concede to the Committee on Agriculture a day or two at least for the consideration of measures in which the agriculturists are most interested; and I say to you now, whatever may be your motives, we take your acts as having in view a design to consume the time given to the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture, I say, have waited nine months and we do not propose to wait any longer. If we are defeated, it will be by the very men that have been crying out upon this floor that justice has not been done to the agriculturists of this country and that time has not been given to the Agricultural Committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, every member of the House knows that I have been a very earnest and consistent opponent of special rules that have been brought in here from time to time for the consideration of certain named bills. I have opposed these rules because I was opposed upon principle to the adoption of the code of rules adopted by the House. I have been most earnest in my opposition to them. For the first time, as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture states, in nine months, it is proposed by the Committee on Rules to give to the Committee on Agriculture the only means by which important bills reported by that committee can be considered at this session. Grouped in this order are four of the most important bills considered by that committee during this Congress or of any that will be presented by any committee in the Fifty-first Congress for consideration.

Behind these bills to-day are more voting thousands of earnest citizens than favor every species of legislation upon your calendar [applause]; restless, excited, and anxious, from one end of the country to the other to-day, simply because they have been shut out by the consideration of other matters from the consideration of measures reported in their interest just like those reported from the Committee on Agriculture, and I warn my friends upon this side of the House to-day to make no mistake in their votes upon the adoption of this rule. While it is not all we are entitled to, it is the best we can do, and the Democrat representing an agricultural district in the House of Representatives to-day who throws an obstacle in the way of the consideration of these bills will rue it before the snow flies in November. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is pretty near time that this important committee, which has considered bills here from the beginning of this session, shall have time to present them to the House for consideration. I would greatly prefer that each one of these bills should be brought forward as we brought forward the oleomargarine bill, when we stood here for ten long days and fought that bill to a conclusion, and won it by one of the largest votes ever cast in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Before I give the time to the gentleman from Georgia—

Mr. HATCH. Just give me one minute more.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. HATCH. I want to say this: I want to reiterate what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON] said in regard to the river and harbor bill, that if the consideration and passage of the conference report on that bill is to stand in the way of the passage of this rule and the consideration of these bills, let the river and harbor bill wait until December next. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. I want to say a single word.

Mr. BLOUNT. Just here or before you close?

Mr. CANNON. I want to say a single word before I yield to the gentleman from Georgia. This order will not interfere with the con-

sideration of the river and harbor bill before the morning hour. During the morning hour the river and harbor bill can be called up as a privileged question, and on Friday next or on Monday next it could be called up.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will my friend permit me right there?

Mr. CANNON. Now, I want to say that there is no antagonism nor intention to antagonize these bills so as to bring in any antagonism here. Now I yield to the gentleman from Georgia eight minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. Ten minutes, the gentleman said.

Mr. CANNON. No, I did not. I yield the gentleman eight minutes.

Mr. McMILLIN. In the time of the gentleman from Georgia, if he will permit me, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois this question: He says the river and harbor bill is privileged. Does he not know that in its present status it is not privileged? It is now before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and has no more privilege than any other bill, and would have to be considered in Committee of the Whole if any one should make the point of order against it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE].

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois. If my friend will allow me—

Mr. BLOUNT. I can not yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois. I want to state to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] that that is not conceded by any manner of means. It will be—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Speaker, as I understood the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH], he raises the issue entirely upon the consideration of the river and harbor bill, and he says that the farmers of this country have risen up and have disturbed the old political organization because these questions have not been considered that are to be heard under this special order. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that there is no farmers' organization in this country that is disturbing any political organization on account of the kind of lard that shall be used. It is not an issue of the "negro and the hog" that has disturbed the political organizations, but it is the infernal financial and revenue system of this country that has caused the farmers to rise up in their might and threaten to overthrow the political organizations; and I want to say—

Mr. HATCH. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him there by stating that the bill that he has advocated in committee—the option bill—is one of the bills to be considered under this order?

Mr. ENLOE. Yes, sir; and the option bill is placed in this order in such a way as to indicate that it has been selected as a victim. It has been placed in the rear end of this order, when it is known that the time will be consumed and the bill thus defeated. Why do you not place that bill before the lard bill, as it involves a much more important question? But you have put it after the hogs, when you know that the consideration of the lard bill will consume all the time, and it will have to be disposed of first.

Mr. CONGER. But the option bill has two full days.

Mr. ENLOE. I know it gets two days, but it gets the last two days, and the bills considered in that order may not be disposed of, and the time for its consideration will thus be used. The gentleman did not want, and I predict right here and now that there will not be in the House or in the Senate, a vote to sustain the Butterworth option bill, and it has been so placed in this order that it can not be considered and disposed of under this order.

Now, as to Friday. The gentleman from Illinois says that the river and harbor bill being privileged may be considered on Friday or Monday. He says that so as to get gentlemen who want to have the river and harbor bill considered not to vote against this order; and I am justified in saying that no one who has watched the progress of this fight can doubt that the Committee on Rules and the majority party upon this floor have determined that there shall be no time devoted to the consideration of private claims, notwithstanding they make an exception of Friday in this order.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], in the outset of the debate, as I understood him and as he was generally understood, declared that this order did exclude the consideration of the river and harbor bill. His last statement was a modification of that and was to the effect that the river and harbor bill might possibly get in in the morning hour in spite of the order. That this order will interfere very largely with that measure is quite patent from the refusal on the part of my friend from Illinois to allow me to offer my amendment. The order was intended to be a distinct exclusion of the river and harbor bill. Now, the bills to which the order applies are important. I may differ with some gentlemen as to whether they ought or not to be passed, but at the same time I am content for them to have a fair consideration under the rules of this House.

I have been contending for that all along, but for the simple reason that I have proposed an amendment the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. FUNSTON] and the ex-chairman of that committee [Mr. HATCH] have discovered a purpose to defeat the considera-

tion of the measures included in this order coming from the Committee on Rules, and have made a threat that, if it shall so happen, we are to understand that the river and harbor bill, designed for the improvement of the rivers and harbors and the reduction of freight rates throughout the country, is to be defeated—

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman does not mean to say that I have made any such threat?

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I will withdraw the statement as to the gentleman, if he disavows the threat.

Mr. FUNSTON. Allow me to say—

Mr. BLOUNT. Not in my time. The gentleman is on record, and if his statement and mine do not correspond the record will show it, and he can take care of himself later.

Mr. FUNSTON. Very well.

Mr. BLOUNT. Now, there is nothing in my amendment proposing to include the river and harbor bill that would interfere with these other measures, and if the previous question shall be voted down and this amendment shall be included, it will then be quite competent to adopt an amendment allowing as much additional time as may have been consumed by the consideration of the river and harbor bill. The House can take another day or they can take as much additional time as may be necessary. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON] has referred to the fact that these measures are farmers' bills, and he says that down in Georgia and Tennessee there is a good deal of interest felt in our legislation here in relation to agriculture. That is true, sir, but it is likewise true that the very bill which so stirs the soul of the gentleman from Kansas and of my excellent friend from Missouri [Mr. HATCH], the lard bill, excites quite a contrary sentiment in the section to which the gentleman from Kansas directs our attention, and therefore I am not at all disturbed by the scarecrow that he has set up.

I hope that the previous question will be voted down. If the House is bent upon the consideration of these bills under this order, I trust that the order will be amended to the extent of allowing the river and harbor bill to stand on the same footing with the other appropriation bills. I can see no objection to that, and I trust that the House will vote down the previous question and allow the amendment I have suggested to be voted upon.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. OATES. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield now, as I have promised to yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY].

Mr. OATES. Then I will ask my friend from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] if he can give me an explanation of why a day is not assigned for the consideration of what is known as the alien land bill.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman from Alabama inquires why the Committee on Rules have not given to his alien land bill a day in the resolution now under consideration. I want to say to the gentleman that, if he will only be patient and will help us to sustain and adopt these various resolutions and orders that we are bringing into the House to do the important business of the country, we will, I am sure, before the end of the session, endeavor to supply an opportunity for the consideration of his bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no public business the consideration of which has been so unanimously demanded as that which is included in the resolution reported this morning, and in giving these five days for legislation relating to agriculture, the Committee on Rules have but responded to the agricultural sentiment of the country, both North and South.

Mr. Speaker, we have given to the Committee on Agriculture, for the bills which they propose to have considered, all the time that they have asked, and no gentleman on the other side has claimed in this discussion that we have not given to those bills all the time required for their full consideration. Again, Mr. Speaker, this rule of ours is not intended to antagonize the river and harbor bill. Nobody ever thought of that. No gentleman of the minority of the Committee on Rules ever suggested it when we were considering this rule in the committee this morning. No gentleman there asked, in my hearing, to have the river and harbor bill excepted.

Mr. BLOUNT. I certainly heard the question asked, and I submitted it myself.

Mr. MCKINLEY. So far as I have heard there was not a single suggestion before the Committee on Rules that the passage of this rule would in any wise interfere with the consideration of the river and harbor bill, and for one, if I had supposed that this rule would interfere with the river and harbor bill and its consideration at this stage of the session, I myself would have been willing to make that exception. But the river and harbor bill will take care of itself. It always has taken care of itself and it always will take care of itself at any stage of any session of Congress. Gentlemen on this side of the House who take the responsibility of passing this rule will also take the responsibility of passing the river and harbor bill before we adjourn this session of Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Therefore the appeal made upon the other side upon the ground that we propose to exclude the river and harbor bill is made not because they love that bill, but because they propose to stand in opposition to

every rule that is brought in here for the dispatch of the public business. That is all there is in the opposition which comes from that quarter. Not a single rule has been reported from the Committee on Rules that has not been opposed in precisely the same spirit that has been manifested here this morning in the opposition to the pending rule. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the previous question should be sustained and this rule should be adopted, so that these important agricultural bills which are demanded by the agricultural interests of the country may be speedily disposed of. And while I am on my feet I want to say further that the Committee on Rules, in suggesting the work for this week and a part of next week, have authorized a report of a rule to give the Committee on Labor two or three days to consider important labor bills pending before that committee or already reported to the House, and which the laboring interests of the country are justly pressing upon the attention of Congress.

Mr. FARQUHAR. What have you done with the shipping bill?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York asks what we have done with the shipping bill. If the gentleman will give us time and will send a resolution to our committee, which he might have done—

Mr. FARQUHAR. The resolution is there.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I can say, speaking for myself and myself alone, that I am ready to join in reporting a rule to give this House the right to consider not only the steam-ship bill, but the tonnage bill, which bears the gentleman's name.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I now move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered; there being—ayes 103, noes 45.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. FRANK. I demand a separate vote upon one of the propositions involved in this order—

Several MEMBERS. Too late.

Mr. FRANK. I refer to that clause which provides that the previous question shall be taken on Saturday next upon the bill defining lard. I demand a separate vote on that proposition.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think that is a distinct proposition upon which the gentleman is entitled to a separate vote. This order, which is so drawn as to dedicate a certain number of days for the consideration of certain business, must stand or fall as a whole.

Mr. FRANK. That will be for the Chair to determine upon the reading of the resolution. I think I am entitled to a separate vote under the rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the test to be applied in such a case as this is whether after the matter on a division is asked shall have been separated from the rest there will remain a substantive proposition—

Mr. FRANK. Precisely; and I think this case will successfully meet that test.

Mr. BLAND. Do I understand that my colleague [Mr. FRANK] does not desire to fix any day at all for the consideration of the bill which he has named?

Mr. FRANK. No, sir; I desire—

Mr. BLAND. While I may agree with my colleague as to the particular bill pending, I would like to have the question considered.

Mr. FRANK. I desire the consideration of that bill. But the proposition on which I desire a separate vote is this:

House bill 11568 defining lard, on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered at 4 o'clock p. m., Saturday, August 23.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman consider the words "on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered," etc., as a substantive proposition?

Mr. FRANK. I do unquestionably.

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Does this order cut off all amendments and substitutes? Are we bound to vote on the bill only or can amendments be offered?

The SPEAKER. Amendments can be offered. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FRANK] will perceive at once that if the proposition he has indicated should be voted down, there would remain no substantive proposition—

Mr. FRANK. If the part of the resolution which provides for the previous question were voted down, there would still remain—

The SPEAKER. But the questions must be taken in their order.

Mr. FRANK. Very good; then I demand a separate vote on that part of the report which is embraced in these words:

That after the disposition of said bill the House proceed to the consideration of House bill 11568, defining lard, etc., on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered at 4 o'clock p. m., Saturday, August 23.

I demand a separate vote on that proposition, if I am entitled to it.

The SPEAKER. The proposition for the consideration of the lard question?

Mr. FRANK. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I still think that this order must stand or fall as a whole. The Chair will notice that it sets aside certain days for the consideration of business of the Committee on Agriculture. It provides first for the consideration of a certain bill; and, after that is con-

sidered and disposed of, the consideration of another; and so on, each one hingeing on the others. If you strike out any part of this the whole falls. It seems to me that, this being a proposed order or rule—really you may call it a rule—covering certain days and dedicating those days to the consideration of these bills, you can not strike out one clause without destroying the rest, because one hinges upon the others. The resolution stands or falls as a whole and was so intended.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I do not see why the gentleman from Missouri has not a right to demand a separate vote on the proposition in relation to compound lard. What is this order? Let us not be so very technical that we can not do what the rules intend we should do. What is this order? It is intended to allow the consideration of various bills which are named, with a particular time assigned to each. That is the whole of it. Now, if the gentleman wants to raise a question as to the allowance of time to one of these bills, I can not see why, if that clause should be struck out, there would not remain a substantive proposition. There is still left the order relating to the time for the consideration of the other bills. There will be no confusion. If the House should determine to strike out this clause, then what? The order provides for the consideration of the several other bills with the time assigned to each—

The SPEAKER. This order provides an order of business for a certain number of days. The first part of the proposition contains a declaration that a certain number of days shall be devoted to the consideration of a designated bill—

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, that is not all.

The SPEAKER. This is a proposition rather to strike out than to divide. That could have been got at by voting down the previous question and making a motion to strike out.

Mr. BLOUNT. The declaratory part of this is qualified by what follows.

The SPEAKER. Precisely; that is just it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then what follows is as to a given time to be devoted to the agricultural aid bill, and a given time to the inspection of meats, and a given time to the lard bill, and also a given time in relation to the bill defining options. That is really the purpose of it, and the declaration of time in the beginning is a mere summing up. The rule assigns to these bills or undertakes to devote so many days to their consideration and simply sums up the time which the bills will consume. Now, if you take out any one of the bills you simply reduce the time to that extent.

If you vote out the time to any one of them, and then execute the remainder of the order, you will use no more time than that assigned in the order to the other bills, and the declaration in the early part of the order in relation to the lapse of time which is to be consumed will be modified to conform to any construction the House may make of the order in that regard. It does seem to me that that is a practical view of the question, and that any other view of it is a violent mode of reasoning.

Here is a proposition to consider various bills and one of them a bill of great importance to the gentleman from St. Louis. He wants the House to say whether as to this particular bill it will consider it at all. That is all that his demand presents. It is the ordinary way of applying the rule; and to attempt now by a strict, unreasonable construction of the rule to deny to the gentleman the right of allowing the House practically to say whether it will take up the bill or not, seems to me to be a most unreasonable construction. If that is the rule of the House, if that be the true construction of the rule, it is about time that we were taking a larger view of business here by amending the rules themselves.

Such a construction was never contemplated and I do not think that anything can justify it. The rules ought not to be construed to deny rights which are proper to any gentleman on the floor. They ought to be construed in their broadest sense. The gentleman from Missouri, by the practices of the past and by the construction of the very rule of the House itself, has undoubtedly the right to exercise it now, and here so far as I know in the history of this House is the first time that a member is to be denied a right which is unquestionably his, by a technical, strange, unprecedented construction of the rule.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, the previous question operates to shut off debate and to bring the House to a direct vote on the question, but it does not interfere with the right of a division of the question, where it can be divided.

The SPEAKER. No; but the gentleman does not state it quite accurately. It is where the question can be divided so that a substantive proposition will remain.

Mr. DIBBLE. Certainly; I am coming to that. Where the question can be divided and where a substantive proposition remains after excluding the part on which a separate vote is demanded.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from South Carolina must bear in mind that the language of the rule is that the question can be divided. It is not a proposition that a separate vote can be taken on one part, but that the question can be divided so that a vote can be taken on the remaining part as well.

Mr. DIBBLE. Certainly; and I propose to show by the order that that is entirely practicable in the case now under consideration.

Now, if a separate vote be taken first on the agricultural college aid bill—suppose the House should defeat that part of the order—then the order will read with a substantive proposition remaining:

First, to the consideration of Senate bill 2594, inspection of meats for exportation.

The SPEAKER. Would that be a substantive proposition?

Mr. DIBBLE. Yes, sir. It might occupy the same time that the rule fixes for it. The effect of it would be that the time that the agricultural college aid bill was to take up of these days at the beginning shall be taken up first by Senate bill 2594, "inspection of meats;" then the lard bill, and the other bills following in their consecutive order, and in the same way any one of the bills and each of the bills could be taken out of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina gets over the difficulty the Chair has in mind by not paying attention to what would be left after the division of the question. Will the gentleman strike out the first proposition and see what would be left? Read what would be left for the House to vote upon.

Mr. DIBBLE. I will do so. I will take the resolution itself. It provides—

Resolved, That Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday, August 19, 20, 21, and 23, and Tuesday and Wednesday, August 26 and 27, after sixty minutes of the morning hour, be fixed for the consideration in the House; * * *

First, To the consideration of Senate bill 2594 (inspection of meats for exportation), on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered after two hours—

And so on.

Mr. SPEAKER. That you purpose to strike out.

Mr. DIBBLE. No; I purpose to strike out the clause relating to the first bill, if that was the one on which a separate vote was demanded, and I have read the resolution leaving out the first bill and reciting the second.

The SPEAKER. That is to say, all of the resolution down to that point.

Mr. DIBBLE. Yes, all of the resolution that relates to that bill. That is, all relating to the agricultural college aid bill. Now, if you strike out all relating to the inspection of meats bill which follows, then it will leave the substantive proposition again that the House will proceed at a certain time to the consideration of the bill defining lard; and then you go on to the bill defining options. And in the same way you can take up the bill defining lard, which is the third mentioned here and leave a substantive proposition grammatically expressed occupying the whole of the remaining time, which would be the consideration of the options bill.

It is the House deciding to devote the time to three of the bills instead of four of the bills, and the order with that eliminated reads grammatically, sensibly, and correctly. Therefore a substantive proposition is left, and therefore the question is capable of four divisions, or any one of the four, at the demand of a member, under the rules.

Mr. FRANK. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FRANK. The demand that I have made has been made under subdivision 6 of Rule XVI, which reads as follows:

6. On the demand of any member, before the question is put, a question shall be divided if it include propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the question upon which a vote is to be taken? It is upon this—

The SPEAKER. Where does the gentleman purpose to make the division?

Mr. FRANK. I am coming to that.

The SPEAKER. Between just what words?

Mr. FRANK. I propose to make the division after the consideration of Senate bill 2594 has been finally determined by the previous question.

The SPEAKER. That is the first division, after the word "question," is it?

Mr. FRANK. No; the last words of that proposition are the words "after two hours."

The SPEAKER. Now, will the gentleman start at the beginning of that proposition and read it?

Mr. FRANK (reading):

First, after the adoption of this order, of Senate bill—

The SPEAKER. No; will the gentleman begin at the beginning of the proposition?

Mr. FRANK. Very well, I will do that.

Resolved, That Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Saturday, August 19, 20, 21, and 23, and Tuesday and Wednesday, August 26 and 27, after sixty minutes of the morning hour, be fixed for consideration in the House, namely, first, after the adoption of this order, of Senate bill 3714, the agricultural aid bill, on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered after two hours.

That is the first substantive proposition.

The SPEAKER. That is the first substantive proposition.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, omit that.

Mr. FRANK (reading):

And that after the disposition of said bill—

The SPEAKER. After the disposition of what? All that has been struck out, on the supposition of the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK. It would be taken away only temporarily.
The SPEAKER. Does not the gentleman see that he has not a substantive proposition left?

Mr. SPRINGER. Read your substantive proposition.

Mr. FRANK. The substantive proposition is:

First, to the consideration of Senate bill 2594, the inspection of meats for exportation, on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered after two hours—

The SPEAKER. That depends upon the disposition of the other one, and the other one will not be disposed of, on the gentleman's hypothesis.

Mr. FRANK. If you take away one substantive proposition, does not the substantive proposition remain that we shall then proceed to the consideration of the next proposition?

Mr. GROSVENOR. When?

The SPEAKER. No, the next proposition is, after the other one has been disposed of—

Mr. FRANK. Then the rule has no sort of sense in it.

The SPEAKER. It has no sort of sense in its application to this, perhaps. That is precisely what the Chair was trying to point out to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK. Then, can the Speaker give us an illustration of a case where it would have application?

The SPEAKER. Certainly; in the well known instance of an election case, where there are substantive propositions which can be separated. There are two ways of getting at a matter of this sort. One is by amendment. That the House has decided not to do.

Mr. FRANK. Well, then, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The House is deprived of no power whatever; only the House has determined not to separate this, and not to modify it, and not to amend it, but to accept it or reject it as it stands.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to the floor without interruption.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Is it not a fact that this resolution, as it now stands, is indivisible?

Mr. SPRINGER. The point I make is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FRANK] is entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to the floor. The Chair is asking him questions.

Mr. McCLAMMY. I think we should have order while the discussion is going on.

Mr. FRANK. I desire to present this matter in such form as that the House may act upon it, and I desire to move to recommit this report to the Committee on Rules with instructions that they report the same with this alteration: That the option bill precede the consideration of the bill defining lard, and that they report this resolution with that change.

The SPEAKER. That motion the gentleman can make. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FRANK] to recommit with instructions to strike out—

Mr. FRANK. No; not to strike out, but to change the sequence of consideration, namely, that the option bill shall be considered before the lard bill; that they just change places.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Transposing the two propositions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri must indicate more definitely than that what his proposition is. The Chair does not believe it would be possible for the committee to know what the order of the House was under that statement.

Mr. FRANK. That the order be recommitted to the Committee on Rules with instructions that they report this resolution back, making this change: That after the disposition of the bill for the inspection of meats they proceed to consider House bill 5353, defining options, on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered at 4 o'clock p. m., Saturday, August 23, and that on Tuesday, August 26, the House shall proceed to the consideration of House bill 11568, defining lard, etc., on which the previous question shall be considered as ordered on Wednesday, August 27, at 3 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri as stated by him.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the question is not understood here.

Mr. BLOUNT. The question has not been stated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has stated the proposition that the option bill be substituted for the lard bill and the lard bill for the option bill in the order of consideration.

Mr. CANNON. And the time will be broken up and the order broken up.

The question was put on the motion of Mr. FRANK; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. FRANK. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 103.

Mr. ENLOE. Yeas and nays.

Mr. McCLAMMY. I make the point of no quorum.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Twenty gentlemen have arisen in support of the demand for the yeas and nays—not a sufficient number.

Mr. ENLOE. The other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting the other side). One hundred and nineteen gentlemen have arisen in opposition to the demand for the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays are refused. The yeas are 46, the noes 103, and the motion to recommit is lost. The question now is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3714) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, arising from the sales of public lands, to be paid as hereinafter provided, to each State and Territory for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts now established, or which may be hereafter established, in accordance with an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, the sum of \$15,000 for the year ending June 30, 1890, and an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for ten years by an additional sum of \$1,000 over the preceding year, and the annual amount to be paid thereafter to each State and Territory shall be \$25,000; *Provided,* That no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such colleges separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds received in such State or Territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth: *Provided,* That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July 2, 1862, and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, or may be hereafter established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue, for the education of colored students in agricultures and the mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the Legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act between one college for white students and one institution for colored students established as aforesaid, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thereupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of 1862, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provision in reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.

SEC. 2. That the sums hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for the further endowment and support of colleges shall be annually paid, on or before the 31st day of July of each year, by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of the Interior, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the State or Territorial treasurer, or to such officer as shall be designated by the laws of such State or Territory to receive the same, who shall, upon the order of the trustees of the college or the institution for colored students, immediately pay over said sums to the treasurers of the respective colleges or other institutions entitled to receive the same, and such treasurers shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior, on or before the 1st day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received and of its disbursement. The grants of moneys authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purpose of said grants: *Provided,* That payments of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the Legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of the State or Territory for the further and more complete endowment, support, and maintenance of colleges, or of institutions for colored students, as provided in this act, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, or be misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State or Territory to which it belongs, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to such State or Territory; and no portion of said moneys shall be applied directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings. An annual report by the president of each of said colleges shall be made to the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to the Secretary of the Interior, regarding the condition and progress of each college, including statistical information in relation to its receipts and expenditures, its library, the number of its students and professors, and also as to any improvements and experiments made under the direction of any experiment stations attached to said colleges, with their cost and results, and such other industrial and economical statistics as may be regarded as useful, one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free to all other colleges further endowed under this act.

SEC. 4. That, on or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for colleges or of [for] institutions for colored students, under this act, and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of the Interior shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory of its appropriation the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress, in order that the State or Territory may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of the Interior. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid it shall be covered into the Treasury. And the Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Interior shall annually report to Congress the disbursements which have been made in all the States and Territories, and also whether the appropriation of any State or Territory has been withheld, and if so the reasons therefor.

SEC. 6. Congress may at any time amend, suspend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

Mr. McCOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] to offer an amendment, which I accept.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 1, line 17, after the word "dollars," insert: "To be applied only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the

various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life, and to the facilities for such instruction."

Mr. McCOMAS. There should be some arrangement made as to the consumption of the time, there being two hours' debate, so that the disposition of the bill may not conflict with the other orders. I shall ask the House for a vote after two hours' discussion. I suppose the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH], my colleague on the committee, will be recognized to control the time on that side.

Mr. CARUTH. Is it proposed to take a vote on this bill this evening?

Mr. McCOMAS. It is.

Mr. CARUTH. That would bring it to a quarter of 6 o'clock, and I would therefore suggest that the vote take place the first thing in the morning. We would not have a quorum at 6 o'clock, and the consequence would be that the vote would fail.

Mr. McCOMAS. But it may be that the debate will not take two hours. The House may consent to take a vote before that time, as it may shorten the debate. We can not tell.

Mr. CARUTH. I know the gentleman from Maryland is very long-winded, and it may not be possible to shorten the time.

Mr. McCOMAS. If the gentleman from Kentucky, my colleague, will help we will be able to reach a vote this evening.

Mr. CARUTH. I think you had better agree to take the vote in the morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to one hour and fifteen minutes.

Mr. McCOMAS. If we can get unanimous consent to shorten the time of debate—

Mr. CARUTH. Oh, no; I will not agree to that.

Mr. McCOMAS. Then we will try to get a vote if gentlemen do not exhaust the time.

Mr. CARUTH. I do not know that debate will exhaust the time, but I am afraid that debate may exhaust the House, and at the close of debate there will not be a voting quorum present.

Mr. McCOMAS. We can probably get a vote this evening. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ADAMS. I hope the gentleman will allow me to offer an amendment to that amendment. The word "political" should be inserted in that amendment before the word "economic;" so that it will read, "Political and economic sciences." I do not believe in any institution of learning supported by Government money in which the nature of the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States are not part of the instruction, and I move to amend the amendment by inserting the word "political" before the word "economic."

Mr. BLAND. What sort of politics does the gentleman want taught?

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I think if the amendment be read again it will be apparent to everybody that the Constitution of the United States is embraced. I do not know how you could know very much about economic sciences without understanding the Constitution of the United States, and therefore I ask that the Clerk report the amendment again.

ENROLLED BILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to lay before the House a report of the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 6451) to establish a national military park at the battle-field of Chickamauga; when the Speaker signed the same.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the word "dollars" does not occur in line 18 of the bill, as stated in the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think it must be section 2.

Mr. McCOMAS. It is right in the bill, after "dollars," in line 17.

Mr. GROSVENOR. In what section?

Mr. McCOMAS. In section 1 of the bill, on page 2.

Mr. ROGERS. The word "dollars" is not in that line.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the amendment as it will occur in the original bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What page is it on?

Mr. McCOMAS. Page 2.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The word "dollars" is not in that section.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill as read by the Clerk has not been printed. The Clerk is reading from the Senate bill.

Mr. McCOMAS. The amendment was offered by my colleague with the consent of the whole committee, with the understanding that his amendment is to come in after the word "dollars," in line 17 of the first section of the bill.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. In line 18.

Mr. McCOMAS. No; in line 17. I hold the bill in my hand. After the word "dollars," in line 17, the amendment comes in.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. It is not that way in the bill that I hold in my hand. The word "dollars" is in line 18.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to ask the gentleman if that is the bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. McCOMAS. I have the bill as reported to the House, and my colleagues have the bill as it was reported to the Senate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why can not we get the bill as reported?

Mr. McCOMAS. My colleague from Ohio has the right bill, but the wrong print. I have the House print of July 12, 1890, accompanying my report, from the Committee on Education.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the gentleman from Maryland will allow me, I understand that the bill as reported to the House has never been printed.

Mr. McCOMAS. The bill has been printed, but it is exhausted. I had great trouble in getting a copy myself yesterday. The amendment which my friend from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] offers comes in line 17, after the words "twenty-five thousand."

Mr. BLOUNT. As we have not the bill, I hope my friend from Maryland will give us some explanation of how this differs from the Senate bill.

Mr. McCOMAS. I am very sorry that my friend has not the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I am not the only gentleman that has been unable to get a copy of the bill, and, as there are so many in the same situation, I think the gentleman ought to supply the defect by explaining the difference between this and the Senate bill.

Mr. McCOMAS. The difference is that in the Senate print, at the bottom of the first page, the word "thirtieth" occurs, and on the second page of the Senate print the word "dollars" comes in the eighteenth line, while in the House print it comes after the words "twenty-five thousand," in the seventeenth line. The bills are word for word alike.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. BURROWS). If there be no objection the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio will be agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. I think the amendment ought to be explained.

Mr. McCOMAS. If I am recognized in my own time I will make a brief explanation.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] informs me that the House bill is the same bill that was reported to the Senate from the committee, but was not passed by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. McCOMAS. I repeat that the proper bill (which I am sorry is exhausted, but of course I have no control of that matter) is Senate bill 3714, upon which I had the honor to make a report (No. 2697) from the House Committee on Education. Coming from the Senate, the bill was read twice and referred to that committee June 24, 1890, and on July 12, 1890, was reported back favorably, and the bill I now hold in my hand is the proper print. The bill as reported to the Senate, which is probably the bill now in the hands of the gentleman from Georgia, is not the bill that passed the Senate.

First, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] the amendment offered by my colleague on the committee is one that is concurred in by all the members of the House committee, as I understand, and is intended to limit the expenditure of the money which will be appropriated by this bill to agricultural education and education in the mechanic arts and the English language, so as to prevent the money being expended in the ordinary college training in belles-lettres and the dead languages, but to more nearly confine these schools to industrial training and agricultural education.

Mr. McCREARY. The House bill has been exhausted, and a good many of us have the Senate bill. Now, will the gentleman, before he proceeds with his speech, kindly tell us the exact difference between the House bill and the Senate bill?

Mr. McCOMAS. With pleasure. The only difference is in the numbering of the lines. The bills are the same, *in totidem verbis*.

The amendment which is offered by the gentleman from Ohio comes in the House print after "twenty-five thousand dollars," in line 17, and it comes in the bill which the gentleman from Kentucky probably has, in line 18, after the same words.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As the proceeds of the sales of the public lands diminish, will that lessen the amount appropriated by the bill? Or, if not, how is the fund to be made up?

Mr. McCOMAS. This bill when it reaches the maximum expenditure of \$25,000 per annum, if there be then forty-eight States and Territories, will require \$1,200,000 annually. It will require, if passed now, about \$700,000 annually, rising \$48,000 each year. Now, the proceeds of the sales of the public lands were, in 1889, eight million one hundred and seventy-five thousand and odd dollars; in 1888, \$11,595,000; and so on back for a series of years.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But every year the proceeds of the sales of public lands will be decreased, both by the diminution of the amount of public lands for sale and by the increase of settlement under the homestead law. Now, is there provision anywhere in the bill—I have been unable to find it if there is—as to where the difference is to come from between the proceeds of the sales of public lands and the amount appropriated by the bill? Is there any mode pointed

out by which any sum of money needed under this bill greater than the amount derived from the proceeds of the sales of public lands can be obtained?

Mr. MCCOMAS. Not by this bill. This bill itself is supplemental to the act of July 2, 1862, which, as the gentleman well knows, was the college land-grant act of that eminent man, Senator MORRILL, based upon the annual sales of public lands, and in another body, in a discussion lasting for some time, there seems to have been a very confident belief, re-enforced by the statement of the Commissioner of the Land Office, that in the nature of things for a long reach ahead there would be more than ample funds derivable from the proceeds of the sales of public lands (the arid lands and others being in time, of course, brought into play) to carry on this work indefinitely.

Now, if it be not so, the original bill provided that the railway proceeds and the proceeds of the public lands should be coupled together. It was thought that for a long time the proceeds of the public lands so long as they may last should support these institutions; and the evident sentiment in the other body, and perhaps here, is that the proceeds of railway land-grant acts enhanced, as they will be in later years, should be another source so far as may be from which this fund shall be supplied. While the indication is that the fund shall be derived from the source I have referred to, the appropriation in the bill is "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and if this fund should fail the appropriation would doubtless be made.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. On that very point I ask the gentleman's attention. The language of the bill is:

That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated arising from sales of public lands.

Now, is not this appropriation limited to the funds now in the Treasury or which may hereafter come into the Treasury from the proceeds of the sales of public lands?

Mr. MCCOMAS. Even if that be so, the provision reaches forward for many years, because when we consider the vast amount—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As to the other source of revenue which the gentleman suggested, the proceeds from railroads, there is nothing about it in this bill; and if the gentleman will consider carefully the provisions of the act of 1862 it must be evident to him that that act does not permit the application of any funds that may arise under it to this particular appropriation.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Undoubtedly not. But so far this bill enlarges that act. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the proceeds of the sales of the public lands for a number of years as exhibited in a statement which I have before me. In 1890 this fund amounted to \$1,300,000; in 1881, \$3,300,000; in 1882, \$6,500,000; in 1883, \$9,600,000; in 1884, \$10,300,000; in 1886, \$6,300,000; in 1887, \$6,250,000; in 1888, \$11,595,000; in 1889, \$8,175,000. These figures show the net proceeds (after deducting expenses) of the disposition and sale of the public lands.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am not very familiar with the public-land system; but my information is that after a very few years the appropriation carried in this bill could not be paid out of the proceeds of the public lands. I speak in the presence of the chairman and other members of the committee, who will correct me if I am mistaken. I call attention to this matter because we might find ourselves hereafter in this dilemma: having organized these colleges upon a basis requiring the expenditure of this annual sum, the fund out of which the money is to come might be impaired or destroyed; and that would be a very unfortunate condition for these institutions.

Mr. MCCOMAS. It seemed wise to the committee—and I think my friend from Kentucky, who, I hope, is a friend of this measure, will concur in the wisdom of this view—to make this act conform as far as practicable to the existing system. This bill simply enlarges the appropriation for the existing institution in each of the States, avoiding to a large degree the contention which might arise with respect to the appropriation of money for the aid of education in the States. Both sides of the House agreeing generally that the proceeds of the public lands can be properly applied to this purpose, the bill has been framed in accordance with that view and in conformity with the existing system.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As this debate is so short, with no chance for amendment, I simply desired to call the gentleman's attention to this matter because it may become very important hereafter.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask the gentleman from Maryland whether any examination which he has had occasion to make enables him to say that there is no present charge on the proceeds of the sales of the public lands other than that relating to the experiment stations in the States.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I can not speak of that with perfect accuracy; but I am safe in the statement that the proceeds of the public lands have been for a decade and will probably be for many years to come (without reference to any other charges upon the fund) considerably in excess of the total called for by this bill.

Mr. MCRAE. If the gentleman will allow me, I would like to make a statement in this connection and ask him a question or two. He will remember that the last Congress passed an act repealing all provisions

of law for the sale of the public lands, except to actual settlers under the pre-emption law and the commutation section of the homestead law.

The Commissioners of the General Land Office and the Secretaries of the Interior have for ten years recommended the repeal of both these laws. The Committee on Public Lands reported in favor of such repeal during the last Congress; and this House has frequently voted for it. It is to be hoped that both these enactments will be repealed. Now, if this just legislation should be carried into execution, there will be no lands from which revenue can be derived for the purpose contemplated in this bill. The public lands should be held for and given to the homeless, and not sold.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I remind the gentleman that the commutation feature of the homestead law still remains; and I find by a letter from the Treasury Department now before me that during the fiscal year last ended, 1890, the proceeds of sales of public lands amounted to \$7,500,000.

Mr. MCRAE. Yes, seven million five hundred thousand. But you must remember that while the pre-emption law and the commutation clause of the homestead law are both in operation they are likely to be repealed. They are recommended for repeal, and there is a strong sentiment in favor of the repeal of both. I hope they will be. Now, if this is done you will not be able to draw from the proceeds of the public lands except as to the fees, which will, perhaps, not be sufficient to meet the requirements of the bill.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That question has been considered very thoroughly elsewhere; and under existing law this bill, which has received two days' consideration in another body, was so modified, and for the very purpose of providing this public-land basis, excluding railways. It is believed to be the best mode that could be devised, and that it will for years to come prove a satisfactory basis for these institutions.

Now, if I may be allowed to make a brief statement in regard to the scope of the bill and its provisions it will probably prevent many questions from being asked; and I will do it because members of the House do not have the print of the bill at hand, which has been exhausted; and it may enable the measure to be more clearly understood if I enter into a detailed explanation of it. I will therefore confine myself more particularly to a statement of the provisions of the bill itself than to an exhaustive argument in regard to the merits of the proposition presented.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me ask the gentleman, before he proceeds, if the House committee has not reported the Senate bill without amendment.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. BLOUNT. So that if we have the Senate bill before us we have substantially the House bill?

Mr. MCCOMAS. The Senate bill is precisely the same; but we have had offered, by concurrence of the committee, an amendment, which has been read from the desk. I indicated its scope in my report on the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Maryland that a number of the bills have just been sent in from the document-room.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I am very glad to hear of it, for it has been rather embarrassing to undertake to discuss and explain a measure of this kind with only a single copy of the bill before the House.

Now, this bill, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Before the gentleman proceeds will he allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. MCCOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. In the event of the repeal of the laws to which reference was made by the gentleman from Arkansas a few moments ago might it not be well to insert an amendment, to come in after line 5 of the bill, to the effect to modify the clause so as to read: "not otherwise appropriated, arising from the sale or proceeds of the public lands?" This, of course, would include the fees.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Speaker, while ordinarily I would be very glad to accept that amendment at this stage of the session, I would rather take the bill in its present shape than to subject it to the possibilities which might arise from such an amendment. It is an amendment which led to a great deal of discussion elsewhere.

This is a bill, as its title shows, to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the act of July 2, 1862. It appropriates out of the money arising from the sale of public lands, to be paid to each State and Territory for the endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, now or which may be hereafter established in accordance with that act, \$15,000 for the year ending June 30, 1890, and an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for ten years by an additional \$1,000; and thereafter an annual payment to each State and Territory of \$25,000. These sums are required by the amendment I have offered to be applied only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the branches of science with special reference to their application in the industries of life.

The bill provides that none of the money shall be paid out to a State

where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but separate colleges for white and colored students, if the funds be equitably divided, shall be held a compliance with this provision.

It is further provided that in a State where there is a college established under the act of 1862, and an institution of like character may be hereafter established, or has been established and is now aided by State revenues, for the education of colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts, however it may be named and whether or not it has received money under the act of 1862, the Legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and equitable division of the fund, under this bill, between one college for white students and one institution for colored students, which sums shall be paid accordingly, and such institution for colored students shall be entitled to benefits just as colleges for white students under the act of 1862 are.

The sums appropriated are to be paid by July 31, annually, by the Secretary of the Treasury on the warrant of the Secretary of the Interior to the State or Territorial treasurer or to the officer designated by the State or Territorial law to receive it. He shall, upon the order of the trustees of the college or institution for colored students, pay over such sums to the treasurers of the same, and these treasurers shall report to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior by September 1 in each year a detailed statement of the amount received and of its disbursement.

These grants of money are subject to the assent of the Legislatures of the several States to the purpose of such grants. Installments becoming due to any State before the adjournment of the Legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made on the assent of the governor.

Any portion of such moneys which shall be diminished, lost, or misapplied shall be replaced by the State or Territory to which it belongs, and no part of it shall be applied to purchase, erect, or repair buildings.

The president of each institution benefited must report to the Secretary of the Interior the condition and progress of each college, including statistical information as to its receipts and expenditures, its library, the number of its students and professors, and as to experiments and improvements made by the experiment station attached to the college.

The Secretary of the Interior must ascertain and certify by July 1, annually, the right of each institution to receive such money. If he withholds a certificate, the Secretary must report to the President his reasons therefor and the State may appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary. If the next Congress shall not direct the payment of such sum thus withheld it shall be covered into the Treasury.

The Secretary of the Interior is to administer the law if enacted, and he must report to Congress fully. This is the whole scope of the bill, stated more in detail than would be necessary had not the print of the bill been exhausted.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Texas for a question.

Mr. LANHAM. The question I desired to ask is this: Why the appropriation for the endowment and maintenance of these colleges is not made directly out of the general fund from the Treasury, instead of being made by appropriating the sales of the public lands?

Mr. MCCOMAS. As I have already said, this act is in the nature of a supplement to the public-land act on which these colleges were originally based.

Mr. LANHAM. But what is the distinctive difference in appropriating directly from the Treasury and appropriating the proceeds of the sales of the public land?

Mr. MCCOMAS. For myself, I see no difference. But if the gentleman will recur to the debate which took place elsewhere upon this subject he will find a great deal of vigor introduced in regard to that particular branch of the subject. There were many constitutional scruples and opinions discussed—

Mr. BLOUNT. And always have been.

Mr. MCCOMAS. And always have been in regard to the subject. But finally, after much discussion, there was a general agreement to appropriate the proceeds of the public lands.

Mr. LANHAM. In this connection will the gentleman allow me just one moment to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a veto message of President Buchanan in 1859 upon a bill proposing to devote the sales of the public lands—

Mr. MCCOMAS. I would much prefer not to have this interpolated into the body of my talk, but will yield to the gentleman hereafter to ask the consent he desires.

As I have already said, there is a further proviso that in any State where there has been established a college, or where there may be one hereafter established or added for the education of colored students in agriculture and mechanic arts, whether it has received money heretofore or not, the Legislature of said State may propose, by a report to the Secretary of the Interior, some just and equitable division of the funds between the white college and the colored school—the two different colleges—and that this being divided into two parts may be paid accordingly to each of the different schools, which division of payment shall be a satisfactory compliance with the provisions of the act and

entitle the State to this fund for the education of the white and colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is that left optional with the State?

Mr. MCCOMAS. The State can provide the method, but it must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior before the money will be paid out.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to interrupt the gentleman for a moment. I have not kept up with the history of this legislation. There is a division in some of the Southern States now.

Mr. MCCOMAS. There is a division now in some of the States. There are some prosperous colored schools.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is this intended to require additional action on the part of those States?

Mr. MCCOMAS. The gentleman would find, if he had the right bill, that where they have been established heretofore, and are now aided, those are included; and where they are not the bill provides that they may be established. There are two provisions upon that subject.

Mr. O'DONNELL. You say there are forty-five colleges to which this will apply in the various States and Territories?

Mr. MCCOMAS. At present, yes.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Are you aware how many students there are in those colleges?

Mr. MCCOMAS. At present the total number, up to the last information on that subject, is 808 teachers and 14,692 students.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Then the first year this bill would give \$675,000 to the 14,000 and odd students.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Some of these schools are rapidly increasing. Under this act new ones will be rapidly formed, and that 14,692 is by no means the number, I apprehend, for whose benefit this law would operate the next year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would ask the gentleman from Maryland, could not an amendment be offered to this bill which would cover the States which have biennial meetings of their Legislatures? I will say to the gentleman that it will be impossible for the State of Louisiana, under this proviso, to accept the grants of money under this bill before April, 1892. The Agricultural College of Louisiana is very much in need of this money. It needs it now. Every other college in this country will receive it, will be a little more fortunate in the fact that the States have annual rather than biennial sessions, and I will ask the gentleman, when the proper time comes, to accept an amendment which I shall offer, providing for this contingency.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Now, I hope the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] will frame that amendment cautiously, so as not to affect this matter, and I will look at it before expressing an opinion; I apprehend it is not needed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will attempt to do so.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I will agree if he presses it that he may have a separate vote on that amendment. I am not authorized to accept the amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. That was done in a case in Georgia, where a special provision was made, and it seems to me that it might be done here.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I hope the gentleman will frame the amendment carefully.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will do it as carefully as I can.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Such an amendment, if needed, should apply not only to that State, but also to any State where there is no Legislature in session prior to January, 1891. I would suggest that you make your amendment that in that case the assent of the governor will be sufficient compliance with the act, and that there may be a separate vote upon that amendment. I am not authorized to accept your amendment and do not admit that it is needed.

Mr. CARLTON. That same provision, that where Legislatures fail to act the governors might assent, was in the act of 1862. Georgia received her proportion under the provisions of that act.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Now, Mr. Speaker, this annual report which is here required with respect to the receipts and expenditures, the account of the library, the number of students and professors, the experiments in the experiment stations attached to these colleges, their cost and the result of them, and all other statistics of an industrial and economic nature, are required to be made and sent to all the colleges and schools in all the States for the advancement of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is that the law now?

Mr. MCCOMAS. It is a supplement to the act of 1862. It is the act of 1862 amplified. Now, this whole subject is under the control of the Secretary of the Interior, to whom reports are to be made. The expenditure of the funds is entirely under the control of the States. The report as to the expenditures will come, under this act as under the act of 1862, from the States. The gentleman from Tennessee, whom I do not see now in his seat, is in error in saying that this act makes any new law with respect to the report as to the expenditure of the funds to be made by the States.

The object of this bill is to place the system of colleges for teaching agriculture and mechanic arts upon an enduring basis.

The expenditure is liberal, but the interests of the farmers and industrial people are larger still.

The educators in these colleges, officers of the Farmers' Alliance, and representatives of the National Grange appeared before the committees of the House or Senate in behalf of this bill.

The increase of acreage actually cultivated in staple crops, from 113,412,764 acres in 1874 to 211,000,000 acres in 1889, warrants this annual expenditure for colleges to train farmers and improve the cultivation of this vast acreage now tilled.

In the fourth clause of section 5 it provides that—

An annual report shall be made regarding the progress of each college, recording any improvements and experiments made, with their cost and results, and such other matters, including State industrial and economical statistics, as may be supposed useful, one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free by each to all the other colleges which may be endowed under the provisions of this act, and also one copy to the Secretary of the Interior.

Now, I shall not, in the temper of the House, as I understand it, enlarge upon this subject or discuss it fully on its merits.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question right there. What difference does he see between this bill and the Blair bill?

Mr. MCCOMAS. This is an out-and-out appropriation of the proceeds of the sales of public lands.

Mr. ROGERS. But what is the difference in principle between them?

Mr. MCCOMAS. There are a great many.

Mr. ROGERS. You say that you do not object to it.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I favor both. I earnestly contended for the Blair bill and moved to report it favorably to the House. It is on the Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS. Do you not think that if we are to appropriate money for educational purposes we ought to appropriate it for common schools instead of for colleges?

Mr. MCCOMAS. I confess for myself that my sympathies are in favor of both, and more with the Blair bill, because it reaches the poor illiterates.

Mr. ROGERS. I supposed that your side of the House had the management of this matter and would take that up.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I will try to bring it up and have tried. So far as this bill goes, it is agreed to by gentlemen on the committee and has received support on both sides of this House, and it does not conflict with constitutional scruples which many gentlemen might entertain as to the Blair bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman allow me to say in reply to the last suggestion, as to the constitutionality of this question, is not that a thing of the past? And I would also ask if there is anything in this bill providing for this system except what has already been anticipated and is existing law to-day?

Mr. MCCOMAS. That is the whole of it.

Mr. BLOUNT. For instance, you have got your colleges based on the land scrip of 1862, and you have your experiment stations based on the act of 1887; and as I understand it, the effect of this bill is simply to increase the amount appropriated from \$15,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That is the whole scope of this bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Therefore we are not confronted here with the question as to whether we are adopting this or that system, but we have it now, and this is just to extend its operation.

Mr. MCCOMAS. And that is all. It is to appropriate more to secure some more schools in the new States.

Mr. BLOUNT. But the principle is already in the law.

Mr. MCCOMAS. And not only the principle, but the practice, the practice of all the States in the Union, and this simply increases the amount and adds to the number of schools of like character.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. The gentleman speaks about constitutional scruples. Does the gentleman have any constitutional scruples about levying taxes on five millions of people in the State of New York and upon one hundred and fifty thousand in the State of Delaware upon the basis of population and then appropriating money to the amount of \$25,000 to the State of Delaware and only \$25,000 to the State of New York?

Mr. MCCOMAS. That is not a constitutional question.

Mr. HEARD. If the gentleman from Maryland will allow me, I would like to know where the gentleman gets his idea and if he proposes to support these institutions by a direct tax.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I would be glad to answer all questions, but I do not wish to enter into elaborate constitutional arguments and consume the whole time. The question of the gentleman from Iowa I have sufficiently answered.

Mr. HEARD. I was trying to get the gentleman out of a hole that he does not seem to know he got into.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I will yield a moment to my friend from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who desires to offer a paper.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I will not undertake to discuss the bill under consideration. I shall take the time given me to ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD some literature bearing on this question. I ask to have printed the veto message of President Buchanan, on February 24, 1859, upon the bill entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The message is as follows:

JAMES BUCHANAN—II.

February 24, 1859.

To the House of Representatives of the United States:

I return, with my objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, the bill entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," presented to me on the 18th instant.

This bill makes a donation to the several States of 20,000 acres of the public lands for each Senator and Representative in the present Congress, and also an additional donation of 20,000 acres for each additional Representative to which any State may be entitled under the census of 1859.

According to a report from the Interior Department, based upon the present number of Senators and Representatives, the lands given to the States amount to 6,060,000 acres, and their value, at the minimum Government price of \$1.25 per acre, to \$7,575,000.

The object of this gift, as stated by the bill, is "the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college [in each State] where the leading object shall be, without excluding scientific or other classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

As there does not appear from the bill to be any beneficiaries in existence to which this endowment can be applied, each State is required "to provide, within five years at least, not less than one college, or the grant to said State shall cease." In that event the "said State shall be bound to pay the United States the amount received of any lands previously sold, and that the title to purchasers under the State shall be valid."

The grant in land itself is confined to such States as have public lands within their limits worth \$1.25 per acre, in the opinion of the governor. For the remaining States the Secretary of the Interior is directed to issue "land scrip to the amount of their distributive shares in acres under the provisions of this act, said scrip to be sold by said States, and the proceeds thereof applied to the uses and purposes prescribed in this act, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever." The lands are granted and the scrip is to be issued "in sections or subdivisions of sections of not less than one-quarter of a section."

According to an estimate from the Interior Department, the number of acres which will probably be accepted by States having public lands within their own limits will not exceed 580,000 acres, and it may be much less, leaving a balance of 5,480,000 acres to be provided for by scrip. These grants of land and land-scrip to each of the thirty-three States are made upon certain conditions, the principal of which is that if the fund shall be lost or diminished on account of unfortunate investments, or otherwise, the deficiency shall be replaced and made good by the respective States.

I shall now proceed to state my objections to this bill. I deem it to be both inexpedient and unconstitutional.

1. This bill has been passed at a period when we can with great difficulty raise sufficient revenue to sustain the expenses of the Government. Should it become a law the Treasury will be deprived of the whole, or nearly the whole, of our income from the sale of public lands, which, for the next fiscal year, has been estimated at \$5,000,000.

A bare statement of the case will make this evident. The minimum price at which we dispose of our lands is \$1.25 per acre. At the present moment, however, the price has been reduced to those who purchase the bounty-land warrants of the old soldiers to 85 cents per acre, and of these warrants there are still outstanding and unlocated, as appears by a report (February 12, 1859) from the General Land Office, the amount of 11,990,391 acres. This has already greatly reduced the current sales by the Government and diminished the revenue from this source. If, in addition, thirty-three States shall enter the market with their land-scrip, the price must be greatly reduced below even 85 cents per acre, as much to the prejudice of the old soldiers who have not already parted with their land-warrants as to Government.

It is easy to perceive that with this glut of the market Government can sell little or no lands at \$1.25 per acre when the price of bounty-land warrants and scrip shall be reduced to half this sum. This source of revenue will be almost entirely dried up. Under the bill the States may sell their land-scrip at any price it may bring. There is no limitation whatever in this respect. Indeed, they must sell for what the scrip will bring, for without this fund they can not proceed to establish their colleges within the five years to which they are limited. It is manifest, therefore, that to the extent to which this bill will prevent the sale of public lands at \$1.25 per acre, to that amount it will have precisely the same effect upon the Treasury as if we should impose a tax to create a loan to endow these State colleges.

Surely the present is the most unpropitious moment which could have been selected for the passage of this bill.

2. Waiving for the present the question of constitutional power, what effect will this bill have on the relations established between the Federal and State Governments? The Constitution is a grant to Congress of a few enumerated but most important powers relating chiefly to war, peace, foreign and domestic commerce, negotiation, and other subjects which can be best or alone exercised beneficially by the common Government.

All other powers are reserved to the States and to the people. For the efficient and harmonious working of both, it is necessary that their several spheres of action should be kept distinct from each other. This alone can prevent conflict and mutual injury. Should the time ever arrive when the State governments shall look to the Federal Treasury for the means of supporting themselves and maintaining their systems of education and internal policy, the character of both governments will be greatly deteriorated. The representatives of the States and of the people, feeling a more immediate interest in obtaining money to lighten the burdens of their constituents than for the promotion of the more distant objects intrusted to the Federal Government will naturally incline to obtain means from the Federal Government for State purposes. If a question shall arise between an appropriation of land or money to carry into effect the objects of the Federal Government and those of the States, their feelings will be enlisted in favor of the latter. This is human nature; and hence the necessity of keeping the two governments entirely distinct. The preponderance of this home feeling has been manifested by the passage of the present bill. The establishment of these colleges has prevailed over the pressing wants of the common treasury. No nation ever had such an inheritance as we possess in the public lands. These ought to be managed with the utmost care, but at the same time with a liberal spirit toward actual settlers.

In the first year of a war with a powerful naval nation the revenue from customs must, in a great degree, cease. A resort to loans will then become necessary, and these can always be obtained, as our fathers obtained them, on advantageous terms, by pledging the public lands as security. In this view of the subject, it would be wiser to grant money to the States for domestic purposes than to squander away the public lands and transfer them in large bodies into the hands of speculators.

A successful struggle on the part of the State governments with the General Government for the public lands would deprive the latter of the means of performing its high duties, especially at critical and dangerous periods. Besides, it would operate with equal detriment to the best interests of the States. It would remove the most wholesome of all restraints on legislative bodies—that of being obliged to raise money by taxation from their constituents—and would lead to extravagance, if not to corruption. What is obtained easily and without responsibility will be lavishly expended.

3. This bill, should it become a law, will operate greatly to the injury of the new States. The progress of settlements and the increase of an industrious population, owning an interest in the soil they cultivate, are the causes which will build them up into great and flourishing commonwealths. Nothing could be more prejudicial to their interests than for wealthy individuals to acquire large tracts of the public land and hold them for speculative purposes. The low price to which this land-serip will probably be reduced will tempt speculators to buy it in large amounts and locate it on the best lands belonging to the Government. The eventual consequence must be that the men who desire to cultivate the soil will be compelled to purchase these very lands at rates much higher than the price at which they could be obtained from the Government.

4. It is extremely doubtful, to say the least, whether this bill would contribute to the advancement of agriculture and the mechanic arts, objects the dignity and value of which can not be too highly appreciated.

The Federal Government which makes the donation has confessedly no constitutional power to follow it into the States and enforce the application of the fund to the intended objects. As donors we shall possess no control over our own gift after it shall have passed from our hands. It is true that the State Legislatures are required to stipulate that they will faithfully execute the trust in the manner prescribed by the bill. But should they fail to do this what would be the consequence? The Federal Government has no power, and ought to have no power, to compel the execution of the trust. It would be in as helpless a condition as if even in this, the time of great need, we were to demand any portion of the many millions of surplus revenue deposited with the States for safe-keeping under the act of 1835.

5. This bill will injuriously interfere with existing colleges in the different States, in many of which agriculture is taught as a science and in all of which it ought to be so taught. These institutions of learning have grown up with the growth of the country under the fostering care of the States and the munificence of individuals to meet the advancing demands for education. They have proved great blessings to the people. Many, indeed most of them, are poor and sustain themselves with difficulty. What the effect will be on these institutions of creating an indefinite number of rival colleges, sustained by the endorsement of the Federal Government, it is not difficult to determine.

Under this bill it is provided that scientific and classical studies shall not be excluded from them. Indeed, it would be almost impossible to sustain them without such a provision, for no father would incur the expense of sending a son to one of these institutions for the sole purpose of making him a scientific farmer or mechanic. The bill itself negatives this idea, and declares that their object is "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." This certainly ought to be the case. In this view of the subject it would be far better, if such an appropriation of lands must be made to institutions of learning in the several States, to apply it directly to the establishment of professorships of agriculture and the mechanic arts in existing colleges without the intervention of the State Legislatures. It would be difficult to foresee how these Legislatures will manage this fund. Each Representative in Congress for whose district the proportion of 20,000 acres has been granted will probably insist that the proceeds shall be expended within its limits. There will undoubtedly be a struggle between different localities in each State concerning the division of the gift, which may end in disappointing the hopes of true friends of agriculture. For this state of things we are without remedy. Not so in regard to State colleges. We might grant land to these corporations to establish agricultural and mechanical professorships; and, should they fail to comply with the conditions on which they accepted the grant, we might enforce specific performance of these before the ordinary courts of justice.

6. But does Congress possess the power, under the Constitution, to make a donation of public lands to the different States of the Union, to provide colleges for the purpose of educating their own people?

I presume the general proposition is undeniable that Congress does not possess the power to appropriate money in the Treasury, raised by taxes on the people of the United States, for the purpose of educating the people of the respective States. It will not be pretended that any such power is to be found among the specific powers granted to Congress, nor that "it is necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any one of these powers. Should Congress exercise such a power, this would be to break down the barriers which have been so carefully constructed in the Constitution to separate Federal from State authority. We should then not only "lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" for Federal purposes, but for every State purpose which Congress might deem expedient or useful. This would be an actual consolidation of the Federal and State Governments, so far as the great taxing and money power is concerned, and constitute a sort of partnership between the two in the Treasury of the United States, equally ruinous to both.

But it is contended that the public lands are placed upon a different footing from money raised by taxation, and that the proceeds arising from their sale are not subject to the limitations of the Constitution, but may be appropriated or given away by Congress, at its own discretion, to States, corporations, or individuals, for any purpose they may deem expedient.

The advocates of this bill attempt to sustain their position upon the language of the second clause of the third section of the fourth article of the Constitution, which declares that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States." They contend that by a fair interpretation of the words "disposed of" in this clause Congress possesses the power to make this gift of public lands to the States for purposes of education.

It would require clear and strong evidence to induce the belief that the framers of the Constitution, after having limited the powers of Congress to certain, precise, and specific objects intended, by employing the words "dispose of," to give that body unlimited power over the vast public domain. It would be a strange anomaly, indeed, to have created two funds—the one by taxation, confined to the execution of the enumerated powers delegated to Congress, and the other from the public lands, applicable to all subjects, foreign and domestic, which Congress might designate; that this fund should be "disposed of," not to pay the debts of the United States, nor "to raise and support armies," nor "to provide and maintain a navy," nor to accomplish any one of the other great objects enumerated in the Constitution, but be diverted from them to pay the debts of the States, to educate their people, and to carry into effect any other measure of their domestic policy. This would be to confer upon Congress a vast and irresponsible authority, utterly at war with the well known jealousy of Federal power which prevailed at the formation of the Constitution. The natural intention would be that as the Constitution confined Congress to well defined specific powers the funds placed at their command, whether in land or money, should be appropriated to the performance of the duties corresponding with these powers. If not, a Government has been created with all its other powers carefully limited, but without any limitation in respect to the public lands.

But I can not so read the words "dispose of" as to make them embrace the idea of "giving away." The true meaning of words is always to be ascertained

by the subject to which they are applied, and the known general intent of the lawgiver. Congress is a trustee under the Constitution for the people of the United States to "dispose of" their public lands, and I think I may venture to assert with confidence that no case can be found in which a trustee in the position of Congress has been authorized to "dispose of" property by its owner, where it has been held that these words authorized such trustee to give away the fund intrusted to his care. No trustee, when called upon to account for the disposition of the property placed under his management before any judicial tribunal, would venture to present such a plea in his defense. The true meaning of these words is clearly stated by Chief-Justice Taney, in delivering the opinion of the court (19 Howard, page 436). He says, in reference to this clause of the Constitution: "It begins its enumeration of powers by that of disposing; in other words, making sale of the lands, or raising money from them, which, as we have already said, was the main object of the cession (from the States), and which is the first thing provided for in the article." It is unnecessary to refer to the history of the times to establish the known fact that this statement of the Chief-Justice is perfectly well founded. That it never was intended by the framers of the Constitution that these lands should be given away by Congress is manifest from the concluding portion of the same clause. By it Congress has power not only "to dispose of" the territory, but of the "other property of the United States." In the language of the Chief-Justice (page 437): "And the same power of making needful rules respecting the territory is in precisely the same language applied to the other property of the United States, associating the power over the territory in this respect with the power over movable or personal property; that is, the ships, arms, or munitions of war which then belonged in common to the State sovereignties."

The question is still clearer in regard to the public lands in the States and Territories within the Louisiana and Florida purchases. These lands were paid for out of the public Treasury, from money raised by taxation. Now, if Congress had no power to appropriate the money with which these lands were purchased, is it not clear that the power over the lands is equally limited?

The mere conversion of this money into land could not confer upon Congress new power over the disposition of land which they had not possessed over money. If it could, then a trustee, by changing the character of the fund intrusted to his care for social objects, from money into land, might give the land away, or devote it to any purpose he thought proper, however foreign from the trust. The inference is irresistible that this land partakes of the very same character with the money paid for it and can be devoted to no objects different from those to which the money could have been devoted. If this were not the case, then, by the purchase of a new territory from a foreign government, out of the public Treasury, Congress could enlarge their own powers and appropriate the proceeds of the sales of the land thus purchased, at their own discretion, to other and far different objects from what they could have applied the purchase money which had been raised by taxation.

It has been asserted truly that Congress, in numerous instances, have granted lands for the purposes of education. These grants have been chiefly, if not exclusively, made to the new States as they successively entered the Union, and consisted at the first of one section, and afterwards of two sections of the public land in each township for the use of schools, as well as of additional sections for a State university. Such grants are not, in my opinion, a violation of the Constitution. The United States is a great landed proprietor, and from the very nature of this relation it is both the right and the duty of Congress, as their trustee, to manage these lands as any other prudent proprietor would manage them for his own best advantage.

Now, no consideration could be presented of a stronger character to induce the American people to brave the difficulties and hardships of frontier life, and to settle upon these lands, and to purchase them at a fair price, than to give to them and to their children an assurance of the means of education. If any prudent individual had held these lands he could not have adopted a wiser course to bring them into market and enhance their value than to give a portion of them for purposes of education. As a mere speculation, he would pursue this course. No person will contend that donations of land to all the States of the Union for the erection of colleges within the limits of each can be embraced by this principle.

It can not be pretended that an agricultural college in New York or Virginia would aid the settlement or facilitate the sale of public lands in Minnesota or California. This can not possibly be embraced within the authority which a prudent proprietor of land would exercise over his own possessions. I purposely avoid any attempt to define what portions of land may be granted, and for what purposes, to improve the value and promote the settlement and sale of the remainder without violating the Constitution. In this case I adopt the rule that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

JAMES BUCHANAN.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has eleven minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Have I only got eleven minutes left out of the hour?

Mr. PAYSON. You have been talking about that time.

Mr. CARUTH. My colleague sees that I gauged him accurately.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I yielded to answer questions on every side.

Mr. CARUTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there does not seem to be any justice in the provisions of this bill. The bill provides that the sum of \$15,000 be paid the first year, increased by \$1,000 the second and succeeding years till it amounts to \$25,000 in ten years, to be paid to each State for the purpose of securing additional instruction in the colleges in that State; and after the ten years for all time it proposes to appropriate \$25,000 a year to each of the States without regard to population or taxes or wealth for the purpose of sustaining institutions of learning in those States; and it does not seem to me that there is any justice in such a proposition. The Constitution of the United States provides that direct taxes shall be apportioned among the States according to their respective numbers, and practically all other taxes are apportioned in the same ratio, and when expenditures are to be made justice would seem to require that for general purposes they should be appropriated in the same proportion.

The Blair educational bill proposed to distribute the money on the basis of illiteracy and to provide for the education of the people where there was a great amount of illiteracy by the aid of the General Government, basing the appropriations upon the necessities of the situation. There was some reason in that. But this bill proposes to distribute an amount of money to be raised every year by general taxa-

tion among the States without regard to their needs, without regard to anything except the fact of statehood. I do not think that proposition is constitutional. If it was constitutional I do not think it would be reasonable. I do not think it is right to tax the people of the State of Iowa on the basis of its population, with eleven Representatives, to raise money and then to give to other States ten times as much of that money, in proportion to their taxation, as is given to the State which I represent.

Under this bill the State of New York, with thirty-four Representatives, would get only \$25,000, while the State of Delaware, with one Representative, the State of Rhode Island, the State of Vermont, each with two, would get \$25,000. The six new England States, with twenty-four Representatives, would get \$150,000, while New York, with thirty-four Representatives, would only get \$25,000. There is no justice in any such legislation, and, with due respect to the distinguished gentleman in another body who introduced it, I say that it is not at all in harmony with the spirit of the Blair educational bill or with the spirit of any other proposition that I have ever known to be put forward for the distribution of public money for educational purposes.

Mr. HEARD. Does not the same injustice obtain with regard to the payment of the salaries of United States Senators?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. But that is under a provision of the United States Constitution that can not be avoided. The Constitution expressly provides that there shall be equal representation of the States in the Senate, and the Constitution can not be changed in that respect.

Mr. HEARD. I thought the gentleman was arguing in regard to the injustice of the proposition.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Well, the injustice to which the gentleman refers in relation to the pay of United States Senators is one that we can not avoid; but we ought not to create a new injustice by our own act. We ought not to undertake to raise money from five millions of people and then appropriate it on the basis of population to others without regard to the ratio on which it was paid.

Mr. McCORMICK. Is there anything to prevent an agricultural college in the State of Iowa from taking students from the State of Maine, the State of Rhode Island, the State of Delaware, or the State of Vermont?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Or the State of Michigan?

Mr. McCORMICK. Or the State of Michigan?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. The agricultural-college act of our State provides how the students shall be received, and it provides that they shall be received into the institution on recommendations from the officers of the various counties of the State.

Mr. McCORMICK. But is the institution limited to students from the State of Iowa?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I do not know; but the recommendations have to come from the officers within the territory of the State and from the different portions of the State. But even if the gentleman's suggestion were correct, why should we enact legislation here that would compel us in the State of Iowa, in order to secure a fair distribution of this fund, to send our students to Delaware, Vermont, and Rhode Island?

The claim that it is for agricultural instruction is a very seductive argument, but I will not consent to such an unfair distribution of the public funds simply because it is asked in the name of agriculture. The distribution, if made at all, should be on the basis of population.

Mr. CARUTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DUNNELL].

Mr. DUNNELL. I desire to state some of my objections to this bill. One of the objections which I intended to name has been shadowed forth in the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE]. This bill, stripped of all verbiage, is simply a proposition to go to the Treasury of the United States for \$15,000 for each State in the Union to help support an agricultural college in that State. We all of us, or nearly all, have voted for the repeal of the pre-emption law. The interests of the country demand the repeal of that law. A repealing act has passed through this House many times and it ought to become a law.

The time has come when there should be simply the naked homestead law, without any commutation clause or provision in it. When that legislation takes place where will be these resources that are now so much talked about? No matter whether we get ten millions to-day or eight millions or five or six millions, the outcome of this legislation will be that we shall henceforth have to pay out of the Treasury of the United States fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen thousand dollars per annum to each State and Territory for the support of a State agricultural school.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. DUNNELL. I can not yield. Mr. Speaker, I have never yet fallen into the theory that the Federal Government should assume educational functions in the different States. I did not vote for the Blair bill. I have never yet been converted to the theory that the Federal Treasury should take care of education in the several States. I have always believed it better for each State to rely upon its own resources, to develop its own intelligence, to build up its own State institutions rather than to rely upon the Federal Treasury. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, Mr. Speaker, suppose there is that provision in this bill, or suppose that Congress should fail in a given year to appropriate this money; if we begin, we have got to go through. If we give \$15,000 for two or three years, what havoc and ruin we shall work if in the fifth or sixth year we fail to keep up this appropriation. Here is a new school proposed to be supported on \$15,000. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] knows nothing about the cost of an institution of learning if he supposes that \$15,000 will bring into existence a new school. Again, why should the State of Massachusetts take \$15,000 from the United States Treasury? She is loaded with wealth. Why, then, give her \$15,000 to help carry on her educational institutions?

I suppose our State University would be glad to have \$15,000; I have not been asked to vote for such an appropriation; but my constituency would be better pleased by a repeal of the pre-emption law and the assistance which would thereby be given to the development of the State at large than by receiving \$15,000 in this way. We have had a large income already in connection with our schools. Our State University has absorbed the Agricultural College, the latter being now simply a subordinate branch of the university. So it is in a great many of the States.

In fifteen of the States in this Union we have not a distinctive agricultural college as the outcome of the act of 1862. This pittance, as I may call it (though in some respects it may appear a large sum), will not create new schools; and those already in existence, if they have made wise use of their money, are able to go on in the future as they have done for the last twelve years. This proposition means simply to take so much money out of the Treasury, though professedly it is an appropriation of the proceeds of the public lands. Those proceeds go into the Treasury directly in the first instance; and this bill proposes to take the money out. It does not change the nature of the proceeding to call it an appropriation of the proceeds of the public lands.

But, sir, the proceeds of these sales will very soon—I hope within the next ten years—become a cipher in this country. We should hold every remaining acre of agricultural lands belonging to the United States for the actual settler under the homestead law. The great wrong which will flow from this proposed law is that the same influences which will enact it here to-day will prevent the repeal of the pre-emption law. They will do so that we may have "proceeds from the sales of public lands." These sales are the prices which the settlers will have to pay to obtain homes. If these colleges are in want, let us go to the Treasury and take the money and call it by the right name. We should not doom the remaining public lands to aid in the support of agricultural schools or any other schools. They should be free and open to the people. These are my reasons for my vote in opposition to this measure.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CARUTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR], who desires to explain his amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the time this bill was considered by the Committee on Education and when it was agreed that it should be favorably reported by the committee, it was also agreed that I should have the right to amend the bill restricting the use of the money to agricultural education, if I so desired. There happened to be on that occasion a very full meeting of the committee, and a majority of the members were unwilling to defer the disposition of the bill to a subsequent day for the purpose of considering this amendment, as it is difficult at times to have a quorum present. Therefore the amendment I have proposed was never considered in the committee; but it was agreed, as I have stated, that I should have the right to submit an amendment of this character in the House if I so desired, after giving the matter further consideration.

Afterward, when it became known that I expected to propose this amendment in the House a number of gentlemen connected with the agricultural colleges of the country, and also a number of gentlemen representing the agricultural interests of the country came here for the purpose of agreeing, if possible, as I understand, upon some amendment which would not defeat the bill and which would be satisfactory to all of the friends of the measure. There was at first great anxiety that the bill should pass the House as it came from the Senate, as the Senate might not agree to the amendments that the House would make, in which event the bill would fail. I said to these gentlemen that I should insist on making an amendment, and after considerable consultation the amendment which I have proposed was agreed upon and I was to make it.

The amendment I have proposed has the approval of Henry E. Alvord, president Maryland Agricultural College; W. H. Scott, president Ohio State University; H. H. Goodell, president Massachusetts Agricultural College; George W. Atherton, president of the Pennsylvania State College; John Trimble, secretary National Grange and member of legislative committee; Mortimer Whitehead, lecturer National Grange and member of committee on national legislation of New Jersey State Grange.

I hold in my hand a paper prepared and signed by all of these gentlemen approving the amendment I propose.

I have also received some telegrams on this subject, including one from the president of the Ohio Grange, J. H. Brigham, strongly approving the amendment, but I must say that it was Mr. Brigham's de-

sire that this bill should not be considered at the present session. I have several letters from him requesting that it be deferred until the next session of Congress, and while I shall cheerfully support the bill if it is amended as I propose, I would have been better satisfied to postpone its consideration until the next session in order to hear further from the farmers in regard to it.

After we had agreed upon the wording of the amendment, I carried it to most of the members of the committee—not all of them. I attempted to find all of them, but failed. I believe, however, that all the members of the committee to whom I showed the amendment assented to it; and I think it has the approval of all who are favorable to the passage of the bill.

The bill as it passed the Senate gave all of this money to the agricultural colleges, to be used as they saw proper. If they want to use it to give instruction in Latin or Greek or Hebrew, they can do so. The objection has been made that our agricultural colleges educate young men to be lawyers and doctors and preachers and teachers and disqualify them for the farm; that, in fact, they educate them in such a way as to prevent their ever being farmers; and I am satisfied that in some instances there is too much truth in this, and the object I have in presenting this amendment is to limit the use of this money to instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts, and to such branches of education as will benefit labor and prepare young men for the various industries of life, and my amendment is broad enough to embrace all kinds of labor and all kinds of employment in this line.

It embraces just those branches which fit young men for entering upon a successful career of industry. This is what we want. Young men need to be taught the science of every-day life, how and when to plow, how and when to reap, the composition of the soil, and the needs of plants and fruits and crops, the use of machinery, etc. These are the mysteries into which they should delve, and if they are led in these paths they will become interested and duty will also be pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, there is another amendment which I think ought to be made, though it may not be necessary. I did not feel at liberty to change the language of this amendment, for the reason that it had been agreed upon by gentlemen representing different colleges and different agricultural organizations.

But I am going to ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified by the addition of one word in the first line of the amendment, so it will read: "to be applied only to additional instructions in agriculture, mechanic arts, the English language," etc. The word I propose to insert is "additional."

Mr. HEARD. Will this require any change in the course of study, any addition to the course?

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I think not. My object in asking unanimous consent for this modification is this: In my conferences with these college presidents I learned that a certain amount of money in each institution is applied to agricultural education, that is, what they consider instruction of a purely agricultural character, especially intended to fit young men for the farm or the shop or the mill or some of the other practical industries of life, and I think that the addition of this word would limit the appropriation to additional instruction in these lines.

If a certain sum is now used in any college for purely agricultural or mechanical instruction I do not want that money withdrawn and a part or all of this substituted in its place. If this is done we will not be providing any more instruction or not much more than we now have.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I have a letter from Professor Chamberlain, the president of the Iowa Agricultural College, who strongly urges the adoption of the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and saying that Mr. Brigham favors it in this form. I would therefore caution the gentleman in regard to changing the proposition unless he has consulted with these gentlemen who are the authors of the bill.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I have consulted with some of them and they are in favor of the amendment as modified and prefer it to the original form. My reason for not introducing the amendment in this form in the first instance was that some of the men to whom I have referred had given their assent to this amendment in the language in which I first presented it, and have never been consulted as to the change I now propose, and hence I propose this additional word for your consideration and for your judgment.

Let me explain the object of this additional amendment a little further. The trouble is that in some of the States there is very little difference between an agricultural college and a literary college. I made this objection to these college presidents who came here in the interest of the Senate bill, and I told them that I should vote against the bill as it came from the Senate, but would be willing to vote for it if it could be framed so as to subservise the interests of the farmers and mechanics of the country. I inquired of them how much money, as a matter of fact, was annually expended by them in what they call agricultural and mechanical education, and they gave some amounts.

Suppose a college now expends \$25,000 in this kind of instruction and we pass this bill without adding the word "additional" before "instruction," what will prevent a college from using the \$25,000 appropriated by this bill in lieu of the other \$25,000? Or what will prevent

the college from taking \$15,000 of the \$25,000 they now use and adding this \$25,000 to the \$10,000 that would be left when the \$15,000 is transferred to some other college instruction?

I do not know that any college would do this, but it might be done if we do not provide that this money shall be used for additional instruction in those branches in the interest of which we now propose to have this money expended. I do not want any of the money now used in the interests of agriculture diverted to instruction in Latin, or Greek, or Hebrew, or to any other instruction foreign to the work of an agricultural college as I think these institutions should be managed and employed.

I want it understood, Mr. Speaker, that this appropriation shall be an additional sum to be used to fit young men and young women for the various industries of life. If any agricultural college is now employing annually \$25,000 for such educational purposes as are contemplated in my first amendment, I want this \$25,000 added to it, and I want to be able to hold these colleges responsible so that we can call upon them from year to year and know for ourselves whether this money is expended for additional education in agriculture, the mechanical arts, etc., or not.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the word "additional" may be added before the word "instruction." There can not be any objection to its insertion in this connection, as it seems to me, and I desire in any event to present it.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object.

Mr. MCOMAS. The amendment agreed to covers the whole business.

Mr. CARUTH. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL], chairman of the Committee on Education.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill has not been asked for by the farmers, that I know of. I have carefully looked over my correspondence and I find but three letters in its favor: one from a graduate of the Michigan Agricultural College and two others from two professors in that institution, all worthy gentlemen.

This bill starts off giving an appropriation of \$15,000 "to colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," forty-three in number, amounting to \$645,000 the first year, and every year thereafter the appropriation increases \$1,000 annually for ten years, when it is fixed at \$25,000 each year, making a magnificent permanent endowment for these colleges of \$1,075,000 per annum. If it is for the benefit of agriculture, why not confine its provisions to the purely agricultural colleges, instead of bestowing a portion of these large sums upon institutions that have established an agricultural chair to comply with the forms of law? Heretofore 10,000,000 acres of land have been appropriated for the benefit of agricultural colleges.

The farmers appear content with this and have not asked for the passage of this bill. I believe several college presidents have shown some interest in the measure and have sought to impress their view upon the Committee on Education, to which this bill was referred. I think my colleagues on that committee will bear me out in this assertion. The farmers ask this Congress to take up and pass the Conger lard bill, the pure-food bill, the Butterworth bill to prohibit gambling in grain, and the bill to save us from alien landlordism.

These are the bills the farming community are demanding action upon, and I am glad to know their wishes will soon be granted. They are willing that the bill now under consideration should wait until these other measures, vital to their well-being, are enacted into law. The amendment offered for the committee by Mr. TAYLOR was a portion of the bill as originally presented by the Senate, but for some reason was stricken out.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, letters from the ex-master of the National Grange, the present master of that body, the master of the Mississippi State Grange, the Ohio State Board of Agriculture, the Schoharie County (New York) Farmers' Association (fourteen hundred members), the farmers of Niagara County, New York, all demanding, in the interest of agriculture, that this amendment be made a part of the bill. I also have a petition to the Committee on Education, signed by the officers of the National Grange, Patrons of Industry, and four college presidents of the National Association of Agricultural Colleges, asking for the insertion of the amendment.

These papers did not reach the committee until after it was agreed to report the bill as it came from the Senate. I can vote for the bill with the amendment, but not without it. I could wish that a bill to encourage general education all over the land could be considered. As I have never voted against any measure in favor of education I shall support this bill if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Speaker, the presentation of the questions involved in this bill at this time is an apt illustration of the uncertainties of legislation in this body.

I understood from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCOMAS] that it was his purpose on yesterday to move a suspension of the rules when the Committee on Education had been reached in order that this pending bill might be considered and if possible passed under a suspension of the rules. When the hour of adjournment arrived and the committee had not been reached I supposed that this matter had been

passed over, at least for awhile. But judge of my amazement, judge of my astonishment, if you can, when I found this morning upon entering this Hall that it was the design of the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, to pull out of his inside pocket a resolution of the committee fixing a time for the consideration of this bill amongst others. I came to the conclusion that it was indeed true of this, as of all other things human, that no man can tell what a day or an hour will bring forth.

I come in here with no prepared speech to make against this measure, but I come, Mr. Speaker, with the sentiment, and in the name, and under the principles of the party I uphold, to enter my solemn protest against the passage of this bill by Democratic votes. I have been told that this measure is not akin to the Blair education bill. If the same principle that gave birth to the one measure did not give birth to this also, then I am unable to determine from what source this bill has sprung.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that the man who can take this bill and show its distinction in principle, or any difference that exists in the principle it embodies, from that embodied in the Blair bill is a man of so fine an intellectual mind, so endowed with intellectual acumen as would enable him to divide a hair into two parts and to determine its west from its northwest side. [Laughter.]

Here is a proposition submitted by the Committee on Education, supporting a bill that passed the Senate without discussion, to appropriate the money of the people of this country to the extent of \$1,100,000 per annum for an indefinite period for the support of these agricultural and mechanical colleges.

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to put a single obstacle in the way of education. Such education as I myself possess was given to me as a free gift from the public schools of this country. I have always been a firm and devoted advocate of our public-school system. But, sir, I am unwilling to undertake by any legislation we may adopt to carry the authority of this Government into the various States of this Union and, by a proposition of this character, make our Government an educational institution. I am unwilling to take the money that is derived from the tax-payers of this country out of the Treasury of the people and apply it to this matter of education in the States. And when I lift my voice in opposition to it I have good Democratic sentiments and good Democratic principles behind me on which to sustain my opposition.

We Democrats look back to the great apostle of our faith, Andrew Jackson, with a species of reverence; and when the Congress of the United States passed a bill away back yonder in 1833, when the Government was young, to appropriate for a limited time the proceeds of the sales of the public lands of the United States, and for granting public lands to certain States for educational purposes, Andrew Jackson, the great apostle of Democracy, laid down then what I believe to be the cardinal principles of the party in that regard, that—

If the money of the United States can not be applied to local purposes—

Says he—

through its own agents, as little can it be appropriated to these institutions through the agency of the State governments.

And he vetoed that measure.

Coming down the line of Democratic precedents, we find that this measure that became a law in 1862, which this bill amends, originally passed in 1859, and that James Buchanan, the Democratic President of the United States, stamped his veto upon it and it failed to be passed over that veto by the then Congress of the United States.

Mr. GEAR: Have you not any better backing than James Buchanan?

Mr. CARUTH. I will attend to the question that is before me now. I say that Democratic authority stands back of me. James Buchanan in that veto message of 1859 vetoed the same bill which passed in 1862.

Mr. GEAR. You need better backing than that.

Mr. CARUTH. That is pretty good backing.

Mr. GEAR. For a Democrat.

Mr. CARUTH. Andrew Jackson was a Democrat, and James Buchanan was a Democrat who had some regard for the Constitution of his country, whatever the gentleman from Iowa may say against him.

Mr. GEAR. He said that there was no law by and under which rebellion or secession could be put down.

Mr. CARUTH. But he never proclaimed that there was any higher law in this country than the Constitution of the United States that you and I are sworn to maintain. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it is because of my devotion to that instrument, which I took an oath to support, that I am here to enter my solemn protest against the passage of this bill.

Mr. GEAR. I never knew one of my Democratic friends who could not find a warrant in the Constitution for anything.

Mr. CARUTH. And I never knew one of my Republican friends who regarded the Constitution of this country as our fathers made it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I say that aside from the constitutional objection which presents itself to my mind there is another objection to this bill that ought to be urged in this presence. I have heard a good deal upon the subject of lobbies. My eloquent and distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON], to whom the name of a railroad corporation is as a red flag in a bull's face—whenever the

word "lobby" is used that gentleman rises upon his hind legs and howls; I have heard him and other members in this House talk about the existence of a lobby for the purpose of influencing legislation; but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the only lobby I have seen at this session of Congress was the educational lobby, composed of the presidents of the agricultural institutions. They have haunted the corridors of this Capitol; they have stood sentinel at the door of the Committee on Education; they have even interrupted the solemn deliberations of that body by imprudent and impudent communications.

I want to read you one. On the 25th day of June, 1890, the Committee on Education was in session, presided over by its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL], a good man and true, considering his politics [laughter on the Democratic side], a man devoted to the interests committed to his keeping, and to him came this communication, which was read in the presence of the committee:

HON. JAMES O'DONNELL,

Chairman of the Committee on Education:

DEAR SIR: May we respectfully represent to your committee that gentlemen from Dakota, Kansas, Maine—

My God, think of his being here!—

Tennessee, Iowa, New Jersey, and Maryland are waiting at Washington, unable to see intelligently the members from their States until Senate bill 3714 is reported or acted on by your committee. We dislike to appear too eager—

My God, if there is any eagerness in the world it is possessed by these gentlemen who are presidents of these agricultural colleges—but it seems to many of us that the absence of one member of a committee so strong as yours—

How did he expect the Committee on Education to get along in the absence of its distinguished member from Ohio, Judge TAYLOR?

Mr. O'DONNELL. Colonel TAYLOR.

Mr. CARUTH. Colonel TAYLOR—

ought hardly to detain the many friends of this measure longer. Can not some progress be made to-day?

And from that hour to this they have haunted the halls of this Capitol with their presence. They have buzzed in your ears, sir, and in yours, and in the ears of every member of this House. It has been an organized, strong, combined lobby for the benefit of the agricultural colleges of the country. Now, what do they propose to do if you give them this money? Do they propose to go out into the highways and byways and take the poor boy by the hand and lead him to the institution of learning? Do they throw wide open their portals for any boy to enter there who may desire? No, there is a golden knocker on the door. There is but one open sesame to admission there, and that one word is "money." They are paid institutions, and not free. They do not afford the blessings of free education for the children of the people. No boy can afford to go there and be supported unless there is a rich parent behind him. But we are asked to give \$100 a year to each one of these students, shutting our eyes to the Constitution, shutting our eyes to the infamy of this measure.

Mr. CULBERSON, of Texas. When they put down the tuition they make it up on the board.

Mr. CARUTH. Yes, they make it up on the board. I received a circular the other day—I think it was from Georgia—asking me to appoint a cadet to a certain school.

Several MEMBERS. Alabama.

Mr. CARUTH. Alabama, the State of my friend, Colonel OATES. In that circular they asked me to appoint a cadet to that institution, and they told me in that bill that the board was free, but the tuition was \$130 per annum. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Just the other way.

Mr. CARUTH. The board was free and the tuition was \$130 a year.

Mr. MORGAN. Two hundred dollars.

Mr. CARUTH. I did not nominate the cadet; I do not propose to nominate the cadet; but I do know that, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] says, when they put it down on the tuition they put it up on the board. [Laughter.]

Now, I see that out of all these fifty-five colleges, employing 808 teachers, educating but 14,000 children, not one of them offers us knowledge without money and without price.

Mr. OATES. Does my friend remember what school that was?

Mr. CARUTH. I do not.

Several MEMBERS. Huntsville.

Mr. CARUTH. Huntsville, I am told on all sides.

Mr. OATES. The agricultural college is in the district which I have the honor to represent, and students there get free tuition.

Mr. CARUTH. I am glad to hear that. How much are they charged for board? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. Does the gentleman refer to the school at Huntsville?

Mr. CARUTH. I do not know anything about the institution. I know that the tuition is \$130.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. I want to say to the gentleman that at the school at Huntsville, Ala., the best gentlemen in Northern Alabama are being educated, and will also inform him that a number of

the best people of North Alabama subscribed their money and established the excellent military academy to which he refers. In a spirit of generosity they have extended to each member of Congress the privilege of sending one cadet to that institution at less than half the usual rates. I am astonished that the gentleman receives the commendable generosity of these good people in such a spirit.

Mr. CARUTH. And nobody but a gentleman or the son of a gentleman can get the advantages of it. No man but a rich man's son can afford to be educated in one of these institutions.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman from Kentucky permit me to say that in the agricultural college of the State of Mississippi there are students who earn their own expenses by manual labor?

Mr. CARUTH. Will the gentleman allow me to state to him that at Yale College, at Harvard College, at Cornell University, and other institutions of learning throughout this land there are students who earn their own expenses during tuition?

Mr. MORGAN. Is not Cornell University an agricultural college?

Mr. CARUTH. I do not know. I do not think it is in that list.

Mr. GEAR. I will state to the gentleman from Kentucky that there is no limitation in Iowa in regard to the pecuniary condition of the students. A student in any rank of life can go into that State institution; and I know of my own knowledge that the sons of Iowa farmers are being educated there, their expenses being limited simply to their board, which is less than \$1.80 a week. My friend says they are not educated. I beg to say that they are taught not only practically about agriculture and farming, but also in the highest branches of scientific knowledge relating to farming.

Mr. CARUTH. I do not want to detract from the State of Iowa. That it has large educational advantages I do not doubt. That it has learned men I do not doubt; and if I had a doubt upon this subject, it would be removed by the presence of these distinguished Representatives from that State upon this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky to except the agricultural college of the State of Michigan and the university of that State from his charge.

Mr. CARUTH. The university? Where is it? Where is the institution? Is it Ann Arbor?

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. We have one at Ann Arbor and the other is at Lansing.

Mr. CARUTH. That is one of the reasons why I do not want to vote for this bill, because this appropriation is obtained, not for the purpose of sustaining separate institutions of learning, but for the purpose of making annexes to and adjuncts of some established university.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. CARUTH. And this is one of the reasons why I am opposed to this bill.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Will my friend allow me a question right there?

Mr. CARUTH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. The Agricultural College of Michigan is one that has been established there for thirty years, and was founded in the State by appropriations made by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CARUTH. Then it has been founded upon the money of the United States, when the people of Michigan ought to sustain it themselves.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. In the Agricultural College and University of Michigan, the same as in every other college in other parts of the United States, there are students from all over the country, and some of the students come from the State of Kentucky also. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CARUTH. You can not make a speech in my time. I yielded to you for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me for a question?

Mr. CARUTH. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I would like to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the State of Kansas has an agricultural college where there are five or six hundred students to-day in which no tuition is charged, and there they are taught that which pertains purely to agriculture.

Mr. CARUTH. Are you president of the college?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I was president of the Kansas Agricultural College for nearly five years, and I think I know more about agricultural colleges than the gentleman seems to.

Mr. CARUTH. Did you leave the college for the college's good? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. No; I came here for the benefit of the farmer.

Mr. CARUTH. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is any other State in the Federal Union that has not been heard from, I pause in order that it may proffer proof of the excellency of its institution here and now—

Mr. CARLTON rose.

Mr. CARUTH. Except the State of Georgia. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARLTON. I want to state that there is an agricultural college in my State and in the town where I reside. In it tuition is absolutely free, and board is not allowed to be more than \$12.50 a month.

Mr. CARUTH. And that is another reason why I object to this bill. Every man on the jury is to get a little of the pork himself. [Laughter.] But let us rise, my friend from Georgia, above any such a sordid and selfish principle as that. Let us get above such a thing as that and not tax the people of this country to sustain institutions of this character, founded at least upon doubtful constitutional right.

Now, if these institutions of learning of which gentlemen speak are doing so well, why do they come before Congress and ask for this money? Why do they besiege the corridors of this Capitol? Why do they hang around the committee-rooms of this House? Why should the United States Government enter upon a wholesale scheme of education? Why should it assist pay schools when it will not assist free schools? Mr. Speaker, upon every view of this bill, upon principle, I oppose its passage. [Applause on the Democratic side.] How much of my time remains?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. CARUTH. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TURNER], and I will yield the three minutes remaining to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. I yield my three minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Now give us a good one. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER, of New York. My friend from Iowa must be of the same grasping spirit that the eloquent gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] has ascribed to those college presidents if, after the eloquence and the logic he has already heard upon my side of the question, he still wants more. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I will tell you how the gentleman from Iowa feels. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER, of New York. I trust that the gentleman will kindly take his own time to tell us that.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Let me tell you how I feel. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER, of New York. In your own time. Mr. Chairman, I can conceive no good reason why a million dollars a year should be appropriated to teaching the sons of farmers agriculture any more than a like sum should be appropriated to teaching the sons of the men in my district bricklaying or carpentry or any other useful employment.

Mr. MCCOMAS. This bill provides for that. It provides for teaching any industrial or mechanic art.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. Oh, yes; but does any one of these agricultural colleges teach carpentry or masonry or any other thing but agriculture?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, yes; they teach them all. [Laughter and confusion.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will be in order. The gentleman's time is being consumed by the House itself.

Mr. TURNER, of New York. I appeal to the House, Mr. Speaker, that that is hardly fair treatment. Now, I have had some little experience in my early days in this matter of agricultural colleges. I attempted once to become a student in an agricultural college which was endowed by my native State.

Mr. KELLEY. What State is that?

Mr. TURNER, of New York. The State of New Hampshire.

That institution was of the same order as those which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] describes. It requires as much or nearly as much money, to become a student there as at any other institution of learning, and I never heard of any handicraft school, if I may be allowed that expression, in connection with any of those agricultural colleges. I never supposed there was any such thing, nor am I inclined now to credit the statement that any class of artisans are educated at any of these agricultural colleges.

But, Mr. Speaker, the real animus, the real purpose of this legislation is simply this: The agricultural classes are in a state of unrest, and the great agricultural communities that have given Republican majorities year after year are asking themselves to what end they have given those majorities. Now, I say to gentlemen on this side of the House—for I know that an appeal to those on the other side would fall upon deaf ears—I say to gentlemen upon this side of the House, if you will give the American farmer the same chance that you give to the manufacturing class, if you will remove from him the burden of unjust tariff taxation that has weighed heavily upon him for a quarter of a century, he will be able to educate his own sons in his own way without governmental aid.

It is very well for gentlemen to talk as though this were a trifling matter, this fastening an additional tax of \$1,000,000 a year upon a people already overburdened with taxation; but this Congress, one branch of which defeated a bill which, however wise or unwise it may have been, proposed to give governmental aid to common schools, and this party, charged by the people at the last election with the duty of legislation, which defeated the Blair educational bill in defiance of its solemn pledges, can hardly atone to the people who asked for common-school education free to everybody by offering an ornamental education to those who shall have succeeded in obtaining enough preliminary education to enter these colleges.

Why, sir, boys are fairly equipped for the race of life when they have the education necessary to enter most of these institutions; and so long as there is in any part of this country a lack of elementary schools for the education of any considerable number of children so that they may understand the institutions of the country and the value of the ballot, that they may read and write the English language, and be able to understand a simple legal instrument, I believe that the public money might as well be spent in founding a great art academy, a school of sculpture or a college of mining or engineering, as to devote money raised by taxation to the support of an agricultural college, especially as such colleges have in almost every instance proved such conspicuous failures that they could not support themselves. I believe it to be a very good rule—

Mr. HOUK rose.

Mr. TURNER, of New York (to Mr. HOUK). You have taken most of my time in "howling" and you can not use up the rest of it in questions. [Laughter.] I decline to yield.

I believe it to be a very good rule that when a business will not pay, if undertaken on a self-supporting basis, it is not a good business for the American Government to engage in. If there is any great demand for this character of education it is very wonderful that among all the institutions spread over this land there should not be some established by private enterprise to meet this long-felt want, and that such private institutions should not be thronged with students paying their own expenses.

I believe that every man who is taxed to support an institution of this kind, in which he himself or his children can have no interest, may well protest, and ought to protest, against this wholesale voting of money for the support of a particular class of educational institutions. If you want to assist the farmers, give them a fair chance to buy and sell in the markets of the world. I believe that any measure of this kind, purporting to be in the interest of the farmer, is simply a sop thrown to him that he may slumber still longer under our present iniquitous tariff legislation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have eight minutes left, of which I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, in order that members may have a proper understanding of this question, I shall take the liberty of printing with my remarks the act of July 2, 1862, providing for the establishment of "colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," and also the act of March 2, 1887, providing for the establishment of agricultural experiment stations in connection with these colleges.

An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be granted to the several States for the purposes hereinafter mentioned an amount of public land, to be apportioned to each State a quantity equal to 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress to which the States are respectively entitled by the apportionment under the census of 1860: *Provided,* That no mineral lands shall be selected or purchased under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That the land aforesaid, after being surveyed, shall be apportioned to the several States in sections or subdivisions of sections not less than one-quarter of a section; and whenever there are public lands in a State subject to sale at private entry at \$1.25 per acre the quantity to which said State shall be entitled shall be selected from such lands within the limits of such State; and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to issue to each of the States in which there is not the quantity of public lands subject to sale at private entry at \$1.25 per acre, to which State may be entitled under the provisions of this act, land scrip to the amount in acres for the deficiency of its distributive share, said scrip to be sold by said States and the proceeds thereof applied to the uses and purposes prescribed in this act, and for no other use or purpose whatsoever: *Provided,* That in no case shall any State to which land scrip may thus be issued be allowed to locate the same within the limits of any other State, or of any Territory of the United States, but their assignees may thus locate said land scrip upon any of the unappropriated lands of the United States subject to sale at private entry at \$1.25, or less, per acre: *And provided further,* That not more than 1,000,000 acres shall be located by such assignees in any one of the States: *And provided further,* That no such location shall be made before one year from the passage of this act.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That all the expenses of management, superintendence, and taxes from date of selection of said lands, previous to their sales, and all expenses incurred in the management and disbursement of the moneys which may be received therefrom, shall be paid by the States to which they may belong, out of the treasury of said States, so that the entire proceeds of the sale of said lands shall be applied without any diminution whatever to the purposes hereinafter mentioned.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted,* That all moneys derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned, and from the sales of land scrip hereinbefore provided for, shall be invested in stocks of the United States, or of the States, or some other safe stocks, yielding not less than 5 per cent. upon the par value of said stocks; and that the moneys so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished (except so far as may be provided in section 5 of this act), and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted,* That the grant of land and land scrip hereby authorized shall be made on the following conditions, to which, as well as to the provisions hereinbefore contained, the previous assent of the several States shall be signified by legislative acts:

First. If any portion of the fund invested, as provided by the foregoing sec-

tion, or any portion of the interest thereon, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, it shall be replaced by the State to which it belongs, so that the capital of the fund shall remain forever undiminished; and the annual interest shall be regularly applied without diminution to the purpose mentioned in the fourth section of this act, except that a sum, not exceeding 10 per cent. upon the amount received by any State under the provisions of this act, may be expended for the purchase of lands for sites or experimental farms, whenever authorized by the respective Legislatures of said States.

Second. No portion of said fund, nor the interest thereon, shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings.

Third. Any State which may take and claim the benefit of the provisions of this act shall provide, within five years, at least not less than one college, as described in the fourth section of this act, or the grant to such State shall cease; and said State shall be bound to pay the United States the amount received of any lands previously sold, and that the title to purchasers under the State shall be valid.

Fourth. An annual report shall be made regarding the progress of each college, recording any improvements and experiments made, with their cost and results, and such other matters, including State industrial and economical statistics, as may be supposed useful, one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free, by each, to all the other colleges which may be endowed under the provisions of this act, and also one copy to the Secretary of the Interior.

Fifth. When lands shall be selected from those which have been raised to double the minimum price, in consequence of railroad grants, they shall be computed to the States at the maximum price, and the number of acres proportionally diminished.

Sixth. No State while in a condition of rebellion or insurrection against the Government of the United States shall be entitled to the benefit of this act.

Seventh. No State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act unless it shall express its acceptance thereof by its Legislature within two years from the date of its approval by the President.

SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted,* That land scrip issued under the provisions of this act shall not be subject to location until after the 1st day of January, 1863.

SEC. 7. *And be it further enacted,* That the land officers shall receive the same fees for locating land scrip issued under the provisions of this act as is [are] now allowed for the location of military bounty-land warrants under existing laws: *Provided,* Their maximum compensation shall not be thereby increased.

SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted,* That the governors of the several States to which scrip shall be issued under this act shall be required to report annually to Congress all sales made of such scrip until the whole shall be disposed of, the amount received for the same, and what appropriation has been made of the proceeds.

Approved, July 2, 1862.

An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture, and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agricultural science, there shall be established, under direction of the college or colleges or agricultural department of colleges in each State or Territory established, or which may hereafter be established, in accordance with the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," or any of the supplements to said act, a department to be known and designated as an "agricultural experiment station": *Provided,* That in any State or Territory in which two such colleges have been or may be so established the appropriation hereinafter made to such State or Territory shall be equally divided between such colleges, unless the Legislature of such State or Territory shall otherwise direct.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the object and duty of said experiment stations to conduct original researches or verify experiments on the physiology of plants and animals; the diseases to which they are severally subject, with the remedies for the same; the chemical composition of useful plants at their different stages of growth; the comparative advantages of rotative cropping as pursued under a varying series of crops; the capacity of new plants or trees for acclimation; the analysis of soils and water; the chemical composition of manures, natural or artificial, with experiments designed to test their comparative effects on crops of different kinds; the adaptation and value of grasses and forage plants; the composition and digestibility of the different kinds of food for domestic animals; the scientific and economic questions involved in the production of butter and cheese; and such other researches or experiments bearing directly on the agricultural industry of the United States as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States or Territories.

SEC. 3. That in order to secure, as far as practicable, uniformity of methods and results in the work of said stations, it shall be the duty of the United States Commissioner of Agriculture to furnish forms, as far as practicable, for the tabulation of results of investigation or experiments; to indicate, from time to time, such lines of inquiry as to him shall seem most important; and, in general, to furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of each of said stations, annually, on or before the 1st day of February, to make to the governor of the State or Territory in which it is located a full and detailed report of its operations, including a statement of receipts and expenditures, a copy of which report shall be sent to each of said stations, to the said Commissioner of Agriculture, and to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. That bulletins or reports of progress shall be published at said stations at least once in three months, one copy of which shall be sent to each newspaper in the States or Territories in which they are respectively located, and to such individuals actually engaged in farming as may request the same, and as far as the means of the station will permit. Such bulletins or reports and the annual reports of said stations shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster-General may from time to time prescribe.

SEC. 5. That for the purpose of paying the necessary expenses of conducting investigations and experiments and printing and distributing the results as hereinbefore prescribed, the sum of \$15,000 per annum is hereby appropriated to each State, to be specially provided for by Congress in the appropriations from year to year, and to each Territory entitled under the provisions of section 8 of this act, out of any money in the Treasury proceeding from the sales of public lands, to be paid in equal quarterly payments, on the 1st day of January, April, July, and October in each year, to the treasurer or other officer duly appointed by the governing boards of said colleges to receive the same, the first payment to be made on the 1st day of October, 1887: *Provided, however,* That out of the first annual appropriation so received by any station an amount not exceeding one-fifth may be expended in the erection, enlargement, or repair of a building or buildings necessary for carrying on the work of such station; and thereafter an amount not exceeding 5 per cent. of such annual appropriation may be so expended.

SEC. 6. That whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of the Treasury from the annual statement of receipts and expenditures of any of said stations that a portion of the preceding annual appropriation remains unexpended, such amount shall be deducted from the next succeeding annual appropriation to such station, in order that the amount of money appropriated to any station shall not exceed the amount actually and necessarily required for its maintenance and support.

SEC. 7. That nothing in this act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the said colleges and the government of the States and Territories in which they are respectively located.

SEC. 8. That in States having colleges entitled under this section to the benefits of this act and having also agricultural experiment stations established by law separate from said colleges, such States shall be authorized to apply such benefits to experiments at stations so established by such States; and in case any State shall have established, under the provisions of said act of July 2 aforesaid, an agricultural department or experimental station, in connection with any university, college, or institution not distinctively an agricultural college or school, and such State shall have established or shall hereafter establish a separate agricultural college or school, which shall have connected therewith an experimental farm or station, the Legislature of such State may apply in whole or in part the appropriation by this act made to such separate agricultural college or school, and no Legislature shall by contract, express or implied, disable itself from so doing.

SEC. 9. That the grants of moneys authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purposes of said grants: *Provided*, That payment of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of its Legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this act shall be held or construed as binding the United States to continue any payments from the Treasury to any or all the States or institutions mentioned in this act, but Congress may at any time amend, suspend, or repeal any or all the provisions of this act.

Approved March 2, 1887.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard declamation here against the furnishing of aid by the Federal Government to educational institutions. But that proposition is not before us at the present time. The act for the establishment of these agricultural colleges was passed in 1862; and under it the State of Georgia has received some \$243,000. The State of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH], who has declaimed so loudly against this policy, has received some \$200,000. In addition to that, Georgia, Kentucky, and various other States of this Union, in pursuance of the act of 1887, have been receiving from the Federal Treasury annual appropriations of \$15,000 each for agricultural experiment stations.

You have then these agricultural colleges already created; the States have accepted them; they have been endowed by appropriations of public lands. You have also your agricultural experiment stations in the various States, each of which, under the act of 1887, is to receive its annual appropriation of \$15,000; for, although the appropriation was not made for the last year, there is in the act the declaration of this system of annual appropriations as a permanent policy. This being the situation, what does this bill propose? Simply to increase the amount appropriated to each of these stations by the sum of \$1,000 annually until it shall reach \$25,000.

That is all there is in the proposition. How is there any question of constitutionality involved? How does there arise any question as to the propriety of this general policy? The acts referred to have already been passed; these colleges and agricultural stations have been established. Coming now to the consideration of this question, we find these conditions existing; and this proposition, as I have said, is simply to increase to a limited extent the amount of the annual appropriations—that and nothing more.

Some question has been raised whether under a possible change of our land system we may not reach a time when there will be no money arising from the sales of public lands, and whether there might not then be a continuation of these appropriations. Why, sir, the very language of this bill provides distinctly that this money shall be taken from the sales of the public lands, and from that source only. The very instant you shall have changed your land laws, so that there is no longer any fund arising from this source, then, by the very force of the language of the act, the appropriation ceases.

The official figures show that during the last fiscal year we received from the sales of the public lands the sum of \$8,018,000. I understand from the chairman of this committee and from other gentlemen that the estimate of increased expenditure when you shall have given to these institutions the amount provided for in this bill, is only \$1,200,000. Hence, unless you shall hereafter deliberately change your legislation in reference to the public lands, there is no possibility of there being any deficit in this direction.

If, however, Congress should see fit to change the existing system, then a new question would present itself, whether we would undertake to appropriate directly from the Federal Treasury for this purpose. When that contingency shall arise, and not till then, we shall be called upon to meet the question whether there is any more propriety in expending for this purpose money taken from the sales of public lands than money from the general Treasury.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCOMAS. I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it happened that I was not present at the moment when my friend from Kentucky made reference to me as one "getting up on his hind legs and howling against

corporations." A few presidents of agricultural colleges come here in the interest of what? of colleges designed to give a special education to those who labor on the farm and to mechanics in the shops. There is an immense difference between such gentlemen coming in the interests of such institutions and lobbyists paid \$10,000 a year and kept here all the time by railroad companies to look after their steals. The difference between my friend and myself is as to the class of bills which we antagonize. I antagonize railroad bills; he antagonizes agricultural bills. I am endeavoring to advance the present and future interests of farmers and am heartily in favor of this bill. He opposes it. We are alike, in both "getting up on our hind legs and howling." [Laughter.]

I wish to say a word, Mr. Speaker, on the bill, for the reason that during a presidency of five years of an agricultural college I necessarily acquired some knowledge of the agricultural college question. During the first half of that period since the agricultural grant was made, 1862, the colleges organized in it were entirely and naturally devoted to the professional curriculum, and necessarily turned out lawyers, doctors, preachers, and teachers. During the latter half of the period the agricultural colleges, finding that they were not giving a satisfactory education to the farmers, devised a curriculum for the purpose of affording specific technical knowledge and more satisfactory and practical results to those persons engaged in farming or mechanical occupations.

The object of this bill is to cause those colleges which have been absorbed by professional educators and which have turned out professional men only to adopt and apply a modern curriculum applicable to the mechanic arts and agriculture alone; and I give my hearty support to this measure, for the reason that it will in future give to the sons and daughters of farmers that power derived from specific knowledge which will be of inestimable value to them in the prosecution of their business.

I hope the House will adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio and also the insertion of the word "additional" before the word "instruction," so as to prevent the agricultural colleges which have been already absorbed by the universities throughout the country from using this fund for professional education only, and that the House will condition all of the bill on the distinct proposition that the education furnished must be industrial, a practical one, out of which the farmers of the country can make more money than they do, or out of which the girl or woman who is compelled to support herself by her own labor can make more money as a telegraph operator or printer or in other directions than without it.

I hope the House will adopt the bill and also the amendment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under the order of the House the previous question is considered as ordered, and the pending question is on the amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR].

Mr. CARUTH. I move to recommit the bill with instructions.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion is not in order at this time. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert the word "additional" before the word "instruction" in the third line.

Mr. MCOMAS. That amendment was not agreed to.

The question being taken on the amendment to the amendment, the House divided; and there were—ayes 48, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question now recurs on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time.

The question recurred on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CARUTH. I believe I have arrived now at the proper place in which to move to recommit.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman can now submit the motion.

Mr. CARUTH. I move to recommit the bill with the instructions I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recommit the bill to the Committee on Education with instructions to strike out all provisions requiring report to be made to the Secretary of the Interior, and all provisions authorizing the withholding of the funds by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 53, noes 95.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us have the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The question recurred on the passage of the bill.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 135, noes 39.

So the bill was passed.

Mr. MCOMAS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

And then, on motion of Mr. MCCOMAS (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (S. 3477) for the relief of Neil Neilsson—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 3,000 copies of the testimony taken by the Select Committee on Relations with Canada be printed, 1,000 of which shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives;

to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE BILL WITH SENATE AMENDMENTS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a House bill of the following title, with Senate amendments, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11459) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, and for prior years, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 3719) to provide for the inspection of live cattle and beef products intended for export to foreign countries, accompanied by a report (No. 2985)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 885) authorizing the Lexington Ponton Bridge Company to construct and maintain a ponton bridge across the Missouri River, and to legalize the bridge already constructed at the city of Lexington, in the State of Missouri, accompanied by a report (No. 2986)—to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWENEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 5680) to constitute Des Moines, Iowa, a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Des Moines, accompanied by a report (No. 2987)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON, of Washington, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 2828) to ratify and confirm certain agreements with the Cœur d'Aléne Indians in Idaho Territory, and to make the necessary appropriations for carrying the same into effect, and for other purposes therein named, accompanied by a report (No. 2988)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SKINNER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 3076) for the relief of Russell S. Newall, accompanied by a report (No. 2989)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 11050) to grant a pension to Mrs. Etta Hubbs as an army nurse, accompanied by a report (No. 2990)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 10841) authorizing the city of Albany, Oregon, to construct a bridge across the Willamette River, in Oregon, accompanied by a report (No. 2991)—to the House Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. MORSE: A bill (H. R. 11779) to prohibit the sale or supplying of intoxicating beverages in military and naval institutions and branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and for other purposes—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania (by request): A bill (H. R. 11780) regulating the rate per annum of telephone service in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 11781) to authorize the Corpus Christi and South American Railway Company to construct a bridge across

the Rio Grande at or near Brownsville, Tex.—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CASWELL: A bill (H. R. 11782) to limit the effect of the regulations of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRILL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 213) amending and construing the act approved July 1, 1890, in relation to oaths in pension and other cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWELL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 214) extending the "act fixing the rate of interest to be charged on arrearages of general and special taxes now due the District of Columbia if paid within a time specified" to October 31, 1890—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. FEATHERSTON: A bill (H. R. 11783) for the relief of M. B. Woodyard, Mrs. Alice N. Rush, Mrs. Sue T. Smox, and Joseph N. Woodyard, heirs of Col. Humphrey M. Woodyard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 11784) for the relief of Andrew J. Plough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11785) for the relief of Francis M. Price—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11786) increasing the pension of Edward T. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEST: A bill (H. R. 11787) for the relief of Ira W. Center—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11788) to increase the pension of Henry A. Routzong, of Aurora, Nebr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANSBROUGH: A bill (H. R. 11789) granting a pension to Frank C. Myrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 11790) for the relief of Kate K. Parsons, of Mayo, Knox County, Tennessee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 11791) granting a pension to James S. Maratta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED, of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11792) for the relief of Denis Kelly—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11793) for the relief of Peter Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11794) for the relief of David H. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKDALE (by request): A bill (H. R. 11795) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Bontura—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11796) for the relief of Joseph Collins, of St. Landry Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11797) for the relief of the estate of Ludger Lemelle, deceased, late of St. Landry Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11798) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Oates, deceased, late of Warren County, Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11799) for the relief of Adelaide Oliviere, of Iberia Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11800) for the relief of Alfred A. Taylor, of St. Landry Parish, Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALLACE, of New York: A bill (H. R. 11801) for the relief of Mary B. Cole, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. George W. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BLAND: Petition for reference of papers in the claim of Henry Hake—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of P. S. Whittaker, for pay for horses—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FEATHERSTON: Protest of S. P. Willford, Pinkney, Ark., against passage of the Conger lard bill (H. R. 283)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of colored cotton farmers and planters, and Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, Little Rock, Ark., against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of S. Hornmell, of Portia, Ark., against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fort Smith, Ark., against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Memphis, Tenn., against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 80 citizens of St. Francis County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 129 citizens of Lee County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 147 farmers and citizens of Phillips County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of colored planters and farmers, adopted March 24, 1890, and the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, of Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition from 103 farmers of Lee County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 34 farmers of Phillips County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 57 colored farmers and laborers of Lee County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 70 colored farmers and farm laborers of Phillips County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 390 colored farmers and farm laborers of Phillips County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 30 members of Phillips County Wheel, Phillips County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 16 members of the Agricultural Wheel of Phillips County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 55 members of Lee County Wheel, Lee County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest from Hon. J. P. Jones, county judge of Desha County, Arkansas, against same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Jacob Trieber, of Helena, Ark., against passage of House bill 283, known as the Conger bill, and House bill 679, known as the Butterworth bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEST: Petition and proof upon the bill for the relief of Ira W. Center—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition and communication in reference to eight 12-pound brass howitzers unearthed at Albuquerque, N. Mex., August 12, 1889—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS: Memorial of J. C. Allen & Co. and others, citizens of Corsicana, Navarro County, Texas, protesting against legislation by Congress compelling railroads to transport petroleum barrels free—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE: Memorial of E. O. Fuller and others, citizens of Canton, Mass., protesting against legislation by Congress compelling railroads to transport petroleum barrels free—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEIL, of Massachusetts: Memorial of D. P. Morrison and others, citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against legislation by Congress compelling railroads to transport petroleum barrels free—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PAYSON (by request): Petition of S. C. Clarke and others, citizens of the District of Columbia, for a municipal government, etc.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition, affidavits, etc., in case of William A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, August 20, 1890.

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

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I ask leave of absence, beginning to-morrow, for six days, on account of health.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks to be excused from attendance upon service in the Senate for six days from to-morrow, on account of his health. Unless objection is made, leave will be granted.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of citizens of Almena, Kans., praying for the prompt payment of pension claims to relieve the wants of the veterans on account of the total failure of crops in Western Kansas and Nebraska; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Mart. Armstrong Post, No. 202, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lima, Ohio, praying for the appointment of S. S. YODER as one of the managers of the soldiers and sailors' homes of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions of gratitude adopted by the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Congregational

Church of Washington, D. C., for the passage of the original-package bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Vinland Farmers' Alliance, Vinland, Kans., praying for the removal of the restriction imposed by the British Government on the importation there of cattle from the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Friends, Damascus, Ohio, protesting against use of the United States mails by lotteries, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3857) to provide for the disposal of a portion of the United States military reservation at Baton Rouge, La., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

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

A bill (S. 4313) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Smith; and

A bill (S. 4320) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary E. Dickey.

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 (H. R. 10208) granting an increase of pension to Moses Graham;

A bill (H. R. 8890) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Solomon, a private in Company A, First Indiana Infantry, Mexican war service; and

A bill (H. R. 5712) granting a pension to J. G. Fetherstone.

Mr. MOODY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7914) granting a pension to Jay Marvin, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 4336) granting a pension to Mary A. Irving; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES. By request of the Wage-Workers' Political Alliance I introduce a bill and ask its reference to the Committee on Printing.

The bill (S. 4337) to provide for the publication of a periodical which shall be known as "The Congressional Petition-Box," and for other purposes was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 4338) to provide the assessor of the District of Columbia with plats of subdivisions outside the cities of Washington and Georgetown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MOODY introduced a bill (S. 4339) for the relief of William Tarrant and Lyman L. Hatch, who allege loss of property by Indian depredations; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Select Committee on Indian Depredations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3714) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], coming over from a previous day. It will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. QUAY on the 18th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the following orders be adopted for the government of the Senate during the present term of Congress:

Ordered, 1, That during the present session of Congress the Senate will not take up for consideration any legislative business other than the pending bill (H. R. 9416); conference reports; general appropriation bills; pension bills; bills relating to the public lands, to the United States courts, to the postal service, to agriculture and forestry, to public buildings; and Senate or concurrent resolutions.

Ordered, 2, That the consideration of all bills other than such as are mentioned in the foregoing order is hereby postponed until the session of Congress to be held on the first Monday of December, 1890.

Ordered, 3, That a vote shall be taken on the bill (H. R. 9416) now under consideration in the Senate and upon amendments then pending, without further debate, on the 30th day of August, 1890, the voting to commence at 2 o'clock p. m. on said day and to continue on that and subsequent days, to the exclusion of all other business, until the bill and pending amendments are finally disposed of. For the foregoing-stated purpose the following rules, namely, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXV, and XL, are modified.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.