

sively in the customs service of the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WALCKER: Petition of North Brookfield, Spencer, East Blackstone, and Worcester Granges, encouraging silk culture, to prevent gambling in farm products, the adulteration of food and drugs, and for a pure-lard law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the same bodies, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WARWICK: Two petitions, one of citizens of Canal Fulton, Ohio, and the other of Louisville, Stark County, favoring the Stone immigration bill—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of John Brader and others, favoring an amendment to Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Miss Mary E. Brader and others, of Central Tennessee College, against opening Chicago Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of Buena Vista Grange, to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the same body, for a pure-lard law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, April 4, 1892.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in compliance with law, an annual report setting forth the names of the clerks and other persons employed in the Treasury Department during the calendar year ended December 31, 1891, showing the time each was actually employed and the sums paid to each, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in compliance with a resolution of March 24, 1892, a list of all persons employed in the Navy Department, and stating that there are no persons in that Department not specifically authorized or appropriated for by law; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of his letter of the 15th instant to the Superintendent of the Census, based upon a report of the examination and review of the Census Office rendered March 5, 1892, and a copy of that report, together with the letter of the Superintendent of the Census of March 17 in relation thereto; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Census, and ordered to be printed.

### ZOOLOGICAL PARK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a resolution of the Board of Regents, recommending an increase of the appropriation for the maintenance of the Zoological Park; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States:

Petition of H. C. Filch and 45 other citizens of Bradford, N. H.

Petition of C. H. Chickering and 36 other citizens of West Chesterfield, N. H.

Petition of R. A. Moore and 29 other citizens of North Monroe, N. H.

Petition of C. H. Rockwood and 8 other citizens of Swanzey, N. H.

Petition of J. F. Hanson and 22 other citizens of Strafford, N. H.

Petition of John F. Elliott and 30 other citizens of Lynne, N. H.

Petition of Thomas V. Cherley and 27 other citizens of Dunham, N. H.

Petition of S. A. Masse and 34 other citizens of South Newberry, N. H.

Petition of William S. Mansfield and 25 other citizens of Gilson, N. H.

Petition of C. F. White and 20 other citizens of Fitzwilliam, N. H.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of Harry Hook and 90 other citizens of Berks County, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill 401, relative to the immigration and importation of aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of F. P. Seabold and 24 other citizens of Allentown Pa., and the petition of A. B. Cowan and 26 other citizens of Ephratah, Pa., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts and a petition of William F. Warren, and other citizens, of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of a bill providing for the closing of the World's Columbian Fair on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of Richard C. Humphreys and other citizens of Boston, Mass., and a petition of citizens of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Stow Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Massachusetts:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of 856 citizens of Wellington, Ohio, a petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Defiance, Ohio, and a petition of citizens of Zanesville, Ohio, praying that the World's Columbian Fair be closed on Sunday, and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited on the grounds; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of 16 citizens of Penfield, Ohio, and a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion, or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Kirtland and Center Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of the Knights of Labor of Seattle, Wash., and a petition of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of the bill requiring the use of automatic couplers and power brakes on all railroads; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that the public lands remaining unsold may be granted to the States, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States residing in Gallatin County, Mont., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to insure the early and economical building and operation of the Nicaragua Maritime Canal; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Port Townsend, Wash., praying that jurisdiction be conferred upon the Federal courts of the State of Washington for all Federal matters arising in the Territory of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Col. Thomas M. Anderson Garrison, No. 46, Regular Army and Navy Union, of Vancouver, Wash., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the law relative to the retirement of enlisted men; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the following petitions of Hartland Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PERKINS presented the petition of M. H. Rich and 54 other citizens of Jewell County, Kans.; the petition of S. L. Standish and 8 other citizens of Blakeman, Kans., and the petition of Alfred Wootton and 22 other citizens of Woodson County, Kans., praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Olathe and Morning Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kansas:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in the rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Ezekiel Webster Grange, No. 24, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Hampshire, praying that the sale of intoxicants be prohibited on the grounds of the World's Columbian Exposition; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the following petitions of Star King Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Hampshire:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition signed by Mrs. A. C. Clark and 68 other citizens of McPherson County, S. Dak., and a petition signed by Mary A. Richardson and 30 other citizens of Marshall County, S. Dak., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PADDOCK presented the petition of B. H. Landis and 22 other citizens of Lancaster County, Nebr.; the petition of James B. Jones and 70 other citizens of Custer County, Nebr.; and a petition of Full Moon Alliance, No. 2073, of Gothenburg, Nebr., praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of M. F. Vaine and 53 other members of the Regular Army and Navy Union of Fort Niobrara, Nebr., praying for the passage of House bill 405, to increase the efficiency of noncommissioned officers; the passage of House bill 406, known as the twenty-five-year retirement bill; the passage of House bill 413, giving preference to soldiers and sailors for civil office; the passage of House bill 416, granting an increase of pension to soldiers and sailors; the passage of House bill 5116, known as the Bingham naval retirement bill, and for the passage of Senate bill 2094, favoring enlisted men in the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and common council of Sault St. Marie, Mich., praying that a further appropriation of \$100,000 be made for the completion of the four-company post at new Fort Brady; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Council of Trade and Labor Union of Detroit; Mich., praying for the passage of House bill 287, constituting eight hours a day's work; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the following petitions of Pokagon Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Michigan:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States:

Petition of J. F. Hoffman and 17 other citizens of Hudson, Mich.

Petition of H. P. Wheeler and 103 other members of Fayette Grange, No. 251, Jonesville, Mich.

Petition of K. J. Brown and 2 other members of Alpine Grange, No. 348, Alpine, Mich.

Petition of John Campbell and 150 other citizens of West Haven, Mich.

Petition of Levi Rogers and 12 other members of Eaton Rapids Grange, No. 360, Eaton Rapids, Mich.

Petition of J. Isborne and 20 other citizens of Ridgway, Mich.

Petition of W. A. Lott and 21 other citizens of Quincy, Mich.

Petition of William Poatt and 52 other members of Lapeer Grange, No. 246, Lapeer, Mich.

Petition of J. W. Gifford and 26 other members of White Oak Grange, No. 246, Michigan.

Petition of G. W. Ross and 18 other citizens of Morenci, Mich.

Petition of W. H. Moon and 26 other citizens of Fallossburg, Mich.

Petition of Nelson Geoffrey and 176 other members of Charity Grange, No. 417, Carsonville, Mich.

Petition of C. H. Stone and 31 other citizens of Hastings, Mich.

Petition of A. W. Martin and 15 other citizens of Big Rapids, Mich.

Petition of George O. Merriam and 21 other citizens of Gableville, Mich.

Petition of Patrick Sweeney and 11 other citizens of Elk Rapids, Mich.

Petition of J. A. Symes and 52 other citizens of Sparta, Mich.

Petition of Charles Pasinger and 57 other citizens of Shelby, Mich.

Petition of M. E. Hull and 20 other citizens of St. Louis, Mich.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HISCOCK presented the petition of Seymour Van Dusen and 53 other citizens of White Plains, N. Y., and vicinity; the petition of William M. Jansen and 33 other citizens of Napanoch, N. Y., and vicinity; the petition of Edward E. Eames and 224 other citizens, employés of H. B. Claffin & Co., of New York City; the petition of R. Humphrey Elias and 24 other citizens of New York City; the petition of Virginia Granberry and 23 other citizens of New York City; the petition of Samuel F. Hyman and 7 other citizens of New York City, praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of 676 citizens of New York, collected by the American Defense Association and the American Patriotic League, praying for the passage of an amendment to the laws relative to immigration, naturalization, citizenship, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of Rev. R. H. Weeks and 31 members of the Baptist Church of Pitcher, N. Y., praying Congress to aid the World's Columbian Exposition by adequate appropriations, provided said exposition shall be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of fifteen insurance companies of Boston, Mass., praying that an appropriation be made to estab-

lish telegraphic communication along the Virginia beach from Cape Charles to Assateague; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of 86 citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of a law subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Seneca County, N. Y., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Caton, Wheeler, Ulysses, Paines Hollow, Beaver Falls, Stockholm Depot, Upper Lisle, Troupsburg, East Avon, and Plessis Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the Medical Society of Charleston, S. C., signed by Mazyck P. Ravenel, M. D., praying that no reduction be made in the appropriation for the library of the Surgeon-General's Office; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRICE presented a petition of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Zanesville, Ohio, and petitions collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, signed by 212 citizens of Ohio, praying that no exposition or exhibition for which appropriations are made by Congress shall be opened on Sunday, and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of 23 citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, and a petition of 23 citizens of Stark County, Ohio, praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Stillwater Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARLISLE presented a petition of officers and teachers of Berea College, Kentucky, praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Madison County, Ky., praying that no money be appropriated for the World's Columbian Exposition unless the sale of intoxicants be prohibited on the grounds, and that it be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. VANCE presented a petition of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARBOUR presented a petition of the city council of Portsmouth, Va., praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a public building at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Portsmouth, Va., praying that an appropriation be made for paving Third street running along the west side of the navy-yard at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Portsmouth, Va., remonstrating against the passage of any bill disturbing in any way the pilot systems as now established; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McPHERSON presented a petition of the students of the Union Theological Seminary of New York City; a petition of the faculty and students of the Rochester (N. Y.) Theological Seminary; a petition of the students of the McCormick Theological

Seminary of the Presbyterian Church of Chicago, Ill., and a petition of the faculty and students of the United Presbyterian Seminary of Xenia, Ohio, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the petition of W. E. Crosby and 21 other citizens of Livingston, N. J., praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the faculty and students of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, of Princeton, N. J., praying that the sale of intoxicants be prohibited on the grounds of the World's Columbian Exposition; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Cass and Howard Counties, Ind., praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Lyons, Greene County, Ind., praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of 27 citizens of Grant County, Ind.; a petition of 30 members of Carrollton Grange, No. 501, Patrons of Husbandry, of Indiana; a petition of 10 citizens of Bryant, Ind.; a petition of 12 citizens of Harrisville, Ind.; a petition of 25 citizens of Young America, Ind.; a petition of 28 citizens of Goshen, Ind.; a petition of 16 citizens of New Cumberland, Ind., and a petition of 28 citizens of Celina, Ind., praying for the passage of legislation subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. VILAS presented the petition of S. Hollensteiner and 40 other citizens of Manitowoc County, Wis., praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch antiopium bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Ashland, Wis., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Spring Brook Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wisconsin:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the free delivery of mail in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of members of the bar of Lacroix County, Wis.; a memorial of members of the bar of Dane County, Wis., and a memorial of members of the bar of Eau Claire County, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the bill proposing to detach certain counties from the Territory of the western judicial district of Wisconsin and annex the same to the eastern judicial district; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas presented a petition of the general council of the Choctaw Nation, praying for the enactment of certain legislation regarding their rights in the Indian Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of C. J. Hemphill and 15 other citizens of Sangamon County, Ill., praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the following petitions of Sidney Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Illinois:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PASCO presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pensacola, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 1282 exempting American coastwise vessels from compulsory pilotage; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER presented a memorial of 150 citizens of Kit Car-

son County, Colo., remonstrating against the ceding of the arid lands to the several States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Ni Wot, Colo., praying for the passage of legislation to prevent speculation in fictitious farm products; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Fairplay, Colo., remonstrating against the passage of a general bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the following petitions of Horse Creek Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Colorado:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WASHBURN presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Aitkin, Minn., remonstrating against the building of the Sandy Lake Dam without a lock; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for a survey to determine what, if any, practical line for a canal with capacity for barges and vessels that could navigate the lakes, exists, to unite Lake Superior with the Mississippi River at the twin cities; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Center Alliance, No. 204, of Rock, Kans., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Board of Trade, praying for the construction of a ship canal from the great lakes to the sea coast; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the mayor and city clerk of Fairhaven, Wash., praying for the enactment of a law preventing the immigration or importation of Chinese to the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Skagit County, Wash., a petition of citizens of Adams County, Wash., and a petition of citizens of Whatcom County, Wash., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Thurston County (Washington) Farmers' Alliance, praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts, and that the money-order system be extended to all fourth-class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fairhaven, Wash., praying for the early completion of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Seattle (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, praying that the States be given the lands of the public domain yet remaining therein unsold, to be kept for parks, or sold, as the several States may deem best, all moneys resulting therefrom, however, to go into irreducible funds for the schools and other public institutions; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Port Townsend (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, praying for the enactment of a law providing that all matters arising in Alaska which may come under the cognizance of the United States courts, which have heretofore been taken to the United States courts of Oregon, may hereafter be referred to the United States courts of the State of Washington; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented the following petitions of St. John's and Preston Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of citizens of Helena, Ohio; a memorial of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Lancaster, Ohio; a memorial of citizens of Blandon, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Schuylkill County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Jasper Township, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Wyoming County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Ramsey Township, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Lehigh County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Bedford County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Wayne County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Richmond Township, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Jefferson County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Northumberland County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Lycoming County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of North, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Dauphin County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Berks County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Columbia County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Roaring Spring, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Bedford County, Pa.; a memorial of Washington Camp No. 102, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Dauphin County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Hastings, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Vermillion, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Bradford County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Clarion County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of De Witt, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Northumberland County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Montgomery County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of McKean County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Northumberland County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Shawnee, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Clinton County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Bedford County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Schuylkill County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Hocking, Ohio; a memorial of citizens of Athens County, Ohio; a memorial of citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio; a memorial of citizens of Clinton County, Ohio; a memorial of citizens of Hennepin County, Minn.; a memorial of citizens of Baltimore County, Md., and a memorial of citizens of Summit County, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of what are known as the Faulkner, Crain, and Teller bills, relative to home rule for Utah Territory; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented memorials collected by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, signed by 450 citizens of Connecticut, remonstrating against the opening of any exposition or exhibition on Sunday where United States funds are expended; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the following petitions of Highland and Hamden Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Connecticut:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of W. Duncan and 55 other citizens, of Newville, Pa.; the petition of Irwin H. Fessler and 26 other citizens, of Freedensburg, Pa.; the petition of James A. Mitchell and 29 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.; the petition of James K. Helm and 50 other citizens, of Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; the petition of E. S. Mobly and 11 other citizens of Beach Creek, Pa.; the petition of M. R. Smith and 44 other citizens, of Hamburg, Pa.; the petition of M. M. Boor and 20 other citizens, of Buck Valley, Pa.; the petition of James A. Robert and 67 other citizens, of Freeland, Pa.; the petition of James W. Baer and 45 other citizens, of Glen Hope, Pa.; the petition of Frank Hassler and 30 other citizens, of Tamanend, Pa.; the petition of R. S. Henry and 16 other citizens, of Butter Cup, Pa.; the petition of H. A. Gerber and 57 other citizens, of Reynolds, Pa.; the petition of D. H. Robinson and 23 other citizens, of Suterville, Pa.; the petition of William Gresh and 20 other citizens, of Montoursville, Pa.; the petition of F. C. Portzline and 40 other citizens of Hoffer, Pa.; the petition of Aldin Roop and 14 other citizens of Coopersburg, Pa.; the petition of S. J. Barlet and 31 other citizens, of Eckley, Pa.; the petition of Reuben A. Beaver and 27 other citizens, of Montana, Pa.; the petition of John Lamberson and 27 other citizens, of Huntingdon, Pa.; the petition of Andrew Brown and 28 other citizens, of Orwin, Pa.; the

petition of David Ballingall and 64 other citizens, of Philadelphia, Pa.; the petition of Solomon B. Mack and 113 other citizens of Pavia, Pa., and the petition of H. B. Pearce and 46 other citizens, of Irvona, Pa., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the States from passing any law respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of 202 citizens of West Branch, Iowa, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. COLQUITT presented the petition of Dr. W. A. Candler, president, members of the faculty, and 260 students of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia, praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors on the grounds, and the management of the art department according to the American standard of purity in art; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. VEST presented the petition of L. C. Humphrey and other citizens of Cass County, Mo., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Clinton, Mo., praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday and the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors on the grounds; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. SAWYER presented a petition of the faculty of Ripon College, Wisconsin, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday, and that no intoxicating liquors be sold on the grounds; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of citizens of Dunn County, Wis., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a memorial of citizens of Scotia, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of a general bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Arnold, Nebr., and a petition of citizens of Kearney, Nebr., praying for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARRIS presented the petition of T. D. Wilson and other citizens of Madisonville, Tenn., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COKE presented a petition of citizens of Mason County, Tex., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of San Antonio, Tex., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Kentucky, remonstrating against the passage of a general bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Legislature of Kentucky, praying that the franking privilege be extended to the commissioners of agriculture of the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 808) establishing a port of delivery at Des Moines, Iowa;

A bill (S. 2315) to protect foreign exhibitors at the World's Columbian Exposition from prosecution for exhibiting wares protected by American patents and trade-marks;

A bill (S. 2643) changing the time for holding the circuit and district courts in the district of West Virginia;

A bill (H. R. 3867) to amend the act concerning officers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 115) amending the "Joint resolution to regulate licenses to proprietors of theaters in the city of Washington, D. C., and for other purposes," approved February 26, 1892.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments, submitted reports thereon, and moved their reference to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to:

A bill (S. 2733) to provide for the rebuilding of the bridge across Rock Creek at P street NW., in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 2734) to provide for the rebuilding of the bridge across Rock Creek at K street NW., in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported an amendment intended to be proposed to the District appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment;

A bill (S. 75) granting to the State of North Dakota certain lands heretofore set apart as a wood reservation for Fort Totten military reservation, for the use of the militia of North Dakota, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2221) for the relief of Mary J. Neenan.

Mr. ALLISON. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6746) to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments. I submit with the bill a written report, which I ask may be printed; and in this connection I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 396) confirming titles to certain lands in Columbia County, State of Florida, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1615) to facilitate the disposition of causes in the Court of Claims, reported it with amendments.

Mr. HOAR. I desire an order of the Senate. I move that a letter of the Attorney-General relating to the subject of Senate bill 1615, which I will send to the desk, be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1958) to submit to the Court of Claims the title of William McGarrahan to the Rancho Panoche Grande, in the State of California, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, favorably.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to state that I was absent from the sittings of the committee during most of the time when that bill was before it, and that since I have been able to attend I have been unable to give the subject the very extensive investigation which it requires. I therefore do not concur with the report at present, and reserve the right either to concur with it or to oppose it as I shall determine after examining the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2611) to authorize the Glen Echo Railroad Company to cross the Washington Aqueduct, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 855) providing for the extension of the coal laws of the United States to the District of Alaska, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1772) for the construction of a wooden dry-dock at the United States navy-yard at Portsmouth, N. H., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 2822) to prescribe the manner in which individual Indian and tribal lands in the Puyallup Reservation in Washington may be alienated; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2823) for the relief of

Mary Almarolia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLQUITT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2824) regulating rates of postage on second-class mail matter at letter-carrier offices; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2825) to amend the postal laws so as to prevent certain classes of books from being transmitted through the mails as second-class matter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CARLISLE introduced a bill (S. 2826) to restore to Simpson County court, Kentucky, a certain amount of money illegally collected as an income tax; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SANDERS introduced a bill (S. 2827) providing for the expenses of a commission to negotiate with the Crow Indians as to certain lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WALTHALL introduced a bill (S. 2828) for the relief of L. M. Garrett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2829) granting to the State of North Dakota certain portions of the abandoned Fort Abraham Lincoln military reservation, together with the buildings thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. GEORGE introduced a bill (S. 2830) to repeal section 714 of the Revised Statutes, allowing pensions to judges in certain cases; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 2831) to promote the efficiency of the militia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2832) for the relief of William P. Hogarty; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Wilson Rittenhouse; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2834) to amend section 2893 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2835) to correct the military record of Thomas Amey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 2836) for the relief of Hannah B. Crosman, executrix; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to introduce a bill granting a pension to James M. Ray. The bill is accompanied by the affidavits of J. A. Devinney, William Elledge, and Dr. T. B. Owings, and I move that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (S. 2837) granting a pension to James M. Ray was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2838) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry Wingate, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HISCOCK introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 71) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain guns to the Rensselaer County Soldiers and Sailors' Monument Association, of Troy, N. Y.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

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

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT MEMPHIS.

Mr. BERRY. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read, printed, and lie over until to-morrow.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved.* That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate whether or not the Kansas City and Memphis Railway and Bridge Company, authorized by act of Congress approved April 24, 1888, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., have complied with that portion of said act which required such company to provide for a passageway for wagons and vehicles of all kinds and for the transit of animals.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over until to-morrow.

#### NATIONAL SANITARIUM.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to give notice that on Monday next, at the close of the morning business, I shall ask the permission of the Senate to briefly address it on the joint resolution (S. R. 67) providing for the appointment of a commission to select a site for the establishment of a national sanitarium for the treatment of pulmonary diseases—not to interfere with the appropriation bills.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

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 1st instant approved and signed the act (S. 444) granting to the State of South Dakota section numbered 36, in township numbered 94 north, of range numbered 56 west, in the county of Yankton, in said State, for the purpose of an asylum for the insane, to correct an act approved June 16, 1880, attempting to make such grant to the Territory of Dakota, and for other purposes.

#### THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

Mr. SHERMAN. As the Calendar is now in order, I desire to ask the Senate to consider a bill in which the farmers are largely interested. It is Senate bill 797, reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DAWES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Before taking up that order—

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to let me get this bill through. If it takes any time I will not stand in the way of the appropriation bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is proper for the Chair first to lay before the Senate resolutions coming over from a previous day, which were submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. The resolutions will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Resolutions by Mr. MORGAN, directing the Committee on Finance to make examination and report to the Senate certain information in relation to currency and coinage.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to give notice that at the close of the routine morning business on Wednesday I shall desire to address the Senate on the pending resolutions offered by the Senator from Alabama relative to the silver question.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MORGAN. For what purpose?

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to have a bill passed to which I think there will be no objection and in regard to which there is some urgency. It will take but a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 797) to provide for fixing a uniform standard of classification and grading of wheat, corn, oats, barley, and rye, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. That is a subject that must take up some time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not think there will be a single objection to the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information and then we can tell.

Mr. MORGAN. If I can get the consent of the Senate to an understanding that at the close of the routine business to-morrow morning I can call up these resolutions, upon which I propose to submit some remarks, I will not get in the way of Senators this morning, particularly of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, who wants to close the Indian appropriation bill, and which ought to be closed, of course. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that I may call up my resolutions to-morrow at the close of the routine morning business, and then that I shall be permitted to address the Senate upon them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to make a qualification. I wish the Senate itself to understand the nature of this request. Under the rules, when a resolution goes over, the Senator introducing it has a right to call it up and to address the Senate upon it, but when it is interrupted by the expiration of the morning hour at 2 o'clock, it goes on the Calendar, and it can then be taken up only on motion. That is the rule, and if the Senator asks that by unanimous consent these resolutions shall stand in the way of all the morning business just so long as anybody desires to speak upon the prolific topic of the silver question I most respectfully object. But if he simply—

Mr. MORGAN. I most respectfully object to the Senator taking me off the floor to bring up a bill

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well; I will give way, although it is a bill to which there can be no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, there is objection. I have objection.

Mr. STEWART. I object to cutting off any opportunity to discuss the question involved in the resolutions.

Mr. SHERMAN. Whenever a majority of the Senate are in favor of discussing it it ought to be discussed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DAWES. I wish to say, in view of the request of the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. WILSON. I ask the Senator from Alabama to yield to me one moment.

Mr. DAWES. I wish to say that I do not desire to stand in the way of the universal courtesy accorded to a Senator who gives notice of a desire to make remarks to the Senate, and therefore if the Senator from Alabama prefers to go on this morning I will yield to him.

Mr. TELLER. We do not know what is going on, Mr. President.

Mr. PLATT. We can not hear a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Senators will please suspend conversation and resume their seats. Business will be suspended until order is restored.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope Senators are aware of the very little time I have now, and that they will forbear.

Mr. WILSON. I have been endeavoring for some time to get the attention of the Chair in order that I might make an objection to any arrangement which will interfere with the morning business and consideration of the Calendar, as there now seems to be a proposition pending that will probably consume an indefinite time. I think we ought to give some consideration to the Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN. I am not speaking under any arrangement; I am speaking under the rules of the Senate, which provide for my privileges, which I propose to enjoy moderately.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], upon which he is entitled to the floor. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance is directed to make examination, and report to the Senate as soon as practicable—

1. What has been the effect on the price of silver bullion, of the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and whether the said act has in any manner contributed to promote or sustain the "established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals, gold and silver, on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio," or such ratio as may be provided by law, as declared in section 2 of said act.

2. Whether the issue of Treasury notes as provided in said act has been and will be a sufficient provision of law for maintaining "the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio," or whether any and what further legislation is necessary to provide a new ratio between gold and silver to keep them on a parity with each other.

3. Whether the Treasury notes that have been issued under the first section of said act of July 14, 1890, have at any time, or at any place, been at a discount in exchange for gold or silver coin; and whether, in the judgment of said committee, they are likely to be at such discount, if said act shall remain permanently in full force and operation. And further, whether said Treasury notes furnish to the people a safe and sound legal-tender currency, as good for their purposes as gold coin or silver coin; and further, whether said Treasury notes have at any time since the date of the act of July 14, 1890, taken the place in our national currency of large sums of gold coin that were sent to Europe for speculative purposes, and whether the presence of those Treasury notes in our volume of currency during the absence of such large sums of gold did not save our people and our Government from a dangerous financial crisis and threatened bankruptcy.

4. Whether the coining or issue of any dollar of gold or silver is now authorized by the laws of the United States, and, if so, under what law is such coinage permitted, and further, whether it is a safe financial system to authorize the printing and issue of paper dollars, and to forbid the coinage of gold or silver dollars.

5. Whether it is just to the people who are compelled to use the subsidiary coins of the United States in their daily business, and to receive them in payment for labor, and also to use them in payment for food, medicine, raiment, and shelter, that such coins should contain less pure silver than the full legal-tender silver dollar in which their creditors and bankers have the right to collect their debts from them.

6. That said committee ascertain, and report to the Senate, as nearly as they may the proportion of the silver coin and gold coin that is in actual circulation in Great Britain and the European states; in Russia, China, and Japan; in India, Turkey, and Egypt; and in Australasia, Canada, the United States, and each of the other commercial states on this hemisphere; and in Hawaii and the West Indian Islands.

2. *Resolved further*, That inasmuch as great anxiety exists among the industrial classes of the United States as to the causes of the depression of prices and the paralysis of markets for their productions; and, as their sufferings are severe, that said committee shall proceed promptly to inform the Senate upon the matters submitted to them under the foregoing resolutions, except the sixth, and, as to that resolution, they shall have authority to send for persons and papers if they shall see fit.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I know that this is a subject which strikes upon the attention of some Senators in an alarming way, because the people of the United States are very earnest in their desire to have some relief from existing financial conditions and embarrassments and some of us are not ready to act. I know that the behests of party stand in the way of a free expression of opinion in this body upon a question of finance that has now been

mooted for twenty years in the direction of the free coinage of silver; and I feel the embarrassment that any man would feel under such circumstances in bringing forward and discussing a matter which I think the people of the United States desire and are determined to further investigate; if we of the Senate are not willing to express our opinions by our votes and otherwise upon a question of this kind they will express an opinion for us at the ballot box next November, and on other occasions.

I am not of those who believe that the restoration of the financial system of the country to a condition suited to the wants of the people, depends exclusively upon the remonetization of silver with all of its free-coinage privileges. I think perhaps there are some other things requisite to be done in addition to that, to make the financial system worthy of the American people and our country with all of its vast and wonderful powers and resources.

I believe that since 1878, when we took the first step in the direction of the restoration of the finances of the United States to their former and normal condition before they were revolutionized by the act of 1873, we have made very great progress. We have brought the country up to a very much better condition than it was prior to 1878 and back to 1873, when the demonetization of silver took place. I am encouraged by the progress we have made to continue in the good work. I am encouraged to believe that there are in the act of 1890 several provisions that are worthy of consideration. I think we shall ascertain, upon the investigation to be ordered under these resolutions, that that act has accomplished some good, perhaps a great deal of good, for the people of the United States.

I think that it ought to be amended and reformed, and whatever of movement I should be disposed to make for the relief of the financial conditions would be first of all in the direction of amending and reforming the act of 1890. I would not give up one inch of the ground that we have gained in the enactment of that statute, but improving upon the condition as it has been established, after long and laborious efforts and struggles, I would try still to step to the front and do for the country other things that are just as requisite to be done as were those provided under that law.

I am not a doctrinaire on the subject of the free coinage of silver. I think that is a practical question and not simply a question of political economy. I think that it is no more a doctrinal question of political economy than is the alleged operation of the Gresham law. The Gresham law is regarded by almost all political economists, and especially by doctrinaires, as being an infallible rule for the people of this country in respect to the coinage of gold and silver. The infallibility of that rule has been very severely tested and has been disproved by the experience of the United States in the most signal way on various occasions. I prefer to the Gresham law or any other law of political economics the Constitution of the United States.

I prefer the foundations on which our fathers rested the financial system of this country, and upon which they expected that we should maintain it, and I am unwilling to have any legislation until that Constitution is altered, which abrogates any one of its provisions, which retires to the rear the provisions or guarantees made in that instrument in favor of gold and in favor of silver as the coinage of the United States. The people of this country also have that impression, and have had it since the foundation of our Government, and they are not satisfied now, nor will they ever be satisfied, until full constitutional sway is given in our legislation in respect of both these metals.

Bimetallism was established in the Constitution when gold and silver were wedded together, in the very language of that instrument, and in the only process by which they could be reduced to circulating medium, that of coinage. No man has the right to put them asunder by destroying one of these metals or making either of them inefficient in the service of the country in all of its financial operations and powers.

Our fathers, for good reason and in the most careful way, ascertained and regulated their actual value, and their relative value to each other by comparing each metal with other standard productions through the history of many generations of people. They "regulated the value" of these coins and fixed the proper ratio at 15 to 1, because that was the purchasing power of the coins of each metal through a long series of years. If this had not been disturbed in 1834, so as to advance the relative value of gold, we should have had no trouble with the ratio, but they fixed them at 16 for 1, leaving the fine silver in a dollar at 364 grains, where it still stands.

The argument is so very strong, so direct, and so impressive in favor of bimetallism, that there is not a single gold standard man in this Senate to-day—and there are several here—who is willing candidly to confess that he is not a bimetallist; not one. They will tell you in debate, they will write it in letters, they will print it in speeches, that they are for bimetallism; that that

is the chief point to which their hopes are directed, and until that is accomplished they can never be satisfied with the financial situation in the United States, and they will tell you of many expedients and means by which they hope ultimately and after a long lapse of years and of suffering to reach the condition where they can afford to be bimetallicists in practice as well as in theory, but those conditions are plainly impossible.

Bimetallism, Mr. President, is indispensable from the very language of the Constitution of the United States. No man can strike out gold as a money metal and obey the Constitution, nor can any man strike out silver as a money metal and obey the Constitution; and it is no obedience to the Constitution of the United States that we are willing to give a small portion of the circulating medium of this country in the shape of subsidiary silver coins, which are 6 cents on the dollar less in value than the standard silver coins and gold coins of the United States, into the hands of the industrial classes who earn their bread every day.

A man who is willing merely to give to the common industrial laboring people of this country only subsidiary coins upon the basis of our present statute laws, which subsidiary coins are 28½ grains short in weight of the pure metal, the standard metal of the silver dollar authorized to be coined under the laws of the United States, is not a bimetallicist. He is a hypocrite. He pretends to be a bimetallicist when he is only willing to dole out, as we are doing, about \$67,000,000 into the hands of the common industrial classes of this country in the shape of subsidiary silver coins, at a loss of 6 cents on every dollar, and compel them to take them in sums of \$10 or under, as legal tender, and then refuses to permit them to pay a \$20 debt in anything but standard gold coin or standard silver coin, or a greenback. He makes our silver coins and gold coins worth 6 cents on the dollar more than the \$10, with which the laboring man could pay a small debt. That is not bimetallism.

That, Mr. President, is "holding the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope." That is a positive wrong committed daily, hourly, and every moment upon those classes of our fellow-citizens in this country who every day labor for wages, and at nightfall buy, with the proceeds of their day's labor, something wherewith to feed themselves or clothe themselves or some shelter into which they may creep.

I suppose that the sixty-five or seventy millions of people in the United States, those who labor every day for the bread of life and those who do not labor, use in their daily transactions more of this debased subsidiary coin than is used of standard coin in the daily transactions of the men engaged in the commerce of this country by actual exchange from hand to hand. What I mean to say is this: That the people who use and handle and are compelled to use and handle, who are compelled to earn and receive and are compelled to live upon these debased subsidiary coins, handle a larger aggregate amount during one day in their transactions in the United States than there is of standard gold and silver coin actually handled in the other transactions of the country.

So then that bimetallicist, as he calls himself, who is willing to compel the ordinary laboring population of this country to use this debased silver coin, 28½ grains below the standard value, in their daily transactions, is a man who has got his own consent, for the purpose of dubbing himself by a title which he thinks is popular to rob the people he represents. This robbery is the basis of the claims of many to be considered as bimetallicists.

The division of opinion and demarkation by lines of action in this country between the silver men and the gold men is simply this: The silver men want bimetallism; they want the metals placed upon a parity with each other and kept there. The gold men do not want bimetallism. They want the silver destroyed, driven out of the currency, dishonored, and reduced to the mere capacity or condition of a commodity.

The money character of silver, that character by which alone we are entitled to call it a precious metal, they ignore and discard and scout, and they are not willing to have it; they are not willing that it shall perform any function in this country, except the same that wheat and corn and cotton perform, of being a mere commodity of commerce, except only that they are willing to pinch out of it enough to furnish the ordinary laboring people of this land debased subsidiary coins to serve them in their daily transactions.

Now, I commend this to those gentlemen who have been so eloquent and so persistent in their efforts to make the world believe that the free coinage men in the United States are desirous of putting a cheap dollar upon the people. You put cheap, debased half dollars upon the people and you compel them by law to take them. Then you cry out fraud against the friends of standard dollars. There is not now in the United States, according to the laws of the United States, the opportunity to coin a gold coin of less than \$5 in denomination. The gold dollar is

stricken out by the act of the last Congress as a coin, and no man can coin a gold dollar any more in the United States. It is my opinion that not only the theory but the practice under the law of 1890 has had the same effect upon the silver dollar; so that as a matter of fact there is no law, no mandatory statute in the United States for the coinage of a dollar of gold or a dollar of silver.

I can demonstrate, I think, to the satisfaction of anybody, any plain common-sense man, that the power to coin silver dollars to-day, corresponding precisely with the practice, as I will show it now in a few moments, of the Treasury Department is a mere discretionary power left in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury which he may exercise or not at his will and pleasure. If I were to go there with any sort of demand, or present any kind of urgency or emergency that an American citizen could feel or experience in respect of the necessity of having silver dollars coined, the Secretary of the Treasury could turn to me and say "the power to coin silver dollars under the act of 1890, which repealed all antecedent acts, is with me entirely a discretionary power, and I can coin them or I can refuse to coin them at my will and pleasure." Therefore, Mr. President, there is no mandatory law, there is no statute having the force and effect of law in the United States to-day for the coinage either of a gold dollar or of a silver dollar.

I suppose that no one in this august and splendid body of men will be heard to say that a permission given by law to the Secretary of the Treasury to coin silver dollars of the standard value for the purpose of redeeming the coin certificates issued under the provisions of the act of 1890, is a law for the coinage of silver.

Left in that situation, without any coinage law for silver or gold dollars at all, you compel the people hereafter, if this law stands just as it is and if the action of the Secretary of the Treasury is to be just what it is now and has been heretofore, you compel the people of the United States by positive law to receive subsidiary coin for their daily toil, their daily productions, whatever they may be, and you refuse them permission to handle or to have any other minor gold coin, I will call it, or any other silver coin except the debased subsidiary coin.

The biggest coin that a man can hold by the law of the United States if that coin is struck to-day, whether of gold or of silver, is the half dollar. The Secretary of the Treasury may dole out to him, if he sees proper, a dollar, but he can not issue that dollar except in the redemption of coin certificates; he can not coin it for any other purpose than the redemption of the coin certificates. A man must hold a coin certificate and go there with it for redemption before he can respectfully or respectably insist that he shall put his mint to work and strike a dollar that he wants to use in silver, in place of paper money, that he can take with him and circulate amongst the people.

That is the condition we are in to-day in respect of our gold and silver coinage; and while the world is standing tiptoe—no, not the world, but the financial kings of the earth are standing tiptoe and belching forth aspersions and denunciations and criminations upon us because the price of 371½ grains of silver is not a dollar in the commercial markets. While they are doing that, knowing very well that the present price of silver has been depressed by the iron heel with which they have crushed it down, using the great power of this great Government, knowing that only they are responsible for the present value of silver commercially, these men tower in their rage and indignation and scorn when they speak to us about wishing to put out upon the people as a dollar that which can be bought in the markets of the United States as bullion for 80 or 85 cents. [To Mr. STEWART]. What is it to-day?

Mr. STEWART. Eighty-seven.

Mr. MORGAN. Eighty-seven. They at the same time, in order to increase the power of gold held in large sums from \$5 up, and in order to increase the power of such issues of money as they may see proper to predicate upon that gold, to be increased or decreased in their purchasing power or in their volume according to their good will and pleasure, they hand out to the people of the United States \$67,000,000 in these debased subsidiary coins, debased by actual requirement of law.

Mr. STEWART. The dollar, if the Senator will allow me, is only about 67 cents. That is made of 412½ grains. It is the ounce which is worth 87 cents.

Mr. MORGAN. The dollar is about 67 cents.

Mr. STEWART. Sixty-seven cents.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I propose as well as I know how to do it in the interests of the people to strip the masks off the faces of those gentlemen and let them for one time look the truth dead in the face.

On Saturday I wrote to the Director of the Mint and asked him some questions about what the practice was under this present



act of 1890 in regard to the coinage of the bullion we have been buying, and here is his response:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,  
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1892.

DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your inquiry of the 1st instant whether since June 30, 1891, the silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, has been coined, and to what amount, and whether the provisions of that act, as to the coinage of silver bullion are held by the Department to be mandatory or only permissive. I have the honor to reply as follows:  
The number of silver dollars coined at the mints of the United States since June 30, 1891, from silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, has aggregated 1,997,620.

That, however, was for the purpose of supplying a demand that existed prior to the passage of that act.

At present a monthly coinage of silver dollars from purchased bullion is being executed at the mints of the United States at San Francisco, Carson City, and New Orleans.

How much he does not undertake to say.

No silver-dollar coinage is at present being executed at the mint at Philadelphia, which is busily engaged upon the recoinage of subsidiary silver coins and the execution of the necessary minor coinage.

It is held by the Department that the coinage of silver dollars from silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, is discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury and that the only coinage required by that act is an amount sufficient to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the same law.

Very respectfully,

E. O. LEECH, Director of the Mint.

HON. JOHN T. MORGAN, United States Senate.

They have, in practice, stopped coining silver dollars, and they have in theory repudiated the idea that the Congress of the United States in the act of 1890 did anything more than merely to grant a discretionary permission to the Secretary of the Treasury to coin as much of the bullion he may purchase under the provisions of that act as he might consider a necessary provision for redemption. Now, that act means upon its face, as construed fairly and properly and as understood at the time of its passage, that to provide for the redemption of a dollar note issued to the hands of a citizen, there must be a dollar of silver coined and held ready to redeem it, and so with a million dollars. But the Secretary of the Treasury, in practice and in theory, has adopted a rule of the Department by which it is held that it is entirely discretionary with him what amount he shall coin and when he shall coin it.

Mr. President, if the act of 1890 being thus construed is not amended then we acquiesce in having confided into the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury the mere discretion to coin or not to coin the money that has been bought through the labor and toil of the people for the purpose of furnishing a quota of silver money for the use of these great communities that we represent. Who can call that a law? It is a mere protection to the Secretary in exercising his discretion. It saves him from impeachment, and that is all it does, for not obeying what would otherwise be his duty, for we buy that silver, not for the purpose of hoarding it merely in the form of bullion, but we buy it in order to supply silver coinage to the people of the United States and to maintain what? I will read what we have got to maintain as expressed in this act, and a more solemn pledge was never made in the world.

It being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio.

What did we mean by putting that language in that act? Did we mean to maintain a parity between silver bullion and gold coin or gold bullion and silver coin, or did we mean to maintain a parity between the coins struck from these metals?

It is said, in the words I have quoted, to be the established policy of the Government of the United States to maintain this parity, and yet the Secretary of the Treasury, in view of that solemn declaration on the part of Congress, concludes from the language of the act that he is entirely safe and correct in construing this act to be a mere permission to him to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury at his will and pleasure.

Mr. BUTLER. If I do not disturb the Senator from Alabama, I should like to ask a question for information, if he can give it.

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I see the Director of the Mint makes no reference to it, but is it true that these monthly purchases of bullion are still going on and that the bullion is being piled up in the Treasury of the country?

Mr. MORGAN. Four and a half millions a month.

Mr. BUTLER. That is still going on, and that is still being piled up in the Treasury, I understand.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I will come to that presently, for I will want to know from the Senator from Kentucky in my rear [Mr. CARLISLE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who work together in the same line I understand—I will want to know what they are going to do with this bullion when it gets to be a thousand millions or two thousand millions in the Treasury.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to ask the Senator a question, and that

is, whether he is not entirely satisfied as a lawyer that the discretion is entirely left to the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir, I am not as a lawyer nor as a Senator nor as an American citizen nor as a man of plain common sense.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can only say there was not the slightest doubt in the minds of the conference committee that that was to be entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MORGAN. But when that conference committee made its report I happened to rise on the floor of the Senate and say I did not know anything about what they were doing or what was the motive of their action, and it was piteously pleaded that it was indecorous for a man on the floor of the Senate to inquire into the secret performances of any committee. Now, what secret reservations that Senator may have had for the purpose of qualifying the words of this solemn statute I do not know. All I can go by is the text of the law itself, the face of the text, and there is not a man of ordinary common sense in the United States who would not, I think, believe that it was the purpose of Congress that the two metals should be put upon a parity in their circulation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Undoubtedly. Allow me to say that the language of that law is so plain that I do not see how any Senator, especially so good a lawyer as the Senator from Alabama, could doubt it. It declares that the Government of the United States shall maintain the parity of gold and silver coin.

Mr. TELLER. No; it does not.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gold and silver metals.

Mr. TELLER. That is quite a difference.

Mr. SHERMAN. Not a bit of difference. It also provides distinctly that for every dollar the Treasury of the United States issues under that law there shall be behind it a dollar's worth of silver according to the gold price at the time it is bought.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good.

Mr. SHERMAN. And that the Secretary of the Treasury shall not coin these silver dollars except as they were needed; and who is to decide that except an executive officer?

Mr. MORGAN. That last clause is not in the law by expression or by intendment or by inference or by a guess of any man, except the man who knows the heart of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understood it so.

Mr. MORGAN. You so understood it, and the conference committee may have so understood it. The Senator from Ohio shaped this measure in the conference committee, and when we got through with it he brought it to the Senate and denied the privilege to a Senator to get up and ask the whys and wherefores and what was meant by this and that and the other thing found in the report of the conference committee.

Mr. CARLISLE. The Senator from Alabama has referred to me in connection with the act of July 14, 1890. I simply desire to say in response to that allusion that I did not support the act of July 14, 1890, either in the committee or in the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I know the Senator did not support it, but I have a letter of the Senator here which supports something worse than that.

Mr. CARLISLE. Possibly I have supported a great many things worse than that.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I think you have, several.

Now, Mr. President, before I get further into this subject I wish to call attention to the point in the letter of the Senator from Kentucky where he deprecates the results, I suppose, of the act of 1890, or at all events he deprecates the policy of that act without designating it in his letter, because he says that it will hoard up enormous masses of metal in the Treasury, and he cites the fact that there are now 12,000 tons of metal in the Treasury of the United States, all of which is hoarded up under the act of the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio both agree that there should not be any of that coined unless the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion should find some convenient opportunity—I will not say of what kind, I will impute to him no intentions except patriotic intentions and some opportunity to serve his country, not his party or some individual of his party—to coin a modicum of this vast mass of 12,000 tons of silver that lies useless and dead in the Treasury of the United States. Four million five hundred thousand ounces of silver per month will amount to 55,000,000 ounces in a year and the amount of money that may be coined out of those will probably be as much as \$60,000,000 or \$65,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. Nearly \$70,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN. At the present standard?

Mr. STEWART. At the present standard.

Mr. MORGAN. Seventy million dollars a year, and in ten years that is \$700,000,000, and in twenty years' time it is \$1,400,000,000. When does the Senator from Ohio propose to stop this piling up of bullion in the Treasury? Where does he propose to put the limit of accumulation of silver put under lock and key

and not coined; how long will he keep it in prison bounds and out of competition with gold? What use could the people of the United States make of that silver in the twenty years during which \$1,400,000,000 of it would be accumulating in the Treasury?

We can not tell exactly when this very peculiar policy of the Senator from Ohio is to stop. When you get ready to stop it, and you have got 200,000,000 ounces or 500,000,000 or 1,000,000,000 ounces of silver in your Treasury, what disposition are you going to make of it when you get ready to stop? Are you to put it up at auction and sell it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose if we have to go on we should make the same disposition of it as we do of the three or four hundred millions of silver that lie in the Treasury and can not be forced into circulation with all the power of the Department.

Mr. TELLER. They are all doing money duty.

Mr. MORGAN. The statement of the Senator from Ohio requires to be proved. I am willing to take the Senator's statement about almost any question of fact but just that. When the Government of the United States through all its officials has been retarding the putting of silver money into circulation continually by every manner of device, I must still occupy the ground of doubt upon statements like that. More than that; the Senator speaks of three hundred or four hundred million dollars in the Treasury. We have got the exact amounts here and I will call attention to them.

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

Mr. MORGAN. In a moment. And there are no silver dollars nor is there an ounce of silver bullion in our Treasury this day unless it has been collected in the way of taxation in some form or other that is not represented by an active working silver certificate or coin certificate somewhere among the people. Will the Senator deny that?

Mr. SHERMAN. So with the bullion. Every ounce of it is represented.

Mr. MORGAN. I understand that the bullion is so represented as well as the coin.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is easier to keep the bullion than it is to keep silver dollars.

Mr. MORGAN. No, it is not; for a silver dollar has no more power to lift itself up and fly away than a square block of bullion has.

Mr. HISCOCK. Will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HISCOCK. I ask the Senator if he favors the repeal of the act providing for the issue of the certificate issued either upon coin or bullion?

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New York is sitting there and amusing himself with imaginations upon what I may be willing to do upon some proposition not connected with this subject that I am now dealing with.

Mr. HISCOCK. I beg the Senator's pardon, for so long as the certificates are allowed the result will be to pile either the coined silver or the uncoined silver in the Treasury, and it seems to me that to avoid this piling up, of which he complains, there exists a necessity for the repeal of the law which authorizes the issue of the certificates. I have never been able to see any difference between the accumulation of silver dollars and the accumulation of bullion.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator is diverting me from my line of argument; nevertheless, I will stop to say to the Senator that I believe there has been no such institution of paper money found in the United States or any other country as the coin certificate. I believe it has a value far beyond its mere monetary or legal-tender value. It has a value beyond a dollar of silver or a dollar of gold. It has a value in being that one instrumentality of the Government of the United States by which all of its credit and all of its power can be brought to do that which is pledged in this act to maintain the parity between the metals. So I hope not to live to see the day, and I hope that generations will pass before this peculiar American institution of a coin certificate has been allowed to lapse or to fall into decay or into neglect. It is the salvation of the land at this very moment. It has saved the Senator's great metropolis of New York from bankruptcy and ruin within the last nine months.

Mr. HISCOCK. Then I desire to ask the Senator this question: If we continue these certificates, and the Senator is right that that would increase the currency, free coinage will accumulate more either bullion or coined dollars than are accumulated under what is known as the Sherman law, and instead of stopping this piling up and accumulation of bullion and coin he is increasing it.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. HISCOCK. That is the point that I desired to bring out.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the Senator think I am afraid to march

up to that point? Not by any means. I embrace it with perfect delight.

Mr. HISCOCK. I understood the Senator to attack the Sherman law because there was such an accumulation of silver or coin under it in the storehouses of the Government, and that is what he was trying to restrain.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New York, very unfairly to me, was simply anticipating or imagining that I was going to do a very foolish thing. I did not expect to do anything of that sort. I was not attacking it at all. I was bringing some facts to the attention of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio, and I want to know what is to be the outcome of it, not that I am dissatisfied with the present prospect, but I want to know what the outcome is to be; but I would connect along with this another feature that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio, I suppose, would never consent to connect with it, and that is the option on the part of the holder of bullion to have it coined into dollars and take it into the currency of the country if he wishes to do it, or to accept silver certificates for it at the par value at the Mint. I would connect that option with it which the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New York would refuse to connect with it. Why? They would refuse to connect that with it for the plainest of all reasons, and that is to say, that the silver that would under this option in favor of the holder of bullion find its way into actual circulation would become the competitor of gold. That is the reason they refuse it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that that option now is given to the holder of every certificate issued under that law. He can go and demand a silver dollar at his pleasure and receive it, and if enough people go there and make that demand, as a matter of course the Department would have to coin more and more of the silver. So the Secretary now has the option, and if that is all the Senator desires, I should be very willing to give it to him in some other form.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the best illustration of the delusiveness and the wrong and the hidden evils and the concealed purpose of this law that I have yet heard stated on the floor of the Senate or anywhere else.

The Senator from Ohio says a man can go there with his bullion and sell it and he gets his coin certificate for it, and he can turn right around and demand the redemption of it in silver dollars if he wishes. That is the Senator's statement. The Secretary of the Treasury says, "No, this is bullion I have in the Treasury. I have not coined it, and I do not intend to coin it except at my will and discretion. I can not pay you in silver coin, because I have not got the coin. I have got the bullion, but I have not got the coin. I can refuse you."

You leave it to the option of the Secretary of the Treasury to refuse to coin, and yet you leave to the holder of the silver the right to go there and demand the coin. How can these two propositions meet and coincide and become harmonious under the construction that the Senator from Ohio puts upon his law? Did the Senator mean to say that when he makes a promise to the holder of a coin certificate that he can get silver or gold for it on presentation of his certificate, that he could turn to the Secretary of the Treasury and instruct him that it was purely a matter of discretion with him whether he would coin that silver or not for the purpose of redeeming the certificate?

I saw at that time, and called attention to it, the absurd incongruity in that law, and I knew then the use that would be made of it, and here it is laid before this Senate to-day in the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. He has not coined this seventy or eighty million dollars of bullion, not a dollar of it, that was bought with the people's money, these coin certificates, and he does not intend to, except according to his discretion. He does not mean to have an opportunity furnished to any man in the United States to flood this country with silver. He means that gold shall have the whole field, gold in pieces not under the denomination of \$5, and that when he has got you between these walls he can hold you fast until he has ground you still more with the money power of this land.

To my mind, Mr. President, it is a very simple proposition, and the disclosure made on the floor of the Senate to-day is a mere new revelation of a secret purpose couched in this law, which has attended every measure of legislation connected with silver and gold for the last twenty years or more, to dethrone silver entirely, make it utterly useless and impossible to get hold of, or impossible to circulate it at the will of the owner of bullion, so that the officers of the Treasury Department can rule month after month, and year after year, to increase the purchasing power of gold in this country or to decrease it at pleasure. What they want, and never cease to strive for, is a field of control over industry in all its departments through the power of gold, without any rival competitor.

I am very much obliged to the Senator from Ohio, although he has now left the Chamber, that he has furnished me this oppor-

tunity to expose the internal workings of this act and the purpose which attended its passage. I am glad he has enabled me to show to the people of the United States now beyond all question and dispute, that it was the intention of that act of 1890, as it was framed, and the act following immediately afterwards demonetizing the gold dollar, or rather retiring it, to put more power in the hands of the holders of gold and less in the hands of the holders of silver; in other words, to strike down the power of men based upon the holding of silver entirely and to give extraordinary and increased powers to the holders of gold. The people of the United States now understand, if they have never done before, the real animus of that act.

I have some other suggestions which are in line with this part of the debate—which has occurred unintentionally so far as I was concerned and rather interrupted the course of my argument, though I am very glad it happened—in considering the demonetizing act of 1873. We can not understand it unless we look at the surrounding facts and circumstances. I will recite some of them and the motives will be perfectly apparent to the Senate when I have mentioned them.

When silver in 1870 had increased, in ten years, from \$150,000 to \$16,000,000—the product of American mines—the holders of gold, the concentrated and, therefore, consecrated money, became greatly alarmed lest their power over industry and commerce should be snatched from the hands of the few who held gold and disseminated into the hands of the eager people who stretched forth their hands to grasp the relief then apparently in reach, through the merciful providence of God, when the mountains were stored with silver.

The people then had a public debt of the United States to shoulder of \$2,480,672,427.81, in addition to the debts of the States, counties, cities, and towns, enormous in their proportions, and their private debts—a very heavy burden. Their daily toil had to pay every dollar of this vast sum. It was their only resource. Even from the mines, then yielding \$50,000,000 of gold per annum, they must pay in labor a full dollar's worth for every pennyweight.

The industries of these States were prostrate, and they could not contribute very much to the lifting of this crushing load. The people hailed with delight the yield of the silver mines, for our bonds were payable in coin of the United States, and silver was at a premium. It was to them as "the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." They had the right to pay their debt in silver, and the earth opened its bowels of confusion to aid them.

Then, for this course, silver was instantly killed as a money metal, and when, after a time, the murder was out and they and their sympathizers saw, too late, that the fatal blow had fallen, in dismay they left their fields and shops and went wandering in the highways, much as the Russian peasantry are wandering to-day, famine stricken, in search of food.

How was this brought about? The answer is, by the same fatal purpose that is now being declared by the opponents of silver. The Evening Post, of New York, dated March 30, tells us what the purpose is.

We say that the day of silver and silver bills has passed. \* \* \* Moreover, as the tabling of a bill carries all the amendments with it so the killing of the Bland bill kills international bimetalism, which, sooth to say, is only a shade less absurd than national bimetalism, being an attempt on the part of several to lift themselves by the bootstraps all together, instead of separately. Moreover, the killing of the Bland bill kills the present silver law. \* \* \* Another consequence will be the nomination of Mr. Cleveland by the coming Chicago convention.

The purpose has been always the same that it was when, in 1868, in June, Mr. SHERMAN made a report to the Senate from the Finance Committee, in which he declared in favor of "a single standard, exclusively of gold."

Now, I am sorry the Senator from Ohio is not here that I might ask him if he has given up that idea. If he has he is the only antisilver man of any consequence in the United States who has given it up unless he has changed to the other side of the question. He reported a bill confining the use of silver to subsidiary coin, the very thing that he has since accomplished by the act of 1890, and the subsequent act refusing coinage hereafter to gold dollars and confining the coinage of silver to subsidiary coin. That was his proposition then as it is now. That is the result of his legislation; that is the attitude of that great man, now in the leadership of a large faction of the Democratic party of the United States, as well as of perhaps two-thirds of the Republican party of this country on this question.

It was then that the destruction of bimetalism, except for subsidiary purposes, began in earnest, and in 1873 it was accomplished by the act which struck the coinage of the silver dollar from our laws, destroyed its legal-tender power as to sums over \$5, and made the gold dollar the sole unit of value. The act of February 6, 1873, provided for the free coinage of trade dollars of 420 grains Troy after killing off the standard dollar of 412½ grains and destroying its legal-tender quality and preventing its

coinage, and made them legal tender for \$5, but destroyed every other right of the free coinage of silver.

A main purpose of this law was to unload this silver on China, Japan, and Mexico. It brought our standard of silver-dollar coinage up to the Mexican standard, and furnished the Chinese and Japanese a large margin of profit in melting trade dollars and recoinage them into their cash and other silver coins. It was supposed that China would entice the rival of gold from these to happier shores in the Orient, but the mistake was that their commerce would not afford the commodities for exchange with us to pay for our \$16,000,000 a year of silver product.

To prepare the way for the single standard exclusively of gold raised over the battlements of the wealthy classes by the Senator from Ohio in 1868, in June the Chinese Empire was being courted and flattered into free commerce with us and free immigration by the leading men of the then dominant party, which resulted in the baneful Burlingame treaty in 1870. We are yet in the struggle to protect the lives and honor of our laboring classes against that treaty, the leading purpose of which was to assist the gold men in banishing silver into China. This dump for silver having been found, as was supposed, two years later came the resumption act of January 14, 1875. Silver legal-tender coin having been stricken from existence, except as to trade dollars and subsidiary coins with a legal-tender limit of \$5, the resumption act made our redemption of all Government obligations virtually in gold coin. There was nothing else with which to pay; no other coin in this respect but gold coin.

Mr. GEORGE. The trade dollar never was a legal tender.

Mr. MORGAN. The trade dollar never was a legal tender except for \$5. Thus more than \$2,000,000,000 of public debts and all private debts were changed from coin demands to gold demands by the joint action of the act of 1873 and the resumption act coming two years later than the act of 1873, by which silver was stricken out as a money metal.

At last the golden scepter ruled the Republic, and the people got Chinese immigration, the prostration of their industries, the land filled with tramps, the bankrupt law of 1867, and the unlimited issue of money by the national banks, for giving up the right to pay their war bonds in the standard coin of the United States as it was on the day named in the bonds.

When they found that under the Constitution of the United States, and under the pressure of public opinion, it would be a matter of impossibility that the Government could sustain itself in refusing to pay silver out of its vaults upon the war bonds, when they had stipulated expressly that they were payable in the coin of the United States at standard value at the time when both were legal metals, the plan was resorted to of destroying silver absolutely, its opponents saying "dump as much of it as you can into China, but if you can not get it there, destroy it anyhow, get it out of the way, and then we will pass a law of specie resumption," by which it is said the greenback shall be redeemable in coin at the Treasury of the United States, and through greenback redemption, for that was the lawful money of the United States and there could not be after that any redemption in silver or anything that stood as the representative of silver, because there was none of it left remaining in the Treasury of the United States. That was the situation and that was the result of the act of 1873.

Prior to this time, and in support of the argument that was advanced then by gentlemen in both Houses and by men outside of the Congress of the United States for the reduction or limitation of this country in its financial operations to the single gold basis or single gold standard, the history of the country was looked over, and it was found that some time in our legislation in the United States, in 1834, the ratio between gold and silver being 15 for 1 was raised to 16 for 1, for the purpose of increasing the purchasing power of gold at that time, for which there was a reason, and the same reason that influenced Great Britain in her gold policy when she, I believe, in 1816—if I am not mistaken in that date—concluded she would strike out her silver money except for subsidiary coin, and that thereafter the pound sterling should be the unit of value, and there should be nothing coined in British mints except gold and subsidiary silver coin.

The struggle to find relief from the hardships of the demonetizing act of 1873 has been very great; but before I proceed with that I will call attention to the following subjects and inquiry: Why the United States and Great Britain first adopted the single gold standard.

In 1834 we thought that the new discoveries of gold in North Carolina and Georgia were going to make us very rich in gold, there being then very little silver produced in the United States, only \$250,000 against \$7,500,007 of gold for the ten years succeeding 1834, and a sum quoted in our Mint report as "insignificant" in respect of silver, against \$14,000,000 in gold from 1792 to 1834.

We then had the same motive, based on our hopes and our ex-

perience, that Great Britain has had from 1818 to this time for making her gold the commanding metal in finance, over the silver of Mexico and South America. We then did not dream of the ownership of California, Nevada, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, with their enormous wealth in silver. In 1854 we produced \$60,000,000 in gold and \$50,000 in silver, and held to our false policy of 1834. In 1864 we produced \$46,000,000 in gold and \$11,000,000 in silver, and the white metal began to be a public rival of gold. Then began the struggle to hold the supremacy of gold, this time against a domestic competitor. Not any longer against Mexico and Peru and Bolivia and Ecuador, but this time against our own mines and our own country.

In 1873 it was a neck-to-neck race between the two metals, the production in that year being, of gold \$36,000,000, and of silver \$35,750,000, only a difference of \$250,000, between them. The capitalists who had measured the property of the debtor class by the single gold standard, seeing that silver—the unit of value, fixed by law, was about to double the debt-paying ability of the people, resolved that it should die the death.

Silver was then at 3 per cent premium over gold. It was a rival too powerful and too popular to live, and in a mysterious way it met its death at the hands of Congress. Too many of my Democratic brethren are now, it seems, rejoicing over that taking off to make it agreeable for me to dwell upon the dark picture of its untimely death. In 1883 the production of gold was \$30,000,000, and of silver \$46,200,000, and in 1890, the production of gold was \$32,800,000, and of silver \$70,464,000. In fifty-six years our production of silver grew from \$50,000 to this enormous sum, or 1,409 times its bulk. In fifty-six years it increased 1,409 fold.

Mr. GEORGE. Annual production?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, annual production.

For ten years past the yield has been about one-third gold to two-thirds silver, and this ratio is likely to be maintained without material alteration. The experience of bankers since that business was first begun has been that one-third in volume of coin, as compared with the issues of paper money, is an ample fund for its full redemption.

So that, if gold were the sole metal in which our coin certificates would be paid, as has been the case with our bonded indebtedness, and if the silver on which the coin certificates are issued should lie dead in the Treasury, we would still be able from the products of gold from our own mines to redeem every dollar of our coin certificates in gold, as they might be presented for redemption.

In 1890 the gold product in Great Britain and all her colonies was about \$35,000,000 and her silver production was about 12,000,000 ounces, say \$15,000,000. Great Britain and her colonies it seems are producing as much gold as the United States and one-sixth as much silver. We are equally as much interested as Great Britain is in the commercial and financial power of gold and six times as much interested in the purchasing power of silver.

Is there not room here for the deep foundations of an American financial policy, based on the yield of our mines, and employed to sustain our great staples of cereals and textiles, our iron, copper, zinc, lead, coal, petroleum, lumber, and the yield of our fisheries; in all of which we have a redundant production, far beyond our wants, to enter into our foreign commerce?

How an American can contemplate the power, influence, and wealth that must flow from this opportune combination of money and material, in reach of the enterprise of this great people, and fear to grasp the golden scepter and wield it in peace and benevolence for the benefit of the world, for the glory of his country, and for the promotion of liberty secured by free constitutional government, is something I must refuse to realize.

Mr. President, we here find the motive for action on the part of the two governments is a selfish one. There was never anything but a selfish motive for the action of any government, and there never will be. The motive on the part of the Government of Great Britain was that she and her colonies produced very largely of gold and very small quantities of silver. Up to 1834 we did not have that motive, for between the foundation of the Government or rather the passage of the coinage acts of 1792 and 1834, we had coin from the products of our own mines and our own mints less than \$10,000,000, I think it is, of both gold and silver.

So that ours was not then a country that was a yielder of the precious metals in either form, and we were indifferent at that time in respect of the one metal in its power over the other; hence we adopted both upon the advice of men like Hamilton and Jefferson and others, who took a broad and world-wide examination of questions of finance, and who concluded it was best in accord with the spirit of liberty found in our written Constitution and the spirit of our people and their prosperity and safety for all time to come, that they should have an opportunity of enjoying the benefits of both of the precious metals that the Almighty

had placed in the bosom of the earth, doubtless for the purpose of assisting in the civilization and Christianization of mankind.

You may look back over the history of this world in all its parts, national or individual, collective or singular, and you can not find any production of the earth or any other factor that has been so valuable and so indispensable in the promotion of civilization as the divine ordination of silver and gold in their twin connection. It seems to have been established through the providence of Almighty God. Up to 1834 we had no peculiar or selfish motive in this matter. In 1834 the whole country was electrified by the discoveries of what were then supposed to be vast and unexampled deposits of gold in North Carolina and in Georgia.

I remember even as a child the thrill that ran through the country at that time at the marvelous discovery of gold in Georgia and in North Carolina, and when I got to be a boy of 12 or 15 years of age it had gone over into Alabama, and when I got to be a man, making a stump speech one day in Alabama on a little branch at Arabochoe, a little placer digging there, a bare-legged boy with his pants rolled up to his knees came running into the crowd holding a nugget above his head shouting, and that broke me down, and we did not have any more exercises except a jollification over this finding of a nugget of gold that weighed 30 pennyweights in that branch.

The foundation of our financial system gave way under pressure of our gold discoveries, and we adopted straightway the ratio of 16 to 1 in order to make the purchasing power of gold greater—a most unfortunate movement, that has led from that time to this, in consequence of the unbalanced condition of the philosophy of the financial system of our Government, to continual wrangling and controversy between silver men and gold men. Great Britain discovered, I think it was in 1818, what I have just stated—

Mr. GEORGE. In 1816.

Mr. STEWART. The law was passed in 1816, but it did not go into effect until 1818.

Mr. MORGAN. What was her wise, selfish policy with respect to gold? She wanted to make it the most powerful metal in the world, more powerful than silver, for the double reasons that her colonies produced it in what was then considered pretty large abundance, but her commerce naturally put her in the lead of the nations of the earth in financial affairs, and she wanted the concentrated money just as every wielder of power, political or religious or moral or financial or any other kind of power, always wants his power concentrated in the hands of a very few people in order to make it entirely effectual.

Then we went on in our new policy, and when gold was discovered in California—which was discovered before any silver—then a question occurred about the demonetization of gold, whether it was not getting too powerful and whether there was not too much of it coming in, and it was largely discussed.

After awhile discoveries of silver were made, some in California and some in Nevada, New Mexico, and elsewhere, and silver thus commenced piling up the column and got pretty nearly to an equilibrium with gold, and in 1872, when it had reached the equilibrium with \$250,000 difference, then the desperate men, who were resolved that they would keep gold far in advance, decreed the death of silver, and it went to its death under the act of 1873. It was rather a sudden death and an obscure one. The people did not know it for some three years after it was dead, and Gen. Grant did not know it for two years, when he expressed his great surprise, in a letter he wrote, that silver had been destroyed as legal-tender money.

Mr. GEORGE. He did not know it when he signed the act.

Mr. MORGAN. No, nor did anybody else, except a few members of Congress, as far as we are informed. That was another conference committee business. That was another one of the glories that come from under these hidden arrangements to surprise and enlighten the world. Then the fight for restoration commenced that I have described. It progressed, and it has been a fight all the time from that day to this; but since 1878, or thereabouts, when the first attack was made upon the act of 1873, and the country received really its first information as to what had been done in respect to the demonetization of silver by the act of 1873.

We have not in our efforts asked to have an advantage given to silver over gold, but we have asked and are continually asking and will continue to ask that silver shall be restored to its relation to gold as it is fixed in the Constitution of the United States, and that the obstructions which have been in its way and which have thrown the whole weight of the power of this Government against silver from 1873 to the present time, shall simply be removed and let it have a chance to live.

The people first took up this question of restoration and pressed it upon the attention of Congress. I do not remember that any Congressman came forward voluntarily, except as he was moved

by the urgent petition and clamors of his people, to make any demonstration against the fearful power of gold, consolidated as it was through the demonetizing act of 1873 and the resumption act of 1875. It was a fearful ordeal for a man to stand up against the powers of the Government at that time and proclaim a doctrine which might be held to impair or impugn in some sense the credit of the United States in the payment of its bonds.

It was a fearful experience that drove the people to find out about this matter. The politicians, housed up and drawing their salaries, and comfortable and unused to the toils of the field and the mine and the workshop and the fisheries and the forests, could not feel the disturbance that a laboring man, a tolling man felt when he saw that his labor was all in vain, that he had an enormous amount of public debts to pay out of his own toil; for no debt is paid except out of toll applied to agriculture, to the fisheries, to the forests, to the mine, to the factories, to the machine shops, and the like.

Labor earns every dollar that is paid on a public debt. The lawyers, the preachers, doctors, members of Congress, and the like, do not earn a dollar of that. They help distribute it, enjoy it, take their commissions out of it, but, after all, every dollar of the debt of the United States and every other debt in this country is shouldered right down upon labor and production. You can not get away from that proposition. That is true and no man can deny it. It enters as a factor into every consideration relating to finance and taxation, and we had as well meet it on the ground floor as up in the air.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Senator from Alabama will please suspend. It becomes the duty of the Chair, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 2729) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. DAWES. I ask that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not desire to object to the request, but I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, in charge of the Indian appropriation bill, whether he intends to call that bill up to-day?

Mr. DAWES. It is my intention to call it up at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] unless the Senator should feel it his duty to consume the time of the afternoon.

Mr. MANDERSON. Then I should like some intimation from the Senator from Alabama whether he proposes to consume the afternoon?

Mr. MORGAN. I have never been able to measure the time, Mr. President, if I was going to make a speech, not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Alabama is entitled to the floor according to the precedents, but if there be time to take up the Indian appropriation bill this afternoon I hope to conclude it.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope, then, that we may understand definitely whether the appropriation bill will be taken up this afternoon or whether it will not be. There are a number of Senators here who are desirous to be present when the vote shall be finally taken upon the bill and upon the pending question.

Mr. DAWES. If it were in my power to give any more definite information, I should. If it be more agreeable to the Senators to have the time fixed to-morrow or something of that kind, I shall not object.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it better to have some definite time fixed, so that we shall not be required to dance attendance here in the Senate when we do not know whether or not this bill will be reached.

Mr. DAWES. In reply to the Senator from Nebraska, I do not see how, under the usages of the Senate, I can now fix a time. I appreciate all the Senator says. I will endeavor to have the bill taken up to-morrow morning without question.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire the least disrespect towards the Senator from Alabama by my inquiry. I simply have some other matters to attend to that are important in the line of my official duty, and I can attend to them this afternoon if the Indian appropriation bill is not to be considered.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator sees just how I am situated. I would be more definite if I could.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am unable to see why the Senator in charge of the Indian appropriation bill can not say whether he proposes to take up that bill this afternoon or not.

Mr. DAWES. I have said all I could, that I did propose, if

there were time after the Senator from Alabama got through, to call up the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is a very indefinite solution of the problem.

Mr. DAWES. I know it is. I appreciated the Senator's interrogatory, and I wish the Senator would appreciate the embarrassing position in which I am myself placed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to laying aside the unfinished business informally. The Senator from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I repeat the people first took up the question of restoration. A fearful experience drove them to it. The politicians, including the President and many of our greatest men, were aroused by the anguish of the people, and, rubbing their dreamy eyes, found that the Senator from Ohio had slain silver.

The first significant protest of the people was a Democratic majority in the House and then in the Senate, with Allen G. Thurman, the real hero of the restoration, in the lead. There was no great tariff issue then before the people. Justice, relief, and restoration to financial soundness were the demands of the people. The demand has never ceased and will never be hushed until the people are restored to their constitutional rights.

The Bland bill was the first great move. "The Bland bill was intended to make an approximation, and did make an approximation towards the rehabilitation of silver. Silver had to be replaced in various respects. First of all, it had to find its way in some form or other into the mints and Treasury of the United States. Then it had to be restored to its legal-tender quality, and then some respect had to be paid to the standard of value and the ratio of value, whether it should be 15 to 1 or 16 to 1 or 15½ to 1; whether, having destroyed silver coinage by the act of 1873 and driven it out of the statutes entirely, when we replaced it it would go back with its original ratio of 16 to 1 for gold, or whether it would go back with the English ratio of 15½ to 1 for gold.

Those questions had to be approached one by one, seriatim. It was more than the power of Congress could compass to take up the whole subject of silver coinage and its relations to gold and reestablish and reinstate it in a single act. So it appears. The Bland bill was the result. That bill reestablished the legal tender of silver coin. It reestablished the 412½ grains standard silver nine-tenths fine. It required the coinage—not merely the purchase, but it required the coinage—by the United States mints of not less than two nor more than four million dollars per month. It permitted the use of silver certificates. Gold certificates had been permitted to be issued by a separate act. It made those silver certificates receivable in the banks of the United States as part of their reserve.

The Bland bill with the Allison amendment—the honorable Senator who now stands before me being responsible for the provisions for the purchase of silver by the Government of the United States in that act—the Bland bill with the Allison amendment became the law of the United States and we worked under that till 1890. The banks in the meantime had refused to accept deposits of silver certificates. They would accept deposits of silver and give certificates of special deposit, but they would not accept them on general account, because they said they could not carry them through the clearing houses. The fact was that they did not want to carry them through the clearing houses.

After a long struggle we compelled them to receive these certificates by the act to extend the charters of the national banks, of July 12, 1882.

The last clause of section 12 of that act was inserted on the motion of my colleague [Mr. PUGH]. Then we went further and forced subsidiary silver coin as a legal tender up to the sum of \$10 by the act of June 9, 1879.

Before that time the subsidiary coin had been a legal tender only for \$5. By a long and serious effort we at last forced the gold men to receive subsidiary legal coins for \$10, with great benefit to the people at that time. That was an astounding concession to the men that elected the House of Representatives and the Senate, the President, and everybody else.

The House continued to be Democratic, with Randall and CARLISLE warring over the tariff; and that their warfare was bitter and "up to the hilt" there is no one can doubt who remembers the history of the United States. That it was honest and sincere no one can doubt. At the same time the tariff and its modifications and the correctness of the principles upon which many of its levies were made was then more seriously a question of dispute amongst the leading Democrats of the United States than the question of free coinage or the abolishment of silver is to-day amongst the Democrats of the United States.

Silver was then a chord of union that had not been loosed to bind the Democracy together. That chord had not then been loosed nor had the golden bowl been broken at the fountain. There was

still an opportunity for life of the Democratic party, and that opportunity was chiefly founded upon the fact that they were all striving to reinstate the people of the United States in the possession of their ancient constitutional right of having gold and silver, as we declared in that act of 1890, maintained on a parity, and that the Government of the United States should lend its powers in that direction rather than in the opposite direction of breaking down the parity between the metals.

Then Mr. Cleveland came in 1885, with a Wall street congestive chill on him about a coming flood of silver, and he commenced prophesying, and prophesying evil, and according to the evils that he apprehended, threw the whole weight of his Administration against silver, beginning with a letter which he addressed to members of Congress before he had been inaugurated as President of the United States, in which he begged them to repress and destroy silver coinage.

We had already encountered the veto of the President of the United States [Mr. Hayes] upon the Bland bill, and had overcome that. The political parties of the United States, or the men who composed them in both these great bodies here in Washington, were so earnest in their determination to restore to the people of this country that of which they had been robbed that they waived for a time their fidelity to party lines and party principles, and they voted upon these questions according to their convictions as to what was best for their own constituents. The result was that the Bland bill was passed, which did rehabilitate silver to a very large extent, which expressed the approbation of the people of the United States that silver should be a legal-tender coin, and that it should have a large coinage, if not a free coinage.

Mr. President, every movement that we have made since 1878 has been a march to the front, and while silver has not yet accomplished all that was expected of it and desired of it, it has not by any means suffered a defeat on any part of its ground. It has been set back time and again, the opposing forces have been frequently of sufficient power to drive it from its lines on the battlefield, but nobody has ever captured and occupied its camp, and those gentlemen in Wall street who vainly fancy now that because the Bland bill was not taken up in the House of Representatives the silver question is dead are utterly mistaken in their conjecture.

They will find sooner or later, and they will find it very soon, that the people of the United States have got a sedate and fixed policy about that which they are pursuing, that they will be turned neither to the right nor to the left, and that there is no man and no party in the United States that has or ever can have power enough over the true representatives of the industrial classes in the United States to cause them to swerve for one moment in the march to the restoration.

I lock hands with any man and every man who is marching for the restoration of silver. I want to see the Government and Constitution of my country put back to that degree of recognition and influence where they were prior to 1873, and I want the bonds of matrimony that were celebrated between gold and silver in laying down the very foundations of our creed so established, so reinstated, and so preserved that no man shall put them asunder.

Mr. President, in referring to the condition of our present legislation and the struggles we have been making to try to get the country back to the recognition of gold and silver coinage, I have had occasion to speak of the money power. I do not speak of that in any invidious manner. I do not blame men for loving money, or wanting money, or having money, or using money. It is their right and their privilege to do it. If they get it honestly, that is all we need to ask. Its power and influence will be felt, and has always been felt, in society and in government, and we can not control men in the use of money, nor ought we attempt to control them in its use, beyond what we would do in respect of the use of any other species of property, or any other power, or any other influence they have got.

When rightly used it is the handmaid of civilization, and the source of blessings to mankind; when abused it is a tyrant, and its tyranny reaches both to soul and body. It is a corruptor, a beast of prey that feasts on the blood of human society, leaving the carcass to decay and poison the pure air of heaven.

Money, the measure of all values, must receive its own measure from the laws. Outside the law there is no power "to coin money, or to regulate the value thereof." If you can not find the power expressed in the law to coin money or to regulate its value, you will not find it anywhere. It never has existed outside of positive law.

When money is good, the law makes it good, when it is bad, the law is responsible.

The only natural and accepted basis of all promissory money is gold and silver. This has always been so, and will always be true. Other foundations than gold and silver have been found on which to rest bills of credit, such as bonds, bank notes, and

Treasury notes, as temporary makeshifts, but these, when they are liquidated, must be resolved into gold or silver coin.

A note payable in gold may support the judgment of a court that the defendant must deliver so much gold to the plaintiff; but when the sheriff comes to execute the judgment, and he is met with a legal tender of number of dollars stated in the mandate of the writ of execution, he is bound to accept the legal tender so offered to him in satisfaction of the judgment or he repeals the law. If he has not the power to repeal the legal-tender law he is bound to accept the legal tender of a proper number of dollars in satisfaction, and you can not have it otherwise.

Just in this connection I should like to observe upon the futility, the absolute folly, of those provisions that are found in the Bland act and also in the act of 1890—I am not quite so sure about the act of 1890—that the coin certificates for the legal-tender silver dollar shall be a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, except where a contract for payment in gold or some other commodity is couched in the agreement itself.

Mr. STEWART. It is in the act of 1890.

Mr. ALLISON. And in the act of 1878 as well.

Mr. MORGAN. I knew it was in the act of 1878. Now, there can be nothing more absurd than that. It is very true that the Supreme Court of the United States have said that where a contract contains an agreement, we will say for the payment of \$500 in gold coin, they can render a judgment for \$500 in gold coin. It does not vitiate the judgment if they render it in that way; it does not improve it any; it does not alter its legal effect. They can render a judgment for \$500 in gold coin, but when their marshal goes out with his writ of execution to collect that bill, and the debtor tenders him a thousand dollars in greenbacks, pronounced also to be lawful money by the Supreme Court of the United States, or a thousand dollars in legal tender standard silver dollar coins, that marshal is bound to release him and his property, and to receive the thousand dollars in satisfaction. Then what becomes of the contract to pay in coin? It amounts to nothing. It is a privilege put in the statute that if a man wants to make a fool of himself the law will not object. That is the whole business.

As I have stated it that must be the law, or else two persons may by agreement amend a constitutional law of Congress. A paper legal tender will thus extinguish a judgment for gold founded on a contract payable in gold.

In such a transaction it is only the power of the law that preserves the parity between legal-tender paper money and a judgment of a court for the payment of so many dollars in gold.

It is the power of the law that maintains the parity; it is not the power of commerce. Strip either coin of its capacity as a legal tender, disassociate it from any provision on the part of the lawmaking power to give to it a certain currency under certain conditions, and it is no longer of any value as money.

In every case where one sort of money has actual control over another sort it is the power of the law that secures it, and not the commercial value of the dominant money. So if gold has any advantage over silver in this country that advantage must be given to it by law, and can be given to it in no other way.

There may be an accidental or fictitious advantage from time to time, a rise and fall with the emergencies of trade, the laws of demand and supply, but when you come to speak about coining money and regulating the value thereof under the Constitution of the United States the parity between the two metals must be maintained by the active power of the laws of the United States, and not by the fluctuating and uncertain power of its mere commercial value.

If the Constitution of the United States had meant that Congress should regulate the parity between the metals according to the commercial value of the metals respectively, it would have said so; but instead of doing that it not only requires that Congress shall pass laws for coining money and regulating the value thereof, but it goes further and it prohibits the States, which had the power theretofore to declare what they chose to declare to be a legal tender for debts, from making legal tender between A and B, their citizens, of anything or any commodity except gold and silver coin. Congress had the power to make the coin. The States had no such power. So the States gave up all of their power in respect of legal tender except that they could adopt the law and make gold and silver coin legal tender for debts.

Now, following this idea up, when the demonetization of silver took place in 1873 West Virginia put a statute on her books—it is there to-day—allowing her people to pay their debts in silver coin of the United States. Although the United States Government has demonetized silver and refused its further coining, and had taken from it its legal-tender value unless it was subsidiary coin or trade dollars which run up in legal-tender power to the sum of \$5, notwithstanding all of this action on the part of the Government of the United States West Virginia, in the exercise of her sovereign power, as she had a perfect right to do, provided

that debts might be discharged in West Virginia by the silver coins of the United States.

She could not have provided that they should be discharged in wheat or corn or pig iron or anything like that; but there was the constitutional authority for her that wherever she would find a coin of the United States, old or new, if it was a standard coin and had been issued under the authority of the laws of the United States, she might make it a legal tender, although the United States might have withdrawn that quality from it.

Mr. MILLS. Could she make one metal alone a legal tender to the exclusion of the other?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I suppose she could not. There might be this sort of a case. If all the metal in the State was of one sort she might refer to that as the metal that should be legal-tender coin; but if she undertook in making silver dollars a legal-tender coin to say that gold dollars should not be a legal-tender, I have not any idea she could do it. She would thereupon destroy the unity between the metals which was fixed in the Constitution of the United States and make a distinction between them by her laws, which would be an excess of her authority.

Mr. GEORGE. Did that law of West Virginia ever undergo judicial determination?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know that it ever did.

If silver dollars worth 80 cents each in commerce are tendered to pay a judgment for so many dollars in gold they can not lawfully be refused. To get rid of this result there is but one possible expedient, and that is to demonetize the silver dollar and have the gold dollar as the sole basis—the redeemer of all promises to pay and all other forms of indebtedness.

This is to be the result of depriving silver of free coinage.

If we strike silver from free coinage, if we say to the people of the United States you shall not have your bullion coined at your option by the Government of the United States, you say in effect to them: "We will take this out of the legal-tender category of money metals; it shall not any longer be used for the purpose of paying debts contrary to the wish of the creditor; it can not be used for a purpose of that kind;" and being useless for that, it is a mere commodity, and, being a mere commodity, the Government of the United States has no power to deal with it any more than it has with wheat, corn, or anything like that.

So the whole question of the free coinage of silver and its legal-tender quality is so united and blended together as that no man can separate between them. If you deny to silver its legal-tender quality you kill it as a money metal; you may have as many laws as you please on the statute book for its use, but you can not regulate the value of it in the ratio of gold to silver.

The two metals were intended under the Constitution of the United States to be identical in respect of the use to be made of them under the laws of the country, identical in all their functions, and whoever undertakes to separate between them will find himself necessarily involved in the category of destroying the one against which the discrimination is made. It can not be otherwise, logically or in fact.

Bimetallism, the free coinage of silver, the legal-tender quality of silver, the right of silver to be considered as a money metal, are all wrapped up in the like powers and conditions and circumstances that belong to gold, and you can not separate between silver and gold in respect of any of them without destroying the metal that is discriminated against as a money metal.

So I return to my proposition. Whatever effect is given to silver money in the United States to keep it on a parity with gold must be the result of positive law completely disassociated from its commercial value. The commercial value of a dollar of silver has no more connection with its legal capacity and function as a legal-tender coin in the payment of a debt against the will of a creditor, than the amount of paper or rags in a hundred-dollar bill has with the legal-tender quality of the greenback.

It is true that silver is a valuable metal. It is valuable for many things. In the grand aggregate, the silver of the world, however, is not worth one-tenth part of the iron that is in the world. But when you come to pound for pound, or ounce for ounce, the silver may be and is a more valuable metal. It is valued not because it makes a tool for the mechanic to work with, not because it enters substantially into any of the real industries of the world, unless it may be in some chemical solvent for the purpose of taking photographic pictures or the like of that. It has very little value as a metal considered by itself. It pleases the fancy of men and women of good taste and can be wrought into jewelry and articles of decoration that are very splendid and very enticing; but taken by itself simply as a metal, silver is a very poor affair compared with iron.

The world appreciates it for the reasons I have been stating. But it has other reasons of value, the leading one of which is the fact that all civilized humanity, and all humanity in the process of civilization from the dawn of civilization down to this moment, have adopted silver as one of the efficient agents of the great

work. We can not ask men to lay down those traits, characteristics, opinions, and sentiments which have come down to them through cycles of ages, through their blood and brain and brawn, and abandon them of a sudden in view of the opinions of some doctrinaires that the further use of silver as money is going to be a disadvantage to any community in which it is found.

The people are not going to do it. The will of the people, if we can ever get ourselves to understand something about what that means in this great land of laws—the will of the people is something which we must respect, and when it is sedately established and has followed them along through generations and generations for centuries and for cycles, we can not lay it down and abandon it and set up some theory of our own in contradiction of it and to its destruction. That man is not a representative man in his heart or in his action who feels that way toward the people whom he represents.

Now, the people of the United States were never more astonished, never more grieved, never more disgusted, nor were they ever more deeply wounded than they were when they awoke a year or so after the fatal act and found that the silver money established in the Constitution of the country by the joint act of the great fathers and all the celebrated lights of that age, had perished in a night by the hand of a few men who wanted to destroy it for the sake of building up one class of men in this country against another.

Such a shock as that the people of the United States had never before experienced. They have not gotten over it, and they are not going to get over it. They are going to try silver again, and if they find that the honorable Senator from Ohio has more wisdom than 65,000,000 people in the United States after all, they will insist still that that statute shall go upon the books and let them try it a little while longer, when they will give their permission to us to repeal the act if it does not suit. But once they put it there, the Senator knows it will never come off.

Mr. MCPHERSON. They have got it there now.

Mr. MORGAN. No, they have not quite got it. They have got pretty close to it, but not altogether. If the Secretary of the Treasury, under the advice of the honorable Senator from Ohio and with the kind permission of the President and the particular faction of the party to which he belongs, shall conclude that in the exercise of the discretion conferred upon him by Congress he will coin silver dollars, when he puts them out and the people get them in exchange for coin certificates they are still legal tender with gold, equal in all particulars. So while we are badly dilapidated we are not thoroughly wrecked. We are not in as bad a condition as the Senator from Ohio left us in 1873 when he demonetized silver, to say the least of it. Since that fateful hour we have climbed very high; we have our eyes still upon the top of the peak where victory is written; and we are not going stop until we get there.

Mr. President, there is another very peculiar phase of the money power that I want to discuss before the Senate. I do not pretend that I am, in the statistical view of the question, so well informed upon it as that I can give a fixed opinion about every feature of it, and yet my convictions about it are so strong that I can not possibly get rid of them. I will state some facts that every Senator here who has been an observant reader of events will know. I will go back to 1878, when the remonetization of silver took place in part under the Bland act. Two million dollars a month of actual coinage of legal-tender dollars were to be paid out into the hands of the people or else their representative silver certificate were to be paid out.

Now, take the prices of the great staples of cotton, wheat, and corn. They are the greatest of our staples, although we have some other articles in the United States that are entitled to be considered as staple article, such as the product of our mines, iron and different metals, fisheries particularly, and lumber. These are entitled to be considered as staples, but I refer to the three great staples, cotton, corn, and wheat, the textiles and the cereals peculiarly adapted to the use of man and animals.

You may take the fluctuations of silver bullion since 1878 and, if you please to go further back, since 1873, month after month, during the whole period down to this very day, and you will find that the fluctuations in cotton and the fluctuations in grain of different descriptions have been almost correspondingly the same with the fluctuations of silver bullion. When the price of silver would go up in the market the prices of these products would go up, and if silver would go down the products would follow. That is a peculiarity of our history. The facts are not to be denied, for they are ascertained by every-day records made and kept by men who control the commerce of the country.

Mr. MILLS. That has not been the case with wheat in the last six months.

Mr. MORGAN. It has.

Mr. MILLS. The price of wheat has risen very largely in the last six or eight months

Mr. MORGAN. What is the price to-day?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know, but wheat has been over a hundred cents a bushel.

Mr. MORGAN. It is now 76 cents, and silver—

Mr. STEWART. That was occasioned by the famine in the Old World and the good crops here.

Mr. MILLS. Precisely; but it shows that it takes something else to fix the price.

Mr. MORGAN. I will get to that.

Mr. STEWART. The manufactured commodities there fell 35 or 40 per cent.

Mr. MORGAN. I know what the Senator says is true, and I agree with him that there are two factors at work. One is the power of the consumer to buy these staples. I understand that perfectly well. But the other, nevertheless, has a fixed relation to it; and the Senator is mistaken when he supposes that recently the history of the upward and downward progress of the four commodities I have named is not nearly the same.

Mr. McPHERSON. Would it interfere with the Senator if I should ask him a question in this connection?

Mr. MORGAN. I will answer a question in a moment. I want to get this idea before the Senate, if the Senator pleases. I will state at what wheat is quoted in the market by reading an extract from a newspaper of yesterday or the day before, which will give the idea more perfectly than I will be able to bring it before the Senate perhaps in this mere discursive way of treating the question. Here is an article taken from the Post of this city of day before yesterday.

#### THE LOW PRICE OF WHEAT.

Silver is down very low, not quite but very nearly as low as it has been at any time.

Considerable surprise has been naturally occasioned by the fact that recent prices of wheat have been ruling far below the corresponding quotations of a year ago. Within a day or two May wheat at Chicago brought only 79 cents a bushel as against 104 cents for the same day last year.

This feeling of surprise is due in a great measure to the exaggerated calculations which were made, upon apparently good authority, in regard to the failure of the harvests of the rest of the world and the abundant yield in America.

It was confidently declared that Europe lacked 900,000,000 bushels of its ordinary requirements and that its available supply outside of the United States could not exceed 100,000,000 bushels. It was shown that out of its abundant harvest this country could easily spare 225,000,000 bushels, leaving 575,000,000 bushels short of an adequate supply, and thus creating a condition which must logically give rise to famine prices. The other representations may have been strictly accurate, and the various elements of the problem may have been correctly stated, but the logical sequence has not been realized.

The peculiarity of the present market situation lies in the circumstance that, while the granary of Eastern Europe is under starvation conditions and most of its countries are short of their usual food supplies, the American farmer is getting less for his wheat than he has done during the worst years of his recent experience. Doubtless the calculators greatly underrated the wheat supplies available from India and Egypt and in that way arrived at an erroneous result. But in all probability the chief fact overlooked in reaching a wrong conclusion in this case is that multitudes of men in all European countries have been out of employment this winter, and that men out of work can not and will not consume as much food as they would do when engaged in prosperous occupations.

Now we find the parallelism in this market. As silver goes down wheat goes down. I do not contend that a money that is stripped of its power as a legal tender carries up with it or carries down with it the price of the wheat, the corn, the cotton, that we send to foreign countries or that we consume here, but I contend that when silver is put in the condition that it is in the act of 1890 and it is a mere commodity, it is like wheat and corn and cotton and iron and provisions, and whatever effect causes a depression among the other leading cereals and commodities in the country will always produce a like effect upon silver bullion.

Perhaps it may not be identical. There are fluctuating and varying circumstances attending upon the price of staples, sometimes a greater local demand, or a moment of depression in the demand for one more than in another, but when we relegate silver bullion to the condition of a mere commodity as wheat and corn and cotton, then we put it within reach of the power of the money of the world to buy it at higher or lower prices according to the abundance of money, according to the uses that can be made of money in making such purchases.

Now, to illustrate, wheat goes down in Europe in face of the fact that all of the vast Empire of Russia is now in a state almost of starvation. We are sending off cargoes of wheat to Russia to save the people from actual starvation, and yet the price of wheat goes down in the European markets. We know that there wheat is in great demand. We know that England and Austria and Germany and France and Italy and all of the interior of Europe are short in their crops, and that the draft which is made upon them by the famine in Russia must be a very heavy one, and yet wheat goes down to 79 cents. The reason of that must be that the money of Europe is gold and that gold is in the hands, naturally, of a few men.

Gold itself is a concentrated power as compared with silver, concentrated sixteen times, and the holders of it are also men

and corporations in whose hands there is concentrated a great credit and power. There has been a very serious agitation in financial circles in Europe, growing out of the suspension of the Barings during the last year, which took \$79,000,000 of gold in two months' time out of this country and carried it to Europe. There have been other causes of disturbance over there. There is a very uneasy feeling in Germany to-day, the causes of which I need not enter upon, but we understand perfectly that the feeling in Germany is very uneasy. What is France now? What is Paris but a city honeycombed with dynamite explosions from day to day?

What is the cause of the agitation? We do not know so much about what the cause is. The honorable Senator from Texas will say, and probably say with perfect truth, that the cause is that the people are out of employment; that they have not any commerce to depend on any more. He will say that for these causes France is boiling with trouble; that Austria has to hold an army in the field to keep her people in check; that Germans actually invade the palace of the Emperor with working masses who come to demand blood or bread; and so throughout all Europe.

Money naturally retires under such circumstances. Famine drives money into its recesses. War and threatened commotion of a civil character drive money out of circulation. Money is scarce in Europe, and it is being hoarded there; and as it becomes scarcer in Europe, as everywhere else, its purchasing power increases; and wheat that a month or two months ago, when there was a prospect of relief in financial circles in Europe, would bring a dollar a bushel brings now 79 cents, if that is the proper quotation.

Mr. GEORGE. The starving people can not get the money to buy it.

Mr. MORGAN. The starving people can not get the money to buy it with.

Mr. STEWART. The money does not exist.

Mr. McPHERSON. Is there starvation anywhere else in Europe except in Russia?

Mr. MORGAN. We will say that there is none except in Russia; but there is a shadow of starvation upon every place near to those where the awful condition prevails that exists in Russia.

Mr. President, let us come to the question of the power of money. That is what we are trying to consider. We take out of the category all the silver, as they do in Europe, except the subsidiary coin, and we deal with the question of the power of money as it concerns gold and silver alone. We find that when the money is concentrated into gold first and then again concentrated in the hands of men who have the power and the credit to hold it, it is always used either as a weapon of power or a means of enrichment. We see that there is an opportunity, to say the least, for the unlimited spread of the power of gold, which means the unlimited depression of all the fruits and results of industry at the option of the holders of gold.

Now, let us bring that home. We have the same policy here. We have concluded that it is best for the American people that these corporations that have made millionaires and hundred-fold millionaires out of parvenus in twenty-five or thirty years, miserable counters of usury and robbers of industry—we have concluded that the power of corporations and other institutions in this country that are built up in the bosom of this beautiful Republic, shall have still further power to concentrate the money of the United States in their hands, and in order to do it we strike away two-thirds of the money metal of the United States and take one-third, and thereby increase, as two is to three, their power of accumulation and concentration. We have them in that shape here to-day.

The men in the United States who control the money power of this country control it through the agency of gold, and they do it because silver is driven out of circulation. What we buy under the act of 1890 is banked up here in bullion. The people can not get it back. Make silver and gold what the Constitution made them, twins in financial right and financial power. Then let the people get hold of this two-thirds of the money metal of the land and scatter it out among themselves and employ it in their business. What is the result? You negative the power of the capitalists by bringing two men against one. Here are two men who have a dollar each of silver in their pockets and he has a dollar of gold, and their combined power is greater than his, if the law keeps them in parity.

If I have a conviction in respect to this matter that is deeper, and broader, and stronger than another it is that it was among the very wisest provisions of the Divine Father of the human race when he began to use and did use, and planted in the bosom of the earth for the purpose of using, gold and silver as factors in civilization, that he intended that it should take place, that the holders of the concentrated metal, the scarcer metal, should not have the power over the rest of the people of the world ab-



solutely, but He would associate with that yellow metal a white sister that should go with it into all the parts of the earth and into all of the enterprises of humanity, and should spread its power into the hands of the people at large, so that a few men should not become the mere representative in their own person of the entire money power of the world.

Napoleon leading his armies in his desperate ventures through Europe was never more completely the master of those on whose necks he trod than the capitalists of this country are the masters of the people, because we have deprived the people of having the only possible means of countervailing and counteracting their influence by the spread of silver, as good as gold, through the country.

In these references, which you work out with a great deal more precision and with more satisfaction to yourselves than I am able to do, do you not see a reason why prices for wheat decline in the very jaws of famine, and prices of cotton decline because there is no consumer; and there are few who feel able to buy enough of it to keep the mills running and the cotton fields producing?

Do we not see that while that is the case, and the crop of cotton is large, as it is also of wheat and corn, that the larger the crop is the more disastrous it is to the farmer, for the reason that the men who hold the purchasing power have in their hands a capacity for depressing these prices below what is their actual cost of production and their relative value considered in respect of other things? We find the price of silver decline. That is affected by the same cause exactly.

Although we can not measure it, although, perhaps, there is no financial barometer or thermometer by which we can scale the rise exactly in degree, the truth is that the legislation set on foot by the honorable Senator from Ohio in 1873 has had the effect of putting gold out of its proper level high on the barometric scale or the thermometric scale of business, as we may call it, leaving silver and the products of the country down on the zero level. The truth is that gold to-day is 40 per cent above its fair price, and we ought to yoke silver with it to hold it down to a level with other productions. Whenever we consent to divorce them and to allow gold to monopolize the financial power and strength of this land, we may expect to see it rise, and as it rises every commodity and every industry in the United States will be depreciated, and after awhile will be almost destroyed.

I have said that the money metals of this country derive their actual power from positive law. They do not depend upon commercial value for their financial power. Gold will not let anything live anywhere within the realm of its sweep and sway that it does not control—silver, diamonds, iron, corn, wheat, provisions, everything. It is the imperial master, unless you bridle it with the restraining authority of the law. Never was there a wiser conception than when our fathers united it with silver indissolubly and inviolably in the Constitution of the United States.

So I think we see a reason why it is that our country is so depressed in all of its industries at this time, for the depression includes everyone. We find that the silver mines are being locked up in Arizona. Men can not make wages out there, and the mines are going by the board. The truth is there is but one industry in the United States that is not embarrassed to-day by this cruel arrangement under which silver is dethroned of all its influence and power, and that is the money-shaving business. That is the only business in the United States that is prospering in the present situation. Usury runs riot. Discount has no bounds set to it. It is like the raging sea, it defies the power of man to set bounds to it.

Speculation in money upon the sweat of the brow is not the work of a great many people, but it is the work of a set of people who are armed with all the necessary power to burden the people and destroy them.

The people of the United States have never been, in my recollection, so restless as they are to-day, except after 1873, when they found what had been done to them and dropped their plows and hoes in the fields and their tools in the workshop and took to the high road, straggling about in search of employment that they could not find. Then it was that that desperate and awful character, the American tramp, had his birth. Thousands and tens of thousands since that time have followed along in that weary, lonely, miserable, wretched path, and the authors of the destruction of silver are responsible for the whole of it.

I do not propose, Mr. President, now to undertake to array the facts and propositions to refute the danger of the silver dump in the United States. There can be no danger in it, so far as I can see. Whoever brings an ounce of silver into the United States must bring it for the purpose of carrying something out in the place of it. He does not want to carry the silver back; he wants to exchange it while it is here for something else for which he expects to pay the full value. The people of the United States are quite competent to take care of themselves in any dealings of that kind; and I have not been able to understand and formu-

late in my own mind a project through which it was possible that silver could or would ever be brought into this country for the mere purpose of dumping it.

It is said that they want to bring it here and exchange it for gold. They can not do that unless they pay for the gold the prices we want to sell it at. If we have gold to sell and they bring silver here they can buy it.

I have some statistics here that I want to call attention to for a moment that I think will throw a little light on the question of dumping.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator sitting nearest to me [Mr. GEORGE] suggests that the only trouble about the dumping process is that there will not be enough to dump for our use.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe that is strictly true. There will not be as much as we want after it is all dumped.

Mr. STEWART. That is the only trouble there will be.

Mr. GEORGE. Then we ought to be in favor of the dump.

Mr. STEWART. We are.

Mr. MORGAN. Here is an extract from the Louisville Courier-Journal, whose editor has the reputation, and I think justly, of being a very enlightened man. It is the facts, however, that he states here to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. He is telling us why the \$71,000,000 of gold that went away last year does not come back and what is keeping that gold abroad:

The advance in the rate of foreign exchange and the decreased gold movement to this country have been the occasion of much comment, and in some quarters do not seem to be well understood. When it was a thoroughly ascertained fact that the crops last season were very large in this country and very small in Europe, it was thought that the increased breadstuff export would bring back to the United States the \$75,000,000 in gold which was sent to Europe last spring and summer. Such anticipations have been fulfilled only in part, for less than half the gold has returned to America, and at present the receipts are very small. During November and December the gold imports amounted to only about \$11,000,000, against \$25,000,000 in September and October, and there seems to be no prospect at present of a larger movement.

Yet, the exporter of breadstuffs has fully equalled expectations. During December, 1891, about six times as much wheat was sent to Europe as during December, 1890, while the flour export nearly doubled. In fact, exports have been steadily running far ahead of the imports, and the excess during the last four months of 1891, complete figures not yet being obtainable, was between \$135,000,000 and \$150,000,000. In the face of these figures, many people wonder why more gold does not come to the United States.

But, one important thing not generally taken into consideration is the payment of interest and dividends on American properties owned in Europe, and a very large item it is, sufficient to offset a considerable proportion of the excess of our exports over imports. Of course no one can tell precisely how large the investments of European capital in this country are, but they are very great, having been heavily increased during the last five or six years. The English money will amount to more than that from all the remainder of Europe combined, though the Dutch have considerable sums here, particularly in railroads, while some supplies have been drawn from Germany and France.

Until the Baring failure European money was coming here in a plentiful stream. The English were buying great properties all over the country, and the English syndicate became a familiar thing. Notable among the purchasers were the Minneapolis flour mills and many large breweries. In numerous cases there was a large amount of talk that came to nothing, but the real purchasers were sufficient to draw heavily upon British capital. Though the buying ceased with the Baring failure, which caused a contraction all over the world, the sum left in this country is very large. It is calculated that the interest and dividend payments due from America to Europe will now amount to \$100,000,000 annually, and that is probably a moderate estimate.

But letting it stand at \$100,000,000, the sum paid or to be paid to Europe during the last six months would be \$50,000,000. Between \$35,000,000 and \$40,000,000 in gold have come back from Europe, making eighty-five or ninety million dollars which Europe has to put against our excess of exports over imports of about the same amount. Hence, by taking these things into consideration, the problem works itself out, and there is nothing strange about it at all.

No narrow nor hasty view of foreign investments here should be taken, simply because they draw some money back in the shape of interests and dividends. *The country wants every dollar of legitimate capital it can get. It benefits in two ways. It is the tool with which the country is developed, creating business and furnishing employment, and when the capital sent here pays the fair interest which it should it enables those who own it in Europe to buy more heavily of our own products, particularly the agricultural.*

That factor has not been considered in debate here, to say the least of it, but it is worthy of attention, and the resolutions I have had the honor to offer will draw the attention of the Committee on Finance to the actual situation.

Now, I will suppose that Mr. Watterson, of the Courier Journal, is right in saying that it takes \$100,000,000 a year to pay the interest on British or foreign capital invested in the United States. Some assert that \$300,000,000 is required annually to pay all the interest and dividends we send across the Atlantic.

I will suppose that that is a good thing. I do not really think it is, but I will suppose that it is. What does that represent? We know, although we can not exactly put our finger upon the fact that foreign capitalists own about two-thirds of the capital stock of the railroads of the United States. The dividends paid upon those go abroad. They own, I will say to the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], a very large amount of the capital in the protected manufactures of the United States, and in the mines they own enormous sums of capital.

It occurs to me that if we are accepting and adopting British policy as something that we can not get rid of, and that we are so feeble and unmanly that we can not escape from it at all; if

that is our poor, miserable situation, the misfortune is only doubled by the fact that we have to pay this gold interest of \$100,000,000 a year to be taken abroad by men who come here to speculate on our products. I do not think that it depends so much upon the fruitfulness of the country or the wisdom of this policy as it does upon the capital and credit it takes to accumulate. Great Britain did not make her tenth dollar out of her own soil and people, and yet she enjoys the power to control the markets of the world through the markets of London. She has acquired it from all the outside world by her superior credit.

It is not, after all, because she is smarter than the Yankee, but it is her name, her credit, the long standing of her houses brought down from sire to son that have given her what we call credit; the commercial supremacy of one man who has been a long time in successful business over another man who, indeed, may be a smarter man than he is but is just beginning. Great Britain has had this commercial supremacy, and she has had the command of enormous sums of money, much of which she borrows.

Great Britain has the power of concentrated capital and credit, every dollar of which she makes count, like gold, against India and all the rest of the world. She comes over here, and when she finds that the other markets are not quite valuable to her, she spends her money in railroads, and factories, and mines, and different institutions, and she realizes \$100,000,000 a year interest upon it that we have got to ship to her. How? It is said in gold. I say no; as to that \$100,000,000 we will segregate it from the rest of our responsibilities.

I do not consider it a debt to be paid in gold. There is no such obligation either express or implied, morally, or any other way. We have the right to pay that debt just like we pay one of our own people who happens to own a farm, or a sugar mill, or a wheel factory, or iron works, or something of that kind in the United States. That \$100,000,000 has to go in gold, and some Senators here are very desirous of maintaining that situation, so that the \$100,000,000 shall go every year in gold to these people abroad, because they are afraid to break it up. They have not the proper American snap and stamina in them, it seems to me; they have not sufficient confidence in this great country and this great people.

There is no reason either in the eyes of God or man why an American should be afraid to trust the powers of his land. In 1873, as I remarked in the beginning of this argument, when we had \$3,000,000,000 of public debt, to say nothing of private debts, and debts of cities and counties and States, when silver was at 3 per cent premium, it was demonetized and destroyed. That was drawn from the people as a factor with which they hoped to meet some portion of this enormous burden.

It was enough to have broken the spirit of any people on earth except these. But people who triumphed over embarrassments like these can be trusted to triumph over anybody or any country, supported as they are by the great resources of this imperial land of ours. So I have faith in them; I do not mistrust them.

Now, Mr. President, I will bring my remarks to a close, although I find a field before me that I could occupy with a great deal of pleasure to myself, to say the least of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator allow me to propound a question to him before he closes?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that the annual product of gold in our mines in the United States is about \$32,000,000 a year. If our annual production is of the value of \$32,000,000 in gold, and we send \$100,000,000 in gold every year to pay the British debt, how long would it take us to have the gold of the country exported; and then if we do not have any silver money where shall we have any money at all? That is the question I wanted to propound.

Mr. MORGAN. I think I can inform the Senator from the writings of an able paper upon that question. If the Senator from Mississippi will give attention to this paper I think he will find out more than I can tell him about it. I will read an extract from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal. After adding up the amount of gold and silver produced in the respective countries, this paper goes on to give the gold production and the silver production for 1890. It puts down the production of the United States in gold at \$32,845,000, and of silver at \$70,465,000. The whole production of the world in gold for the year 1890 was \$116,008,900, in silver \$166,677,233, of which the United States produced \$70,465,000; Australasia, \$12,968,080; Mexico, \$50,000,000, and so on, and India consumed \$50,000,000 in her mints. India has prospered recently until she takes \$50,000,000 of silver a year and converts it into coin. Then the paper says:

Now, if the Bland bill becomes a law, where is England to get her supply of cheap silver for the manufacture of Indian rupees, colonial florins, shillings, etc.? This is perhaps what is grieving the Tribune. Will she go to Latin America? From the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan, every nation except Brazil has either a double standard or a single silver standard.

Brazil produces less than one-half million ounces of silver per annum, and uses it in her small transactions, along with a copper currency. Will England go to Austria or Russia for a supply? Those nations maintain a silver standard of value, and the product of their mines is used in their own mints and factories. Will England seek for cheap silver bullion in her own Antipodean and Hyperborean and African colonies? All told, her colonies produce less than 12,000,000 ounces per annum, while the devotion of the colonial Englishman to the mother country is nowhere so pronounced as to induce him to dispose of an ounce of silver bullion for 80 cents when he can obtain \$1 for it elsewhere. England can get no relief from all the lands washed by the Indian Ocean. The silver which is sent to India and China remains there. It never returns. From time immemorial Asia has been the historic grave of the white metal, while England has been for generations the sepulcher of gold. According to the various reports of the Director of the Mint, the mines of the United States have produced—

This is the point, now, that the Senator wishes me to answer:

Since 1845 up to and including 1891 (the latter year being estimated) the enormous sum of \$1,886,498,300 in gold, and yet the stock of that metal in this country at the present time is reported to be about \$650,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. About one-third.

Mr. MORGAN. Not much more than a third.

Of this amount there is, according to the Tribune, about \$120,000,000 in the Treasury. Here is a direct loss of nearly one and a quarter billions of dollars in gold, most of which has left the country since the California mines were opened.

And of course our supply has increased during all that period.

The country has barely managed to retain one-third of the gold dug out of the ground by her own miners. The Tribune, which is no doubt honest in its devotion to the single gold standard theory, may be able, perhaps, to show the country how it can keep the gold that is dug from its own mines at home. It has not been necessary to send foreign silver here to take it away. Both metals seem to have disappeared almost as fast as they have been taken from the earth, and, what is more, Johnny Bull has taken the lion's share of both. For the previous six years, from 1885-'86 to 1890-'91, she had to import no less than \$235,354,961 in silver bullion for her India mints alone. What does the Tribune think of an international conference to consider the question of the United States keeping its gold as well as its silver at home?

Notwithstanding the tremendous production, overproduction we will call it of our mines here, we have not now much more than one-third of the product of our mines in our country. What has carried it abroad? It has been our indebtedness to other countries. Of course a large part of it has been for the war, but it continues to be the case that gold goes off and does not return. Silver goes to China and other places and it never comes back. We are wasting these metals all the time. Perhaps the position of the Senator from Ohio is a better one than that; I mean the hoarding of bullion in our own Treasury and the issue to our own people of coin certificates, the representative of the dollars found in the Treasury of the United States.

But with that money circulating, every dollar of coin certificate is as good as a dollar of gold, or a dollar of silver; and the whole power of the Government of the United States is brought to bear to maintain what the Senator says in the act of 1890 is necessary to be done, and he solemnly pledges shall be done to maintain the parity of the metals with each other. How much better is that than the locking up of one of the metals in the Treasury of the United States and having it unrepresented by anything in circulation, or deporting it to China to get rid of it, or striking it entirely out of the category of coin metals and making of it a mere commodity?

If we can enrich our country by the storage in our Treasury and the coinage of the gold and silver bullion that we can collect from our mines, I say we ought to do it, and let a representative of every dollar thus stored go into the community so as to become the active and efficient agent of each dollar in bullion and coin in the Treasury to work among the people in their daily occupations.

It is said that it would make a bank of the United States. What is it now? In that very act of 1890 we withdrew sixty-odd million dollars deposited by the banks of the United States in the Treasury to redeem their circulation, carried it into the general fund of the Treasury, ordered it to be covered there, and hereafter to be used as a fund to be accounted for by the Treasurer of the United States to the Government as a miscellaneous fund. Then we assumed the correlative duty of redeeming the national-bank notes. The Government of the United States is a bank of issue and redemption. It is not a bank of discount, but is a bank of issue and redemption, full and complete, and has been for years.

That condition of the United States Government towards the financial affairs of our country has been affirmed by every court in the United States, that has ever touched the question, as being entirely constitutional. Never has a court decided that the Government of the United States did not have a right to issue national-bank notes and to redeem them, or Treasury notes and redeem them, or greenbacks or silver certificates and redeem them, or gold certificates and redeem them, or any other certificates and redeem them.

It has been sixty years since a question of that kind was raised in the Congress of the United States, and the courts have uniformly given their support of the existing attitude of the United States Government towards finance and have affirmed, what no

man can deny, that the Government of the United States in operating upon its credit, for a basis of capital, instead of money actually lodged in the Treasury, has gone on to issue national-bank notes through the national-bank instrumentalities, silver and gold certificates and gold certificates. We have been issuing money all the time, and it is too late to talk about the United States Government not being a bank of issue and redemption.

Treating it as such, what do you want to have in the treasury of this bank? What can you have in its treasury better than gold and silver? You can not have anything better; and when the bank, instead of issuing, as it does now, national-bank notes upon the faith of the bonded indebtedness or Treasury notes without any other faith than the mere taxing power of the country, when the Government of the United States issues dollar for dollar upon a gold and silver basis of money actually lodged in the Treasury, will not that money be as good as gold and good as silver in the hands of every man who wants to use it in this world, and will he not prefer it to either coin?

I am sure that that will be the case. By this means the Constitution is left undisturbed, the money is perfectly secure, the people themselves are the owners of the money in the Treasury, carrying it in their pockets in the form of Treasury demands on which they can get the coin when they choose to take it. So I think that is a safe system.

In marching out of the dreadful morass of 1873 to the high ground that we are upon now we have made many and very valuable advances and improvements upon the former financial condition. The coin certificate is a great improvement upon anything that we have heretofore had, because it is redeemable alike in gold and silver, and it is a pledge of the law power of the Government of the United States, including its taxing power, that the Government will always be ready to redeem. The Government retains the option of redeeming in gold and silver, and why? To prevent fraud, to prevent corners, to prevent combines.

But the Government will always do what any sensible debtor will do, pay the creditor in the money he wants. He could not demand any money from the Government of the United States honestly that he would not get. If he says, "I want gold" he would get gold; if he wants silver he would get silver; until he should undertake to make a corner, which I think would be a matter of physical and moral impossibility. Then he would fail to get the money he wants and he would get the other sort of money. That much of a check is necessary; it is proper; it is right. That feature is a proper protection by the Government which I admire.

Now, I would improve it in one respect. First of all I would require the coinage of every dollar that is in the Treasury. I would put it into actual coin so as to show that the people of the United States have the recognition of Congress for the coinage of every dollar. And when a man comes with his silver and gold bullion for the purpose of having it coined he should have it done upon the terms of the act of 1837; he should have the option to coin it and take coin certificates for it, or at his option have it coined and carried out and put into circulation. He will be certain to put it into coin certificates unless he wants to ship it abroad, and he would not have it coined if he wanted to ship it abroad.

So the result will be that there will be free coinage of gold and free coinage of silver, and there will be a free withdrawal upon coin certificates of gold and silver from the Treasury of the United States. Whenever it is found that the supreme and concentrated power of gold in this country is being handled in such a way as to depress the price of the crops the people will have their resort to the other and equal money, and they will take it and scatter it abroad through their operations of every description, and these men will see at once that they have a rival in the field that is as strong and as great and as rich and as true as they are. Then the concentrated power of a single metal in the hands of a few persons will be obviated by the power being dispersed and disseminated among the great body of the people at large.

So I would let the act of 1890 stand. I would make it compulsory on the Secretary of the Treasury to coin that money. In addition to that, I would give all the free-coin rights to bullion-holders that were given by the act of 1837. I would work the two propositions in concert, and the Government and people could express themselves in all their acts and all their conduct in favor of maintaining the parity between the two metals.

Through this coin certificate the parity is maintained, for the coin certificate represents equally a gold dollar and a silver dollar, and when that is the case, when the gold dollar and the silver dollar owe their peculiar power as money to the law of the land and not to mere commercial value or advantage in this country or in that or the other, then we have accomplished the full duty of the Constitution, and the representative of this gold and silver dollar will go out to the land as being itself equal to

gold and silver, and the whole difficulty will disappear, and there will be no more quarreling between the friends of silver and the friends of gold.

In the midst of our distresses, toilsome, rugged, heartbreaking as they have often been, disappointing to me at least as they have so frequently been, I congratulate myself that we have gone from point to point on higher ground than we occupied before, and that we are about to get an American system here which, if we have the faith to adhere to it and the manhood to use it, will make New York the clearing house of the commerce of the world, and it will be done in a very short time.

Incalculable power must come from the use of the progressive contribution of \$100,000,000 of precious metals a year from our own mints, one-third gold. Suppose in the recent affair between Chile and the United States, or Great Britain and the United States, it had become the necessity of this people to defend their honor that they should have put themselves in a state of war. My mind and yours ran over these fields of inquiry, and one of the great questions we had to ask ourselves was, "Where are we going to get the money to do this with?" In one instance we would have been involved with a country from which we have drawn much of our money supplies heretofore. That might have been a most serious problem.

But if we had a thousand million dollars of gold and silver in our Treasury, even if it was bullion, and our people had a thousand million dollars of those certificates in their possession, every one as good as gold, every one as good as silver, and every one a legal tender, we would consider ourselves as being fortified by an enormous power here—the money-making power. Suppose you wanted to run the issue of coin certificates to \$2,000,000,000 by the use of 2 for 1, we would still be inside of the 3-to-1 limit of the banker. Suppose you wanted to do that, what is to prevent it? A thousand millions of money would sustain 100,000 men, perhaps, during the whole length of the war we might have to fight with such a country.

Provisions are here in abundance. You would exchange your coin certificates with your people for them. Your munitions of war are here in abundance. Your soldiers are certainly here in every abundance. You would pay them, feed them, clothe them, take care of them in sickness and health, you would transport them across vast distances, and do everything that may belong to an army in active exercise, thoroughly mobilized.

Every expense would be met by the people of the United States from their own Government with what they treat as being as good as gold and as good as silver, because no man can ever present a coin certificate at any time that it will not be redeemed in one of these coins. The redemption is an absolute certainty with 2 for 1. It is equally absolute with 3 for 1. If we wanted to stretch the subject up to \$3,000,000,000 upon a gold and silver basis of \$1,000,000,000, we could compass it without difficulty.

How independent and strong and powerful we should be among the nations of this earth if our people had what they should have, absolute faith in the power of the Government of the United States to exchange into coin all the coin certificates that they might be able to bring against the Treasury at any moment, and in consequence of that great faith of the people, and the power of the Government, and the wisdom and helpfulness of our policy we should be able to conduct a great war with the greatest power in the world without borrowing a dollar to carry it on.

What would we think of our power under circumstances like that? If we would have such power as that under military exigencies what must be our power when we should apply it under similar conditions and like circumstances to the control of the commerce of this world? New York, I say again, would become the clearing house of the commerce of the earth.

If this Senate and this Congress could for one moment forget Mr. Cleveland, and Mr. HILL, and Mr. CARLISLE, and Mr. Harrison, and Mr. CULLOM, and my friend from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and other great and good men who are aspiring to the Presidency of the United States, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] if he had not discarded all claim to the Presidency by his voluntary act, I understand, and the honorable Senator on my left [Mr. PALMER] whose modesty prevented me from alluding to him—if we could for one moment forget our justifiable, reasonable, friendly aspirations and hopes in favor of our pets and favorites to a great political office and come together and lock our hands on this question and say that we will do for this country all that the possibilities of its resources and a devoted love of its institutions and its peoples will admit, we would have no more trouble about the silver question.

We are very nearly out of the woods now, and if you will add the free coinage of silver on terms equal with gold, and will cause the Treasury of the United States to coin the silver that is there on the same terms that it does gold, I believe that we should soon master every difficulty in our way. Then the hon-

orable Senator from Ohio would have the right to rejoice and, contrary to his will, he would be led up into such high positions that he would be able at last to bless the country when he did not expect to do it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I do not intend to engage in this discussion, but still I wish to ascertain the sense of the Senate. If we are to have a general silver debate now to the displacement of other business I should like to have that point tested; and in order to settle it definitely, without engaging in the debate at all, I will move to lay the pending resolution on the table.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. We have the unanimous consent of the Senate that the next two days shall be given to the Calendar.

Mr. TELLER. To-day and to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. Yes, to-day and to-morrow. I understand that the Senate, in accordance with its usual courtesy, permitted the Senator from Alabama to conclude his speech, which was not concluded at 2 o'clock; but that agreement, I insist, is binding upon every member of the Senate, unless it is rescinded by unanimous consent.

Mr. SHERMAN. My motion to lay the resolutions on the table is pending, and I make it for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator to withdraw it for a moment. He can hardly take advantage of us in that way, I think.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not take advantage, after three hours of debate, when I do not propose to reply.

Mr. ALLISON. Are the resolutions before the Senate at this time, I desire to ask the Chair?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that the resolutions passed from the consideration of the Senate at 2 o'clock except for the courtesy of permitting the Senator from Alabama to conclude his remarks, which was allowed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], who has charge of an appropriation bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the resolutions are already disposed of in that way, then I have no objection. All I desire is that before we engage in this debate a majority of the Senate, not by a courtesy granted to one member, but by a vote, shall proceed to the consideration of the silver question, and then I shall be prepared to discuss it. But it seems to me it is very unfair to take it up in detachments in this way. However, I will ask for the ruling of the Chair as to whether the resolutions are pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution, after one day's consideration, would, in the opinion of the Chair, go to the Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN. If that is the case, the resolutions can only be taken up by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. My colleague [Mr. WOLCOTT] gave notice to-day that on Wednesday, after the morning business, he would address the Senate on this subject. I ask that he have the usual courtesy of the Senate, and that the resolutions may lie upon the table until that time, so that he may address the Senate then.

Mr. PADDOCK. They are on the Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN. They are on the Calendar, and when a majority of the Senate is prepared to discuss the silver question the Senate can take them up.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] will allow me to make a suggestion, I do not think it matters whether the resolutions lie on the table or go to the Calendar. Whenever any Senator has heretofore asked that at a particular hour of a day a bill on the Calendar or a resolution on the table may be taken up for consideration in order that he may submit remarks upon it, I do not know of a single instance in the past where it has not been conceded; and I do not think there will be one in the future where it will not be.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. HARRIS. As a matter of courtesy. It does not matter practically whether the resolutions go to the table or go to the Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. It is a very simple proposition. If the resolutions go to the Calendar, and I understand they have gone there, it will be the simplest thing in the world for any Senator to introduce a series of resolutions on the same subject and speak on them. So I do not see what would be gained by requiring a vote to take up the resolutions.

Mr. HARRIS. They can be called up on any hour of any day for the purpose of submitting remarks.

Mr. BUTLER. A Senator could introduce a resolution to-morrow morning and speak to it, and so the same thing could be done on every morning during the session.

Mr. TELLER. I do not care how the object is attained. I understand, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] does, that it is a courtesy which has never been denied in this body to a Senator who has given notice that he proposes to make some remarks at a particular time. So I presume that on Wednesday when my colleague is ready, and when the time arrives which he has mentioned, he will be allowed to proceed.

The Senator from Ohio, flushed perhaps with the victory apparently in the other House against silver, seems to think he can down the debate in this body on the subject. I want to say to the Senator that we spent some time during the last session to prevent him and others who thought with him from securing a rule that would cut off debate in this body, and the Senator might as well meet the question now as at any time; that this question will be debated, and if not upon this upon some other resolution.

Mr. STEWART. Or on some bill.

Mr. TELLER. Or upon some bill; and we shall take just as much time as we want; and we shall neither be frightened nor driven, unless the Senate can be driven into adopting a *clôture* rule, which I do not think it can do now any more than it could in the last Congress.

Mr. President, there is not any question that has come before the American people since the war in which the American people are more interested than in this question, and their representatives on this floor intend to be heard. They do not intend to sit here and allow the great metropolitan journals of this country to traduce and slander them, and call them brigands, repudiators of the public debt, and the friends of dishonest money. They propose to come here and challenge the committee of which the honorable Senator is a member and everybody who thinks with them to enter this debate.

Mr. President, we have been debating this question for fifteen years. We have never retired from the debate with any shamefacedness on our part, and we do not believe we shall do it now. We feel competent to debate this question here in the presence of the whole American people and the world, and that is what we mean to do.

All Europe to-day is disturbed over this financial question. There is more interest in the question whether silver shall be money to-day in Europe than in any other single question. It is a question of vital interest to the world. It is a question of the greatest importance to the American people; and the American Senate cannot spend its time better than in discussing this question.

I give notice now that under the rules of the Senate we are able to be heard and that we will be heard in despite of the honorable Senator from Ohio, who appears to be so anxious to stifle debate.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I deny in the most emphatic terms that I have endeavored to stifle debate. There is no ground for such an assertion. There is not an iota of ground upon which such an assertion can be made. I never objected in my life, and I have been here longer than any of you, to any Senator speaking at any time when he chose upon any subject; and every man here knows it.

The honorable Senator from Alabama, who has indulged in a long speech to-day, much of which I listened to with pleasure, has had an opportunity. But the Senate of the United States is a unit. It is a body with power. It ought to be able to determine what are the proper ordinary proceedings of the body. It ought to be able to determine when it will discuss silver, when it will discuss gold, when it will discuss Indian affairs; and unless we had some order in our proceedings there would be "confusion worse confounded."

Sir, I am willing to discuss and I never shrank from debate on the silver question or the gold question or the currency question. I have not been willing at all times to talk at all hours and reply to every gentleman who might choose to make a speech; but whenever the Senate undertakes to engage in this debate I will take my share of it, and I will take my responsibility for it.

To the speech of the Senator from Alabama I had a strong inclination to reply. In the first place, he commenced his speech with a long tirade against the act of July 14, 1890. He arraigned it. He said that the Secretary of the Treasury ought not to have the power that is plainly and distinctly conferred upon him by that act, not to issue silver coin except as needed to redeem the Treasury notes as issued.

Why should silver be coined prior to this necessity? It is worth more as bullion to-day than as coin. If it were coined a cent and a half would be spent on every silver dollar, and then it would be piled up in bags to be kept in custody, in such a shape that it might be handled and stolen, while if it is left in the form of bullion it can not be carried away by thieves or in any other way, and it is more cheaply and easily stored as bullion. Therefore it was that the law of 1884 provided that it should not be coined

except as needed. The mints of the United States could scarcely coin four and a half million pieces every month.

It would require the whole capacity of the mints to do it, and therefore the bullion is not coined. If any of these Treasury notes or any kind of notes are presented to the Government for payment with a demand for specie, we have two or three hundred million dollars, I do not know how much, in the Treasury ready to pay out for that purpose for any of the notes that are presented.

There is another thing. The Senator closed his remarks with exactly the opposite position; he extolled the law of July 14, 1890, and very properly extolled it, because it may be made with proper amendments and limitations and arrangements the fulcrum upon which rests the whole financial system of the country. The whole currency of the country is now on a most sound and stable basis. There is no bank in the world and there never was a bank in the world so strong as the Treasury of the United States is this day to redeem every obligation that is outstanding.

As for the greenbacks, the United States notes, we have \$100,000,000 in gold set aside for their redemption, and that is a better reserve than can be found in the Bank of England this day in proportion to its liabilities. It is enough for the payment of the Treasury notes, and there is a dollar's worth in gold behind it. The wise men of New York often overlook that in their comments. They assume that the old law of 1878 is still in existence, where a Treasury note may be issued for 371 grains of silver, worth now about 68 or 69 cents on the dollar.

Instead of that, every one of these Treasury notes is based upon enough silver to be equal to gold at the time it was purchased, and taking the average for a period of years equal to gold at all times. So the Government of the United States has behind its issues not only the \$100,000,000 of gold set apart, but dollar for dollar in gold for every note that is issued. What could be stronger and what could be better?

But there lies behind that act one fundamental principle that ought never to be departed from, and that is that all our money should be of equal purchasing power in the markets of the world, not only in this country, but in all the countries of the world. We declared in that law, and that is the life and soul of it, without which we never would have touched it, that these two metals should be maintained at a parity with each other.

How could they be maintained at a parity but at the gold standard, if you please, if the gold standard for the time being was the highest, or the silver standard if silver should rise again, as it has in past times, above par in gold? We declared that we would maintain them at par with each other, and we can do it easily because we have at least dollar for dollar in silver behind the Treasury note, and the silver is now worth about 69 cents on the dollar. How can we maintain the dollar in metal which is only worth 69 cents equal to \$1 the metal of which in gold is worth \$1? It is in the nature only of fiat money.

We have behind it as security dollar for dollar in gold. The money intrinsically is worth only 69 cents, and the difference between that is represented by so much silver in the Treasury, so that every dollar is represented by gold.

I say, therefore, that the principle of the double standard ought to be adopted and maintained by the Government of the United States, as it can be maintained under the act of 1890, and there is no doubt about the ability of the Government of the United States to maintain the parity of these two metals.

But, on the other hand, a proposition is made, which is now beginning to be debated for the first time in this country, and that is the free coinage of silver. Formerly, it is true, the free coinage of silver meant the equality of silver and gold, and never from the time Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson agreed together upon the ratio between silver and gold up to 1873 did that vary more than 3 or 4 per cent, and whenever it varied even but 1 per cent, the cheaper metal filled the channels of circulation and the dearer metal was excluded. Now, when the value of the two metals is separated by nearly one-third, or from sixty-nine to one hundred, we maintain the parity in the same way that every bank maintains its parity. We have behind every one of these dollar notes a dollar's worth of silver or gold at the then market price of its purchase.

Mr. TELLER. What is its market price now?

Mr. SHERMAN. It has now gone down, and what can prevent it from going down? Nothing can prevent it from going down. It has been going down for four centuries. When America was discovered 8 ounces of silver were equal to 1 of gold. Now, it requires 23 to be equal to 1 of gold. Shall we take the cheaper metal, adopting the methods of the ancient nations, China and Japan, or shall we take the dearer metal, that which is the measure of value in all European countries now and which is getting to be more and more the settled standard of all values,

of all metals, of all property, and of all productions? That is the question.

Now, it is proposed to substitute a dollar by the free coinage of silver in the place of the dollar we have now. That is practically to take off 31 per cent from every pension which has been granted by the Government of the United States. For a time it will take off 31 per cent from the labor of every citizen and artisan of this country who depends upon his daily wages for his daily bread. It will take 31 per cent off from the debtor from a debt that has been contracted in gold or upon the basis of the value of gold. It is that which the people of the United States are to understand when we are asked to pay \$1 for what now we can buy for 69 cents. Every instinct of the purchaser is against it, and every man who has anything to sell, or who produces anything, or has his labor to live upon, or who has capital invested—every one of them will see in that proposition a dangerous proposition.

Senators must perceive that the question now presented to us is very different from the one presented in the past. I am entirely willing to discuss this question, I like to see it discussed, and I want to see it discussed, but let it be in an orderly manner, when mind can meet mind, when reason can be brought against reason, when facts and experience may be tested by an honest debate, not by a desultory debate scattered along all through the ordinary course of our business.

Mr. MORGAN. Can not that be done now, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. SHERMAN. If it could be done now it would be all right.

Mr. STEWART. We propose to do it now.

Mr. SHERMAN. The question is, we have something else to do besides this, having appropriation bills and various other objects, whether we should lay them aside now and take up this question. That is one thing. It is for the Senate to decide. I do not care which is done. I am ready to meet any of these questions at any time, but my idea is that the ordinary course of proceeding would require us to fix a day when this question shall come up and be discussed, so that all the Senators who are deeply interested in the subject may be here and hear the debate, and the sparks of one mind lighting that of another may be cast upon this subject, and we may have the benefit of it in discussion.

That is all I care for. I do not run away from it. I never ran away from any question or opinions that I have formed or expressed. I may have been often wrong, as I know I have been wrong, as we are all human; but I believe, after all, that the law of 1890, though misconceived by the goldites, as they are called, and by the silver men, as they are called, may be made the basis of a firm financial system, which will give us money equal in purchasing power not only in every part of the United States but in every part of the habitable globe.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I can not allow the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to pass without observing that it is not the silver men who are depreciating the money in the hands of the pensioner, but it is the gold contractionists. We have now \$500,000,000 silver coin or certificates representing that coin, which the people are compelled to take. By the operation of the gold contractionists it has been depreciated, and it is being depreciated daily in their hands. The bullion in the silver dollar you compel them to take now contains only about 67 or 68 per cent in gold, and you propose to reduce it further by dishonoring it and robbing and repudiating those who hold the silver coin.

The Secretary of the Treasury proposed a scheme, which appears to have been indorsed by the President, to reduce the price of silver very much, and it has had its effect. Such a proposition as this under that law ought not to go unrebutted. The Secretary said in his speech on November 17, 1891, at Delmonico's, the place where our Secretaries get their information and their inspiration and take their orders, that—

The resumption act confers authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to any extent he may feel called upon to do to increase or to maintain the gold reserve. The act of July 14, 1890, commands him to preserve the parity between gold and silver. It has always been the custom of this country to pay its obligations in gold. [Applause.] Therefore should there be any trouble about this and the present hundred millions of gold, or reserve fund we call it, being intrenched upon, it was in his power under the law to issue bonds for gold, paying 5 per cent, and replace or increase the reserve fund.

Now, what is the result of placing that construction upon it? It is to say that silver is not money; it is to degrade silver, and every time you do that you depreciate its value. It was in violation of the pledges of the party. Every party when it has been out of power heretofore has been in favor of silver as the money of the Constitution. The Democratic party so declared in 1880 and 1884. When it got in power it was silent. The Republican party was out of power in 1888, and it declared that it was in favor of using both gold and silver as money, and con-

denned the action of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

Now comes the Secretary of the Treasury, and notwithstanding the commands of the law of 1890, he says that he will sell bonds, buy gold—not use silver, but buy gold; silver is not honest money, as it was declared to be by the Republican party when it was out of power and by the Democratic party when it was out of power—but he follows the example of his predecessors when he says he will buy gold to redeem Treasury notes which by the act of 1890 are redeemable in silver coin.

I undertake to say that there is no authority whatever in the resumption act or any other act to buy gold for this purpose. On the contrary in the act of 1890 it is expressly provided that the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin sufficient silver to provide for the redemption of these notes. When he would not do it and when he would not use the silver for that purpose, would not treat it as money, he struck a fatal blow at silver. What right had he to sell bonds to buy gold to redeem Treasury notes, when those Treasury notes were to be redeemed according to the act itself in silver or gold at the option of the Government?

We are following what example? Many of the commercial nations of the world have repudiated silver coin by law. It is not a legal tender in England for large amounts. France makes it a legal tender equally with gold, and the administration of France obeys the law. The French Government, in pursuance of law, keeps their reserve of gold and silver about equal—about two hundred and sixty or two hundred and seventy millions of each, and they pay out in liquidation of public obligations, gold or silver, whichever may be most beneficial to the Government. Here in the United States we have a law that makes every debt of the Government payable in either gold or silver; and in violation of that law and to the great detriment of the public, every Secretary of the Treasury for the last twenty years has paid in gold and refused to pay in silver, thus dishonoring and degrading silver.

Other countries, I say, have repudiated silver by law. We have maintained silver by law, making it a legal tender equally with gold; but the Administration of the Government has repudiated it contrary to law. I say that it has been the plain duty, under the law, of every Secretary of the Treasury for the last twenty years to pay in the cheapest money; to do the best he could for the Government; to do as they do in France. Why, although France did under pressure stop coinage, she did not do it until we had done it. Although she stopped coinage, she did not dishonor the money she had.

Just look at the history of the transaction so far as the United States is concerned. The national debt originally was payable in lawful money. Greenbacks were lawful money, but the interest was payable in coin.

In 1869 an act was passed declaring that the public debt was payable in coin of gold or silver. In 1870, when the debt was refunded, it was provided that it should be redeemable in coin of the then standard value, which consisted of gold and silver of the present ratio, and that is printed upon the back of every bond.

Before the passage of the Bland act the same gold cry was heard. It was claimed even that our debts were payable in gold alone. One of the greatest debates ever had in the two Halls of Congress then occurred, and after full discussion, by nearly a two-thirds majority it was resolved that every obligation of the Government was payable in silver equally with gold. But that did not affect the Secretaries of the Treasury. They continued to pay gold and refused to pay silver.

Thus they have dishonored the money of the country. Silver has been continued legal-tender of money by Congress on account of the imperious demands of the people. But the Administration refused to use it. It has been dishonored, and it is dishonorable for any public officer to discriminate between gold and silver in the payment of the public debt, dishonorable, I say, but that is a practice which I have condemned and do now condemn.

What is to be the condition of the country? See where we are drifting. Does anybody understand what is taking place? Since silver was demonetized there has been no material increase of gold coin of the world, and by law the people of the United States, of Germany, of Egypt, and of Italy have been compelled to buy gold to pay obligations contracted to be paid in silver or in paper.

This has made an enormous demand for gold. I was counting up the other night, and I ascertained that by the legislation demonetizing silver about \$1,000,000,000 of gold has been bought and is now held in reserve, besides the current purchases to pay obligations contracted to be paid in either gold or silver, which amount to thousands of millions of dollars. In accomplishing this, in buying this gold, the products of the country have been sold at an enormous discount.

The gold kings say further that they will compel poor Austria

to sell her silver and buy gold. If she buys the amount which they demand and holds it in reserve she will take over 4 per cent of all the gold in the world. What will become of the people of Austria? They must sell their products at a reduced price; they must reduce wages; they must pay more for gold than we will. They come in competition with us. We will not let them have it unless they pay more for it than we can, and that will bring up the price of gold and force down the price of all commodities.

Not only this, but the edict has gone forth from the great money center in London that all contracts in America where English money is used or where bankers having any interest in English affairs lend, that they shall make contracts that shall require payment in gold.

What does all this scrambling for gold mean? There is only about \$3,700,000,000 of gold in all the world. What does this mean? It means that the price of gold shall go up and the price of property shall go down. What does it mean when the Secretary of the Treasury says that he will go into the market and sell bonds and buy gold to pay the obligations which are specifically declared to be payable in silver, and he is required by law to coin silver for that purpose?

This will help the gold rings to put up gold. They have already put gold up to 50, yes, nearly 100 per cent. They have placed it out of the reach of the people and hold it there. It is a close corporation. They have their hands upon the throats of the people of the civilized world, and they arrogantly tell us that they will make everybody buy gold. They claim the power, and I think perhaps they have it, to nominate the Presidential candidates of both the great political parties and to select men, who will refuse to obey the law, who will refuse to use silver equally with gold as the coin of the country, who will discriminate against it, who will buy gold and put gold out of the reach of the people. They say they will do that, and they ask us what we are going to do about it.

May be it has come to that and that the Democratic party and Republican party are both merged in this great gold trust, and that there is no hope for the people, no hope of relief for them, while the two parties reign. It looks so. If we can not get a Secretary of the Treasury from either party who will do as they do in France, pay in that money which is most convenient for the Government, and make no distinction between gold and silver, if we can not get such an administration from either party, the process may go on.

Population is increasing and business ought to increase, but it can not expand with a shrinking gold basis. They even tell us that Great Britain is about to make India sell her 900,000,000 of silver and buy gold, which will take over 25 per cent of all the gold in the world. They tell us boldly that they will break down the system of France and make France a gold purchaser. She has 650,000,000 of silver. France is strong. If France would enter into this scheme to buy gold to take the place of her silver, what would be the price of gold?

Never in the history of this world was there such an extent of credit based upon metallic money. Eighteen years ago we had nearly or quite twice as much metallic money as we have to-day, which was the money of the people. In the language of the royal commission of England, it was one money; the gold and silver of the world was one money, and answered all the purposes of reserves, and upon it rested the credit and business of the whole world. To-day, according to the gold men and according to their practices, there is but one money, and that is gold.

Issuing silver certificates to be redeemed in gold is not enlarging the basis of circulation. Silver under such circumstances is merely credit money, depending for its value upon the promise to redeem in gold. The day of reckoning is bound to come. The extension of credit on the gold basis is far beyond the danger line, and it is still expanding. The people are struggling against the chains which the gold men have forged; they are struggling while the price of their wheat, their cotton, and all their farm products goes down. Because we accidentally had a good crop this year and there was a famine in Europe making a demand for food, the gold men pretended that that was the result of their policy, and not the act of Providence. Because imported commodities went down they said legislation had effected it, when the fact was that the people of Europe were compelled to sell their commodities for what they could get to buy bread.

After the failure of the Barings word went forth through all Europe that the reserves must be increased and credits curtailed or there would be universal bankruptcy. Mr. Goschen made that statement in a speech about a month or so after the failure of the Barings. It will be remembered when that failure took place that the Bank of England was forced to borrow \$15,000,000 from the Bank of France to tide over and prevent a crisis. What did they do? They bought from us gold and sold their securities at whatever sacrifice. Over \$75,000,000 of our

gold was exported. The gold advocates said it would be sent back, but it was not. It was retained for the reserve to sustain the financial institutions of Europe. When the time came and the people were compelled to buy bread they sold their commodities from 25 to 30 per cent discount for that purpose. Wheat for a time sold at a more reasonable price.

But how was it with your cotton? How with your wool? They could not eat cotton and wool, and did not buy them, but let the price go down. The Textile Fabric Association in England showed in their meetings last fall that it was impossible for them to buy the raw material. Their customers were too poor, money was too scarce. Their trade was cut off, and there was no relief for them without more money. They had to eat and they had to sell their manufactures at any sacrifice to get something to eat. Cotton went down, and it is going down. The customers of the manufacturers have fallen off. The people can not get money; they must buy food. They can not buy clothing. That is the situation, and cotton has gone down, and it must continue to go down.

This Textile Fabric Association, which comprises more than half of the manufacturers in England, discussed this question with great intelligence, and they petitioned Parliament for relief. They asked for the free coinage of silver so that there would be more money with which they could buy raw material, and more money among the people so that they could have a market for their commodities. Parliament is too near London as Washington is too near New York. There are listed on the stock exchange of London largely American securities. Fourteen thousand millions of stocks of all countries, and the current of interest flowing in from all the world. Mr. Watterson says that \$100,000,000 goes from this country each year, which means 5 per cent on \$2,000,000,000.

They want dear money. They have branches of their houses in New York. The great bankers in New York are but investors and collectors on foreign account. They use every effort to degrade silver and disgrace the advocates of the people. They do everything they can to disparage them; they tell the people that there is an endeavor to swindle the country by a 70-cent dollar. We do not want any 70-cent dollar. We want the dollar of the Constitution. We want the dollar that is worth 100 cents and no other, and we know very well that silver if coined at the Mint would be such a dollar. The mint price is the market price. The Mint price of silver will always be the market price. No man will sell silver for less money than he can get at the Mint.

It is idle to talk about maintaining the parity of these two metals when we use one as money and the other as a commodity. They make all the world buy gold to pay debts, but they will allow no debt to be paid in silver. That is what put silver down and gold up. If this had been done to gold, it would have gone down more than silver. If the commercial nations had so discriminated against gold, no gold would have been used in the world as money because it is not generally used—not 250,000,000 people pretend to use gold and 1,200,000,000 people use silver. With all this adverse legislation, with all this combination of power, with all this adverse action of the Treasury Department of the United States, silver is not yet destroyed, because it is the money of the people, and all have it more or less. It is a better measure of value than gold, as was clearly shown in the discussion from 1853 to 1870 by the advocates of the single silver standard.

There have been only three or four great gold discoveries since history began. But for silver there would have been no civilization. It was pointed out that in California and Australia the coming of gold had a disturbing influence; the men who desire to change contracts, enhance their own property, and depreciate the property of others, combined to demonetize silver, and they have succeeded. Now, they tell us about the market price. What market price could their silver or gold have if you take away the money demand, which is ninety-nine one-hundredths, I think, or very nearly the entire demand?

The money demand fixes it. Take that away, and it sinks down like copper. Either gold or silver must do the same. It is the money demand that makes gold so dear. The corner on gold has forced the people of this country, of Germany, of England, and of poor Egypt, who had to buy \$100,000,000 of gold, and Italy, starving Italy, has to buy it. See the condition of those people. In those poor old countries they are buying gold and selling commodities for a mere bagatelle to get it, and so it is coming in this country if you continue the policy to compel our farmers to sell their commodities to buy gold. If you continue that process you will destroy them. Their mortgages and their obligations have not been lessened; they have been doubled by the necessity of buying gold, and by the prohibition fixed in your laws against the use of silver.

You have excluded silver from your mints, though you have coined some of it. The Secretary of the Treasury tells us that what you have coined is not good enough to pay our obligations. It is not good enough to pay a bondholder, who bought his bond for 50 cents on the dollar and who has been paid three or four times the principal by interest in gold, and the purchasing power of his bond is now five or six times the original cost. He must have his pound of flesh, and you are going to sell bonds, increase the obligation, and make it necessary to buy more gold to pay interest. We double up by geometrical ratio the obligations of the people by legislation.

Senators say this question shall not be discussed, that it is not important. It will be discussed and the people will be informed who are their oppressors; they shall know who puts down the price of farm products. They shall be informed on this subject. I shall do what I can to inform them, and there are others here who are ready to do likewise. When this discussion comes up they will take a part in it. But whenever it is claimed that you are going to keep this country on a gold basis, that you will not pay out silver according to law, I must enter my protest on the spot.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss this question. It is, of course, one of great importance and great moment, and at some time, if the debate goes on, I shall probably have some observations to submit; but in the mean time I should like to say to the Senate and to Senators that there are now two important appropriation bills pending in the Senate, and I think we ought to so adjust and arrange our business as to dispose of them in order that they may go back to the other House and receive consideration there in respect to amendments which are likely to be placed upon them. I had hoped that the Indian appropriation bill would be disposed of to-day, but these interludes have prevented its consideration to-day. The Senator from Massachusetts having it in charge would hardly care to move its consideration at this hour.

I desire to express the hope that to-morrow morning the Senator will move, and I understand that to be his purpose, to take up the Indian bill immediately after the routine morning business. I desire to give notice that as soon as that is disposed of I shall ask the Senate to consider the District appropriation bill. I think we can fairly ask that of the Senate, inasmuch as by unanimous consent two days are to be devoted to the Calendar as soon as these two appropriation bills are out of the way. I shall hope that nothing will interfere with their consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. I rise for the purpose of appealing to the Senator from Iowa to change the notice that he gave a moment since, so as to let the Indian appropriation bill be disposed of, of course to the exclusion of all other business; but let us go to the Calendar for the two days assigned for that purpose, and then take up the District appropriation bill. We can dispose of that certainly this week, and I think it very important for many reasons that we should devote some time to the Calendar, which we have greatly neglected for the last two weeks.

Mr. ALLISON. Well, Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Tennessee. I think it will make very little difference to the Calendar whether the matters there are postponed for a few days or not. I hope the Senator will consent, and I will later on give some reasons to him why I desire to have the District bill disposed of.

Mr. HARRIS. I quite concede the right of way of the appropriation bills and shall not contest it in any form.

Mr. DAWES. I do not know by what rule the floor is assigned. I only know that while the courtesy of the Senate required me to give way for the speech of the Senator from Alabama to-day, it did not require me to go any further. I sought diligently for the floor, as I supposed it was understood I was entitled to it immediately upon the conclusion of his speech.

I have sought diligently the floor from that time to this. It has been awarded to half a dozen Senators while I have been on the floor seeking to bring up the appropriation bill, which, according to the rules of the Senate, has precedence. I do not feel, therefore, that I have been at all negligent in the matter of pressing that bill. I got discouraged in my effort to obtain the floor and have given it up for to-day. If I shall be able to get the floor to-morrow, about which I have some doubt, I shall move to proceed to the consideration of that bill immediately upon the conclusion of the morning business.

#### COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. McPHERSON a director, on the part of the Senate, during the Fifty-second Congress, of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 5, 1892, at 12 o'clock m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 4, 1892.*

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Medical Director John Mills Browne, to be Surgeon-General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, with the relative rank of commodore, from the 3d of April, 1892.

Commodore James A. Greer, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 3d of April, 1892, vice Rear-Admiral L. A. Kimberly, retired.

Capt. Henry Erben, to be a commodore in the Navy, from the 3d of April, 1892, vice Commodore J. A. Greer, promoted.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

###### *Infantry arm.*

Capt. Thomas E. Rose, Sixteenth Infantry, to be major, April 2, 1892, vice Sanderson, Eighteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. William C. McFarland, Sixteenth Infantry, to be captain, April 2, 1892, vice Rose, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George S. Cartwright, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, April 2, 1892, vice McFarland, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1892.*

##### UTAH PROBATE JUDGES.

Edward B. Kirk, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Boxelder, in the Territory of Utah.

George W. Barch, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Salt Lake, in the Territory of Utah.

##### PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Second Lieut. John A. Lejeune, United States Marine Corps, to be a first lieutenant.

##### MARSHALS.

Philemon B. Hunt, of Texas, to be marshal of the United States for the northern district of Texas.

Alexander P. Colesberry, of Pennsylvania, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

##### POSTMASTERS.

Lewis B. Jewell, to be postmaster at Ovid, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

Charles T. Andrews, to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

Emerson A. Hough, to be postmaster at Collinsville, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Jonas H. Geary, to be postmaster at Catawissa, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania.

Andrew K. Black, to be postmaster at Harrisburg, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania.

Pembroke Pierce, to be postmaster at Homer, in the county of Cortland and State of New York.

Bolivar J. Pridgen, to be postmaster at Eagle Pass, in the county of Maverick and State of Texas.

David L. Williams, to be postmaster at McDonald, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania.

John C. McKean, to be postmaster at Charleroi, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania.

Edward A. Goddard, to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

Nathan F. Roberts, to be postmaster at Dexter, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

George C. Higbee, to be postmaster at Beaver Dam, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin.

Abner F. Holt, to be postmaster at Valdosta, in the county of Lowndes and State of Georgia.

Madison J. Benson, to be postmaster at Excelsior Springs, in the county of Clay and State of Missouri.

William P. Skinner, to be postmaster at Cedar Springs, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

Asa S. Hardman, to be postmaster at Leesburg, in the county of Lake and State of Florida.

Charles P. Washburn, to be postmaster at Delphos, in the county of Van Wert and State of Ohio.

George Russell, to be postmaster at Napoleon, in the county of Henry and State of Ohio.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 4, 1892.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

##### ELEVENTH CENSUS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting additional estimate of appropriations for continuing the work of the Eleventh Census; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### ADDITIONAL ROOM, COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the chief justice of the Court of Claims, submitting estimate of appropriation for providing additional space for the files of the court; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### JOSEPH FERNANDEZ.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communication from the Secretary of the Navy, with inclosures, looking to an appropriation for the relief of Joseph Fernandez, a British subject, residing at Key West, Fla.; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

##### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a resolution passed by the Regents of said institution, together with the preliminary statements on which it is based; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### DISBURSEMENTS, CONTINGENT FUND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting report of the disbursing clerk, showing the actual condition of the contingent fund; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF THE CENSUS OFFICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of the examination and review of the Census Office March 5, 1892; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### PRINTING EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR PLUMB.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 8,000 copies of the eulogies delivered in Congress on Preston B. Plumb, of which number 2,000 shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of Kansas, which number shall include 50 copies to be bound in morocco for the use of the family of the deceased, and the remaining number shall be distributed according to the proportion of 2,000 to the Senate and 4,000 to the House. The engraving for the said eulogies shall be done at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and paid for out of the appropriation for that Bureau.*

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to concur in the resolution of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and concurred in.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

##### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WINN, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. STACKHOUSE, indefinitely, on account of important business.

##### OPTIONS AND FUTURES.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported a bill H. R. 7845, as a substitute for the bill (H. R. 2699), defining options and futures, imposing special taxes on dealers therein, and requiring such dealers and persons engaged in selling certain products to obtain license, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The bill for which this is a substitute will be ordered to lie upon the table.

Mr. HATCH. There are three other bills, Mr. Speaker, which would take the same course.



The following bills on the same general subject were also ordered to lie upon the table, namely: The bill H. R. 394, H. R. 3870, and H. R. 6012.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6185) to absolutely prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any Chinese person or persons, whether subjects of the Chinese Empire or otherwise, as well those who are now within the limits of the United States, and who may hereafter leave the United States and attempt to return as those who have never been here, or, having been here, have departed from the United States (save and excepting only the following classes, that is to say: Such Chinese person or persons as may be duly accredited to the Government of the United States as minister plenipotentiary or other diplomatic representatives, consuls-general, consular and commercial agents, including other officers of the Chinese or other governments traveling upon the business of that Government, with their body and household servants), to come to or within, or to land at any port or place within the United States; and the coming of Chinese persons to the United States, whether for the purpose of transit only or otherwise, excepting the classes hereinbefore specifically described and excepted from and after the passage of this act be, and the same is hereby, absolutely prohibited.

SEC. 2. That the master of any vessel who shall knowingly bring within the United States on such vessel, and land, or attempt to land, or permit to be landed, any Chinese person, excepting such whose coming into the United States is not prohibited by this act, from any foreign port or place, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 for each and every such Chinese person so brought, and may also be imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year; but the foregoing section shall not apply to the case of any master whose vessel, being bound to a port not within the United States, shall come within the jurisdiction of the United States by reason of being in distress or in stress of weather, or touching at any port of the United States on its voyage to any foreign port or place: *Provided*, That Chinese persons brought on such vessel shall not be permitted to land, except in case of absolute necessity, and must depart with the vessel on leaving port: *And provided further*, That if any Chinese person inboard on such vessel, while the same is within the jurisdiction of the United States, shall escape from such vessel and on its departure shall remain within the United States, such vessel shall be liable to all the penalties herein provided for bringing Chinese to the United States.

SEC. 3. That the Chinese persons mentioned in section 1, of this act as excepted from the provisions of exclusion herein provided shall be admitted to the United States upon the production of the official credentials of such officers and the identification by them of their body and household servants in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. That collectors of customs and their deputies are hereby authorized and empowered to administer oaths whenever they may deem it necessary or proper to do so, and take from any person an oath, affirmation, affidavit, or deposition in any matter or proceeding relating to the identification of Chinese persons or their right to be or remain in the United States or liability to be deported therefrom under any laws of the United States. Any person who shall willfully and corruptly swear falsely in any such oath, affirmation, affidavit, or deposition, shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and on conviction shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 and not more than \$2,000, and by imprisonment at hard labor for not less than one year and not more than five years.

SEC. 5. That every vessel whose master shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed forfeited to the United States and shall be liable to seizure and condemnation in any district of the United States into which such vessel may enter or in which she may be found.

SEC. 6. That any person who shall knowingly bring into or cause to be brought into the United States, by land or otherwise, or who shall aid or abet the same, or aid or abet the landing in the United States from any vessel or otherwise, of any Chinese person not lawfully entitled to enter the United States, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, on conviction thereof, be fined in a sum not exceeding \$1,000, and imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

SEC. 7. That any Chinese person, or persons of Chinese descent, entering the United States or any of its Territories by crossing its boundary lines, or entering therein in any other manner whatever contrary to the provisions of this act, or found unlawfully in the United States or its Territories, may be arrested upon a warrant issued upon a complaint under oath filed by any party on behalf of the United States, by any justice, judge, or commissioner of any United States court, or before any United States court; and when convicted, upon a hearing, and found and adjudged to be one not lawfully entitled to be or remain in the United States, such person shall be imprisoned in a penitentiary for a term of not exceeding five years, and at the expiration of such term of imprisonment be removed from the United States to the country from whence he came: *Provided*, That when Chinese persons found unlawfully in the United States shall have come into the United States from China by way of contiguous foreign territory they shall be returned to China. A certified copy of the judgment shall be the process upon which said imprisonment and removal shall be made, and it may be executed by the marshal of the district, or any officer having authority of a marshal, under the provisions of this section, and in all such cases the person who brought or aided in bringing such person into the United States shall be liable to the Government of the United States for all necessary expenses incurred in such investigation and removal; and all peace officers of the several States and Territories of the United States are hereby invested with the same authority in reference to carrying out the provisions of this act as a marshal or deputy marshal of the United States, and shall be entitled to like compensation to be audited and paid by the same officers.

SEC. 8. That the provisions of this act shall apply to all subjects of China and to all Chinese, whether subjects of China or any other foreign power: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may make such rules and regulations as will allow Chinese, other than Chinese laborers or artisans, to temporarily visit the United States, and, under such rules, and in accordance therewith, but not otherwise, such Chinese may be permitted to temporarily visit the United States; but such right shall never be given to any Chinese laborer or artisan.

SEC. 9. That any violations of any of the provisions of this act, the punishment of which is not otherwise herein provided for, shall be deemed a misdemeanor, and shall be punishable by fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 10. That hereafter no State court or court of the United States shall

admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed. And any Chinese person now in the United States who may at any time hereafter depart from the United States, and all who are not in the United States, shall be subject to all the provisions, conditions, prohibitions, and penalties of this act.

SEC. 11. That the collector of customs of the port where any vessels arrive having Chinese persons aboard who are seeking admission to the United States shall determine who are and who are not Chinese, and his decisions may be reviewed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and not otherwise. Said collector shall have the right to administer oaths and take and hear testimony, and pending such investigation by such collector such person shall remain on board the ship bringing such person to the United States. When the writ of habeas corpus is issued to determine the right of any Chinese person to land in the United States whose right to land has been decided adverse to such Chinese person by any collector of customs, pending the hearing of such petitions and until the final determination of such proceeding the persons in whose behalf such writ was issued shall remain in the custody of the United States collector of customs and shall not be admitted to bail, and if before the decision in the proceeding the vessel upon which such Chinese person arrived departs from the United States and the proceeding is determined against such petitioner's right to land, such Chinese person shall be returned to China after such determination.

SEC. 12. That it shall be the duty of all Chinese persons within the limits of the United States, at the time of the passage of this act, to apply to the commissioner of internal revenue of their respective districts within one year after the passage of this act for a certificate of residence, and any Chinese person, within the limits of the United States, who shall fail or refuse to comply with the provisions of this act, or who, within one year after the passage hereof, shall be found without such certificate of residence, shall be adjudged by the court before whom he may be brought as being unlawfully within the limits of the United States and subject to the same fines and penalties as though he had unlawfully come into the United States in the first instance.

SEC. 13. That immediately after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such rules and regulations and prescribe the necessary forms to enable the Internal Revenue Department of the Government to issue the certificates required hereby. Such certificates may be issued by the deputy commissioner of internal revenue nearest the place where such Chinese resides. The certificate shall contain a true photographic copy of the applicant, together with his name, age, local residence, and occupation, and a duplicate of the same shall be filed in the office of the commissioner of internal revenue of the district within which such Chinaman makes application. On making application for such certificate the applicant shall pay to the commissioner of internal revenue of the district within which such Chinaman makes application the sum of \$3 for such certificates. The fee collected under the provisions of this act shall be paid to the Treasurer of the United States, and shall be set apart and be known as the "Chinese certificate fund," and shall be used to defray all the expenses of enforcing this act. The Treasurer of the United States may make such allowance in the nature of fees to the collectors of internal revenue for services performed under the provisions hereof, in addition to the salaries now allowed by law, as he shall deem necessary. The total amount so allowed shall not exceed more than \$1 in each case.

SEC. 14. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith be, and the same are hereby repealed, and the provisions of all treaties now in force between the United States Government and the Chinese Empire, in so far as they, or any of them, conflict with the provisions of this act, be, and the same are hereby, abrogated, set aside, and repealed: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect any prosecution or other proceeding, criminal or civil, begun under any existing act, or any acts hereby repealed, but such prosecution or other proceeding, criminal or civil, shall proceed as if this act had not been passed.

Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the first part of the last section be again read. It seems to provide for the abrogation of certain treaties.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 14. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith be, and the same are hereby repealed, and the provisions of all treaties now in force between the United States Government and the Chinese Empire, so far as they, or any of them, conflict with the provisions of this act, be, and the same are hereby, abrogated, set aside, and repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I hope the gentleman from California who has called up this bill, which is reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, will consent to a reasonable time for the discussion of it. It is a very important one, and certainly ought not to be passed under a suspension of the rules. It proposes the abrogation of existing treaties.

The SPEAKER. The first question is whether a second is demanded on the motion.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I understand the gentleman in charge of the tariff bill will not object to a reasonable time for the consideration of this question. I would suggest that unanimous consent be given for a discussion of two hours.

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is this bill reported from a committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to answer the inquiry, not having examined the bill. The motion is to suspend the rules, and the first question is, is a second demanded?

Mr. BURROWS. But if the Speaker will pardon me a moment, it seems to me that the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi is pertinent at this time, because if the House will consent to some extension of the discussion beyond the fifteen minutes allowed by the rule, say for a half hour or an hour on a side, it might influence the demand for a second.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman will understand that the bill is not before the House unless a second is ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I demand a second.

Mr. GEARY. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. And I hope the gentleman will consent to a reasonable time for debate.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree by unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered?

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi and Mr. BELTZHOVER objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made; and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY] will please take their places as tellers.

The House having divided, the Speaker announced that on the demand for a second there were—ayes 118, noes 12.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] makes the point that no quorum has voted. The tellers will please resume their places, and the gentlemen desiring to vote will come forward and do so.

The division being completed, there were—ayes 153, noes 14.

The SPEAKER. A second is ordered, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY] to control the time in favor of the motion, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] to control the time against it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I am not opposed to the bill, and therefore, with the consent of the Speaker, I will yield my entire time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER].

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I wish to make a proposition to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY]. I am opposed to the passage of this bill in this summary way. It is a very sweeping measure. It proposes an absolute abrogation of all the treaties we have upon this subject, and it is a measure which the House ought at least to give sufficient consideration to understand and comprehend. We can not possibly in my judgment—

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable, except under the rule. The Chair will submit the gentleman's proposition, if he has any proposition to make.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I was giving my reasons for submitting a proposition to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY].

The SPEAKER. That is not in order.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I propose that we shall consider this bill for at least two hours. The original bill, to which it is an amendment, was considered for days and days in this House. I propose that we shall consider it for two hours, one hour on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] asks unanimous consent that there be allowed upon this bill two hours' debate, one hour on a side.

Mr. HEARD. I object.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Then I propose that we may consider it for thirty minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit that request. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] asks unanimous consent that debate upon this bill be permitted for one hour, thirty minutes on a side.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think we had better have the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] demands the regular order, which is equivalent to an objection. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to prevent the coming of the Chinese into the United States. The existing law on this subject will expire by limitation on the 4th day of May. Since that law went into operation we have found many defects in it, although at the time it was presented to this House, ten years ago, everybody confidently believed that the passage of the law would settle the Chinese question, and that in time we might look for a reduction in the number of these persons in our midst. Contrary to these expectations, we find that in the last ten years more than 60,000 Chinese have entered the United States through the port of San Francisco alone, while a large number have come over the border.

This bill has been prepared to meet the defects in existing legislation, and as one of those who ought to be familiar with the Chinese question, after my long residence on the Pacific coast, I am satisfied that no measure short of this will effect the purpose desired by our people. I confidently hope that this House will pass it at this time when so much is being said about the necessity for protecting American labor. More especially I address my friends upon the other side, who seem to conceive some hostility to Chinese legislation, and I hope, while they are saying so much about the necessity for protecting American labor, they will not object to a bill like this, which proposes, not to protect American labor by the exclusion of the thing which the foreign laborer makes, but which says to the laborer in our own

midst that we propose to protect him against the imported pauper labor of the Old World.

I will reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] is recognized to control the time for fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I will say in advance, before I begin the consideration of the bill—and I hope this will not be counted out of my time, as it is so short—that I have conceded to my colleague upon the other side of the House [Mr. HITT] one-half of the time to which, under the rule, I will be entitled, and I will be obliged if the Chair will stop me when I have occupied one-half my time.

Mr. Speaker, the novel proposition is made to consider a bill of this importance in fifteen minutes on a side. It is proposed to pass this measure by a suspension of the rules of the House. The first section of the bill, it will be observed, provides for the absolute exclusion of all Chinese from immigrating into this country for any purpose whatever, except the minister plenipotentiary from the Chinese Empire and his suite. That is the bill. My time is so brief that I shall not be able to go into details about it.

The second section of the bill requires all Chinese who are here to go to an internal-revenue officer and pay a certain fee for the purpose of being registered as Chinese subjects within the United States. Another clause of the bill proposes the most extraordinary proposition that was ever made as a law proposition, namely, that the writ of habeas corpus shall be suspended and all bail be denied pending the trial of accused. You might imprison the Chinese minister and yet he could not get out if he happened not to be recognized as the Chinese minister.

Now, what is the proposition? The concluding section of the bill proposes to abrogate every treaty that has ever been made with the Chinese Empire. Is the House of Representatives prepared to do that? Are there any reasons why you should do that? What is the history of your treaty relations with China? Let me briefly dwell upon it.

The first treaty that was ever made by the United States with the Chinese was what is known as the Burlingame and Stanton treaty, which was made in 1858. That treaty opened up China to our commercial men and to our ministers of the gospel to preach the gospel in China. When Burlingame and Stanton returned to San Francisco, the city from which my friend [Mr. GEARY], the author of this bill comes, what was done?

That whole city was illuminated, and the people turned out to welcome Burlingame and Stanton, congratulated them upon the treaty they had negotiated with the Chinese Empire—that they had broken down the walls that had shut in the Chinese people and Chinese commerce and Chinese regulations. They were congratulated for having accomplished this feat of diplomacy, more remarkable than any that had ever been performed in the history of diplomacy. What was that treaty?

No people ever treated you with such liberality as the Chinese Government when you made your first treaty with them in 1858, known as the Burlingame and Stanton treaty. The Chinese in their treaty agreed you should carry to their country your citizens, your commerce, and your religion. In article 5 of the Burlingame and Stanton treaty it is declared:

The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other for the purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as a permanent residence. The high contracting parties therefore join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary emigration for these purposes.

They consequently agree to pass laws making it a penal offense for a citizen of the United States, or Chinese subjects, to take Chinese subjects either to the United States or to any other foreign country, or for a Chinese subject or citizen of the United States to take citizens of the United States to China or to any other foreign country, without their free and voluntary consent respectively.

The right of voluntary expatriation was once regarded as a sacred right, and was amply secured by this treaty. Is it now proposed to abandon this doctrine?

Again it is declared in article 4 of the Burlingame and Stanton treaty:

The twenty-ninth article of the treaty of the 18th of June, A. D. 1858, having stipulated for the exemption of Christian citizens of the United States and Chinese converts from persecutions in China on account of their faith, it is further agreed that citizens of the United States in China of every religious persuasion, and Chinese subjects in the United States, shall enjoy entire liberty of conscience, and shall be exempt from all disability or persecution on account of their religious faith or worship in either country.

Is there any enlightened Representative in this House who will say that this was not a treaty of amity and concord entered into in a spirit of Christianity and enlightened civilization, which should be kept in good faith?

The Chinese Government assented to every proposition you made in the Burlingame-Stanton treaty. Your special envoys and ministers plenipotentiary, sent expressly to China to negotiate

this treaty, came back crowned with laurels and covered with glory; and now, after the passage of your bill of 1880, the Chinese Government again treated with you, giving you the right to interdict the immigration into this country of Chinese laborers or coolies who were diseased and who were criminals. In this way the Burlingame-Stanton treaty was amended in 1880. In 1881 China agreed to still further amend these treaties, and provided in section I of said treaty as follows:

Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country, or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it.

First we negotiated the Burlingame and Stanton treaty. Then we said, "Why, we want to interdict the immigration of criminals." The Chinese said, "Very well; we will consent to that;" and we made another treaty. Then we wanted to prevent the immigration of diseased men coming from China. They said, "Very well; we will agree to that."

Then to come to the bill of 1882, introduced by Mr. Page, then representing California, to prevent the coming in of Chinese for twenty years. I was then a member of this House, and rose in my place and said: "That is an unreasonable term," and read the section of the treaty I have just read, and further said, "But if you will limit it to ten years, the President will probably sign your bill." At that time the distinguished and honorable gentleman from New York, Mr. Arthur, was President—and I can say that of him, though differing politically with him.

Mr. Page rose, on the other side of the House, as will be remembered by older members, and wanted to know if I spoke for the President by authority. I said, "No, of course not; I am not in such relations with him as would authorize me to speak for him; but I think he is an honest man, an upright magistrate, and that he will have due regard for the observance of the treaties of his country, and that he will veto your bill if you put it at twenty years."

Mr. Page would not take my advice, but put it at twenty years. The bill was passed and went to the President, and he vetoed it; and after he had vetoed it, it came back to this House and we passed the existing law, excluding the Chinese for ten years, and that act was signed and became a law. That term is about to expire, and this harsh bill is proposed to renew it by absolutely abrogating at one stroke of the pen every treaty entered into with this friendly power. Is the House of Representatives prepared to go to this extent? You remember, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with the most powerful nation as to numbers on the face of the globe.

There are 430,000,000 Chinese, and their Government has always made every treaty we have asked them to make. They have assented to every proposition we have asked them to assent to, except the last Chinese treaty, which was submitted to China just prior to the passage of what was known as the Scott bill, which was a very harsh bill. I simply want to say that we can not afford to ignore our treaty stipulations or obligations with the most powerful nation on the face of the globe. It is bad faith, and we ought to keep our faith with every nation, whether it be a great or a small one.

In this case we propose to abrogate every treaty, to abolish all treaties, and to let no Chinaman come into this country unless he is a minister plenipotentiary from that country or is in some way attached to the legation of that country, whether as an attaché or a servant. Why, now, we originally demanded that the Chinese should make a treaty with us, and in making the treaty they assented to every amendment we proposed; and in the conduct of the negotiations of such treaties China has shown a degree of civilization and acquaintance with public affairs which entitles her to stand with the most cultivated and civilized nations of the world.

China did not originally want her people to come here. China never asked that her people should be permitted to come here. They were sent here. It is in the memory of the Speaker and other gentlemen that there was a commission created by the Senate of the United States which was sent to California for the purpose of ascertaining what was the condition of Chinese labor there.

Mr. Morton of Indiana, then the leader of the Senate, was at the head of that committee. He visited California and investigated this subject and made a report declaring in terms that the Chinese made most efficient laborers; that they were employed for the construction of railways for the reclamation of the waste lands of California; that they were compelled by California legislation to live within certain restricted limits in the cities and towns, and that they complied patiently with every regulation made by California law.

China has agreed to every modification that we have ever pro-

posed, and I do not want to see this enlightened House of Representatives putting itself on record as being willing not only to abolish all treaties with China, but also to deny to the Chinaman the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus.

[Here the hammer fell.]

I thank the Speaker for reminding me that half my time has expired, and I yield the remainder to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], with the suggestion that if he chooses, he may reserve it until after the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY] has spoken.

Mr. GEARY rose.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope my friend from California will reserve his time until after the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT].

Mr. GEARY. I will do so.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, the great and fatal objection to this bill in the mind of any man of truth who regards his country's honor is that it deliberately violates our plighted faith as we wrote it down in a solemn treaty, and proposed it to another government, they assenting to it reluctantly at our persuasion. That treaty is now in full force and binding upon the American Government. There are many considerations of interest, many great losses in business, that will follow the complete nonintercourse it would produce; but they are of little importance compared to this proposed shame in falsifying our word as a nation in a legislative step so deliberately taken.

We have had many anti-Chinese bills here, each more stringent and harsher than the preceding. They come every other year with the elections, and the writer searches the dictionary for words to surpass predecessors. Heretofore they were aimed at Chinese laborers, and I will join in legislation to exclude laborers and support negotiations to exclude Chinese laborers. But this bill goes far beyond that. It does not mention them. The House has voted for severe bills to exclude them, and tried to keep within the treaty. This bill emulates barbarians in excluding and punishing when found on our soil every man, the most exalted and the humblest, of a great nation, and does it in avowed violation of faith and truth. Never before did we, nor any other legislative body, with cold cynicism, with absolute disregard of the moral sense, violate faith and avow that we were doing it. We have now a treaty which says "shall not absolutely prohibit," and this bill selects those very words from the treaty for its title in order to make it more insulting—a bill to absolutely prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States.

We have in that treaty a provision that "Chinese subjects, whether proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity, together with their body and household servants, and Chinese laborers now in the United States, shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nations." This bill flagrantly violates that provision by excluding all these classes and punishing them cruelly if found here; but it crowns all in the last section, where it deliberately, with a cold perfidy that language can not exceed, declares that all treaties and parts of treaties that are in conflict with this act are repealed, set aside, and abrogated. Mark, it proposes to save all those parts of the treaties which are of advantage to us, such as the guaranty to American citizens in China of the rights of the most favored nation, and hold China as bound by public faith to observe them. Suppose we were dealing with England and the situations were reversed, who is there here who would not vote for a declaration of nonintercourse or war?

At this time we are claiming and exercising in twenty cities in China wide privileges for American citizens under this treaty.

To-day the missionaries are trembling amid dangers, and there are Chinese soldiers guarding American citizens in the disorders which prevail in the Chinese Empire—this upon the demand of our minister based on this treaty; and now we propose to revoke all that part of the treaty which gives any advantage or protection to a subject of China and then to claim that they, as honorable men, shall carry out all that they covenanted with us!

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HITT. Pardon me, but does the gentleman propose to take my time or the time of the other side?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I simply wanted to submit to the gentleman the question whether it is not true that the abrogation by the United States Government of any provision of the treaty is an abrogation of the remaining provisions at the option of the Chinese Government?

Mr. HITT. Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker. Nothing akin in form to the abrogation of a treaty has ever been tried in the history of this country save once, in 1798, and then Congress solemnly

declared that the French having violated their treaty obligations, carried on a war of predatory violence upon us, rejected our claims and repelled every offer of negotiation with indignity, the treaty with them was at an end. But the cold, deliberate, assertion in the solemn form of law that one party will, without cause, set aside an international compact which the other party has scrupulously observed, is without precedent. Has China wronged us in anything? She has scrupulously regarded the treaty. Has she rejected our claims? You, sir, have taken part in legislation here to send back hundreds of thousands of dollars overpaid by China on our claims. The Chinese have been patient in a way and in a degree unknown to us, listening with calmness and dignity to our proposals of successive harsh measures; and shall we now address them in such unchristian language as this?

We are sending missionaries there with the Bible of God, and when the Chinese open its pages they read: "Thou shalt not lie." The Christian people we represent protest against this. Here are protests from the conferences of ninety-five thousand Methodists in New Jersey. We violate faith to do acts that would be barbarism if there were no treaty. If the late Chinese minister, who recently left here, now a private subject, and in whose house, while he was here, I have seen forty Representatives and Senators as guests at his entertainments, should dare now to come back to call upon his successor, or to shake hands with any of the gentlemen whom he then entertained, under this bill, if it be enacted, he would go to the penitentiary for five years! Stanley found nothing in darkest African more barbarous. If Li Hong Chang, the friend of Gen. Grant, should follow Grant's example, and, leaving for a time that mighty Empire of which he has been the Bismarck, should set out to visit other lands, and come here to see the widow and family of his illustrious friend, he would receive not hospitality, but a prison and a fine, and the captain that brought him here and every man that aided in his coming would be fined \$1,000 under this inhuman bill.

Why propose this disgrace? Why not spare us this shame? You have here in the House a bill which has passed the Senate continuing the law as it stands lest it may expire in May. Is not that law severe enough? It excludes all laborers, and is so harsh that it recently prevented from landing and drove from San Francisco two Chinese merchants belonging to a firm known in every financial center of the world—members of a house older than this Republic—and this at the very time that the great American China house of Russell had tottered to its fall. Its fall was caused by the opposition of English influence and the indifference of the Chinese Government and business world. The coldness of China was produced by the nagging, irritation, and harsh course of the United States Government, which had diverted all sympathy on the part of merchants, bankers, and government in China; and so the great house of Russell, the Barings, the Rothschilds of the Orient—an American house that had proudly stood for eighty years—went down in ruin.

This savage exclusion and extreme punishment of all strangers is a revival of the darkest features of the darkest ages in the history of man. It is wholly needless. It is mischievous. It increases the difficulty of making an agreement with China to help keep out laborers. It will result in nonintercourse and break up our trade with China; but that is comparatively nothing, that is as dust in the balance, compared with the foul blot put upon the nation by placing on its rolls, on its statutes, in its laws, a deliberate declaration of our falsehood, coldly avowing that it will set aside a treaty which the other party has carefully and scrupulously observed.

Mr. HEARD rose.

Mr. HITT. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me.

Mr. HEARD. I only wanted the gentleman to point out the feature of this bill which abolishes the writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. HITT. I have but a moment of time left—not enough to go over the bill in detail. You can find there provisions of savagery rare in legislation—fines, imprisonments, and deportation. Under this bill \$300,000 is to be levied immediately upon the Chinamen in this country as a special exaction under the form of a certificate fee. Then there is a provision which seems to be sarcasm, the eighth section, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to admit Chinamen under certain conditions to come to the Columbian Exposition—an Exhibition conducted by a Government that has treated their people with deliberate and scornful exclusion and cruel punishments in this proposed law. Let us keep the white history of our country unspotted, and in this vote prove ourselves faithful representatives of an enlightened, brave, Christian people, in a land where for a hundred years it has been true that—

Man is loved, and God is feared,  
And faith is kept, and truth revered.

[Loud applause.]

I take the liberty of publishing with my remarks the following:

To the House of Representatives:

The New Jersey Conference of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, having over two hundred ministers, and representing a membership of about fifty thousand, has heard with regret that measures are proposed at the present session of Congress, adding greatly to the stringency of the laws already existing against the immigration into this country of Chinese persons.

We desire most earnestly to protest against the enactment of further oppressive legislation against the Chinese people. The legislation of the past, combined with the ill-treatment received by the Chinese in various parts of our country, has a tendency to injure us in the sight of the Chinese, to cripple our missionary work in that country, and to lead to retaliatory measures. The representatives of that Empire who are provisionally thrown among us, are to a considerable degree accessible to Christian workers, and a large number of them have embraced the Christian faith. They are a sober and industrious people. None of them are found in our poorhouses, and they have but very few representatives in our jails.

We earnestly entreat Congress to withdraw all unjust discriminations against this people in their legislation.

Signed by order and on behalf of the conference.

JOHN H. VINCENT, *President*.  
GEO. B. WIGHT, *Secretary*.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

Adopted by New Jersey Conference March 19, 1892, by a rising vote.

GEO. B. WIGHT, *Secretary*.

To the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Newark annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, composed of over 200 ministers and representing about 45,000 church members, assembled in session at Morristown, N. J., hereby most earnestly protest against the continuance of unfriendly legislation against the Chinese people, and especially do we protest against the enactment of such measures now pending as propose the entire exclusion of all classes of Chinese except diplomatic and consular representatives, and the prohibition of the return to this country of any now here who may go home to visit their own land.

We believe that Providence has opened a large opportunity to the Christians of the United States for the evangelization of Chinese persons in this country. Hundreds of them have been brought to Christianity here. Among these, numbers have returned to their own land who are exemplifying the Christian faith among their friends and neighbors. Some have built chapels and in other ways have done their utmost to extend the Christian faith in their own land. Moreover, we have the testimony of our missionaries that these men are the most earnest agents in promoting a friendly feeling toward the United States in the communities to which they have gone.

The continuance of unfriendly legislation, and especially the addition of still greater restrictions, will tend to retaliation on the part of the Chinese and to endanger the life and property of our missionaries in China. There is absolutely no justification for this continued, unfriendly treatment of the Chinese people. They are among the most quiet, peaceable, and inoffensive of our immigrants. They are not found in our grog shops, in our jails, or our poorhouses. The enactment of a uniform immigration law which would look to the good character of the immigrants, and especially to shutting out anarchists and other enemies of government, would be entirely justifiable and proper.

But we do most earnestly protest in the name of Christianity and of humanity against this unfriendly legislation toward a peaceful class of immigrants who number in the aggregate less than the numbers received in a single season from some of the countries of Europe.

Signed by order and in behalf of the conference.

THOS. BOWMAN, *President*.  
JOHN F. DODD, *Secretary*.

MORRISTOWN, N. J., March 31, 1892.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] has grown very indignant over what he regards as an attempt on our part to abrogate a treaty. I regret that in referring to this treaty he has not stated how it was made. He has not told this Congress that the treaty never would have been entered into but for the false representations of the Chinese Government as to what they wished to do in regard to their own laboring people. When that treaty was made China assured our people that she was more anxious to keep her laboring population at home than we were anxious to keep them out; and because our people relied upon that statement of the Chinese Government that treaty was made. But we have found from the very day the treaty was signed until the present moment that the Chinese Government, both through her officers at home and her officers in this country, has done everything in her power to violate the spirit of that treaty.

There has never been a Chinaman arrested in the city of San Francisco for coming here contrary to the laws of this country (and that was prior to the passage of the Scott bill) too that you did not find the Chinese minister going into court and defending their right to violate our laws. We never met like treatment from any other people or any other government, and I am surprised that in an American Congress any man can be found to declare himself in favor of the surrendering to some foreign authority our rights and putting a limitation on our power to legislate for the protection of our own citizens. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Does not the treaty itself provide that we can control this matter by legislation?

Mr. GEARY. Yes, sir; it may be controlled by legislation; but back of that treaty was the declaration of the Chinese Government that she would not attempt to make any such legislation necessary. But we have found that she has constantly violated that treaty; and that is why we are here demanding this abrogation.

There is nothing new in this. The bill passed four years ago by Congress was itself an abrogation, and declared to be such by the Supreme Court of the United States, at the October term

1888, when that tribunal decided that the Scott bill in itself abrogated the Chinese treaty and that the American Congress had a right to do so. I do not care what treaty may stand in the way, whenever any foreign people comes here and says, "We propose to say to the American Congress you have not the right to legislate to protect your own people within your own borders," I am prepared to abrogate every such treaty, to violate every such law, if by so doing I may bring protection to one single laborer in my own land. [Applause.] My idea of "protection" does not stop with legislating in regard to the article produced abroad; I seek to protect the laborer who may have a chance to be employed when the article is to be made here.

Now my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] says that by this bill we propose to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. I am afraid he has fallen into an error; we do nothing of the kind.

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

Mr. GEARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I find in your bill a provision—

Mr. GEARY. I understand what the gentleman is about to say and I will explain that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The lines are in the bill—

Mr. GEARY. I understand what the gentleman means. Let me say to him that it is in the bill as originally presented. That provision, however, was stricken out in committee, and we now provide that whenever the writ of habeas corpus is issued the applicant shall not be admitted to bail pending a hearing.

The reason is this, that in one year in California over eight thousand writs of habeas corpus have been issued by the United States court to investigate the right of the Chinamen to come, and in each case they have given bail for their appearance, Chinamen going their bail, and when the cases were called for a hearing the Chinaman was gone and the bail was worthless. Since the appointment of Judge Morrow to the circuit court of the United States in San Francisco he has declared forfeited over a quarter of a million of Chinese appeal bonds, and the United States district attorney says that he can not collect one dollar of it. That is just the condition that the remedy is sought to be applied to. This bill meets that difficulty, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will pass the House. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. GEARY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN].

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes accorded to me I shall be only permitted to express my hearty approval of any measure which shall be presented to effectually exclude the Chinese from coming to our country. None realize so much as those of our people who live upon the Pacific shores the necessity for such repressive legislation as this. Time and time again have we invoked the aid of Congress in behalf of some such measure which should accomplish the object desired, and time and time again has all legislation upon the subject been found ineffective. Now we have approached apparently the last remedy to be applied, which we believe, if it be enacted into law, will effectually result in the exclusion of these people.

All political parties in all of the States west of the Rocky Mountains have declared themselves in favor of legislation looking to the exclusion of the Chinese. Organizations of labor, almost universally and indeed nearly all of the industrial associations of those States have expressed themselves in favor of some such measure as this.

These Chinese form an exception in every respect to all races of people who seek our shores. They are here simply for a temporary purpose, having none of the ambitions and none of the aspirations, and none of the great objects which induce other people to come and cast their lots amongst us, and seek the shores of this broad land for the purpose of making a future home. Under the old provisions of law which have heretofore obtained a cordon of soldiers would be necessary all along our border to keep these people out.

For over a thousand miles along the entire northern line of our territory, and along the Canadian frontier, as well as along the southern borders, they have had easy means of access, and we have found it absolutely impossible to exclude them by the utmost power which the existing laws provided. Amongst the dense forests of British Columbia they have the most convenient means for getting off at the various little stations on the railroads, and thus they are able to find their way into our territory, with no apprehension of being prevented or obstructed in their well-worn pathways.

We believe that they are not a part and parcel of the world's people with whom it is desirable that we should intermingle; that they can not assimilate themselves to our customs and social existence, and as a matter of fact they come here, as I have said, for mere temporary purposes, with no expectation of remaining, simply to make money and then go home to die and be buried in

China. It is essential, in my judgment, that they should be absolutely excluded, and I believe this measure will accomplish that end. It is high time our gateways should be double locked and barred against the Mongolian, and the time has also arrived for turning the key against much other cheap labor which reaches us from the Old World just as dangerous to our labor system and to our civilization as these Chinese. If we are consistent in our declarations against the admission of the products of cheap labor, let us begin by excluding the degraded beings who make the products. Let us now practice what we preach.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUTTING].

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. Speaker, the existing law restricting Chinese immigration expires by limitation on the 6th of next month, and unless some prompt action is taken by Congress to prevent this immigration there will be an influx of this unassimilative and undesirable race of people in larger numbers than ever before, as thousands upon thousands are ready to swarm our shores.

It is an indisputable fact that notwithstanding the present restrictive act they are coming in over our land borders in large numbers and at times as they desire. Therefore, the necessity of the passage of a restrictive law is immediate. And while the present law has given the country some relief it has been demonstrated by experience that it is not sufficient for the end desired; that is, to prevent the further incoming of these people.

The unparalleled prosperity of this country is so great in comparison with that of other nations and especially that of the Chinese Empire, that this wily race has and will resort to all manner of means in order to avail themselves of the advantages attained in this country to evade the law; as is evidenced by their illegal entrance across the borders and the evasion of the law which provides for the return certificates of merchants. The law admits the return of the merchant class. The coolie class have no difficulty of assuming the guise of a merchant and with a fraudulent certificate, easily procured, they are prepared to and are in this manner evading the law.

The coolie class, with which we have principally to deal, totally disregard the nature of an oath; they do not, as a rule, learn our language or care to understand the principles of our Government; they have no regard whatsoever for our laws, but have laws unto themselves, and their unwritten traditions are more binding upon them than our statutes. If they have families they do not bring them with them. They do not assimilate with us in any way, nor do they share the burden of taxation; and under the Constitution of the United States they can not become citizens. They add nothing to, but absorb our wealth, as the fruits of their labor are sent to the land from which they came as soon as obtained. Experience has taught the West that there is no competing with them. In every avenue of industry that they invade they drive forth all competitors.

As an evidence of their immoral nature I quote from the late Bayard Taylor:

It is my deliberate opinion that the Chinese are immoral and the most debased people on the face of the earth; their touch is pollution, and harsh as the opinion may seem, justice to our own race demands that they should not be allowed to settle on our soil.

The so-called merchant class are of the coolie cast. They are industrious and able traders. Their trade within this country, however, is restricted almost exclusively to their own race and they buy only such of our commodities for their local requirements as they can not import from China. It is true they export American products to a limited extent, and, in justice, I should be in favor of permitting Chinese merchants residing in the United States to go and come at will were it not for the fact that the readmission of this class opens the avenue to the whole race, otherwise there would be no necessity for their exclusion as their readmission could only be to promote commerce between the two countries.

Mr. Speaker, in the limited time allotted to me I can not hope, and therefore shall not attempt, to discuss the merits of the pending bill, but I desire to protest against the passage of that portion of section 8, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may make such rules and regulations as will allow Chinese, other than Chinese laborers and artisans, to temporarily visit the United States.

I sincerely wish the members of this House understood, as we of the Pacific coast do from a contact with these people for over a third of a century, that no possible opportunity can be given any of these people to enter this country of which the undesirable class will not avail themselves. Chinese laborers and artisans will surely take advantage of the loophole this section creates, as they will come in disguise and remain in this country in spite of all we can do; compete with our labor and disseminate the vices of the Eastern type of civilization.

For this and other reasons, if it would be permitted, I should

move to strike out that portion of section 8, to which I have before referred; but as the rules of the House will not permit it, I shall vote for the measure as it is rather than have no legislation, but I shall do so under protest.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HITT. I ask that that privilege be extended to all gentlemen who have spoken upon this question.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY], that the rules be suspended and the bill passed.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. Will it be in order, pending this motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, to move a recommitment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. That it would not be in order?

The SPEAKER. That it would not be in order. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY], to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that he was in doubt.

Upon a division there were—ayes 115, noes 48.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I call for tellers.

Mr. GEARY. Pending that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 43, not voting 108; as follows:

YEAS—178.

Abbott,	Cox, N. Y.	Kem,	Quackenbush,
Allen,	Cox, Tenn.	Kilgore,	Reilly,
Amerman,	Craun, Tex.	Kribbs,	Reyburn,
Arnold,	Crawford,	Kyle,	Richardson,
Babbitt,	Crosby,	Lagan,	Robertson, La.
Bacon,	Cummings,	Lane,	Rockwell,
Bailey,	Cutting,	Lanham,	Sayers,
Baker,	Davis,	Lawson, Va.	Scott,
Bankhead,	De Armond,	Lester, Ga.	Seerley,
Bartine,	Dickerson,	Lewis,	Shively,
Barwig,	Dixon,	Livingston,	Simpson,
Bentley,	Doan,	Lockwood,	Snodgrass,
Bingham,	Dungan,	Long,	Snow,
Bland,	Dunphy,	Loud,	Sperry,
Blount,	Durborow,	Mallory,	Stephenson,
Bowers,	Edmunds,	Martin,	Stewart, Tex.
Bowman,	Ellis,	McClellan,	Stone, W. A.
Branch,	Enloe,	McCreary,	Stone, Ky.
Brawley,	Everett,	McDonald,	Sweet,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fellows,	McGann,	Tarsney,
Bretz,	Fithian,	McKaig,	Terry,
Brickner,	Forney,	McKeighan,	Tillman,
Brookshire,	Fowler,	McMillin,	Townsend,
Brown,	Funston,	McRae,	Tucker,
Bryan,	Fyan,	Meyer,	Turner,
Buchanan, Va.	Gantz,	Mitchell,	Van Horn,
Bullock,	Geary,	Montgomery,	Washington,
Bunting,	Goodnight,	Moore,	Watson,
Busey,	Gorman,	Mutchler,	Waugh,
Butler,	Hall,	Newberry,	Weadock,
Bynum,	Hallowell,	Norton,	Wever,
Cadmus,	Halvorson,	O'Donnell,	Wheeler, Ala.
Caminetti,	Hamilton,	O'Ferrall,	Wheeler, Mich.
Campbell,	Harmer,	O'Neil, Mass.	White,
Caruth,	Harries,	O'Neil, Pa.	Wilke,
Castle,	Hatch,	O'Neil, Mo.	Williams, Mass.
Catchings,	Hayes, Iowa	Page, Md.	Williams, N. C.
Cate,	Haynes, Ohio	Parrett,	Williams, Ill.
Causey,	Henderson, N. C.	Patterson, Tenn.	Wilson, Wash.
Chipman,	Hermann,	Patton,	Wilson, Mo.
Clark, Wyo.	Holman,	Paynter,	Wilson, W. Va.
Clarke, Ala.	Hopkins, Pa.	Pearson,	Wise,
Clover,	Johnstone, S. C.	Peel,	Youmans.
Cobb, Ala.	Jolley,	Pierce,	
Cowles,	Jones,	Price,	

NAYS—43.

Alexander,	Craig, Pa.	Henderson, Ill.	Perkins,
Andrew,	Culberson,	Herbert,	Post,
Beaman,	Curtis,	Hitt,	Powers,
Belknap,	English,	Hooker, Miss.	Randall,
Beltzhoover,	Epes,	Hopkins, Ill.	Robinson, Pa.
Bergen,	Flick,	Johnson, Ind.	Stevens,
Brosius,	Grady,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stockdale,
Bushnell,	Greenleaf,	Lawson, Ga.	Storer,
Ceatham,	Harter,	Little,	Stout,
Coburn,	Heard,	Lodge,	Taylor, J. D.
Coolidge,	Hemphill,	Miller,	

NOT VOTING—108.

Alderson,	Burrows,	Coombs,	Enochs,
Atkinson,	Byrns,	Cooper,	Fitch,
Belden,	Cable,	Covert,	Forman,
Blanchard,	Caldwell,	Dalzell,	Geissenhainer,
Boatner,	Caphart,	Daniell,	Gillespie,
Boutelle,	Chapin,	De Forest,	Griswold,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Clancy,	Dingley,	Grout,
Broderick,	Cobb, Mo.	Dockery,	Hare,
Brunner,	Cockran,	Dolliver,	Haugen,
Buchanan, N. J.	Cogswell,	Donovan,	Henderson, Iowa
Bunn,	Compton,	Elliott,	Hoar,

Hooker, N. Y.	McKinney,	Rayner,	Taylor, Ill.
Houk, Ohio	Meredith,	Reed,	Taylor, Tenn.
Houk, Tenn.	Milliken,	Rife,	Taylor, E. B.
Huff,	Morse,	Rusk,	Taylor, V. A.
Hull,	Moses,	Russell,	Tracey,
Johnson, Ohio	Oates,	Sanford,	Turpin,
Ketcham,	Otis,	Scull,	Wadsworth,
Lapham,	Outhwaite,	Shell,	Walker,
Layton,	Owens,	Shonk,	Warner,
Lester, Va.	Page, R. I.	Smith,	Warwick,
Lind,	Pattison, Ohio	Springer,	Whiting,
Lynch,	Payne,	Stackhouse,	Willcox,
Magner,	Pendleton,	Stahlnecker,	Wilson, Ky.
Mansur,	Pickler,	Steward, Ill.	Winn,
McAleer,	Raines,	Stone, C. W.	Wolverton,
McKenna,	Ray,	Stump,	Wright.

Accordingly, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GILLESPIE with Mr. WADSWORTH.  
 Mr. PAGE of Rhode Island with Mr. KETCHAM.  
 Mr. LAPHAM with Mr. QUACKENBUSH.  
 Mr. MOSES with Mr. BELDEN.  
 Mr. DE FOREST with Mr. WILSON of Kentucky.  
 Mr. GEISSENHAINER with Mr. WRIGHT.  
 Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. SANFORD.  
 Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. COGSWELL.  
 Mr. COMPTON with Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey.  
 Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa with Mr. DOCKERY.  
 Mr. HAYNES of Ohio with Mr. SCULL.  
 Mr. WHITING with Mr. BURROWS.  
 Mr. HOUK of Ohio with Mr. CALDWELL.  
 Mr. LAYTON with Mr. HULL.  
 Mr. ALDERSON with Mr. DOLLIVER.  
 Mr. TRACEY with Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois.  
 Mr. CAPEHART with Mr. RUSSELL.  
 Mr. OWENS with Mr. ENOCHS, until April 12.  
 Mr. MANSUR with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee.  
 Mr. TURPIN with Mr. HOOKER of New York.  
 Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR with Mr. OATES, until April 7.  
 Mr. BUNN with Mr. ATKINSON.  
 Mr. PENDLETON with Mr. PICKLER, until the 5th of April.  
 Mr. WOLVERTON with Mr. BRODERICK.  
 For this day:  
 Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio with Mr. RIFE.  
 Mr. RUSK with Mr. RAINES.  
 Mr. MEREDITH with Mr. MORSE.  
 Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. GROUT.  
 Mr. RAYNER with Mr. DINGLEY.  
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. WALKER.  
 Mr. BRUNNER with Mr. CHARLES W. STONE.  
 Mr. WARWICK with Mr. SHONK.

LINE-CARRYING PROJECTILES.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2056) to repeal the provisions of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, requiring life-saving appliances on steamers," approved March 2, 1889, so far as they relate to steamers plying exclusively upon any of the lakes, bays, or sounds of the United States.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the provisions of an act entitled "An act to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, requiring life-saving appliances on steamers," approved March 2, 1889, be, and the same are hereby, repealed so far as they relate to the carrying of line-carrying projectiles and the means of propelling them on steamers plying exclusively upon any of the lakes, bays, or sounds of the United States.

Sec. 2. That nothing herein contained shall be construed to repeal or affect the provisions of said act so far as they apply to ocean-going steamers; and that all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] will take their places as tellers.

Mr. MALLORY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MALLORY. If this motion is carried will the bill be open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will not.

The House divided; and tellers reported—ayes 85, noes 19.

Mr. LODGE. I withdraw the demand for a second.

The SPEAKER. A second has been ordered, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD] to control the time in favor of the bill, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to control the time against it. The

gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is to repeal the amendments to sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes, passed March 2, 1889, by which it was enacted into the general law that steam vessels upon the lakes, in the bays, and on the inland waters were required to carry what were known as projectiles. The act has never gone into effect. Congress immediately passed a joint resolution suspending the act for that year, 1890, and again passed another joint resolution suspending it for 1891. So the suspension expired on the 29th day of March last.

Therefore, the provisions of the act sought to be repealed have never been in force and effect; and for the reason that no one connected with the vessel interests of the lakes or of the inland waters, bays, or sounds has ever asked or requested that it should be put into force and effect, and no public interest has demanded it. The passage of the law of 1889 was urged solely by parties interested in the manufacture of the projectiles, and by no one else; and when the question came up as to its practical effect upon the steamboats upon the lakes and inland waters—in the bays—such an opposition presented itself that Congress unanimously passed a joint resolution suspending the force of the law, and at the same time requested the Secretary of the Treasury to have an investigation made by the steamboat supervisors as to the requirements and advisability of the law. In October and November last the steamboat inspectors met, investigated, and examined into the whole question, and after such investigation they unanimously, without a dissenting voice, decided that the law was useless; that in fact it was more dangerous to human life upon the lakes, upon the sounds, and in the bays to carry these projectiles than not to carry them.

This bill repealing the act of 1889 has been passed by the Senate, and now comes to this House. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have reported in favor of its repeal, and there is no opposition, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, to the passage of this bill, except what comes from the parties who are interested in the manufacture of the projectiles.

Mr. BUSHNELL. What does the gentleman mean by vessels carrying "projectiles?"

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I will explain that. It is carrying a gun something like a small cannon.

Mr. BUSHNELL. A mortar?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. A mortar, by which they throw a line or expect to throw a line on shore in case of shipwreck, and thus to be enabled to save life, provided there is any one on shore, and also to throw skyrockets. The evidence taken by and before the steamboat inspectors was that in every instance wherein they had tried to operate this apparatus by throwing these projectiles the gun either burst or it failed to throw the line on shore, with perhaps one or two exceptions, when they did succeed, after several efforts, in throwing the line. The reason for it is this: When you have one of these mortars on a vessel it is liable to be there one, two, or three months, or three, four, or five years without being used, and by dampness and other causes it gets out of order.

The sailors are only employed, as a rule, one or two trips, or at the most by the season. As stated by the Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service and by the steamboat inspectors, the carrying of these projectiles, the powder, and all things connected with them, is absolutely more dangerous to human life than the projectiles themselves. The reason of the urgency of the passage of this bill at this time is this: The steamboats upon the lakes are now getting ready to engage in their traffic, and if this bill is not passed at this time they must necessarily provide themselves with these articles, which are absolutely useless, and not only useless but dangerous, as appears from the report of the steamboat inspectors, more or less. They can not succeed in getting their insurance or the insurance upon their cargoes, and they can not get their licenses to go upon the lakes; they can not pass inspection without providing themselves with these useless guns unless relieved by the passage of this act.

Navigation is about opening. During the three years that this law has been under discussion not a single person, vessel owner, master, crew, Government inspector, or any other person has spoken a word in its favor; on the contrary, all have pronounced its enforcement on the lakes an absurdity. The only ones before the committee who advocate the law are the manufacturers of projectiles. It is a case pure and simple of manufacturers trying to enforce a sale by law. Immediate action is demanded in the interest of commerce.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, this act which it is proposed to repeal, or to substantial repeal, was passed by the Fiftieth Congress. It then had the cordial support of the Inspector of Steam Vessels, of the Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, of the Massachusetts and other humane societies, and of all interested in the protection of human life against the dangers of ship-

wreck. It was found, however, when the bill became a law, that it put a burden upon the steamship companies—not a very serious burden, but still a burden of from \$50 to \$100 in each case. Thereupon the steamship companies began to stir against the law, and they succeeded in securing its suspension for a year. They then got it suspended for another year, and they are now attempting to secure its repeal for all except ocean-going vessels.

The purpose of the law was to compel every steamship carrying passengers to be provided with a projectile which would carry a life line on being discharged from a cannon on the ship. The greatest means of saving life on a ship that has gone upon a reef or sand bar is the establishment of communication with the shore by means of a life line. It is extremely difficult at times, especially in a heavy sea and with a heavy wind, to throw a projectile from the shore over the vessel. It is a comparatively easy thing to throw a projectile carrying the life line from the vessel to the shore. There have been two cases recently where these projectiles have been found serviceable. One was the case of the steamer Whitesboro, on the coast of California. That vessel went ashore 100 miles from a life-saving station, and by means of one of these projectiles was enabled to get a line to the shore and thus to save the entire crew, officers, and passengers.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. Is it not a fact that in that case the captain reported that if they had not had these appliances they could have gotten the line ashore just the same?

Mr. LODGE. I understand they said that when the tide went down, six hours later, they probably could have done so.

Mr. WISE. It was testified before the committee that the same results exactly would have followed if they had not had those appliances.

Mr. LODGE. That testimony has not been printed, but I understand it was stated by some of the witnesses that at low tide, six hours later, a line could have been thrown ashore—that the captain so stated.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these projectiles are merely for the protection of the public. The argument made by the steamship companies is that the projectile-makers formed a combination to put up the prices of projectiles.

The makers of the projectiles deny that statement. I do not know whether it is true or not. I do know that there is an unpatented projectile known as the "Lyle" projectile which is used by the Government, which the inspectors are authorized to pass, and which any steamship company can use.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Does not the evidence taken before the committee show that in experiments with the Lyle gun it burst or failed to produce the desired result in every single instance but one?

Mr. LODGE. I was not aware that the testimony was to that effect. I know that by law the companies are allowed to use the Lyle projectile.

Mr. LOCKWOOD again rose.

Mr. LODGE. I can not yield for further interruption. The gentleman has his own time. But, Mr. Speaker, the Lyle projectile is not the only one that they can get. I merely mentioned it to show that there was at least one unpatented projectile which the companies could use. There are a great many of these projectiles of different kinds and different makers. The only reason for the opposition to the existing law is that it puts a tax upon the steamboat companies and therefore they object to it. They have appeared, and they are the only persons who have appeared. There is no protest from the public against this law. The only protest is from the steamboat or steamship companies, and their attitude is just the same as that of every other corporation; they do not want to be put to extra expense. We know how such legislation has been resisted in the matter of the heating of railroad cars by stoves. We know that corporations, whose first business is to make money, are always slow to take up any of these improvements.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the existing act is in the interest of the public. I believe it is necessary to have on all vessels carrying passengers some means of getting a life-line to the shore. I believe it is necessary on the lakes. If it is not necessary on the lakes, if human life is not in danger on the lakes, why do we maintain life-saving stations all along the lake shores? Why does this Government spend a million dollars a year in life-saving stations if there is no danger? The fact is there is danger on the lakes and on the bays and on the sounds, the same danger that there is anywhere else to those who travel by water and go down to the sea in ships. There is abundant competition in the manufacture of these projectiles for the steamship companies to secure such as will comply with the law without undue expense,

and I repeat that the sole reason for the pending bill is to relieve these companies from what they consider an odious and unjust tax. That is, they do not wish to be compelled to pay for carrying appliances which only two years ago the Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service and Inspector of Steam Vessels said were necessary for the protection of the public, not merely on ocean-going steamships, but on lakes, bays, and sounds as well. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I think a plain statement will convince members of this House that this bill ought to be passed. I can understand why the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is opposed to it, because the only person who appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in opposition to this measure was a constituent of his—

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman will allow me to say that such is not the fact.

Mr. WISE. Well, he is a citizen of Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I dare say he may be.

Mr. WISE. And the only reason that he gave for his opposition was, not that this appliance is necessary, but that the legislation requiring it furnishes a market for his device.

The gentleman has referred to Gen. Dumont, the Supervising Inspector-General. If members of this House will read this report they will find what Gen. Dumont thinks. When he appeared before our committee he was asked the question, Is such a device necessary? He answered, "No;" and said that to require its use is an imposition upon the steamers of this country in the interest of a barefaced monopoly.

That is not all. The Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service was examined by our committee, and stated that on the bays and sounds of this country it is impossible that this apparatus can ever be of any use, and that fifteen years' experience had shown no occasion when it could have been of any use on the lakes.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, every witness examined on this subject (and we gave long hearings before that committee) testified that this projectile is unnecessary, and that to require vessels to be supplied with it is an outrage in the interest of a few manufacturers. Nobody is its advocate but those manufacturers and those who represent them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LODGE. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Seven minutes.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to make it clear to the House that the manufacturer to whom the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE] has alluded is not a constituent of mine. I am not speaking or appearing in his interest at all.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman a question for information. The answer may affect my vote and the votes of others. What is the cost to a vessel of complying with the present provision of the statute on this subject?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that this apparatus costs from \$100 to \$150.

Mr. WISE. About \$200, as we were informed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Is there any testimony as to whether it has added, or is capable of adding, to the security of the lives of passengers?

Mr. LODGE. Yes, sir; there are cases which I have cited—

Mr. WISE. I will state to my friend from Kentucky that the testimony before our committee was that this appliance is altogether unnecessary on the bays, sounds, and lakes.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman is occupying my time; and I do not yield. I am delighted to answer any question of the gentleman from Kentucky, but I object to having my time used by the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, the testimony taken before the committee was unfortunately not printed; but I understand that the testimony of the Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service was that for fifteen years there has not been an accident on the lakes where a life-saving line was necessary. That does not prove that such an accident may not happen at any moment. I will also call the attention of the House to the fact that Gen. Dumont, who supports this bill, stated in the first instance that it had the uniform approval of all concerned, and it was only when it was found to impose this tax upon the steamers that it was suddenly discovered to be such an "infamous" thing, and also suddenly discovered that there was a dangerous monopoly in life-saving projectiles.

Gentlemen have spoken of one individual in my State as interested in the manufacture of a projectile of this kind. There are dozens of such projectiles patented in this country; and the makers absolutely deny that there has been any combination among

them to raise the price. The House can choose between the statements of the two companies, steamship and projectile, and I care very little myself which may be preferred. The point I wish to make in behalf of the public and of the safety of the public is that in my opinion this Government will make a mistake if it should repeal a law which has for its purpose the maintenance of proper safety appliances on board steamships, whether ocean-going or engaged in passenger traffic upon the lakes, bays, and sounds.

I reserve the rest of my time.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHIPMAN].

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Speaker, in replying to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] I wish to say that there are no men more anxious and more prompt to adopt life-saving appliances than the steamboat owners of the lake country; but en masse, without a single exception, they protest against Congress imposing upon them the duty of employing these life-line projectiles. Almost to a man—indeed I know of no exception—they condemn this apparatus as entirely unnecessary; as a needless expense put upon them in the interest of the manufacturers of the apparatus.

I wish to call attention to the report of the Board of Supervising Inspectors of Steamboats on this subject. They are a body of men from every section of the country. They do not act in the interest of any particular section or any particular set of men, but they represent the entire merchant marine of this country. And without a dissenting voice they state in their report that no practical or theoretical reason (this is almost their language) can be given for the presence of this apparatus on board of our vessels on the lakes, rivers, and sounds. The Supervising Inspector-General has given a similar opinion; and so has Mr. Kimball, the Superintendent of the Life-Saving Bureau of the Government. So that the inspectors, the Life-Saving Bureau, and, with one accord, the vessel men, in our part of the country at least, say that these things are unnecessary.

I have been wrecked on those lakes; I have traveled them in every kind of craft, from a bark canoe to the largest steamer, and I know that this apparatus is unnecessary and its requirement is a needless imposition upon the vessel-owners—simply a tax upon them; and when you reflect that the shipping of those lakes is greater than the shipping of the entire seaboard, you can imagine what an immense tax upon that branch of industry this requirement is. Hence the shipowners and all persons interested have come forward and made a demand for the passage of such an act as this. In the Fiftieth Congress and again in the Fifty-first they asked a suspension of the operation of this law as to the lakes. They now desire a permanent repeal; and I hope that in the interest of the shipping industry the House will pass this bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, there is one point to which perhaps attention has not been sufficiently called—that the existing law does not require the steamers to use any special projectile; they are at liberty to adopt any apparatus they choose that is approved by the board of inspectors. And the danger to the public, as far as I can make out from the arguments advanced here to-day, is that in case of wreck the public will be endangered by the bursting of the gun in the effort to throw the life line. This would seem to be a remote danger compared to that of drowning, but still it seems to be the danger alleged by the friends of the bill.

I now yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I represent neither a manufacturing nor a navigation district. We have no great establishments for manufacturing in that district, nor have we any great lakes or bodies of water for shipping; but I think that I do in this case represent the interests of the traveling public. The law we have already in existence favors our inland and coastwise trade by protecting it from competition from all foreign sources. But it requires vessels to provide necessary appliances to preserve human life.

The act which this bill proposes to repeal is in the interest of human life. It does go towards that end. The projectiles furnish means for obtaining, in the face of storm or wreck, to the passengers that security for which they have contracted with the companies. The manufacturers naturally desire the act to remain; the ship companies desire its repeal. The markets of the world are open to the steamship companies to buy such projectiles as they please, so there is no question of monopoly or patent. It is simply a question whether we shall take sides with the steamship companies, with the companies engaged in the manufacture of these projectiles, or shall we take sides with the traveling public? I am in favor of protecting the interests of the traveling public, and in favor of giving to the steamship companies—



Mr. LOCKWOOD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It is a mistake to say that this is a question between the public and the steamship companies. The facts were in evidence before the committee—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I have but two minutes and I hope the gentleman will not consume my time.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Well, will you not allow me to read an extract from the report of the inspector of steamboats, to show that these appliances on board the vessels are a menace to human life?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman has had his own time.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. The fight is not between the steamboat companies and the projectile companies.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. That the gentleman thinks is no doubt true; but, Mr. Speaker, whom do we represent? We do not represent either the steamboat companies or the projectile companies. We represent the people who travel—our constituents, the public. What is fair as between the steamship companies and the projectile companies? It is fair to the steamship companies to have opened to them the markets of the world. It is fair that as they have the gift of no competition by foreign ships they shall make human life secure. It is fair to the projectile companies that there shall be open competition for supplying the steamships with the life-saving appliances. What, then, to the public, our constituents? Why, to require every appliance necessary to give safety to life. We do it already in requiring the steamship companies to have life-preservers, to have inspections of their boilers, to have their pilots licensed, and in various other ways we put on them the duty of protecting human life. This is in that direction; and do not let us, under the pretense that this is a fight between the steamship companies and the projectile companies, take from human life one of the safeguards that it is within the power of Congress to give to it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this is not a fight between the steamship companies and the projectile companies; that the question of human life is as dear and sacred to the steamship companies as to anyone else on the face of the earth. But this is a fight between the projectile companies, who are trying to force on the steamship companies an article which is not in the interest of and is not a safeguard to human life as interpreted by the steamboat inspectors of the country, and they are undoubtedly the best judges. If the gentleman had read the report of the steamboat inspector he would have seen that the projectiles on board of these vessels are regarded as more dangerous to human life than when the vessels are not supplied with them at all.

Mr. BUSHNELL. How?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Because they are likely in case of fire to be exploded, and human life is more endangered by having them on board than if the vessel was not supplied with them.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If this bill is passed will it repeal the law compelling these steamship companies to carry some sort of life-preserving apparatus in the shape of life lines?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. That would depend altogether upon the action of Congress hereafter. I will say to the gentleman that this law is in existence now, but it has never been enforced.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Then, if this present law is repealed, there will be no requirement for carrying life lines on the vessels of this class on these lakes?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Oh, yes. But there is no law requiring them to carry a projectile for throwing the life line to the shore. The law has not required that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Do you not think there ought to be?

Mr. WISE. The testimony is that there ought not to be.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from New York whether the chief of the Life-Saving Service has stated to the committee that this protection is not needed?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. The chief of the Life-Saving Service has stated in his communication to this Congress that it is absolutely worthless so far as the protection to human life is concerned.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The chief of the Life-Saving Service or of the Steamboat Inspection Service?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. The chief of the Life-Saving Service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD] that the rules be suspended and the bill passed.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. LODGE), there were—ayes 105, noes 23.

Mr. LODGE. I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. As many as are in favor of ordering tellers will rise and be counted.

Mr. LODGE. I am entitled to tellers anyway, no quorum having voted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to tellers, if he makes the point.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point that no quorum has voted.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 24, not voting 131; as follows:

## YEAS—174.

Abbott,	Culberson,	Lane,	Reyburn,
Alexander,	Curtis,	Lanham,	Richardson,
Amernan,	Cutting,	Lawson, Va.	Rife,
Arnold,	De Armond,	Lawson, Ga.	Rockwell,
Babbitt,	Dickerson,	Lester, Ga.	Sayers,
Bacon,	Edmunds,	Lewis,	Scott,
Bailey,	Elliot,	Lind,	Seerley,
Baker,	Ellis,	Little,	Shively,
Bartime,	English,	Livingston,	Shonk,
Barwig,	Epes,	Lockwood,	Smith,
Beeman,	Everett,	Long,	Snodgrass,
Beitzhoover,	Fithian,	Lynch,	Snow,
Bentley,	Flick,	Magner,	Sperry,
Blanchard,	Forney,	Mallory,	Stephenson,
Blount,	Fowler,	Martin,	Steward, Ill.
Bowman,	Fyan,	McAleer,	Stewart, Tex.
Branch,	Gantz,	McClellan,	Stockdale,
Brawley,	Geary,	McDonald,	Stone, C. W.
Bretz,	Goodnight,	McGann,	Stone, W. A.
Bricker,	Gorman,	McKaig,	Stout,
Brookshire,	Grady,	McMillin,	Tarsney,
Brosius,	Greenleaf,	McRae,	Taylor, E. B.
Brown,	Hall,	Mitchell,	Taylor, V. A.
Bryan,	Hallowell,	Montgomery,	Terry,
Buchanan, Va.	Hamilton,	Moore,	Tillman,
Bunting,	Harries,	Mutchler,	Tucker,
Busey,	Hatch,	Newberry,	Turpin,
Butler,	Haugen,	O'Donnell,	Van Horn,
Bynum,	Hayes, Iowa	O'Neill, Mo.	Watson,
Cadmus,	Haynes, Ohio	Otis,	Weadock,
Caminetti,	Heard,	Page, Md.	Wever,
Campbell,	Hemphill,	Parrett,	Wheeler, Ala.
Caruth,	Henderson, N. C.	Patterson, Tenn.	Wheeler, Mich.
Castle,	Herbert,	Patton,	White,
Cate,	Holman,	Payne,	Wike,
Causey,	Hopkins, Pa.	Paynter,	Willcox,
Chipman,	Hopkins, Ill.	Pearson,	Williams, N. C.
Clark, Wyo.	Houk, Tenn.	Perkins,	Williams, Ill.
Clover,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Pickler,	Wilson, Mo.
Cobb, Ala.	Jolley,	Pierce,	Wilson, W. Va.
Covert,	Jones,	Powers,	Wise,
Cox, N. Y.	Kilgore,	Price,	Youmans,
Cox, Tenn.	Kribbs,	Quackenbush,	
Craig, Pa.	Kyle,	Ray,	

## NAYS—24.

Belknap,	Cheatham,	Halvorson,	McKinney,
Bergen,	Coburn,	Harmen,	O'Neill, Mass.
Boutelle,	Coolidge,	Henderson, Ill.	O'Neill, Pa.
Bowers,	Crosby,	Hitt,	Randall,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Cummings,	Hooker, Miss.	Stevens,
Bushnell,	Doan,	Lodge,	Taylor, J. D.

## NOT VOTING—131.

Alderson,	Dalzell,	Johnstone, S. C.	Robinson, Pa.
Allen,	Dantell,	Kem,	Rusk,
Andrew,	Davis,	Ketcham,	Russell,
Atkinson,	De Forest,	Lagan,	Sanford,
Bankhead,	Dingley,	Lapham,	Scull,
Belden,	Dixon,	Layton,	Shell,
Bingham,	Dockery,	Lester, Va.	Simpson,
Bland,	Dolliver,	Lord,	Springer,
Boatner,	Donovan,	Mansur,	Stachouse,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dungan,	McCreary,	Stalmecker,
Broderick,	Dunphy,	McKeighan,	Stone, Ky.
Brunner,	Durborow,	McKenna,	Storer,
Buchanan, N. J.	Enloe,	Meredit,	Stump,
Bullock,	Enochs,	Meyer,	Sweet,
Bunn,	Fellows,	Miller,	Taylor, Ill.
Burrows,	Fitch,	Milliken,	Taylor, Tenn.
Byrns,	Forman,	Morse,	Townsend,
Cable,	Funston,	Moses,	Tracey,
Caldwell,	Geissenhainer,	Norton,	Turner,
Capehart,	Gillespie,	Oates,	Wadsworth,
Catchings,	Griswold,	O'Ferrall,	Walker,
Chapin,	Grout,	Outhwaite,	Warner,
Clancy,	Hare,	Owens,	Warwick,
Clarke, Ala.	Harter,	Page, R. I.	Washington,
Cobb, Mo.	Henderson, Iowa	Pattison, Ohio	Waugh,
Cockran,	Hermann,	Peel,	Whiting,
Cogswell,	Hoar,	Pendleton,	Williams, Mass.
Compton,	Hooker, N. Y.	Post,	Wilson, Ky.
Coombs,	Houk, Ohio	Raines,	Wilson, Wash.
Cooper,	Huff,	Rayner,	Winn,
Cowles,	Hull,	Reed,	Wolverton,
Crain, Tex.	Johnson, Ind.	Reilly,	Wright,
Crawford,	Johnson, Ohio	Robertson, La.	

Accordingly, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the rest of this day:

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. FUNSTON.

Mr. HARTER with Mr. TOWNSEND.

Mr. CRAIN of Texas with Mr. SWEET.

Mr. BULLOCK with Mr. SANFORD.

Until further notice:

Mr. DUNPHY with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. GILLESPIE with Mr. DALZELL.

Upon this vote:

Mr. MOSES with Mr. WADSWORTH.

THE FREE-WOOL BILL.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of revenue bills; and, before that motion is put, I desire to ask a courtesy of the House that I think it will not be slow to grant. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, of whose recent illness all are apprised, is able to come into the House to-day. He has prepared, and desires to have read, a speech that will occupy twenty-five or thirty minutes, as he states. We did not know of this fact when we closed the general debate, and I desire that he be permitted to speak, notwithstanding the order closing general debate.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my associates upon this side of the House I join most heartily in the request, and I hope there will be unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Illinois be allowed to occupy twenty-five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BURROWS. I hope that the time will not be limited to twenty-five minutes. I hope he will be allowed to occupy as much time as he desires.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. McMILLIN was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 6007) to place wool on the free list and to reduce the duties on woolen goods.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the first section of the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That on and after the 1st day of January, 1893, the following articles, when imported, shall be exempt from duty, namely: All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all wool and hair on the skin, all nolls, top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, card waste, bur waste, rags, and flocks, including all waste or rags composed wholly or in part of wool.

At this point Mr. SPRINGER entered the Hall, amid loud applause on the floor and in the galleries.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the bill is to be read?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill has never been read. At the beginning of the debate on the bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] asked unanimous consent that the reading be suspended for the time being. The Chair will submit any request to dispense with the first reading.

Mr. McMILLIN. I would suggest that we dispense with the reading at this time, in order that there may be the one reading when it is considered by sections.

Mr. BURROWS. Either way will be satisfactory to us.

Mr. McMILLIN. The first section having been read, I suggest that after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] shall have concluded his remarks, the section may then be considered open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to know what is desired. Does the gentleman ask to dispense with the first reading of the bill?

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes, sir.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped on this occasion to be able to make some extended remarks on the pending bill, but the condition of my health is such that I am admonished that I can not do so. I have prepared a brief statement, however, which I will ask my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] to read for me.

Mr. BRYAN then read for Mr. SPRINGER the following:

In the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, which I had the honor to submit through the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] on March 1, 1892, to accompany the bill (H. R. 6007) "to place wool on the free list and to reduce the duties on woolen goods," the following statement appears on pages 20 and 21:

PRICES OF WOOL IN THE UNITED STATES AND ENGLAND.

Your committee requested the Bureau of Statistics to furnish it with a statement showing the prices of wool of the same quality in the United States and Europe, from 1865 to this time. The Bureau of Statistics referred the matter to Mr. S. N. D. North, the secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, at Boston, Mass., and the special agent of the Census Office in charge of statistics of woolen manufactures. Mr. North procured the statement desired from a firm of wool merchants in Boston, which is everywhere recognized as authority in matters of this kind. The letters of Mr. North and the statement referred to are published in the appendix to this report. (See Appendix J.)

Mr. North, in transmitting this statement, explains that, in order to institute comparisons between the prices of wool in the United States and in

Great Britain, the Ohio medium washed wool has been agreed upon by those in the trade as the grade of wool corresponding to the Port Phillip fleece, an Australian wool of substantially the same quality. Mr. North also explains that the Boston prices of the Ohio wool are given in currency from 1866 to 1879, when specie payments were resumed in the United States. The English prices are all in gold. For the purposes of comparison the Boston prices should also be stated in gold. The premium on gold in 1866 was such that a currency dollar was only worth 71 cents, and steadily declined until 1879, when specie payments were resumed. To the table, as given by Mr. North, has been added a column giving the gold values of the American wool from 1866 to 1878, inclusive. It will be seen by reference to this table that the London and Boston prices of these grades of wool varied but little from year to year down to and including 1890. The statistics for 1891 have not yet been furnished.

It will appear that there were times when the London prices were greater than those in the United States; but a general average would show little difference between the Boston and London prices. As these prices are based on washed wool, the duty on foreign wools would be 23 cents a pound; and if that amount of duty furnished protection to that extent to the American wool-grower this grade of American wool ought to be worth 22 cents a pound more in the United States than the same grade of wool in London. Instead of this, however, omitting the unusual years of 1871 and 1872, in which the prices were unnaturally affected by wild speculation, we find that the American wool for the remaining twenty-three years averaged a little less in price than the foreign wool. This fact shows that the American wool-growers do not receive any increase whatever in the prices of their wool by reason of the tariff on foreign wools. This failure of protection to protect the wool-grower may be explained by calling attention to the conditions of wool manufacture in the United States.

Wool manufacturers, as a rule, do not manufacture goods until they receive orders. This precaution is necessary in order to guard against overproduction. The orders indicate the quality of the goods desired by American consumers for the ensuing season. These qualities of goods can be produced only by the admixture of foreign wools with native wools, and by combining with these whatever of cotton, shoddy, and other adulterants may be used to advantage. The manufacturer, then, first determines the amount of foreign wool required, the amount of cotton, shoddy, and other adulterants that may be used to advantage, and the amount of domestic wool which will be required to complete the component parts of his orders. The domestic wool, therefore, is confined to a limited market. Its only purchasers are American manufacturers. They purchase only what they can use to advantage. The remainder is left in the market or in the hands of the producers; and, if there is a large yield, prices must of necessity be depressed.

As the American producer of wool can not sell abroad at a profit, he must await the pleasure of the woolen manufacturers, who are his sole patrons, and take such prices as may be fixed in the home market, which prices will always be determined by the demand and supply. A mild winter, for instance, which would cause a falling off of consumption, would tend to depress the prices of woolen goods, and consequently the prices of wool. There are many contingencies which affect prices of all kinds, but as a rule they are governed by the inexorable law of supply and demand. If there be a large supply of American wool in the American market and a small demand, prices will be low; if there is a small supply and a large demand, prices will be high. A high protective tariff on wool has the direct effect of limiting the demand for American wools, for the reason that under such tariffs neither domestic wools nor domestic manufacturers of wool can be exported and sold at a profit; and that amount only of domestic wool will be purchased and consumed which will be required to mix with the foreign wool which must be used to produce the required quality and quantity of goods to supply the home market.

Thus it will be seen that the foreign wool used in this country by manufacturers does not come into competition with domestic wool. The one is the complement of the other, just as the wood and iron in vehicles are complements of each other, a given amount of each being required to complete the finished product. That which most competes with domestic wool is shoddy, every pound of which used in the manufacture of woolen goods displaces 1 pound of scoured wool or 3 pounds of wool in the grease.

The Appendix J, to which reference is made in the foregoing statement, is printed on pages 39 to 41, inclusive, of said report. It will be seen from the foregoing statement that "Your committee requested the Bureau of Statistics to furnish it with a statement showing the prices of wool of the same quality in the United States and Europe from 1866 to this time." This request was transmitted to Mr. S. N. D. North, who is not only the special agent of the Census Office in charge of statistics of wool manufactures, but also the secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, whose principal office is at Boston, in the State of Massachusetts. Mr. North, on February 8, 1892, addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, printed on pages 39 and 40 of said report, in which he states as follows:

I may add that the grade of Australian wool which most nearly corresponds to the Ohio washed fleece wool is the Port Phillip fleece, and this is the line of quotations, which should be studied to ascertain the relative London and Boston prices of wool at any given time.

There was transmitted with this letter a diagram, published by said association, which showed these prices by marks. This was not deemed satisfactory; and on the 12th of February, 1892, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means wrote to Mr. North, requesting him to furnish a table compiled from the diagram previously forwarded, showing in parallel columns the average Boston prices of Ohio medium-washed fleeces and the average London prices for corresponding dates of Port Phillip fleece from 1866 to 1891. To this letter, Mr. North replied, under date of February 15 last, in which a table of Messrs. Mauger and Avery, of Boston, was furnished, with the statement that "the Port Phillip fleece is a washed wool, as is also the Ohio fleece quoted." This table is headed "Average price in Boston of Ohio medium wool and average price in London of Port Phillip fleece in American currency, 1866 to 1890, both washed wools."

The table is printed in full in Appendix J, herewith attached. The Ohio wool is given in currency down to 1878, when specie payments were resumed. The American currency prices were reduced to a gold basis by an expert in the Treasury Department, and are given in the table printed on page 44 of the committee's report.

The chairman of the committee requested an expert of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department to compute the annual average price of said wools for the twenty-five years covered by the table; and also the average annual price for twenty-three years, omitting the years 1871 and 1872, with the following result:

Average annual price of wool for the twenty-five years:	
Port Phillip.....	Cents. 41.04
Ohio.....	41.48
Difference in favor of American wool.....	.44
Average annual price of wool for twenty-three years, omitting 1871-72:	
Ohio.....	40.26
Port Phillip.....	40.52
Difference in favor of foreign wool.....	.26

The reason for making a computation leaving out the years 1871 and 1872 is as follows: In the bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers of December, 1891, page 362 *et seq.*, appears an article by Mr. Charles F. Avery, of the firm of Mauger & Avery, entitled "Twenty-five Years of the World's Wool Markets," which concisely recites for each year of the past twenty-five years the causes of the fluctuations as revealed in contemporaneous wool circulars and the records of that firm. Under the head of "1871" Mr. Avery says:

July—Great falling off in clip of the United States.  
October—Speculation in wools and woolens.  
December—Fabulous profits realized by speculators.

Under the head "1872:"

January—Wild speculation in wools of all kinds.  
February—Prices advancing.  
March—Wools contracted for on the sheep's back in Ohio and Michigan, at 65 to 70 cents per pound.

These quotations from Mr. Avery's article explain the unsettled and speculative character of the wool market for the years 1871 and 1872, and render them unfit for comparison as a normal condition of the market. Hence an annual average price of wool for twenty-three years was computed, omitting the years 1871 and 1872, with the result above stated, namely: Ohio, in Boston, 40.26 cents; Port Phillip, in London, 40.52 cents; showing a difference in favor of foreign wool of twenty-six one-hundredths of a cent, or a little over one-quarter of a cent a pound.

This annual average for twenty-three and twenty-five years had doubtless never been made before; and hence, when Mr. North furnished this table to the Committee of Ways and Means, he was undoubtedly uninformed or in the dark as to what a general average would be. When this publication was made the Boston Journal of Commerce stated, in commenting upon this fact, that the table "furnished by Mr. SPRINGER, of the Ways and Means Committee, was unfortunate and inadvertent, and a purely clerical error." Thereupon, Mr. North addressed a communication to the editor of the Journal, in which he states:

The clerical error was made by Mr. SPRINGER in utilizing the figures furnished him for a purpose foreign to that for which they were compiled.

He further stated:

The table was not intended to show relative cost, but simply relative fluctuations in price, which is a very different thing.

Mr. North having inadvertently "let the cat out of the bag," as it were, by furnishing the Committee of Ways and Means with the tables, true in every detail, but the meaning of which he did not then comprehend, now endeavors to retract or explain away the true meaning of the table. In this he has utterly failed.

I call the attention of this House and of the country to the article published in the December number of the Bulletin, a periodical published quarterly by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, of which Mr. North is himself the editor, and therefore the author of the article from which I am about to quote. On page 362 of that number, he proceeds to explain the diagram, a copy of which he first sent to the committee, as follows:

The purpose of this diagram is to demonstrate the truth of the proposition, elaborated in the last number of the Bulletin, that the price of wool in the United States varies in sympathy with the price of wool in the markets of the world; that its value here is determined primarily by its value in those markets; and that, in order to correctly interpret its rise and fall, we must be in possession of all the facts regarding the general business conditions in this and other countries, and particularly the conditions surrounding the wool manufacture.

From this extract it will appear that the price of wool in the United States varies, not in accordance with the tariff on wool, but "in sympathy with the price of wool in the markets of the world; that its value here is determined primarily by its value in those markets, and that, in order to correctly interpret its rise

and fall, we must be in possession of all the facts regarding the general business conditions in this and other countries, and particularly the conditions surrounding the wool manufacture."

This is precisely the position taken by your committee in the extract heretofore quoted and published on pages 20 and 21 of the committee's report. It is not the tariff that controls the price of American wool, it is the value of wool in the world's market. However, Mr. North in the editorial referred to on page 363 says:

That the price of Ohio washed fleece wool, previous to the last two years has quite uniformly been higher than the price of the nearest corresponding grade of Australian wool (Port Phillip fleece), but rarely by the full amount of the duty upon class 1 wool.

Here it will be seen that Mr. North states distinctly that the Ohio washed fleece is the American wool which most nearly corresponds in grade to the Australian or Port Phillip fleece.

The committee called upon the Bureau of Statistics to furnish it with prices of an American wool which was of the nearest corresponding grade of some foreign wool, so as to determine the relative value (which is always determined by the price) of like quality in both markets. This information was given; and the Ohio washed fleece and the Port Phillip fleece have been recognized by the mercantile world for more than a quarter of a century as wools of the nearest corresponding grade. And these two wools, being of nearest corresponding grade, it will appear by the table furnished for the twenty-three years indicated, are of practically the same value in both countries; for value is determined by price, the price at which each sold, showing that on the average the foreign wool was worth a quarter of a cent more in London than the Ohio wool was worth in Boston. In the Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Growers for the quarter ending September, 1891, there appears an editorial, doubtless furnished by Mr. North, in which he says:

The sympathy of markets is world wide; and the law of supply and demand penetrates everywhere, as surely as water seeks its level. The tariff permits us to largely control our own market; but, even when controlling it, we must accept values that are beyond our control. (Page 250.)

Here Mr. North admits that the tariff on wool permits us "to largely control our own market." In this statement, Mr. North inadvertently gives away his case. The American wool merchants do control the home market; and the price which the farmer gets is largely controlled by them, always having in view the fact that they must also accept values which are beyond their control.

Mr. North further states, on page 257 of the same bulletin, as follows:

The foreign wools imported do not represent an equal number of pounds of domestic wool displaced, but increase the market for domestic wool.

If the foreign wool increases the market for domestic wool, why not let it come in without attempting to keep it out by a tariff of 11 cents a pound in the grease, 22 cents a pound washed, or 33 cents a pound scoured?

And further, if the foreign wools do not displace the domestic, there is no competition between the two; and, if no competition, the tariff on the foreign wools would not affect the price of the domestic. The fact here stated by the Bulletin that the foreign wools do not displace the domestic, but increase the market therefor, is precisely the position contended for by revenue reformers; and it will not be surprising if protectionists who still believe that the tariff on foreign wool actually raises the price of the domestic should denounce the Bulletin, which is the organ of the wool manufacturers, as a "free-trade sheet, in disguise, supported by the Cobden Club with British gold."

It should be remarked in this connection that the word "Ohio" applied to wools is not limited to wools grown in that State, but to all wools of like grade in the United States. The Ohio medium wool and the Port Phillip fleece, being both washed wools, the tariff on the importation of the Port Phillip fleece, would be 22 cents a pound. If protection to American wool protected to the amount of the tariff, the Ohio wool should be worth 22 cents a pound more than it actually was during the twenty-five years covered by the present high tariff.

In May, 1872, the price of Ohio medium as appears by the table printed on page 41 of the committee's report, reached 70 cents in gold, and the price of Port Phillip fleece in London was only 47 cents, a difference of 23 cents in favor of Ohio wool. This is the only time since the wool tariff of 1866 at which the American producer realized the protection to which he was entitled, if protection actually protects in his case. This circumstance is explained by Mr. Avery, as heretofore stated, showing the "wild speculation in wools of all kinds in the United States" and also by the further fact which appears in a table printed on page 33 of the report, namely, that during the year 1872 the imports of foreign wool reached 126,000,000 of pounds, while the average imports of wool for the five years preceding was only 44,000,000 of pounds for each year.

This immense increase in importations brought the foreign wool into competition with the domestic. It will also be seen

that the production of domestic wool for 1872 was only 150,000,000 of pounds while the production for 1869 was 180,000,000, thus showing a large falling off in production and immense increase in imports. These two facts explain the conditions which prevailed in 1871 and 1872 and described by Mr. Avery, and caused the "fabulous profits realized by speculators," etc. But, allowing the Ohio wool this advantage, which existed but for one month, the general average for the twenty-five years showed less than half a cent a pound more in value in the Ohio wool than the corresponding grade of Australian wool in London.

Mr. North, on page 258 of the same article, gives the following encouragement to the American wool-grower:

There is, therefore, nothing in the situation which need alarm or discourage the American wool-grower. He must learn to be satisfied with a small profit on his wool.

This may be consoling to the American wool-grower. He must, under a high protective tariff, expect smaller profits on his wool. If, however, he would only realize that protection does not protect him, that he does not get as much for his wool under high protection as he would get without it, he need not be content with smaller profits on his wool.

"Foreign wools," as Mr. North truly states, "will not displace an equal number of pounds of domestic wool, but will increase the market therefor." An increased demand will produce an increased price. The pending bill is in the interest of the wool-grower as well as the wool manufacturer; but it is especially in the interest of the American consumer. If the report of your committee is carefully considered, it will be seen that "the experience of the past quarter of a century of high protective tariffs on wool and on woolen goods has proved to be disastrous to the wool-grower, disastrous to the wool manufacturer, and disastrous to the American consumers."

It may be asked, how, under free wool, can woolen goods be cheaper if native wool is higher? The answer is, that the foreign wool, which is subjected to a tax of 44 cents upon the amount of such wool in a pound of cloth, will come in free; and that such mills as the Arlington will not be permitted to earn dividends amounting to 50 per cent per annum. Take off the tax on foreign wool, permit healthy competition, and prices of woolen goods must fall. Consumers will get the benefit of all that is now paid on foreign wool, and of all that is now charged for protection on cotton, shoddy, and other adulterants.

#### INCREASED CONSUMPTION.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the fact that the placing of raw sugar on the free list and the corresponding reduction of the duty on the refined product by the act of October 1, 1890, caused an increased consumption of sugar to the amount of 23.86 per cent during the year 1891, the first year after its passage; which is nearly 24 per cent.

Pass this bill and a similar result will follow. It will, in all probability, cause an increased consumption of woolen goods to an equal amount. Such an increase in the consumption of woolen goods during the first year after its passage will cause a demand for 597 more woolen establishments, including the 271 establishments which were idle during the census year of 1890, to be started up again.

It will demand an increase of capital in such establishments to the amount of \$74,000,000; an increase in materials to be used to the amount of \$48,000,000; an increase to the amount of \$80,000,000 in the product of woolen mills; a demand for 61,000,000 pounds more of domestic wool, and for 27,000,000 pounds more of foreign wool; it will give employment in woolen factories to 52,000 more hands, and will increase the amount of wages to be paid to such hands to the amount of \$18,000,000.

With increased demand for wool, prices of wool will increase; and, with increased demand for labor, wages will also increase.

Pass this bill, and thousands of feet heretofore bare, and thousands of limbs heretofore naked or covered with rags, will be clothed in suitable garments; and the condition of all the people will be improved. Those who favor its passage may be assured that they have done something to promote the general weal, something—

To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land.

[Loud and prolonged applause.]

#### APPENDIX.

Mr. SPRINGER obtained leave to print in the RECORD the following extracts from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, which he prepared to accompany the bill (H. R. 6007) to place wool on the free list and to reduce the duties on woolen goods, with some comments thereon, and an article from a magazine on the same subject:

#### THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

The bill provides for the admission free of duty of all wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and of wool and hair on the skin, rolls, top waste, and other wastes, and rags composed wholly or in part of

wool; and also repeals what are known as compensatory duties on woolen goods and reduces the ad valorem duties on such goods. It also repeals the compensatory duties upon carpets of all kinds, rugs, and mats, and reduces the ad valorem duties thereon from 40 per cent ad valorem to 30 per cent ad valorem. It also reduces the duties upon certain qualities of waste which have been advanced beyond the condition of scoured wool, by the use of machinery or by the application of labor, to 25 per cent ad valorem. The duty on shoddy, mungo, and certain other wastes is put at 25 per cent ad valorem. The provisions of the bill are to take effect the 1st day of January, 1893. It also provides that goods in public store or warehouse under bond at that time may be taken out by the payment of the rates provided for in this bill. This provision renders it unnecessary to provide drawbacks and will enable manufacturers and dealers to dispose of the higher-taxed stocks on hand before the bill takes effect.

The rates of ad valorem duties prescribed in the act of October 1, 1890, were fixed at from 30 to 60 per cent; and in connection with these ad valorem rates, duties per pound and per square yard were imposed upon woolen goods and carpets embraced in Schedule K of said act. The combined ad valorem and specific duties under existing law were estimated by the Treasury Department pending the consideration of the bill in the Fifty-first Congress, based upon the actual importations of the year ending June 30, 1889, at an average of 91.76 per cent on woolen goods and carpets. This was an increase over the average rates then in existence, which were 67.15 per cent. If the bill reported by your committee should become a law the paragraphs relating to woolen goods and carpets would be so amended as to read as follows (the marginal figures indicating the rates ad valorem of the combined ad valorem and specific duties, under existing law, as estimated by the Treasury Department, as above stated) namely:—

#### THE LAW AS PROPOSED.

391. On woolen and worsted yarns made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

Valued at more than 30 cents and not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

Valued at more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

392. On woolen or worsted cloths, shawls, knit fabrics, and all fabrics made on knitting machines or frames, and all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, not specially provided for in this act, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

Valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

Valued at above 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

393. On blankets, hats of wool, and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty shall be 25 per cent ad valorem.

Valued at more than 30 and not more than 40 cents per pound; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound; upon all the above-named articles, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

On blankets and hats of wool composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animal, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

Flannels, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at above 50 cents per pound shall be classified and pay the same duty as women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character and description provided by this act. [That is, 35 and 40 per cent ad valorem, according to quality.]

394. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character or description of which the warp consists wholly of cotton or other vegetable material, with the remainder of the fabric composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Valued at above 15 cents per square yard, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That on all such goods weighing over 4 ounces per square yard the duty shall be 35 per cent ad valorem.

395. On women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloth, bunting, and goods of similar description or character composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, and not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That, on all such goods weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

396. On clothing, ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, not specially provided for in this act, felts not woven and not specially provided for in this act, and plushes and other pile fabrics; all the foregoing, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, the duty shall be 45 per cent ad valorem.

397. On cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part, the duty shall be 45 per cent ad valorem.

398. On webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, and tassels, dress trimmings, laces and embroideries, head nets, buttons, or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms, for tassels or ornaments, wrought by hand or braded by machinery, any of the foregoing which are elastic or nonelastic, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, or other animals is a component material, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

399. Aubusson, Axminster, Moquette, and Chenille carpets, figured or plain, carpets woven whole for rooms, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, and oriental, Berlin, and other similar rugs, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

400. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 30 per cent ad valorem.

a The Treasury expert did not furnish the ad valorem rates upon woolen cloths, knit fabrics, etc., in this paragraph (392), but only the rates on worsteds, in classes 1 and 2. The rates ad valorem under the whole paragraph were pointed out in the testimony of Mr. Ernest Werner before the Senate Finance Committee (post p. 5), wherein it appears that the average on such goods in this paragraph, upon the samples he submitted, under existing law, was 120.93 per cent. Upon one of the samples, the rate was 151.85 per cent ad valorem.

b No imports reported and no rates given.

c See also testimony of Daniel McKeever (post pages 5, 6) wherein it appears that some of the articles embraced in this paragraph are taxed in the existing law as high as 255 per cent ad valorem.

401. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets, or carpeting of like character or description, 30 per cent ad valorem.
402. Velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 30 per cent ad valorem.
403. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 30 per cent ad valorem.
404. Treble ingrain, three-ply and all chain Venetian carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem.
405. Wool Dutch and two-ply ingrain carpets, 30 per cent ad valorem.
406. Druggets and bookings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 30 per cent ad valorem.
- Felt carpeting, figured or plain, 30 per cent ad valorem.
407. Carpets and carpeting of wool, flax, or cotton, or composed in part of either, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.
408. Mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bed sides, art squares, and other portions of carpets or carpeting made wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this act, shall be subjected to the rate of duty herein imposed on carpets or carpetings of like character or description. (That is, 30 per cent ad valorem.) (See report, pages 1, 2, 3, and 4.)

#### BURDEN OF THE WOOL TARIFF.

Extract from an article published in the North American Review for February, 1892, (vol. 154, pp. 132-137,) entitled:

#### "HOW TO ATTACK THE TARIFF."

"The placing of wool on the free list and a corresponding reduction of the duties on woolen goods are a matter the importance of which can not be overestimated. The duties on woolen goods were increased by the McKinley bill from an average of 57.15 per cent to 91.65 per cent. The increase on wool was from 34.32 to 40.66. The duties imposed on woolen goods are of a twofold character: First, there is a duty per pound or per square yard, which is intended to compensate manufacturers for the higher price which they claim they must pay for wool by reason of the tariff; and second, a duty ad valorem, being, as is alleged, imposed to compensate for the higher-priced labor of this country as compared with foreign countries.

"The duties per pound or per square yard are especially burdensome upon the cheaper grades of goods worn by the masses of the people. These specific duties frequently amount to over 100 per cent of the value, and in some cases to over 200 per cent. If these specific or compensatory duties are repealed, the ad valorem duties only will remain, and these do not exceed in any case 60 per cent, and are frequently as low as 35 per cent. The average, perhaps, would amount 45 per cent. This is the amount of protection which the friends of the protective system have adjudged is necessary to prevent injurious competition from abroad. But if wool is placed upon the free list, and the compensatory duties upon woolen goods are repealed, the manufacturers of woolen goods will have no reason to complain of their new conditions; on the contrary, while the people will get the benefit of a reduction of more than one-half of the tariffs on woolen goods manufacturers will have the benefit of cheaper material and will be enabled to sell their products abroad in competition with the products of other countries. Thus a larger market will be secured for woolen goods; there will be a greater demand for labor in establishments of this kind; and new industries, it is confidently expected, will spring up in all parts of the country.

"It is next to impossible to estimate accurately the amount which the consumers of the United States pay annually on account of woolen goods. The amount of such goods made in the woolen mills for the census year 1890 was valued at \$344,000,000. This does not include the output of ready-made clothing establishments for men and women; nor does it include the cost to consumers of the work done by tailors and dressmakers; nor the labor bestowed in the manufacture of woolen goods in the families of the country. The amount of woolen goods imported into the United States for the year 1890 was valued at over \$56,000,000 and the average duty paid upon these goods was 67 per cent, the McKinley bill not having been passed at the close of that fiscal year. The output of factories and ready-made clothing establishments and the amount of goods imported with the tariff added to them is given at factory or wholesale prices. The amount paid by consumers will undoubtedly be increased at least 25 per cent over such prices.\*

"When all the facts are taken into consideration it will be seen that the consumers of woolen goods in the United States paid during the census year 1890, in money and in labor, at least \$750,000,000 for the woolen goods actually consumed and purchased. Just how much of this amount is due to the tariff on wool and woolen goods can not be estimated with accuracy, but it is reasonable to assume that not less than \$150,000,000 of this cost is due to the tariff on wool and woolen goods. At least half of this amount would be lifted from the shoulders of the people annually by placing wool upon the free list, and repealing the compensatory duties on woolen goods. This estimate does not take into consideration the large increase in the tariff on wool and woolen goods made by the McKinley bill.

"So far as wool is concerned, the McKinley bill has completely failed to accomplish the object which its authors claimed they had in view. In the report which accompanied the bill, when it was brought into the House of Representatives, it was stated that in every case of increased duty, except upon tin plate and linen fabrics, "importations would fall off." It was stated to be the aim of the committee to fix the duties upon manufactured goods and farm products so as to discourage the use of like goods and products and give our producers the benefit of the home market, and also to afford ample protection to the farmers of the country engaged in wool-growing. The protection on wool, which the bill secured, was claimed to be sufficient beyond doubt, to enable the farmers of the United States, at an early day, to supply substantially all the home demand. This was the argument made by the authors of the bill to justify the imposition of increased duties upon wool, and as a compensation for the increased duties on woolen goods.

"Time is a cruel arbiter. It is no respecter of persons. It visits upon false theories and false pretenses the judgments which they deserve. The statement of the imports of the United States, furnished by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, shows that the imports of wool for the ten months ending October 30, 1890 (the McKinley bill took effect October 6, 1890), amounted to 88,000,000 pounds; while the imports for the ten months ending October 30, 1891—the ten months next after the passage of that bill—were over 119,000,000 pounds, an increase of over 30 per cent. Thus are the theories upon which the McKinley bill was constructed crushed by the irresistible force of facts.

"But this is not all. The increased duties on woolen goods were, as claimed, made necessary by the increased duties on wool. The manufacturers of woolen goods were satisfied with the old law; but if the duty on wool was to be increased, they must be compensated by an increased duty on woolen goods. The increase was made, as stated above. The statistics show that, for the ten months ending October 30, 1890, the imports of woolen goods were valued at over \$49,000,000, while those for the ten months ending October 30, 1891, were valued at only \$29,000,000, a decrease of over 41 per cent. It also appears that the price of wool has averaged from 2 to 3 cents a pound less since the passage of the McKinley bill than it was when the bill passed. The only

\* This estimate is too low. The increase would amount to 40 per cent.

beneficiaries of the measure are the manufacturers of woolen goods, and it is doubtful whether they will, in the end, receive substantial benefit therefrom. The wool-growers and consumers of woolen goods have not been benefited; on the contrary, they have been greatly injured thereby.

"Legislators who regard the interests of the people can not disregard these facts. It is their duty to apply a remedy for existing evils, and to correct the blunders of their predecessors. Every consideration of the public weal demands that wool shall be placed on the free list, and that the compensatory duties on woolen goods shall be repealed. If the present Congress does not respond to this demand, it will be derelict in duty.

"A measure which would bring such immediate and substantial relief will not be regarded with indifference. It would bring relief to the consumer as well as the manufacturer, and redound to the prosperity of the wage-worker as well as the capitalist."

"The other measures which may be passed by the House of Representatives during the first session of this Congress and to which reference has already been made, will attract universal attention and be received with great favor. They will remove the most glaring inequalities of our tariff laws and bring immediate relief to those most entitled to consideration. They will be especially aimed at monopolies and other combinations to limit production and oppress labor.

"It is futile to attempt that which can not be accomplished. A good general will not waste his ammunition and resources in assaults upon an impregnable fortress when there are forces of the enemy encamped upon the open field within convenient reach. The friends of tariff reform should waste no time in endeavoring to secure that which is beyond their reach. Their time can be well employed in attacking the weak and exposed points of their enemies' lines. By pursuing this course there will be no step backward in the cause of genuine tariff reform. Everything should be done and will be done to bring about a thorough and complete revision of our tariff laws at the earliest time practicable. Such revision should be in the interest of the consumers of the country, but brought about by such conservative methods as will not embarrass any legitimate industry in the country or deprive labor of one day's employment or of one cent of its just remuneration. On the contrary, any revision of the tariff ought to be followed by an increased stimulus to industries, increased demand, and better wages for labor; and by lower prices for manufactured articles which are most necessary to the health and comfort of the people.

"An issue thus directed to the weakest points of the McKinley bill would be much easier of comprehension and more conducive to successful, aggressive warfare than one encumbered by the endless details of a general revision of the tariff, requiring defensive arguments, and arraying the whole protected industries of the country upon the weakest points of the measure. The importance of preserving the McKinley bill as a distinctive issue in the Presidential campaign should not be lost sight of. Its general provisions are wholly indefensible; it deprives labor of its just reward, fosters monopolies, and encourages combinations of capital to limit production and to control prices. It was enacted in the interest of the favored few and for the oppression of the masses of the people. Opposition to the objectionable features of this measure, coupled with a demand for genuine tariff reform, should be the paramount and overshadowing issue in the Presidential contest; and upon that issue the Democratic party is already assured of success, not only in the election of a President, but of a Congress Democratic in both branches.

"WILLIAM M. SPRINGER."

#### FREE SUGAR INCREASES CONSUMPTION.

The increased consumption of woolen goods which will result from placing wool on the free list and reducing the duties on such goods may be approximately ascertained by reference to the increased consumption of sugar which resulted from admitting raw sugar free of duty, and reducing the duties on the refined product. The weekly statistical report on the sugar trade, January 7, 1892, of Messrs. Willett & Gray, of the New York Trade Journal, contains the following statement on this point:

"The year 1891.—Full detailed statements for 1891 are given in the 'Statistical,' with comparisons for ten years. In 1891, the receipts of sugar were, at New York, 824,081 tons; Boston, 193,661 tons; Philadelphia, 491,396 tons; Baltimore, 25,849 tons; a total of 1,534,987 tons at the four ports. Receipts of foreign sugar at New Orleans, 88,928 tons; San Francisco, 136,534 tons. No sugar was received into the United States through any other ports. Total receipts of foreign sugar in 1891 were 1,760,449 tons, against 1,338,047 tons in 1890. The domestic crop of Louisiana is estimated at 180,000 tons, against 220,000 tons last year; the crops of Florida and Texas, at 7,000 tons. The beet-root sugar production in the United States in 1891 was 5,400 tons, and of sorghum sugar 570 tons, and of maple sugar 22,000 tons, and of molasses sugar 31,320 tons. The total production of the United States is 246,290 tons, against 280,000 tons last year. The total consumption of sugar in the United States in 1891 was 1,885,994 tons (say 1,619,704 tons foreign, 234,970 tons domestic, 31,320 tons home manufacture from foreign molasses), against 1,522,731 tons in 1890 (say 1,257,232 tons foreign, 212,000 tons domestic, 53,499 tons home manufacture from foreign molasses). The increased consumption of 1891 over 1890 was 363,263 tons, or 23.86 per cent, and the consumption for each individual (per capita) 67.46 pounds, against 54.56 pounds in 1890.

"The importation of refined sugar in 1891 was 2,772 tons at New York, 1,227 tons at Philadelphia, 1,025 tons at New Orleans, and 833 tons at San Francisco. The export of raw and refined sugar in 1891 was 29,837 tons from the four ports, 4,693 tons from San Francisco, and 212 tons from New Orleans. The extra increase of 18 per cent in consumption above the usual average yearly increase of 5 per cent is due directly to the free sugar tariff and the extreme low range of prices ruling during the entire year with small fluctuations. We do not look for an increase in 1892 much, if any, above the nominal rate of 5 per cent, especially as the range of prices in 1892 will be on a higher level than in 1891."

The probabilities are that there will be a greater per cent of increase in the consumption of woolen goods if the pending bill should pass than occurred in the case of sugar.

(See report of Committee on Ways and Means (No. 501) on free wool.)

#### APPENDIX J OF REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

##### PRICES OF WOOL IN BOSTON AND LONDON.

[National Association of Wool Manufacturers, office, 70 Kilby street. Officers for 1892: President, William Whitman, Boston, Mass. Vice-presidents, John L. Houston, Hartford, Conn.; A. C. Miller, Utica, N. Y.; Thomas Dolan, Philadelphia, Pa.; Theodore C. Search, Philadelphia, Pa. Secretary, S. N. D. North, Boston, Mass. Treasurer, Benjamin Phipps, Boston, Mass.]

BOSTON, MASS., February 8, 1892.

DEAR SIR: In writing you the other day, at the request of the Superintendent of Census, giving you such information as was in my possession regarding the prices of domestic wool for a period of years, I neglected to inclose copies of a diagram recently published by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, which shows the fluctuations in the prices of Ohio fine and Ohio medium washed wools for a period of twenty-three years, or since

the enactment of the tariff of 1867; and also the corresponding prices of colonial wools of the several descriptions in the London market.

The publication of this diagram in the December bulletin of this association was accompanied by an elaborate review of the conditions surrounding the domestic and the English wool markets for the entire period, which was prepared by Mr. Charles F. Avery, of the well-known firm of Mauger & Avery, and to which you are respectfully referred.

Copies of this diagram are inclosed, and additional copies will be forwarded for the use of your committee if they should be desired at any time.

Very respectfully yours, S. N. D. NORTH, Secretary and Special Agent Eleventh Census.

Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C. (See report, page 39.)

BOSTON, MASS., February 15, 1892.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of February 12, and take pleasure in inclosing herewith, as requested, a table compiled from the diagram previously forwarded to you, showing in parallel columns the average Boston prices of Ohio medium washed fleeces and the average London prices for corresponding dates of Port Phillip fleece, from 1866 to 1890.

The Port Phillip fleece is a washed wool, as is also the Ohio fleece quoted. The London prices are reduced to American money. It should be observed that these London prices are uniformly gold prices, while the American prices are average prices in currency, until the resumption of specie payments, January 1, 1879.

I also send you by this mail a copy of the last bulletin of this association, in which you will find the notes of Mauger & Avery, indicating the condition of the domestic and the English wool markets during each of the years covered by this table.

With great respect, I have the honor to be your obedient servant. S. N. D. NORTH, Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, Chairman Ways and Means Committee.

In the table which follows a separate column has been added to show the gold prices of American wool.

Table with 2 columns: Wool type (Ohio, Port Phillip) and Price (Cents). Shows average annual price for 25 years.

Table with 2 columns: Wool type (Ohio, Port Phillip) and Price (Cents). Shows average annual price for 23 years, omitting 1871-72.

Average price in Boston of Ohio medium wool and average price in London of Port Phillip fleece in American currency, 1866 to 1890—both washed wools.

[London quotations from Windeler & Co. American prices from Mauger & Avery, Boston.]

Main data table with columns for Year, Month, Ohio medium (currency/gold), and Port Phillip fleece (gold). Rows cover years 1866 to 1875.

Average price in Boston of Ohio medium wool and average price in London of Port Phillip fleece in American currency, 1866 to 1890—Continued.

Continuation of the main data table, covering years 1885 to 1891.

\* The prices reduced to a gold basis were calculated upon the value of currency at the dates indicated as given in the quarterly report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879.

S. N. D. NORTH, Secretary National Association of Wool Manufacturers, Boston, Mass. (See report, page 41.)

APPENDIX K OF REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE WORLD'S WOOL MARKETS.

[From the Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, December, 1891, pages 362 et seq.]

At the request of the secretary of the national association, Mr. Charles F. Avery, of the firm of Mauger & Avery, has very kindly and with much labor prepared a series of notes on the state of the domestic and foreign markets for each year covered by the diagram [1866-1890\*], concisely reciting the causes of the fluctuations as revealed in contemporaneous wool circulars and the records of the firm.

Prominent events and statistics affecting the value of wool in America and Europe from 1866 to 1890.

Summary of wool market events and statistics for America and Europe from 1866 to 1890. Includes sections for AMERICA and EUROPE with detailed descriptions of market conditions, price fluctuations, and import/export statistics.

THE GROWTH OF SHODDY INDUSTRY.

The statistics of the growth of this new industry will prove of interest. By reference to the volume on industry and wealth, census of 1870, the statistics for the manufacture of shoddy for that year were given as follows:

Number of establishments	58
Hands employed	632
Capital	\$815,950
Wages	198,372
Materials	1,098,603
Products	1,708,592

These figures show that the industry was fairly prosperous during the decade between 1860 and 1870. The capital employed was increased 561 per cent; and there was an increase in the value of the product to the amount of 339 per cent. The statistics of shoddy manufacture are given more in detail on page 72 of Volume II, on Manufactures, of the census of 1880, where the following table will be found:

1880.

160.—Shoddy.

States.	Number of establishments.	Capital.	Average number of hands employed.			Total amount of wages paid during the year.	Value of materials.	Value of product.
			Males above 16 years.	Females above 15 years.	Children and youths.			
<b>The United States.</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>\$1,165,100</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>\$400,326</b>	<b>\$3,368,650</b>	<b>\$4,989,615</b>
Connecticut	2	86,000	93	38	8	35,345	261,200	347,500
Illinois	13	22,000	16	12	3	12,300	74,500	100,000
Maine	1	6,000	4	1	3	1,905	7,200	12,000
Maryland	1	5,000	5	4	6	3,100	14,150	22,500
Massachusetts	30	490,500	334	105	32	173,439	1,308,715	2,305,885
New Hampshire	2	17,300	13	8	2	5,700	38,900	49,600
New Jersey	1	35,000	10	5	1	25,000	80,734	137,500
New York	7	32,700	43	32	3	33,610	321,220	407,500
Ohio	1	250,000	30	216	—	40,000	575,000	700,000
Pennsylvania	11	186,000	90	40	13	47,441	510,977	655,895
Rhode Island	6	49,600	51	26	6	18,590	137,054	195,045
Vermont	2	15,000	6	9	—	3,895	37,000	56,000

It will be seen from the table of materials consumed (in Appendix O) that the wool consumed in wool manufactures 1890 was 372,873,713 pounds. This was wool in the grease, and should be reduced, according to the legal rate of loss, 66 2/3 per cent. It will thus be seen that in 1890, in the manufacture of woolen goods of every kind in this country, there were used 124,291,238 pounds of pure wool and 154,130,890 pounds of shoddy, cotton, and other adulterants (not including camel's hair and mohair), the adulterants, exceeding the amount of pure wool, the ratio being 45 parts of pure wool to 55 parts of adulterants.

It can not be said that these adulterants were principally used in the manufacture of carpets and felt goods, for the table above given shows that of the 61,626,261 pounds of shoddy consumed 51,862,397 pounds were used in the manufacture of woolen goods.

The statistics of shoddy manufacture for 1890 have not yet been published, but your committee has been furnished the following statement:

Shoddy, 1890.

States.	No. of establishments.	Sets of cards.	Value of product.
<b>United States</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>\$39,208,011</b>
Connecticut	7	47	648,000
Illinois	3	12	182,110
Maine	2	11	63,670
Massachusetts	23	174	2,287,455
Michigan	1	11	Idle.
New Hampshire	2	10	47,807
New Jersey	4	19	450,709
New York	6	13	618,783
Ohio	3	43	1,377,500
Pennsylvania	33	73	2,343,701
Rhode Island	10	36	1,188,216

\*The ninety-four establishments given above, manufacture shoddy, waste, etc., exclusively; but the gross product includes shoddy, waste, etc., made at all other mills as well, which was not the fact in the returns for 1880.

From this statement it will appear that the number of establishments has increased from 73 in 1880 to 94 in 1890; and the value of the product has increased from \$4,900,000 to \$39,208,011, the increase being nearly 83 per cent. It appears from Mr. North's table that the shoddy used in the manufactures of woolen goods of all descriptions in the census year of 1890 amounted to 61,626,261 pounds.

According to the statement furnished your committee by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, printed in the appendix to this report (Appendix D), there were produced in the United States in the year 1890 276,000,000 pounds of wool.

These figures represent the wool in the grease, and in reducing it to scoured wool there will be a loss of 66 2/3 per cent, which shows that the scoured wool produced in that year amounted to only 92,000,000 pounds. Thus it appears that the shoddy consumed in the United States in the census year of 1890 had a cloth-producing power equal to 67 per cent of all the wool which was produced in the United States for that year; in other words, that the scoured wool produced amounted to 92,000,000 pounds, while the shoddy consumed amounted to 61,626,261 pounds.

The whole number of sheep in the United States for the census year of 1890 was 44,336,072. The fleeces amounted to 276,000,000 pounds. These fleeces produced 92,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, while the 94 establishments engaged in manufacturing shoddy produced a wool product equal to that of 29,005,168 sheep. (See report, pages 18 to 20.)

APPENDIX O OF REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

TABLE NO. 1.—Detailed statement of materials consumed in wool manufacturing industries.

Class.	Year.	Foreign wool.	Domestic wool.	Shoddy.	Animal hair.	Cotton purchased.
		Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.
Total of all industries	1890	114,116,612	258,757,101	61,626,261	16,865,764	75,638,865
	1880	73,200,698	222,991,531	52,163,926	6,335,169	48,000,857
Woolen goods	1890	16,822,138	168,525,805	51,862,397	9,619,277	37,158,712
	1880	20,482,667	177,042,288	46,583,983	4,497,524	24,744,964
Worsted goods	1890	37,869,023	59,832,451	2,608,831	1,063,690	3,881,743
	1880	15,687,815	25,461,511	190,800	519	1,757,842
Felt goods	1890	1,689,588	5,039,495	1,450,384	2,355,928	395,032
	1880	709,067	4,204,806	2,406,849	1,728,000	1,181,500
Wool hats	1890	259,325	4,278,628	306,351	147,600	—
	1880	1,864,139	6,107,471	1,368,562	7,436	185,400
Carpets, other than rugs	1890	54,742,234	2,145,632	653,154	3,645,066	1,755,761
	1880	34,008,252	2,029,318	90,469	96,540	—
Hosiery and knit goods	1890	2,734,304	18,935,089	4,745,144	14,173,32	447,617
	1880	448,758	8,146,137	1,523,293	5,150,20	131,151

TABLE NO. 2.—Summary classification of woolen manufacturing industries.

Industries.	Year.	No. of establishments.	Capital.	Miscellaneous expenses.	Value of all materials.	Value of products.
Aggregate for all industries.	1890	2,503	\$314,300,944	\$19,547,200	\$303,065,642	\$338,231,109
	1880	2,689	159,091,869	—	164,371,551	267,252,913
Woolen goods	1890	1,312	137,930,014	8,511,292	82,184,666	133,612,827
	1880	1,990	96,095,564	—	100,845,611	160,606,721
Worsted goods	1890	143	72,194,642	4,980,187	50,644,342	79,194,652
	1880	76	20,374,043	—	22,013,628	33,540,942
Felt goods	1890	34	4,589,021	233,621	2,809,187	4,654,768
	1880	26	1,958,254	—	2,530,710	3,619,662
Wool Hats	1890	32	4,369,181	251,818	2,799,791	5,329,921
	1880	43	3,615,830	—	4,785,774	8,516,569
Carpets other than rugs	1890	175	39,769,441	1,839,569	28,649,031	47,801,499
	1880	195	21,468,587	—	18,964,877	31,792,802
Hosiery and knit goods	1890	807	55,457,642	3,730,714	36,008,625	67,637,442
	1880	359	15,579,591	—	15,210,951	29,167,227

(See report, page 71.)

EFFECT ON SHEEP HUSBANDRY.

Attention is also called to a statement showing the number of sheep in States east of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers at different periods from 1868 to this time, printed in Appendix B attached to this report; also, to a statement showing the number of sheep in the States and Territories west of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers from 1860 to 1891, inclusive, published in Appendix C to this report. It will be seen by reference to those statements, that in February, 1868, there were 37,011,000 sheep in the States east of those rivers, and that these were the States, with the exception of California, in which nearly all the sheep of the country were to be found at that time. The act imposing high duties upon wool was passed March 2, 1867, and the enumeration of sheep in February, 1868, may be regarded as the number on hand at the time of the passage of that bill, or within less than a year thereafter.

The States whose representatives were instrumental in securing the legislation of 1867 have not been benefited by that legislation if the encouragement of sheep-raising was the object had in view. Take for instance the State of Ohio. In 1868 there were 6,730,000 sheep in that State; in 1870 the number had fallen to 4,928,000; in 1880 to 4,680,000; in 1883 to 5,050,000; in 1890 there were only 3,943,000 reported; while in 1891 the number was given at 4,061,000. This shows a falling off of more than one-third of the number of sheep in Ohio during the twenty-four years of high protective tariff on wool. During that time the population of Ohio has increased from 2,665,360 in 1870 to 3,672,316 in 1890.

A similar result was produced in the State of Illinois, which had in 1868, 2,736,000 sheep, while in 1891 there were only 771,000 in the State. Similar results took place in all of the other States east of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. There were 37,685,000 sheep in those States in 1868; and only 18,476,000 in 1891; a falling off of more than one-half during the twenty-four years in which high tariffs on wool have been in force. The population in the mean time in those States has probably doubled. If the number of sheep had kept pace with the increase of population, there would have been in those States at this time at least 75,000,000 sheep.

It will be seen by reference to Appendix C that the increase in the number of sheep in the United States has been in States west of those rivers or in localities where there was a free range upon the public domain. There were in the whole United States in 1868 nearly 39,000,000 sheep, as appears by a note to Appendix B; at this time there are only 43,000,000, an increase of 4,439,000 in twenty-four years, the whole increase being in sheep upon the ranches of the West. The States which secured the legislation, and which it was supposed would be benefited, have lost more than half the number of sheep which they had at the time the act of 1867 was passed.

In 1867, the year in which the wool-tariff act was passed, there were only 38,000,000 pounds of wool imported into the United States; which was 19 per cent only of the wool consumed in this country. In 1891 there were 129,000,000 pounds of wool imported; which was 30.8 per cent of the total consumption of the country. Thus it appears that there is at this time 62 per cent more of foreign wool consumed in this country, as compared with the whole amount consumed, than there was in 1867. The wool-growers of 1867 believed that the imposition of high tariffs on wool would secure them the control of the home market. The result proves how greatly they were mistaken and how ineffectual the law has been to produce the condition which they desired. (See report of Ways and Means Committee, pages 10 and 11.)

APPENDIX B OF REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Statement showing the number of sheep in the States east of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers during the years named.

Table with 11 columns (States, 1860, February 1868, 1870, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881) listing sheep counts for various states from Alabama to Wisconsin and a Total row.

Table with 11 columns (States, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891) listing sheep counts for various states from Alabama to Wisconsin and a Total row.

\*Total number of sheep of all ages, February, 1868, in the above States and five other States reported, was 33,991,912, and their aggregate value was \$98,407,800; but in the States east of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers the total number was 37,994,609. (See report, page 31.)

S. G. BROCK, Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, January 22, 1892. (See report, page 32.)

APPENDIX C OF REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Statement showing the number of sheep in the States and Territories west of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers from 1860 to 1891.

Table with 10 columns (States and Territories, 1860, 1870, 1880, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891) listing sheep counts for various states and territories from Louisiana to Wyoming and a Total row.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, January 22, 1892.



## APPENDIX D OF REPORT OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Quantities of wool produced, imported, exported, and retained for consumption in the United States from 1840 to 1891, inclusive.

Year ending June 30—	Production.	Exports of domestic.	Domestic retained for consumption.	Imports.	Exports of foreign.	Foreign retained for consumption.	Total consumption, foreign and domestic.	Consumption which was foreign.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Per cent.
1840a	535,802,114		35,802,114	9,898,740	85,528	9,813,212	45,615,326	21.5
1850	652,516,959	35,898	52,481,061	18,695,294		18,695,294	71,176,355	26.3
1860	660,264,913	1,055,928	59,208,985	26,282,955	157,064	26,125,891	85,334,876	30.6
1863	106,000,000	355,722	105,644,278	75,121,728	708,850	74,412,878	180,057,156	41.3
1864	123,000,000	155,482	122,844,518	91,250,114	223,475	91,026,639	213,871,157	42.6
1865	142,000,000	466,182	141,533,818	44,420,375	679,281	43,741,094	185,274,912	23.6
1866	155,000,000	973,075	154,026,925	71,287,988	852,045	70,435,943	224,462,868	31.0
1867	160,000,000	307,418	159,692,582	38,158,382	619,614	37,583,798	197,231,350	19.0
1868	168,000,000	558,435	167,441,565	25,467,336	2,801,852	22,665,484	190,107,049	11.9
1869	180,000,000	444,387	179,555,613	39,275,925	342,417	38,933,509	218,489,122	17.8
1870	162,000,000	152,892	161,847,108	49,230,199	1,710,053	47,520,146	209,367,254	17.7
1871	160,000,000	25,195	159,974,805	68,058,028	1,305,311	66,752,717	226,727,522	29.4
1872	*150,000,000	140,515	149,859,485	*126,507,409	2,343,937	124,163,472	274,022,957	45.3
1873	158,000,000	75,129	157,924,871	85,496,049	7,040,386	78,455,663	236,380,534	33.2
1874	170,000,000	319,600	169,680,400	42,939,541	6,816,157	36,123,384	205,803,784	17.5
1875	181,000,000	178,034	180,821,966	54,901,780	3,567,627	51,369,407	232,156,969	29.1
1876	192,000,000	104,768	191,895,232	44,642,836	1,518,426	43,124,410	235,019,642	18.3
1877	200,000,000	79,599	199,920,401	42,171,192	3,088,957	39,082,235	239,002,636	16.3
1878	208,250,000	347,854	207,902,146	48,449,079	5,952,221	42,496,858	250,399,004	16.9
1879	211,000,000	60,784	210,939,216	39,005,155	4,104,616	34,900,539	245,839,755	14.2
1880	232,500,000	191,551	232,308,449	128,131,747	3,648,520	124,483,227	356,791,676	34.9
1881	240,000,000	71,455	239,928,545	55,994,236	5,507,534	50,486,770	390,415,247	17.3
1882	272,000,000	116,179	271,883,821	67,861,744	3,831,836	64,029,908	376,035,557	19.0
1883	290,000,000	64,474	289,935,526	70,575,478	4,010,043	66,565,435	356,500,961	18.7
1884	300,000,000	10,393	299,989,607	78,350,651	2,304,701	76,045,950	376,035,557	20.6
1885	308,000,000	88,006	307,911,994	70,596,170	3,115,339	67,480,831	375,392,825	18.0
1886	302,000,000	146,423	301,853,577	129,084,958	6,584,426	122,500,532	424,404,109	28.9
1887	285,000,000	257,940	284,742,060	114,038,030	6,728,292	107,309,738	392,051,798	27.4
1888	269,000,000	22,164	268,977,836	113,558,753	4,359,731	109,199,022	378,176,858	28.9
1889	265,000,000	141,576	264,858,424	126,457,729	3,263,094	123,224,635	388,083,059	31.8
1890	276,000,000	231,042	275,768,958	105,431,285	3,288,467	102,142,813	377,911,776	27.0
1891	285,000,000	291,922	284,708,078	129,308,648	2,638,123	126,670,525	411,378,603	30.8

\* Observe the decrease in the production of wool and the increase of imports for the year 1872—facts explained in Mr. SPRINGER's remarks. Also, in Appendix B, above, observe the decrease in the number of sheep between 1868 and 1870 and 1875.  
 a Year ending September 30.      b Census year.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, Washington, D. C., January 21, 1892.

(See report, page 33.)

S. G. BROCK, Chief of Bureau.

Mr. McMILLIN. I now ask that the bill be read by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, all general debate has been closed on the pending bill, which will now be read by paragraphs for debate and amendment, under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1893, the following articles, when imported, shall be exempt from duty, namely: All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all wool and hair on the skin, all nolls, top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, card waste, bur waste, rags, and flocks, including all waste or rags composed wholly or in part of wool.

Mr. BURROWS. In view of the address which has just been read for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman propose an amendment?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir. I move to strike out the words "all wools," in the fifth line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 1, line 5, after the word "namely," strike out the words "all wools."

Mr. BURROWS. I was about to say, in view of the statement which has just been read—

Mr. McMILLIN. I would like to have the amendment reported again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, insisting that it is proper to contrast the Ohio wools mentioned, in a certain state of development, with the Port Phillip wool, and stating that they are of the same grade and enter the market in the same condition, I desire to have read, or will read myself, a letter from Col. North, addressed to Mr. McMILLIN, acting chairman of the committee, in the absence of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]:

BOSTON, MASS., March 9, 1892.

MY DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the use made, in the report on House bill 6007, of a table supplied by me, and showing the fluctuations of prices in Boston and London, for a series of years, of Ohio medium-washed wool and Port Phillip fleece washed, being the grades of domestic and Australian wool most nearly alike on a chart or diagram of wool prices printed in the bulletin of this association for December, 1891.

The inferences drawn from this diagram by the report of the Ways and Means Committee differed from those which accompanied the publication of the diagram in the bulletin; and as they are incorrect, I venture to call your attention to the following facts in the case:

The purpose of the diagram was to illustrate the fact that the prices of domestic wools are dependent upon other conditions than the rates of tariff duty on wool. It was in no sense an attempt to show the relative cost to the manufacturer here and abroad of a scoured pound of wool. Hence the essential elements of such a comparison were lacking. No illusion was made to the fact that the Port Phillip fleece is skirted wool, while the Ohio wools are sent to market unskirted. Nor was anything said of the relative shrinkage of these wools.

In buying wool manufacturers invariably reckon its scoured cost. The Ohio medium wool will shrink, say 40 per cent; and, if costing 37 cents, would be worth, scoured, 6½ cents a pound. The Port Phillip washed wool will shrink, say 20 to 30 per cent, and costing 37 cents per pound, would be worth, scoured, say 50 cents per pound on the average.

None of this wool reaches the United States on account of the double duty. But the Port Phillip greasy wool, costing say 25 cents, and shrinking 50 per cent, would be worth scoured say 50 cents, to which the duty of 11 cents may be added before we reach the value of the Ohio medium wool in the same condition. You will thus readily see how many manufacturers are able to import foreign wool to advantage and pay the duty, when they are seeking special qualities for special purposes.

I much regret that a diagram of prices which was intended only to show the relative fluctuations in the prices of foreign and domestic wools, as its title indicates, should have been used by your committee for the entirely different purpose of showing the relative cost of these wools. I regret it because it not only places the committee in a false position, but myself as well. With great respect,

Very truly yours,

S. N. D. NORTH.

Secretary National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Hon. BENTON McMILLIN.

During the reading of the above communication the time of Mr. BURROWS expired, but by unanimous consent he concluded the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on a vote on his amendment?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was informed by the Clerk that the gentleman had withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. The Clerk is in error.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to what has just been read by my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] concerning Mr. North, who occupies the relation of serving two masters, or endeavoring to do so, one the Government of the United States in compiling statistics for the census, and the other the wool-growers of the United States, I only want to put Mr. North against Mr. North.

If he has been maltreated, he has maltreated himself; and neither this House nor this country will be deceived or deluded by the complaint that the table which he furnished for one purpose has been used for another. He can not complain, if he happens to prove two points, one that he wanted to prove and another that he did not intend to prove; who has the right to complain? Does he come here now and say that the statistics

he gave were false? Does he say that we have made a false appropriation of them? Not at all, but his complaint is that we have used them for a purpose that he did not intend. The truth has gotten out, and that is all that this House is concerned with. [Applause.]

This question is not what was his purpose in compiling the table; but what does the table prove.

Now, what did Mr. North himself say to this House. We called on him. He is an officer of the Government, or doing work for it, and also occupies a relation that enables him to know the facts concerning this matter. We called upon the Census Bureau for information, and the matter was referred by the Census Bureau to him. He wrote to the chairman of this committee. I am going to read both of his letters, and I want the House to pay strict attention to them, and to observe that in not one line or letter does he ever speak of the difference which he now says exists between those wools. He did not say that one was "skirted" and the other was not "skirted" in either of his letters.

Here is what he says, writing on February 8 last:

BOSTON, MASS., February 8, 1892.

DEAR SIR: In writing you the other day, at the request of the Superintendent of Census, giving you such information as was in my possession regarding the prices of domestic wool for a period of years, I neglected to inclose copies of a diagram recently published by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, which shows the fluctuations in the prices of Ohio fine and Ohio medium washed wools for a period of twenty-three years, or since the enactment of the tariff of 1867; and also the corresponding prices of colonial wools of the several descriptions in the London market.

Mind you, sir, he says that he forgot to send this diagram, and seems to regret that the committee did not have it, so as to have the light and knowledge that a sight of the diagram would shed in the committee room, and reflect on the House through the committee:

The publication of this diagram in the December bulletin of this association was accompanied by an elaborate review of the conditions surrounding the domestic and the English wool markets for the entire period, which was prepared by Mr. Charles F. Avery, of the well-known firm of Manger & Avery, and to which you are respectfully referred.

I may add that the grade of Australian wool which most nearly corresponds to the Ohio washed fleece wool is the Port Phillip fleece, and this is the line of quotation which should be studied to ascertain the relative London and Boston prices of wool at any given time.

Copies of this diagram are inclosed, and additional copies will be forwarded for the use of your committee if they should be desired at any time.

Very respectfully yours,

S. N. D. NORTH,

Secretary and Special Agent Eleventh Census.

Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER,  
Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

During the reading of the foregoing the time of Mr. McMILLIN expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I thank the gentleman.

Has he misled the House? Has he got himself into trouble? Again he had occasion to address another communication to the committee after days of reflection when, if any injustice was done him or about to be done him, he might have corrected it by adding what he now adds for the use of the other side of the House, and which has just been read by the gentleman from Michigan. And in that connection let me state that his communication to me was not received before I made my speech upon this bill, or I would have commented upon it then.

Mr. DINGLEY. Was not the letter sent to the gentleman from Tennessee by Mr. North some weeks ago?

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not know when it was sent, but I know that I did not receive it until after I had spoken here. I am not proposing, by this statement, to criticize Mr. North's method of sending the communication, but to explain my failure to reply to it when I spoke upon the bill.

Here is the other letter which he addressed to the chairman of the committee, Mr. SPRINGER.

BOSTON, MASS., February 15, 1892.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of February 12, and take pleasure in inclosing herewith, as requested, a table compiled from the diagram previously forwarded to you, showing in parallel columns the average Boston prices of Ohio medium washed fleeces and the average London prices for corresponding dates of Port Phillip fleeces from 1866 to 1890. The London figures for 1891 are not yet available, but will be forwarded as soon as possible.

The Port Phillip fleece is a washed wool, as is also the Ohio fleece quoted.

Mr. Chairman, a splendid place to put in his qualification if it was required in order to make it an intelligent estimate as to these two wools.

The London prices are reduced to American money. It should be observed that these London prices are uniformly gold prices, while the American prices are average prices in currency, until the resumption of specie payments January 1, 1875.

I ought to state here, parenthetically, that the table has been reduced to a gold basis by an expert of the Treasury Department.

I also send you by this mail a copy of the last bulletin of this association, in which you will find the notes of Manger & Avery, indicating the condition

of the domestic and the English wool markets during each of the years covered by this table.

With great respect, I have the honor to be, your obedient servant.

S. N. D. NORTH,

Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER,

Chairman Ways and Means Committee.

Sir, this committee will see that the Committee on Ways and Means made a practical use of this statement, and the use of which it and the accompanying documents were susceptible without perversion or misapplication.

Now, as to whether Mr. North has got himself into trouble with his Wool Manufacturers' Association by having, in the language of my distinguished friend the chairman of the committee [Mr. SPRINGER], "let the cat out of the wallet," is a matter with which we are not concerned. He furnishes the table; we use the table; we draw the legitimate conclusions from it. We are willing to abide by them, and to let Mr. North and the Wool Manufacturers' Association and all others concerned make the best of it. No intentional injustice was done, certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move to strike out the word "all." Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is not important for the House to inquire whether the original communication of Mr. North was capable of having the interpretation placed upon it which we find that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee did place upon it, namely, that wool in this country is substantially the same price as in foreign countries; but in view of the fact that Mr. North has since sent a communication to the acting chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means saying he did not intend that that table should convey any such impression, because such is not the fact, we must inevitably accept the interpretation which he places upon it.

Neither is it important, Mr. Chairman, that we should know what the views of Mr. North are with reference to the comparative prices of wool in London and in Boston. The price of wool in Boston and London is as well known every day of the week as the price of wheat, and we need not call upon Mr. North or any expert of the Bureau of Statistics or of the Census Department for any information on this point. Every gentleman may consult the market quotations for himself. Now, the facts are simply these, and every gentleman who will reflect must see that they can not be otherwise; that the price of wool in this country, where the grade and the shrinkage and all the other conditions that determine its scoured value are the same, is substantially the amount of the duty that is imposed upon the wool in excess of the price in South America and London.

There is no doubt about this. Gentlemen may consult the market rates any day and ascertain the facts for themselves. I have a communication from the leading wool dealers in this country, Messrs. Justice, Bateman & Co., of Philadelphia, in which they give the prices on the leading grades of clothing wool in Philadelphia and in London on the 1st day of March of this year. It is found that as to many grades of unwashed wool the difference is substantially 10 or 11 cents, and as to one grade the lowest difference, 8 cents per pound—comparing wools of the same grade, condition and shrinkage. This I find corroborated by a comparison of the cabled prices of the last London sales with the quoted prices in Boston and Philadelphia. Anyone who will consult the market quotations will find this to be the fact, and there need be no dispute about it.

Now, if it be not true that the duty upon wool, in view of the fact that we do not produce all the wool that is wanted in this country, and in view of the further fact that it costs more to produce wool in this country than it does in South America or in Australia—if it be not true, I say that, in consequence of the protective duty, wool is higher in this country than it is in London, how, then, can it be possible that the removal of the duty and the placing of wool upon the free list will reduce the price of wool, and thereby reduce the cost of cloth? If the contention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is correct that the protective duty does not increase the price of wool, then the removal of that duty will not diminish the cost of cloth. The only reduction of cost that can come from the removal of the duty on wool must come by diminishing the price of wool.

It must therefore be that, if there is any ground for the contention that the removal of this duty will diminish the cost of cloth, it must come from the reduction of the price of wool.

Now, the chairman of the committee [Mr. SPRINGER] undertook to explain how it could be that the placing of wool on the free list—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask a few minutes longer.

Mr. McMILLIN. I hope the gentleman's time will be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Maine will proceed for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think that as I have but five minutes I will occupy my time, and the gentleman from West Virginia can speak afterward.

The chairman of the committee undertook to explain how it could be that the removal of the duty upon wool would not diminish the price of wool to the farmer, while at the same time it would diminish the cost of the cloth to the consumer. What was his explanation? It was that there must be some foreign wool used in the manufacture of the cloth for the masses, and by having cheaper foreign wool to mix with our own, the lower price of the small proportion of foreign wool used would diminish the cost of the manufactured cloth without reducing the price of the domestic wool. Now, this assumption rests upon a mistake of fact, and the conclusion would not follow even if the fact existed. There are woolen manufacturers in this House, and they will tell you, if they are willing to state the facts in this matter, that we do not use foreign wool in the manufacture of goods worn by the masses. The foreign wools which are imported are used either wholly or by mixing with domestic wools in the manufacture of finer goods almost entirely.

The woolen goods used by the masses are made of domestic wool, but they can be made wholly of foreign wools and would be if foreign wools were cheaper. In other words, if the price of foreign wools under free trade was lower than that of domestic wools, not a yard of cloth would be made here of domestic wools, either partly or wholly, because the foreign wool can be imported of quantities that will exactly take the place of any wools that can be produced in this country. Therefore, if the domestic supply is to be used at all, the price of the domestic supply must under free trade go down to the price of the foreign supply. It is impossible, sir, that you can bring in foreign wool—clothing wool, I am speaking of—costing to-day without the duty 8 to 11 cents per pound less than the price received by our farmers under protection for a similar grade of wool, without reducing the price of all the wool that is produced by the farmers of this country to the extent of this difference of price, from 8 to 11 cents per pound; and unless this be done you can not by your bill reduce the cost of the cloth.

Therefore, gentlemen, you must take one or the other horn of this dilemma. If you contend that the placing of wool on the free list will not reduce the price of the wool produced by the American farmer, then you must admit that such legislation will not reduce the cost of the cloth. If, on the other hand, you contend that the placing of wool on the free list will reduce the price of domestic wool to the extent of the duty—from 8 to 11 cents per pound—and thereby reduce the cost of cloth, then you must admit that the price of every pound of wool grown by American farmers must go down to the foreign standard. There can be no escape from this conclusion.

Therefore, when gentlemen undertake to claim that by placing wool on the free list it will not reduce the price of the farmers' wool but will diminish the cost of the cloth which is made from the wool, they evidently place themselves in a contradictory position.

The only argument that can be used in this connection with any force is that employed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], the argument that the duty upon wool as well as the duty upon cloth is the exaction of a "robber" and that what is proposed to be done by this bill is to compel the "robber" farmer to disgorge his share of the "robbery," and hereafter to force the "robber" manufacturer to also disgorge.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like one minute longer to complete my sentence.

Objection was made.

Mr. DINGLEY. Very well, I will take the time hereafter. I withdraw my *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last line. For about a month I have stood the infliction of tariff speeches without wincing—just like a little man. I think the House can endure me for five minutes while I explain why I want to strike out the last line and all the lines of this bill. As preliminary to what I have to say I will read from a paragraph which I find in the New York Advertiser of March 29:

DIFFERENCE, DISTINCTION, EXTINCTION.

The farmer with a \$5,000 mortgage on his farm can, under free-silver coinage, pay it off with \$3,500 worth of silver; but, on the other hand, the wage-earner with \$500 in the savings bank will wake up to find it shrunk to \$350.

Mr. Chairman, it is in view of the narrow escape this country has recently had that I am opposed to this bill. I will read further. I read now from the Star of this city of date of March 28:

MOVEMENT OF SILVER.

The issue of standard silver dollars from the mints and Treasury offices during the week ended March 26, 1892, was \$401,619. The issue for the corresponding period of last year was \$398,935. The shipment of fractional silver coin from the 1st to the 26th instant aggregated \$705,380.

That is this kind of a dollar. [Holding up a silver dollar.] The dollar of our daddies. Now so innocent, so honest, childlike, and Bland. I say I tremble for my country when I reflect upon the narrow escape that the 371½ grains of pure silver in that dollar had a few days ago from becoming—oh, how near it came—to being debased, depraved, and degraded, and its primal elements changed. And the country going to pieces. [Laughter.] I tremble when I think of the risk that this country ran of having millions of dollars that are now being coined, all of them just like this, in the United States mints, coined under the Bland bill, instead of the bill passed by the honest-money men of this country.

This money is all right for the common people. Why, Mr. Chairman, I went over to the Sergeant-at-Arms' room and drew my pay to-day, and I happened to look at it to see what it was. Every blessed dollar that they paid me was a silver certificate. I want to congratulate the country upon one thing, and that is that it has been demonstrated that the money-changers and money-lenders of this country are abundantly able to take care of their peculiar business and their own personal interests. And now, sir, while this shadow hangs over this Chamber, because it is not dead yet; it squirms a little yet—this Bland bill—it hangs, a black shadow over the House. I tell you that while that shadow still lingers I am opposed to making any change in the revenue laws, for we may want all the dollars we can get if we make this one dishonest by coining the same thing under another law. That is the reason I am opposed to this bill. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly heard on this floor and especially from the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that the McKinley law had prevented the importation of shoddy. I ask that a statement which I send to the desk be read as bearing upon the subject, and I want to say in advance that it is from a leading Republican newspaper in the Northwest, the Chicago Tribune. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

The Clerk read as follows:

WOOL SUPPLANTED BY SHODDY AND COTTON.

The Census Bureau furnished the Ways and Means Committee with some interesting statistics about the condition of the woolen manufactures of this country in 1890. A comparison of the figures with those of 1880 will show what the imposition of duties on foreign mixing wools has done for the people. The following table gives the materials used in the manufacture of woolen goods in the two census years. Hosiery and knit goods, carpets and worsted goods are excluded:

	1880.	1890.
	Pounds.	Pounds.
Foreign and domestic scoured wool.....	109,724,000	100,246,000
Shoddy.....	46,583,000	51,862,000
Camel's hair, noils, and mohair.....	1,318,000	1,841,000
Animal hair.....	4,497,000	9,619,000
Cotton.....	24,744,000	37,158,000
Total.....	186,866,000	200,726,000

It appears from these really interesting figures that while in 1880 wool constituted 58 per cent of woolen goods in 1890 it constituted a shadow less than 50 per cent. Nine millions less pounds of wool were used in making the clothing of the people in 1890 than in 1880, though the population had increased nearly 25 per cent. More cotton, more shoddy, more cow's hair, and less wool. To make a sharper contrast it may be stated that the woolen goods of 1870 were 25 per cent shoddy and cotton and 74 per cent wool. It is stated exultantly that woolen goods kept on going down in price between 1880 and 1890 in spite of the wool duties. Why should they not? A steady process of substitution was going on. Wool at 50 cents a pound was being replaced by cow's hair at 5 cents a pound and cotton at 10. The price went down, but the quality sunk still lower.

Why this increased use of adulterants? Simply because the manufacturer was not allowed to buy freely the foreign wool for mixing purposes. They cost him from 3 to 12 cents a pound more than they did his foreign rival. If he charged up those duties to the consumer the latter bought less cloth. So the manufacturer was compelled to resort to cotton and other cheap substitutes to keep his prices down and persuade the public to buy. So while the quantity of wool employed for all purposes—woolens, worsted goods, etc.—was 25 per cent greater in 1890 than in 1880, the quantity of adulterants used increased 50 per cent. If the census were taken this year the percentage, thanks to the higher wool duties, would be greater yet.

It is curious to notice the progress of degeneration in other woolen industries. The carpets made in 1880 contained 90,000 pounds of shoddy, 96,000 of coarse animal's hair, and no cotton. There were used in the manufacture of carpets in 1890 1,755,000 pounds of cotton, 3,645,000 pounds of animals' hair, and 653,000 pounds of shoddy. Is it any wonder that carpets are cheaper, and also that they do not wear as well as they used to?

If it is desired that the people shall have cheap woolen goods which are made of wool, the way to bring it about is to put wool on the free list. Then they will be warmly and cheaply clad, and the manufacturers will do fully 50 per cent more business than they do now.

Mr. SCOTT. This same distinguished Republican authority says in another issue what I send to the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

The way to raise the price of American wool and to check the use of adulterants is to take the duties off wool. More foreign fleeces would be imported, but they would not take the place of American wool but of these adulterants and of manufactured goods now imported. Then the use of shoddy, which the Lawrences and Burrowses said they meant to stop by their high duties would be checked and cheaper wool used instead. The woolen manufacturers

must have free wool or they will resort to cheap, rotten, coarse, dishonest substitutes. Have not the consumers some interests at stake? They number sixty-five millions, and nothing could be done which would benefit them more than to free-list wool. The more foreign wool used the greater the quantity of domestic wool consumed and the better the price paid for it.

The plan of fostering the American wool industry by duties has been tried for nearly thirty years and has failed. It is time to abandon it and resort to a common-sense method.

Mr. BRICKNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last half of the last paragraph.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment or two, as I wish to make a reply to the article which has just been read from a "leading Republican journal" in the West. I desire to submit a statement from the Treasury Department, bearing date of March 1, 1892, directly upon this question of shoddy, which is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,  
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1892.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your inquiry of to-day I have to inform you that the quantity and value of woollen shoddy imported and entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1891, were as follows:

Pounds, 70; value, \$50; duty collected thereon, at rate of 30 cents per pound, \$21.

Shoddy was not separately shown in the returns of imports prior to the last fiscal year, but was included under the general head of "rags, shoddy, mungo, waste, flocks."

Very respectfully,

S. G. BROCK,  
Chief of Bureau.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS, M. C.,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

It will be seen that this is since the McKinley bill went into effect. So that in opposition to the statement of this leading Republican journal of the Northwest, the exact figures from the Treasury Department show an importation of 70 pounds of shoddy and the duty collected thereon 21 cents.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Can he give us the figures of the shoddy manufactured in this country, and which has gone with other adulterants into the clothing of our people since the McKinley law went into operation?

Mr. BURROWS. I have not the figures at hand.

Mr. DINGLEY. I can furnish them.

Mr. BURROWS. I may say further that we are consuming more wool to-day per capita than at any other time in the history of the country.

Mr. SCOTT. Consuming more shoddy, perhaps.

Mr. DINGLEY. No; less shoddy per capita and more wool.

Mr. BRICKNER. Mr. Chairman, I see by the communication of Mr. North, in which the Ohio fleece wool is mentioned, that its shrinkage is put at 50 per cent. That is correct. But by another communication, which relates to another grade of wool (and that wool is practically one-eighth of the production of the wool of the State of Ohio), its ordinary shrinkage is from 20 to 33 per cent. Therefore, Mr. North has either got his figures mixed designedly or otherwise. The two wools do not relate to the same quality at all. They are not so scheduled, and the duty is on one 11 and the other 12. I will qualify that by stating that if this is fleece-washed it is double that, or 24 cents. But they are two distinct wools.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] concerning the fact that the McKinley bill had stopped the importation of shoddy, I wish simply to say, it is true that it has stopped the importation of shoddy and of a great many other things; but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the stopping of the use of the coarser goods coming from abroad, whether shoddy or otherwise, has vastly benefited the shoddy manufacturers of this country, and they never were in as prosperous condition as they are to-day, by reason of the fact that they are able to manufacture their goods out of shoddy, out of waste, out of rags of every kind and description that have wool in them, and then to sell them at the high rate that is produced by reason of excessive taxes on woollen goods generally.

Now, we have but 44,000,000 of sheep in this country, and yet the adulterants used in the manufacture of woollen goods, including shoddy, waste, hair, rags, etc., adulterants too numerous to mention, equal the fleeces of 29,000,000 sheep, when we have only 44,000,000 sheep. The adulterants and substitutes used instead of wool, made possible in all instances, and necessary in some instances, by reason of the increased rate on woollen goods, keep alive the shoddy industry; and the adulterants of various forms, including shoddy, cow hair, cotton rags, etc., manufactured in the United States supplant 29,000,000 of sheep in this country.

Hence, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] intends to convince this House that by stopping the importation of shoddy, by the imposition of excessive rates of duty the use of it has been stopped, he entirely misleads the House. It is true that in England and other countries shoddy is extensively manufactured and very extensively used; but it is sold at shoddy prices, while in the United States it is made of shoddy and is sold

at wool prices. That is the difference; and if that condition is satisfactory to this country, the last Congress is to be congratulated for having excluded shoddy. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEARD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BRICKNER] withdraw his amendment, which the Chair takes to be *pro forma*?

Mr. BRICKNER. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I renew it.

Mr. HEARD. I have already renewed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HEARD] is recognized.

Mr. HEARD. I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. If I understand him correctly, while the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] says that the effect of the McKinley bill has been to lessen the importation of shoddy, there has been no evidence given to this House, whether there was any given before the committee or not, that the lessening of the importation has lessened its use in this country.

Mr. McMILLIN. On the contrary—and I am glad my friend calls attention to it—the statistics show that under the rate of duty imposed on woollen goods by the McKinley bill there has been an impetus given to the shoddy manufacturing in this country never known before.

Mr. HEARD. Then I say to my friend from Tennessee, I suppose the logical effect of the tariff upon this article has been reached. That is to say, it stimulates home manufactures. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I withdraw my formal amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. The proposition of this bill is to destroy woollen manufactures by admitting shoddy free.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is hardly any call for these wild statements in reference to the use of shoddy by the woollen mills of this country, in view of the fact that the wool bulletin of the census which has just been published affords accurate information respecting the actual consumption. I have that report before me.

In 1880 the consumption of shoddy in this country was 52,136,926 pounds, with a population of a little over or about 50,000,000, or something more than 1 pound to every inhabitant.

In 1890, according to the wild statements which have been made on this floor, we should see from the census report a large increase in the consumption of shoddy beyond the increase in population. Now what is the fact?

In 1890 there were 61,626,261 pounds of shoddy used by the woollen mills of this country, with a population of a little over 62,000,000, or less than 1 pound per inhabitant; whereas, in 1880 the consumption of shoddy in this country was in excess of 1 pound per inhabitant. But inasmuch as the production of woollen goods in this country between 1880 and 1890 increased in yards nearly 40 per cent, and the increased consumption of shoddy was only 17 per cent, it will be seen that there was a very decided decline proportionately in the use of shoddy in this country, instead of an increase, as gentlemen have charged.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to submit a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. I will, if it is simply a question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is in the line of the gentleman's remarks. What estimate does the gentleman from Maine make of the entire amount of woollen goods, of all characters, that are needed for the clothing and the use of the American people during the year 1891?

Mr. DINGLEY. You mean in dollars?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. What is the entire amount of woollen goods?

Mr. DINGLEY. Wool or woollen goods?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I mean of all grades that come under the heads of woollens, worsteds, shoddies, adulterants, every form of wool that by the census or otherwise is shown to be required for the clothing and use of the American people for that year?

Mr. DINGLEY. In 1890 the woollen mills of this country produced in the neighborhood of \$345,000,000 in value of woollen goods, against \$267,000,000 in 1880.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I am not talking about dollars but pounds.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am not able to state the number of pounds.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman's information is probably as correct and broad as that of any member of the House on either side, and the fact I wanted to get at is this: There is a certain amount of goods made up of wool and woollen substitutes which the American people use in a year

Now, if we have statistics that will show how many pounds of wool we actually have, it will with mathematical certainty demonstrate how many pounds of adulterants we use during the year.

Mr. DINGLEY. The statistics of the Census Bureau show the aggregate amount of pounds of wool and the pounds of shoddy used by our mills in 1890.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But there is a good deal more than shoddy used. There are very many adulterants besides shoddy.

Mr. DINGLEY. There are other things used. There is some goat's hair, some mohair, and some camel's hair; but they are not adulterants. They are used in the completed manufacture of the most fashionable goods, and are not adulterants in any proper sense. Let me say with reference to cotton, that it is used not to a large extent as an adulterant, except in cases of hosiery; and even there it is not used improperly as an adulterant, but to prevent shrinkage. Besides, in the woolen bulletin all the cotton hosiery, as well as hosiery that is part wool or all wool is included in the woolen schedule under the head of hosiery. The general fact is simply this: that we are using less shoddy per inhabitant now than ten years ago, and that Great Britain is using more shoddy than we are and more than she was ten years ago. The Boston Commercial Bulletin, a high authority on this subject, states that a careful examination of all attainable official statistics shows that in 1889 Great Britain used 160,619,441 pounds of shoddy together with 231,317,559 pounds of scoured wool.

Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the strangest feature of this discussion is that during its entire course in the arguments advanced I have failed to see a single gentleman upon the Republican side of the House who had the courage to advocate this bill, to be in favor of free wool. I do not propose, in the few minutes allotted to me, to waste any time in discussing statistics; it would be useless.

There are no statistics that can be furnished to this House that in my judgment would change a single vote on the Republican side among the small band of patriots that are left. [Laughter.] One of the signers of the Declaration of Independence is credited with the saying: "We must hang together now, or we will hang separately hereafter." They [pointing to the Republican side] are hanging together now, and the people are hanging them separately very rapidly. [Laughter and applause.]

Looking over the broad expanse of intellect and genius and wealth they comprise and represent I can not but notice what a commentary upon the American woolen industry they present. You can not find a man in that column who can stand up and say that his back is covered with anything but British broadcloth or the fabrics of other lands. Where is the man? I appreciate your intelligence and know you can not be sincere; this wool you are trying to pull over the people's eyes simply means that this aggregation of protected industries and syndicates that furnish you in your campaigns with the sinews of war must be protected and taken care of. What do the business men among you mean? You know that almost every other industry in our country has leaped beyond the barriers of protection. Our manufacturers in leather, cottons, machinery, agricultural implements, cutlery, in fact in nearly every other industry the American manufacturer is selling his goods throughout the civilized world, the only industry behind in the race is the manufacturers of woolen goods; and they will tell you themselves that if you will take this dead weight off their backs, this excessive duty on their raw material, they can go into Europe, and with American skill, superior machinery, enterprise, and superior labor they can compete in any market of the world. Do not underrate the intelligence of the people.

There is not a labor district in this country where you can stand before a body of workmen and satisfactorily explain to them how they are benefited by increasing to them the cost of their clothing from 10 to 20 per cent. There is not a man here who does not know that the actual cost is 10 to 20 per cent on every man's woolen clothing; and to that extent you have cut down the wages of every laboring man in this land. And why? To benefit what industry? To benefit the woolen industry on the rock-ribbed coast of Maine and other places where the conditions are not favorable for sheep husbandry.

Why, the men from the real sheep fields of the country, the men who raise sheep, not for ornament to nibble a little grass on their lawns or for their family use, but where they raise sheep to supply the people of the nation with their meat, and the mills with their wool, every man of them you will find to stand by this bill and vote for free wool.

I have looked over the personnel of these gentlemen who have stood up here claiming to represent the great cause of labor in this contest, a cause you know, that, while it is as broad as the earth, having its summit in heaven, has the most extraordinary representatives on earth [laughter], and I have been amazed and

amused to see those gentlemen charging around here and crying out in the name of labor.

Point to a single labor organization in the land that sustains you in continuing this robbery, for that is the plain English of it, this legalized robbery, by which, for the sake of protecting a few men, you impose such heavy and unjust burdens upon the people of this country. And if those burdens were imposed upon a class which could easily bear them, we would not object so strenuously, but they rest upon the abject poor, and affect not only their raiment, but what through the piercing cold of winter is to them their fuel, their warmth, their sustenance, their life. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. MILLIKEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending, and debate upon them is exhausted.

Mr. DINGLEY. I withdraw my formal amendment.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I renew the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat amazed at the speech of my friend from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL], indeed, he always interests and amuses everybody when he speaks. I do not know how much grass may grow in the pastures of the district which he represents, situated as it is in the city of St. Louis [laughter], nor how many sheep they raise there, but possibly the scarcity of sheep in his district may account for the character of his remarks.

But did it never occur to my friend from Missouri that you can not protect any one industry in this country and make it flourish without at the same time indirectly helping every other industry? [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] There are to-day more than a million of men engaged, either wholly or in part, in raising sheep and producing wool. If the duty on wool is a robbery it must certainly be because it raises the price of wool and therefore raises the price of cloth.

If you repeal this duty and the sheep-raising industry of this country is destroyed, then the million of men who are to-day engaged, in part or in whole, in that industry will be driven out of employment, and where are they to go? Are they going into idleness? Are they not rather going to enter other occupations, and may they not invade the occupations of the constituents of my friend from Missouri, occupations which to-day are more than full? Why sir, the constituents of the gentleman from Missouri and other men of the same class elsewhere have had their representatives in every Congress in which I have been a member, complaining of the want of labor and of opportunities to earn a living; and yet my friend from Missouri stands up here and seriously inveighs against the duty on wool, which protects the wool-grower of this country, and seriously proposes to turn out the million of men engaged in wool-growing to invade the occupations of his own constituents and others elsewhere.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I always yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Missouri, because we always receive instruction from him.

Mr. BLAND. I understand that there are only about 40,000,000 sheep in this country.

Mr. MILLIKEN. About 45,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. And we have about 65,000,000 of people. That gives us a little more than half a sheep apiece. Now, I would like to know whether the gentleman from Maine expects to be adequately clothed these cold winters with only two-thirds of a sheep's skin on his back. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Let me ask my friend from Missouri if he does not think that when even the 45,000,000 of sheep that we now have shall have gone to the slaughter pen and the 300,000,000 pounds of wool which we produce annually shall cease to be produced in this country—let me ask him if he does not think that when that is taken out of the wool production of the world it will raise the demand for wool and the price of wool?

And I ask the gentleman to remember further, that when you have destroyed the American wool-raising industry you will have given to the foreign wool-producer an absolute monopoly of our market. He will have control of your market then, and do you believe that he will not make you pay for his wool whatever price he desires for wool? Why, you can not mention an instance where we have been entirely dependent upon any foreign country for a product of general use in this country where we have placed a tariff upon that product and thus started the industry at home, that, within two or three years, we have not been able to get that product from our own people, manufactured by our own workmen, out of our own raw material, for less money and of better quality than we previously bought it from abroad. A recent case is that of what are called "black goods" in the trade. Before the tariff of 1883 we paid Europe 22 cents a yard for black goods. In 1883 we placed a duty upon those goods, the mills of Massachusetts changed their machinery and went to producing

them, and what was the result? In less than two years from the time that duty was laid we were getting black goods for 14 cents a yard and we are getting them so to-day.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky obtained the floor.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I withdraw my *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I renew it. Mr. Chairman, I have been struck with the skillfulness of my very adroit friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] in avoiding the very simple calculation which would show to the country the amount of woolen adulterants and substitutes which are used and worn by the American people. We use a certain amount of clothing and other articles which are roughly spoken of as woolens. It may be difficult to make the estimate accurately—

Mr. DINGLEY. I gave the number of pounds of wool and the number of pounds of shoddy used in 1890; I do not know how I could have made the statement more accurate.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It has been estimated that it requires something over 600,000,000 pounds to supply our domestic consumption in this line. We raise in America perhaps somewhat over 260,000,000 pounds of wool. What constitutes the other 340,000,000 pounds, and where does it come from? No amount of rhetoric can shut off the question, what is it that goes to make up these other 340,000,000 pounds entering into the aggregate of American clothing, blankets, and other woolen articles that we use? It is not foreign wool, for we do not import more than about one-third or a little over one-third of that amount of foreign wool.

What is the balance? Gentlemen may call it shoddy or substitutes or adulterants. What is it? It is the growth and product of the American tariff. It is shoddy; it is hair of the camel; it is hair of the cow and of the dog; it is the moss that grows upon the Southern live-oak tree; it is cotton. These materials assume all sorts of shapes and are worked in different proportions—from 22 per cent of wool and 78 per cent of adulterants or substitutes to 62 per cent of wool and 38 per cent of substitutes and adulterants of various sorts.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will my friend from Kentucky allow me a moment right there?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. The amount of pure wool used in American manufactures in the last year was 124,291,238 pounds; the amount of adulterants used was 154,130,890 pounds.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken; he does not state the figures half high enough.

Mr. McMILLIN. I was going to state that this includes all kinds of adulterants—

Mr. DINGLEY. But you have not given half the amount.

Mr. McMILLIN. This includes shoddy, cotton, and other adulterants, not including camel's hair and mohair.

Mr. DINGLEY. The amount is more than twice what you state. Probably the gentleman is referring to imported wool.

Mr. McMILLIN. I am speaking of imported wool.

I extract these figures from the report of the Ways and Means Committee on this question; and it will be observed that I speak not of wool unwashed or in the grease, but of pure wool; and when the report is examined fully I think it will be seen that our statement is accurate. There are other statistics concerning carpet wools, etc., with which I will not now detain the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] corroborate my general statement that of domestic wool we use in round numbers perhaps 260,000,000 pounds; we import about one hundred and fifteen or one hundred and twenty million pounds, about one-third of what is used in our manufactures; and the residue, amounting to something more than 200,000,000 pounds, is made up of various substitutes and adulterants. Some are substitutes, others are adulterants.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Now, we are obliged to have clothing; that is absolutely necessary. We use only so much as is fairly necessary; for, however gentleman may undertake to show by statistics of saving banks, etc., the exuberant wealth, the affluence of the workingmen in unknown sections which lie just over the mountains from where the real workingmen live, it is true that America is in no condition to use more than may really be needed of these expensive articles.

Now, what I desire to find is whence comes the 200,000,000 pounds in excess of wool going to make up our clothing and other articles passing under the name of woolens? What ought this material to be? Beyond all doubt the answer of every non-partisan user would be "wool." To the 260,000,000 pounds of American wool there must be added about 340,000,000 pounds to

make up this aggregate—all this should be wool. Is not wool cheap enough? The answer of any student of the market of the world must be "yes, where wool is raised." Why can we not have it? Because there are barriers placed between where the wool is raised and the consumer who is to wear the goods. What is the cause of the increased price? These barriers. Why shall they not be taken away so that the cheap wools of Australia and other places may be mixed with American wool, making articles at a fairly reasonable cost for the American consumer?

Who is benefited? Now, if the House will bear with me for a moment this is the one single schedule by which no man who deserves in all its length and breadth the title of an "honest" man is benefited. No man dealing fairly and openly, as is just between man and man, is benefited by these barriers which we have erected between the foreign wool-grower and the wool-consumer of America. The workman is not benefited, because every dollar that his employer must pay for his material, over and above its actual worth, must come out of the pocket of somebody. If I have a hundred dollars only to put into a product and I am compelled to pay \$60 for the material, I have but \$40 left to pay for the workman, for the plant, for the interest on my debt, and all that is necessary to make the product.

If I have but \$30 to pay for the material, I have that much more to divide with my workman, with my commission merchant, with the man who builds my house or runs my factory. The workingman, therefore, is interested in the material which he puts into the finished product, that its price shall be as low as possible to his employer. Nor is the manufacturer benefited if it be honest goods. If he is giving honest woolen, how could he be benefited? Where does his benefit come in? For what he wants is profit on the capital invested. Every dollar that is not needed, every dollar he pays extra for his material, for his machinery and his dyes, for his labor, for the interest on his investment is that much more which he must put into his business, and on which he must make a profit. He meets adulteration and undervaluation as his competitors, and he is hampered with restrictions. And so we find that under the present conditions the wool manufacturer is not making money in legitimate business. It is languishing.

Is the consumer benefited? Plainly not. For what he wants is to make as few days' work as possible go as far as possible; and if he can make six days' work go as far as ten days go under the present arrangement, he is practically released from prison at hard labor for the other four days that is not required to pay for what he must purchase by his labor, for he takes nothing but labor to purchase with. Who then is benefited? Who are the gentlemen for whom my honorable and accomplished friend from Maine, and my eloquent friend from Michigan, plead so earnestly? They are the manufacturers who sell the adulterants in their crude condition, and the manufacturers who use them in making the finished fabric.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I should like to have about three minutes longer.

Mr. BURROWS. I hope the gentleman will be permitted to proceed for that length of time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Who is benefited, Mr. Chairman, the man who sells shoddy for wool? He who takes cotton and adds to it a little wool and sells the whole as a woolen fabric; who takes the rags and the clippings of the fleece, the hair of beeves from such establishments as Armour's butchery in Chicago, the moss which grows on the Southern live oak, and sells at woolen prices; he is the man who makes money. It is for him that we have exacted from the consumers of America, through a series of years these enormous sums. He has gotten rich; not the honest wool-manufacturer really making honest woolens, not the honest wool-grower, not the consumer, but this man who deals in the fraudulent fabric. Wherever wages can be employed in this particular business, there is return for labor; the workman in shoddy factories and a few gatherers of adulterants may also be beneficiaries, with the man to whom I have referred. But the burdens have been distributed in a variety of ways, upon persons who deserve protection within the true scope of Governmental powers.

The wool-grower has been imposed upon by the adulterant-gatherer, not only directly, but indirectly. For example, we would not take the wool of the Argentine Republic, and this wool meets us in Liverpool in the shape of wheat. As we destroyed his sheep flocks, he turned his lands over into wheat fields; and we who should have bought his wool and manufactured it for our workingmen, giving to them and their families the wages that could have been made from the manufacture of that Argentine wool, find him competing with our wheat in the markets of the world. This South American wool-grower and farmer put his

lands into wheat, abandoned sheep-raising, and we find our farmers butted in the face by Argentine sheep in the shape of wheat in the markets of Liverpool.

It is God's mode of punishing, that he, who for selfish reasons takes bread out of the mouth of his brother, shall have the bread taken out of his mouth by that process. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But unfortunately in this case it does not happen that the particular man whose greed has wrought such wrongs has the bread taken out of his mouth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOAN. Mr. Chairman, the question of a tariff and the question of raising revenue to pay the expenses of the Government is as old as the Government itself. The first Congress that ever assembled under the Constitution had under consideration the principle involved in a protective tariff.

The Congress now in session has the same unsettled question of a tariff and the raising of revenue. Since the formation of this Government to the present hour great questions of finance, of constitutional powers, of the rights of States, and of the supremacy of the nation have occupied much of the attention of Congress, but they have all been settled by legislation, by constitutional enactments, and by the arbitrament of the sword upon the field of conflict. They all belong to the past. But the tariff question remains, and, like Banquo's ghost, "will not down."

On account of a cruel and unjust war waged against the life of this nation by those who should have been its friends, the expenses of the Government aggregate \$1,000,000 per day. To meet these expenses and provide a way for their payment with the least burden to our people is the great absorbing question of the hour. The two great political parties in this country substantially agree that it is better to invoke the aid of a tariff and to levy duties upon importations of goods and merchandise imported by foreign nations into this country to meet these expenses.

To that end and to that extent we all agree. Here we part company, the Democratic party affirming that the true functions of a tariff are not to discriminate in favor of one product as against another product imported, but that all importations shall be taxed according to their value, without regard to the fact whether such products and such imported articles can be successfully grown or produced by our people or not. That is what they call a tariff for revenue only, every article taxed.

The Republican party, having regard for the struggling millions, say that is not right. It is not treating our laboring men who seek employment, who have nothing to sell but strong right arms, pure hearts, and clear brains, as they should be treated by this grand Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. So the Republican party say in the interests of humanity, in the interests of home, that while we must have a tariff sufficient to meet the expenses of the Government, we believe that charity should begin at home; that we will discriminate in fixing the duties on foreign importations, in favor of the American people and for the protection of American labor and American homes.

Is not that principle right? Is it not just to those who support this Government, who pay the taxes, bear its burdens, and who defend its honor and protect its flag? How can this be done? There is only one way, my friends, and that is the Republican way; admit free of all duty, all tax, those articles we can not grow or produce successfully in this country, and tax such articles imported from abroad as we can and should grow and produce here.

This being eminently fair to our people high or low, rich or poor, black or white, and American throughout, what articles or products shipped to this country should be free? That is easily answered, Mr. Chairman. We can not grow coffee, tea, spices; products of the far South lands. For many years prior to 1872 these articles were taxed under our tariff laws. Every pound of coffee brought to our shores was taxed 3 cents. That, of necessity, was added to its price, and our people were compelled to pay it or go without coffee. We could have no competition here to reduce the price, because no man in all this broad land of ours had coffee to sell. We were driven to pay the foreign price with the 3 cents tariff tax added.

The same is true of tea, spices, and similar foreign products that can not be produced here. As the great war debt piled up mountain high in 1865, had been largely reduced and placed within the power of the Government to safely pay it off in the years to come, without undue burden to the taxpayers, the Republican party in 1872 removed all tax off of coffee, tea, spices, etc., so that the people could buy them at the foreign price and save the tax on such articles thus imported. We say this is right.

The Democratic party, following the custom of old England, would tax the poor man's cup of coffee, his tea, his spices, and as we can not have any competition over the price of these products, for the reason I have stated, the tax is positively paid by

the consumers. England collects on such articles as these a tax of near \$76,000,000 annually off of the poor of her country. That sum is taken out of their scanty wages year by year. That is the doctrine of the lords of England. That is the policy of the Democratic party of this country, and they fail to carry it out, and add this additional burden upon the poor of this land, simply because they have not the control of the different branches of the Government.

If the things we can not produce or make in this country are to be admitted free for all our people, upon what articles or manufactured products of foreign importation do the Republican party propose to impose a duty under the McKinley tariff law? They place a tariff or tax upon all manufactured articles of foreign make that come in direct competition with similar articles that we do or can make here. We place that duty so high that good wages can be paid our laboring men while they are at work making similar articles here. This is called a protective tariff—to protect our mechanics, artisans, laborers, skilled and unskilled, from the pauper labor of the Old World. Our people are the sovereigns, we are the servants. We have a high standard of civilization, independence, and manhood. We want no serfs, no slaves.

Go tame the wild elements, or stem with a straw  
The surges that beat o'er the strands that confined them,  
But think not again to give freemen a law,  
Nor think with the chains they have broken to bind them.

But we have been told here on this floor, day after day, that to place a protective tariff on the necessaries of life, such as our people make, robs the poor out of multiplied millions of dollars annually, and that this money is put into the hands of the millionaire manufacturers. If that was a fact, I should oppose it. It can not be true, and it can be so demonstrated and shown. If the manufacturers are making millions of dollars every year as the Democrats state, why is it that half of them are driven to bankruptcy and assignments on account of debts they can not pay? Men who are making money by millions do not assign.

But I have stated that it can be positively proven that the prices we pay now for all we buy are to-day, through sharp competition at home, at the lowest possible price at which they can be produced and the wages paid that are paid in this country, and God knows no laborer wants wages reduced; neither does he want to be robbed.

To hear the arguments of our Democratic friends, we are all robbed by these manufacturers of our very lifeblood.

I will read from the gentleman's speech upon this floor, made the other day upon this bill, and it but voices the sentiment as proclaimed by the Democratic party. He says:

Desiring to make a sharp, distinct, and disencumbered issue with the Republican party whether 65,000,000 people shall continue to pay 91½ per cent increase on all the clothes, carpets, and woolen goods they consume, as the McKinley law exacts, etc.

He gives us an example, so there can be no mistake as to the fact that on all we buy we pay 91½ per cent too much, and the robber manufacturer gets it. Hear him:

Clothes for himself and family, worth \$10 without protection, cost \$19.15 under the existing law.

The existing law is the McKinley-tariff law.

You will see he has taken this \$10 worth of goods and multiplied it by 91½ making \$19.15. Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is honest—he says as much. He is bold and aggressive, and he demands a "sharp, distinct, and disencumbered issue" with the Republican party whether 65,000,000 people shall continue to pay 91½ per cent increase on all the clothes, carpets, and woolen goods they consume, as the McKinley law exacts.

That is the sum and substance of two weeks' argument on the Democratic side of the House. Now, I propose to show beyond all possible doubt, and in a way that can not be questioned, that there is not a particle of truth in the assertion. That is a very plain statement indeed, and should not be made if not absolutely true.

What is the assertion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MONTGOMERY]: "That under the McKinley tariff law the people pay on all the clothes, carpets, and woolen goods they consume 91½ per cent more than they would have to pay if we had no such a law."

Now, let us see how the gentleman will come out with this positive assertion that we pay 91½ per cent more on all the goods we buy. As all "the clothes, carpets, and woolen goods we now consume cost us 91½ per cent too much under the robber McKinley law, it follows that if we deduct the 91½ per cent from the present robber price of the goods we buy we will then have the Democratic price of the same goods and the price that they say the goods would sell for in this country without a tariff. Is not that true?"

To show how absurd this statement is, and it is continually made, I have taken a list of articles published for sale by retail dealers of these goods in the cities of Washington, Boston, New

York, Chicago, and Cincinnati, and the same is true of all cities in which they give the usual retail price of these articles—mark, the usual retail price, not the wholesale price from the robber manufacturers, but the retailers' regular price, such as the people have to pay when they buy, wholesalers' and retailers' profit added. Here is the list:

White domestic flannels, usual price per yard 10 cents, 91½ per cent tariff off—cost .85 of 1 cent a yard.

White wool flannel, regular price 25 cents a yard, 91½ per cent tariff off—cost 2½ cents a yard.

Yard-wide white flannels strictly all wool, usual price 50 cents, now 42 cents a yard, 91½ robber tariff off, leaves the cost of this white all-wool flannel 4.57 cents a yard.

Finest quality satin-striped India-lined apron lawns, regular price 25 cents a yard, 91½ per cent off, cost 2.8 cents a yard.

Cotton camel's hair debeige, regular price 17 cents a yard, 91½ per cent off, leaves the cost per yard 1.54 cents a yard.

Calico, good standard, regular price 5 cents a yard, 91½ cents robber tariff off, cost .425 of 1 per cent; not a half a cent per yard.

Muslin 6 cents a yard, 91½ too much, should cost a half a cent a yard.

Good dress goods of all conceivable shades and varieties, better than the most of our women wore for their best dresses before the war, 20 cents a yard, 91½ per cent tariff deducted, and we could buy these goods at 1.70 cents a yard.

I have before me the price of carpets from the firms of the Lowell Carpet Company, Hartford Carpet Company, and the firm of E. S. Higgins & Co., in 1890 and January, 1892. They are as follows: Extra tapestry (10-wire) 1890, 75 cents a yard; January, 1892, 67½ cents a yard. Now, if we take the 91½ per cent out that we have to pay (you know) tariff tax, we could get that fine carpet at just 6 cents a yard.

Best tapestry selling at 62½ cents per yard—robber 91½ off and you get the same carpet for 5.32 cents a yard.

Extra superior ingrain 57½ cents a yard—deduct the robber tariff and you buy this superior ingrain carpet for 4.89 cents a yard.

Body Brussels, fine frame in 1890, \$1.20 a yard, January, 1892, \$1.07½ per yard—take out the inevitable 91½ per cent that you are compelled to pay on all you buy (says Mr. MONTGOMERY of Kentucky) and you get that fine carpet at 8.06 cents a yard.

Take imperial velvets, selling now at 85 cents a yard; if no tariff you could buy them at 7½ cents a yard. Just think of it, 7½ cents a yard. There is not a pugged-nose, hare-lipped, wall-eyed thief in the South so miserable, so destitute, so God forsaken, so starved that he would go out at the dead hour of night and steal enough wool off of a dead sheep's back to make a yard of carpet and bring it in town for 7½ cents.

But take ready-made clothing and see how we are robbed. Right in this city on Seventh street you can to-day get a pretty good suit of clothes, retail price, for \$8. As the retailer had to pay the robber tariff, if we deduct the 91½ per cent we could buy that suit of clothes, retailer's profit and all, for 68 cents.

In the same store you can buy a good suit of clothes for \$20, better than I ever had on my back until I was 21 years old. If it was not for the McKinley tariff I could go up there to-day (according to Democratic assertions on this floor) and get that \$20 suit for \$2.55.

I have a Testament I purchased at a retail book store for 10 cents. The retailer informed me that he paid the robber publisher 4½ cents for it. Just think of it! The word of God—the New Testament, 27 books, 260 chapters—translated out of the original Greek, for 4½ cents. But mind you, this 4½ cents has the robber tariff; deduct this, and you can buy this Testament for .38 of 1 cent, say three Testaments for a cent.

You can get a good ax for 75 cents; but if we had no tariff you could get it for 1.37 cents—100 good axes for \$1.37.

Drawing chains, 58½ cents; no tariff, worth 4.97 cents.

Good hoe, 37½ cents; no tariff, worth 3.18 cents.

Mowing machine, \$42; no tariff, worth \$3.57. Just think of it! A complete mowing machine for \$3.57.

Take a plow, \$13; no robber tariff, the farmer could get this plow for \$1.10.

And so you could run the whole list with the same result.

Could absurdity go farther than the continued statement that "on all the clothes, carpets, and woollen goods we consume we pay 91½ per cent more than we would if it was not for the McKinley law." Such a statement is more absurd than nonsense on stilts. By charging that we pay 91½ per cent more for all we buy, and then take the millions of dollars' worth of goods that our 65,000,000 people buy annually and deduct this 91½ per cent, and it makes a fearful sum of money. And then they say, in holy horror, "How long, oh! Lord, how long must we endure this robbery?" And then they go into convulsions over the condition of the poor laborers who have to pay this extortion to the robber manufacturers.

Did you ever hear of a Democrat deducting the robber tariff as I have done to show you his price of all these goods? You never have, and you never will. The moment he would attempt it he would that moment prove to you that he had been lying to you. Should he do this, here would be his free-trade prices, held out for the encouragement of American labor, American manhood, and American industry: White domestic flannels, .85 of 1 cent a yard; white wool flannels, 2½ cents a yard; yard-wide white flannels, all wool, 4.57 cents a yard; cotton camel's hair debeige, 1.54 cents a yard; fine quality satin-striped India-lined apron lawns, 2½ cents a yard; good standard calico, .42 of 1 cent a yard; good standard muslin, one-half of 1 cent a yard; good dress goods of all shades and varieties, 1.70 cents a yard; best tapestry carpets, 5.32 cents a yard; extra superior ingrain, 4.89 cents a yard; body Brussels, 8.06 cents a yard; imperial velvets, 7½ cents a yard; a moderate suit of clothes, 68 cents; a good suit of clothes, \$2.55; a good ax, 1.37 cents; drawing chains, 4.97 cents; good hoe, 3.18 cents; mowing machine complete, \$3.57; good plow complete, \$1.10; good two-horse wagon, \$4.25.

Mr. Speaker, I would give a good deal to have the Democrats of this House take one hundred and fifty articles in daily use among the middle and working classes of our people, and give in one column just what they can be purchased for from the manufacturers of this country, and then in an opposite column give the price of the same articles under what they term a tariff for revenue only. No member of this House will live long enough to ever see this comparison made.

The goods purchased and consumed by the laborers in this country are to-day as cheap as they are in free-trade England, while the wages paid our workmen are from 50 to 100 per cent higher.

The fact that no Democrat of high or low degree has ever dared to give the present price of goods under the McKinley law and the price of similar goods here if we had free trade is positive proof of the fact that it can not be done. If it is an absolute fact that we do pay 91½ per cent more than we should, why not demonstrate the fact, so that "he who runs may read?" Why not boldly say: My friend, this yard of calico they charge you 5 cents for is 91½ per cent too much; you ought not to pay over .42 of 1 cent a yard. You ought to get 100 yards for 42 cents. You ought to get 100 tin cups for 42 cents. Good suit of clothes, ready to put on your back, coat, vest, and pants, that they now ask you, at retail prices, \$20 for, you ought to buy for \$2.55. They know very well that if you carry out their theory, that the consumer pays the 91½ per cent tariff on all he buys, you will prove that the theory is false.

Senator FRYE of Maine once called upon Prof. Agassiz, who was a great authority on fish, and asked him to go with him to Rangely Lakes to fish for trout. To induce him to go Mr. FRYE told him of the splendid speckled trout there, weighing from 10 to 14 pounds each. When FRYE told this, the professor gave him a pitiful smile (such as we have seen here) and said: "I have just completed a treatise in which I have demonstrated that it is impossible for a speckled trout to weigh over 4 pounds."

Mr. FRYE said he knew better, but he knew he could not convince him by argument. He said no more to the professor, but went the next day to Rangely Lake and caught two speckled beauties, one of which weighed 10 and the other 12 pounds. Says FRYE, "I packed them in ice and sent them by express to Prof. Agassiz. By return mail I received from him a letter, saying:

MY DEAR SENATOR: The theory of a lifetime has been kicked to death by a single fact.

If the Democratic party would be thus honest, and would give the present price of articles charged by the manufactures, and then give you in dollars and cents what the same articles would cost the consumer under Democratic free trade, then they would have to admit, as the professor did, in the face of the book he had written on theory to the contrary, that our lifetime of assumptions and per cent has been "kicked to death by a single fact."

It might be well to inquire where the doctrine of a "tariff for revenue only" came from, and what reasons were given for such a tariff. I boldly assert that it came from the South, in the interest of the cheapest labor in the world—slave labor.

I desire to read what Hamilton of South Carolina, in 1828, in the book entitled "Cotton is King," said on the subject of a tariff for revenue only:

We must prevent the increase of manufactories, force the surplus labor into agriculture, promote the cultivation of our unimproved western lands, until provisions are so multiplied and reduced in price that the slave can be fed so cheaply as to enable us to grow sugar at 3 cents a pound. Then, without protective duties, we can rival Cuba in production of the staple, and drive her from our markets.

That was the undisguised object then, bold, pure, and simple. Do you hear that, farmers? "We must prevent the increase of manufactories." Why? "Force the surplus labor into agricul-



ture." Why? "Promote the cultivation of our unimproved western lands." Why? Ah, the reason—"until provisions are so multiplied and reduced in price that the slave can be fed so cheaply as to enable us [the 357,000 slaveholders] to grow sugar at 3 cents per pound."

Does the farmer want "to prevent the increase of manufactories" in this country? Does he want to drive the hundreds of thousands of men now working in these manufactories to the farm, "to multiply provisions and reduce the price?"

Is that what he wants? No; he wants more mouths to eat his surplus products. He wants more consumers, not producers. He wants better prices, and a ready home market for all he produces. The South held the same doctrine in 1861 when they proposed to destroy this Government, and upon its ruins build one up whose chief corner stone should be slavery; and so they provided in article 2, section 8, of the Confederate constitution, that—

No bounties shall be granted from the treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid, to promote or foster any branch of industry.

Hon. Robert J. Walker, a Mississippi Democrat, was the author of the graded tariff of 1846, made in the interest of this same cheap labor, and which culminated in the great financial disaster of 1857, and ruined thousands and thousands of people. Men who supposed they had a competency to tide them through life found their property, like the apples of Sodom, turned to ashes in their hands, and they became beggars and mendicants upon the streets and highways.

Another Southern man, the Hon. ROGER Q. MILLS, at a more recent date introduced another tariff bill bottomed upon the same Southern idea of a tariff for revenue only. This Southern bill was passed upon in 1888 by the great jury of the country—the laborers of this nation—and the stamp of condemnation was placed upon it and upon its advocates, and as Gen. W. H. Harrison in 1840 hurled the free traders from power under the free-trade tariff of 1837, so his grandson, Gen. Benjamin Harrison, on the lines of protection to all, swept out Cleveland, England, Mills, and company, and the result was the tariff known as the McKinley tariff, with not a line or paragraph of monopoly in it, guarding and protecting the interests of all. That is Republican.

Now, it is proposed again by the same party, encouraged by their great majority in this House, to work the destruction of our great American interests and varied industries built up under the splendid system of protection to our people. Not having the courage of Hamilton to boldly state the true object, and still having the cheapest labor in the nation at the South, and representing a million of Southern laborers on this floor by no vote or voice of theirs, they proceed with great caution to accomplish the destruction of the entire protective system to our people and compel competition with the pauper laborers of the Old World, and place the great sheep and other industries of this country in direct competition with men who work for from 5 to 8 cents a day, go naked, and live on dirt. So they pick out the farmer's wool and place that on the free list; he is to be the first to suffer—three little bills affecting the entire manufacture of binding-twine in this country and the cotton-ties of the South.

Three free-trade pills, *piper carporate nauseat totum*, warranted to produce death!

When asked "why they do not attack the whole McKinley tariff?" they reply that they intend to do it, but for fear it might hurt the country too bad to destroy it at once, they propose to take a little off at a time. A boy had a dog that he thought a great deal of; he had a long tail, and the boy concluded it would improve the dog's looks to cut his tail off, and so he cut one inch off of the dog's tail each day for ten days. When asked "what in the world possessed him to do that," he said, "He is a good dog and I like him, and I did not want to hurt him bad enough to cut all his tail off at once, and so to save the dog pain, I just cut off one inch each day."

That is the Democratic doctrine with the tariff now. The sheep industry must be destroyed, the binder-twine, and the cotton-ties; and getting bold on these, the entire protective system must go, and the world must be hurled back into the hell of ancient cruelty, and the laborers of this country become just what some slaveholders of the South said of them prior to 1860—"thieves and beggars, prostitutes and hirelings."

What is the history of our country under a low tariff for revenue only, and that under a protective tariff such as we have to-day? We had a protective tariff in 1789, 1812, 1824, 1828, 1842, and from 1861 (the advent of the Republican party) to the present time. Through all these periods of protection I undertake to say that we have evidence of the best men who lived during those periods, that they were periods of universal prosperity and plenty. Labor in demand, capital employed, public and private prosperity great beyond all previous precedent, and joy, peace, and gladness the heritage of all.

We have had free trade or very low tariff in 1783, 1816, 1832, 1846, and 1857. Time, the world's great orator, that proves all things, tests all things, has shown that they were years of depression, commercial paralysis, general bankruptcy, and financial ruin.

I call as my first witness to prove this statement President Fillmore, who said in his annual message to Congress, December, 1851, concerning the results flowing from the repeal of the tariff of 1842:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from \$68,000,000 in 1847 to \$21,000,000 in 1851, with almost a certainty of a still further reduction in 1852. The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand and raising the price of our agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontrovertibly that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

Do we not hear the same argument used to-day to break down the McKinley tariff that was used in 1846 to break down the protective tariff of 1842; that it will benefit the farming population of this country, open up the markets of the world, increase the demand, and raise the price of our agricultural products in foreign markets. Almost the identical language has been used over and over on the floor of the House, in favor of a free-trade tariff and against the present tariff law.

Let me call one more witness, as to the effect upon the country of the very low tariff of 1857. I will call no less a personage than President James Buchanan, the last Democratic President before the rebellion of 1861. In his annual message to Congress he said officially of that distressful free-trade period, and thousands are living to-day who can verify every word he stated, when he said:

With unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and all the elements of natural wealth, our manufacturers have suspended; our public works are retarded; our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is in a deplorable condition.

So deplorable, gentlemen, that the President of the United States was compelled to obtain loans to meet even the current expenses of the Government at exorbitant rates of interest, from 8 to 12 per cent, so low was our national credit.

Will the Democratic party never learn wisdom? Four times in the history of this Government, in the interest of cheap slave labor, that party has forced upon the country free-trade tariffs. Four times such a tariff has produced financial ruin and bankruptcy to the great agricultural and commercial interests of the nation. Patrick Henry said he had "no way of judging of the future but by the past. I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

Have we any better way to-day? How long, gentlemen, must you dig about the roots of the upas tree of free trade before you learn that though you may water it by nectar it produces only the seeds of financial death? Why not stand like patriots and statesmen in defense of the best interests of this nation, the preservation of our institutions, the developing of our mighty resources, the elevation of our people to a higher, purer, and grander civilization than the world ever saw before? Our people are better fed and better clad, more intelligent and refined, enjoy more of the comforts and luxuries of life than can be found among any of the sixty-seven nations of the earth.

Are you deaf to the experience of the past? Is the car you travel in a back number? Are you still bound to the traditions of 357,000 Democratic slaveholders, and can not comprehend the magnitude and scope, the mighty pulsations of the internal and commercial trade of this nation, aggregating over \$50,000,000,000 of money, and affecting the four quarters of the globe? You boast of your Democracy; and it has often been repeated here, by individual members, "I am a Democrat!" A Democrat in my State last year, becoming enthused, vociferously proclaimed, "I was born a Democrat!" "Yes," said a wicked fellow in the crowd, "born like a dog, blind!"

But we are told now that the great boon for the farmers in their depressed condition is to have their wool put on the free list, and to come in competition with the wool-growers of South America and Australia, where pasture is free and the laborers are encouraged with a bountiful reward for "well done good and faithful servants" of 6 cents a day.

The prospect is really encouraging, is it not, to the sheep-growers of the country? You ought to get down on your knees and give thanks to your Democratic deliverers from this "horrible death." You can certainly offer the prayer that the boy offered when the horses ran away with the wagon. He and a neighbor man were in the wagon, on the top of a high elevation; the horses started to run in the direction of a bluff, where 100 feet below ran a river; the lines broke, and the horses were within 50 feet of the bluff and certain death; the man hallooed at the boy

to pray, as he could not, and something must be done at once; the boy instantly dropped to his knees, closed his eyes, and said: "Oh, Lord! for what we are about to receive make us thankful."

It is a splendid scheme, designed to catch the New England manufacturers and elect a Democratic President. The 1,000,000 sheep-owners are asked to put their finished product, the fleeces of wool, on the freelist, and the robber manufacturer (as you have been told) is to have under this Democratic bill just about the same protection on his manufactured goods as he now receives under the McKinley tariff, at least not to exceed 1 cent less. He is to have your wool free of duty, and all foreign wool free also, but Mr. Foreigner can not come here and sell you his manufactured goods free of duty, because this bill protects the manufacturer here to the extent of 39 per cent. They are so charitable to these manufacturers that are charged by them of robbing you out of millions of dollars annually that they take off 1 per cent of their protection from foreign importations only, but on your wool, that is to come in direct competition with the foreign wool, they take off 12 cents a pound. In other words, you are to have no protection; the manufacturers are to have 39 per cent protection.

Australia is now producing nearly one-half of the wool of the world, and wool is therefore depressed from 3 to 8 cents a pound. Now, if the 11 and 12 cents a pound is taken off of your wool, as this bill does, what will be the direct effect on American wool? It is very low now; what will be its price then?

I desire to read a statement made October 1, 1891, by Messrs. Justice, Bateman & Co., wool commission merchants of Philadelphia and Boston, as to foreign markets, and as to the price here and in London.

The new clip of Australian wool is now being shorn, and will be very much larger than any previous clip. The increase there each year is enormous, and is in the way of very much higher prices. American wools are now largely influenced by the value of Australian wools in London, although the latter is always 12 cents per pound below the value of the same wool inside of American custom-houses.

You will see that they state positively that Australian wools in London are always 12 cents a pound below the value of the same wool inside of American custom-houses.

To the same point I want to append quotations for foreign wool from last circulars of Messrs. Helmuth, Schwartz & Co., Messrs. Jacomb, Son & Co., and Messrs. Buxton, Ronald & Co., all of London:

Price of American wools.

	Ohio medium combing.	Michigan X.	Montana fine XX.	Ohio XX fine delaine.	Ohio XX fine clothing.
Price in Philadelphia, March, 1892.....	38	27	17	35	31
Per cent of shrinkage.....	40	53	69	50	51
Scoured cost, including skirts.....	63½	57½	54½	70	63½
Scoured cost, after adding loss on skirts to make scoured wool equal to competing foreign skirted wool.....	70½	64½	61½	77	70½
Free-trade price of wool in United States on basis of same scoured cost of competing grades in London, March, 1892.....	20	17	11½	20½	20
Decline that must take place on American fleeces to reach the current free-wool price of competing grades in London, March, 1892.....	18	10	5½	14½	11

The figures in the first line show the price of American wools in the Eastern markets of the United States on March 1, 1892, while the prices in the fifth line are the free trade or the London values to-day for the same wools on the basis of the scoured value of competing grades of the same kind. Or, in other words, if there was no duty upon wool to sustain the present American prices, as indicated in the first line, the value of these wools to-day would be the figures in the fifth line, which are their values at this date in London. So the farmer can see that if the tariff is taken off of wool he will sell his wool for 12 or 14 cents less than he does now, or he will not sell it at all.

This tariff tinkering since 1883 has lost the wool-growers of the United States over \$30,000,000. The slight reduction of 18 per cent on wool in 1883, made by the Republican party through a combination of circumstances forced upon them, gave a check and uncertainty to the sheep industry in this country.

In 1883 in Ohio the Democrats, in view of this slight reduction in the tariff on wool, issued a circular entitled "Importance of the wool-growing industry in Ohio." During the campaign that year thousands of these circulars were scattered throughout the State, warning the wool-growers of the State of this grievous wrong done them by the Republican party, and promising, if placed in power, to right the wrong. Here is what they stated:

In no State in the Union is there an industry more important than that of wool-growing in Ohio.

In 1883 the number of sheep owned by Ohio wool-growers was 4,594,007, or more than one-tenth the whole number in the United States. The value of these four and one-half millions of sheep is stated at \$13,384,257.

In 1881 the number of pounds shorn in Ohio was 22,651,801. These are enormous aggregates, and certainly show that wool-growing is a source of vast wealth to our people, as it is one of the most widespread of our industries.

The farmer who reads this, and it should be read by every farmer in the State of Ohio who cares for his material welfare, need not be informed that he has a common cause with the representatives of an interest of transcendent importance who number, at the lowest estimate, 400,000 persons. He need not be informed that however grievously and audaciously he may be wronged by the party in power, he is still not without means of righting himself. When 400,000 men are engaged in an industry, that industry must, indeed, be important; and when 400,000 men unite to demand justice, their request will hardly be resisted.

The following astounding figures confirm this statement. They show, for the last four census years, the number of sheep in the United States, the production of wool, and increase during each decade:

Census year.	Number of sheep.	Increase.	Pounds of wool.	Per cent.
1850.....	21,273,320	.....	52,516,050	.....
1860.....	22,471,275	748,055	60,264,913	14½
1870.....	23,477,951	6,006,675	100,102,387	66
1880.....	43,576,899	15,998,948	235,048,834	135

The inference to be drawn from these figures is that the wool tariff came as a blessing to the agricultural classes; that the marvelous growth of the sheep industry would certainly have continued had the tariff been let alone; but that the cause of the increase having been removed, we may expect to see an instant falling off, both in the number of the sheep and the value of their product. Still they continue:

The Republican President, Tariff Commission, and Congress, at the bidding of the monopolists of New England, wantonly and wickedly reduced the duty on wool so as to enable foreign producers to compete advantageously with native growers. The average reduction of the duty, you will remember, was 18 per cent only.

They said:

With the reduction of 18 per cent the abandonment, to a great extent, of sheep-raising must inevitably follow, if the pernicious course designed by the Republican party is allowed to be carried out.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Now mark—

The Democratic party, as the facts show, have been steadily and earnestly opposed to the perpetration of this great wrong against the people.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

They are now talking to the 400,000 Republicans in my State; and, notwithstanding the Republicans of Ohio protested against this falsehood, we were defeated in 1883.

Mr. BURROWS. Is that document a Democratic statement?

Mr. DOAN. This is the document they published, issued to the 400,000 voters, owners of sheep in Ohio, alleging these facts to be true of the Republican party.

Mr. BURROWS. When?

Mr. DOAN. In 1883.

Mr. BURROWS. Why, I am surprised.

Mr. DOAN. I will read further from this pamphlet; it is mighty good reading, in view of these acts, immediately after the election in 1883, and in this House to-day:

To state the consequences in a practical manner, the farmer whose flock produced 500 pounds of wool per year will get \$36 less this year, estimating upon the maximum price last year; and estimating upon the minimum price of last year he will get \$31.50 less than he would had the duty not been removed.

These figures are based upon the supposition that there will be no unusual influences upon the market; but it is easy to understand that, what with the general discouragement felt among farmers, and what with the corresponding activity among foreign exporters of wool to this country, the price will be much further reduced.

Mark—

That foreign exporters will take every advantage in their power is certain, for, during last year, when the tariff of 1867 was still in operation, the value of raw wool imported aggregated \$47,000,000, the duty collected being \$28,670,000. Our farmers will, indeed, do well if the American sheep industry escapes total ruin. \* \* \* The abandonment to a great extent of sheep-raising must inevitably follow, if the pernicious course designed by the Republican party is allowed to be carried out.

These facts indicate that as a political party they are heartily in sympathy with the wool-growers' cause. In their platform of principles, adopted at the Columbus convention, they made the following declaration:

The act of the Republican Congress reducing the tariff on wool, while at the same time increasing it on woolen goods already highly protected, was iniquitous legislation, discriminating in favor of monopoly and against the agricultural interests of the country, and ought to be corrected; and we heartily approve the action of the Democratic members of the Ohio delegation in Congress in voting against that measure.

How do they stand to-day on this subject? Then a slight reduction on wool of 18 per cent was iniquitous legislation, discriminating in favor of monopoly and against the agricultural interests of the country, and ought to be corrected.

I have listened patiently to hear what the good Democratic friends of mine from Ohio, my colleague [Mr. OUTHWAITE] and others, had to say on the pending bill, not to reduce the tariff on wool 18 per cent, but to place it on the free list—no protection whatever.

Mr. ALLEN. Was that since the war?

Mr. DOAN. That was in 1883.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I never defended that political platform.

Mr. DOAN. The gentleman may not have defended it, but he gave it the benefit of his silence at least.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; I was always a revenue reformer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Ohio tell us when it was that that occurred?

Mr. DOAN. In 1883.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Ah, the Ohio Democracy have gotten a great deal of light since then. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOAN. That reduction in the tariff, as I have stated, was but 18 per cent only, and the Democrats said it was pernicious, that it was ruinous to the sheep industry, and that it would ultimately drive the sheep industry from the United States.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. They have learned better since then.

Mr. DOAN. I hope they are progressing somewhat. If they are not, God help them. [Laughter.]

The time of Mr. DOAN having expired, by common consent it was extended five minutes.

Mr. DOAN. Now, here is the peroration of that wonderful address that they made in 1883, under which we went down:

Farmers of Ohio, can you trust the party that has in our National Legislature outraged and robbed you at the bidding of the capitalists of New England?

[Laughter.]

Is there any hope for you from such a party, who have thus deliberately sacrificed your dearest and best interests?

[Laughter.]

The party that created this great wrong can not be trusted to give you relief. The Democrats in Congress were your friends.

[Laughter.]

They sought by every means in their power to prevent this wrong from being inflicted on you. Trust the Democratic party in this matter; it has promised to and will give you relief.

Mr. DINGLEY. That was in the matter of maintaining the duty on wool.

Mr. DOAN. Yes, and the duty had only been reduced 18 per cent then.

Now, I never like a lawyer unless he follows up and proves his case. Here was a reduction of 18 per cent. They said it was robbery; that it was pernicious; that it would drive the sheep industry out of the United States, and more, that the Republicans could not be trusted to right that wrong.

Mr. MCKINNEY. What did you reply to that?

Mr. DOAN. I can not yield for interruptions, as my time is so short.

Now, what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They promised to right this wrong. This is the way they did it. At the very next Congress an excellent gentleman from the State of Illinois [Mr. MORRISON], a Democrat, introduced a tariff bill, not in favor of restoring the 18 per cent deduction on wool, but a horizontal bill, to cut the duty 20 per cent more. If 18 per cent was robbery in 1883, so declared by Democrats, in the name of all that is sacred, what is 20 per cent in addition to it? And let me say to you, that so persistently was the bill pressed on the Democratic side of the House that it came within 4 votes of passage.

Right on the heels of this bill, under a Democratic President, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGER Q. MILLS], now a United States Senator from that State, introduced in this House a tariff bill, not restoring the 18 per cent that was robbery to the farmers in Ohio in 1883, not to cut down 20 per cent in addition as proposed by Mr. Morrison in 1884, but to wipe out all protection whatever and to place the farmer's wool on the free list. Such was the friendly legislation proposed by Democrats from 1883 to 1889, and yet they have, on the floor of this House, consumed days to show that the sheep industry has not prospered since 1883.

In view of such attempted legislation repeated from year to year—and mark, only failed from being carried out because the Democrats were not in political power so to do—how could it be hoped that the sheep industry of this country could extend and ought to have increased from 1883 to 1890, with these Democratic assaults hurled at its life?

We had in Ohio in 1883 between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 sheep, valued at \$13,384,257. Under this continual threat of the Democratic party, the number of sheep in Ohio and in the United States have gradually been reduced. Farmers were afraid to invest money in the sheep enterprise, and so the depression and shrinkage continued, losing multiplied millions of money to the

farmers at a time when the loss was most serious and fatal to them.

In 1890 the Republicans being in power in all the branches of the Government, and having regard for all the interests of all the people, put a stop to the further destruction of the sheep industry in this land, restored the old duty on wool, and as if by magic life returned to the sheep enterprise, and the number of sheep in the United States since that time has increased in number 1,500,000.

And now we have another gentleman from the State of Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and I am glad to see him here again restored to health, introducing a similar bill that must be destructive of the wool industry in the United States.

We are told that the farmer needs no protection on his wool. Now, let us see how he would come out. I have shown that wool of the same grade and character of the American wool sells in London for 17 cents a pound; 1 cent a pound lands it in America, that is 18 cents; 11 cents tariff, that is 29 cents—the price of American wool.

The farmer can well figure for himself on this question—wool in London 17 cents a pound, 1 cent to land it here is 18 cents, and no tariff. Then the farmer here sells his wool of the same quality for 18 cents, or he does not sell at all. Every farmer can understand that. You turn him off with his finished product, wool in the fleece, with no protection against the half-clad and half-fed pauper labor of 6 or 8 cents a day, and at the same time give the manufacturer 39 per cent on his manufactured product, and you call that honest dealing. You rob the farmer, the least able to bear it, and then turn around and give the men you have been denouncing as robbers 39 per cent tariff protection against all foreign importations.

Now, I want to say one word more for the farmer.

The substantial people of this country—the reliable people—the people that are generally solvent—the men who pay 100 cents on the dollar, are the farmers. Ninety-six out of every hundred merchants die insolvent. Eighty out of every 100 middlemen, men who gather up the surplus products of the farms, and risk the markets for profits, leave no estate to be settled up. Thirty-nine out of every 40 professional men of all professions live like Watts' Christian, "at a dying rate." Of manufacturers and producers of that character, 60 out of every 100 become bankrupt. But of farmers, only 20 out of every 100 become insolvent—80 out of every 100 are solvent.

If men who are in business other than farming to-day were compelled, as the farmers are, to put their indebtedness upon a public record where "all that runs may read," more than half of them would suspend business within the next thirty days. The farmer is the reliable man. He has been abused, and you now propose to leave the tariff on manufactured goods and to take off the duty which protects his product. It is an insult to the farmer and to the interests which he represents. If the New England manufacturers insist upon compelling the raisers of sheep to furnish them free wool from the sheep's back, I would meet them half way with an equally emphatic demand that free manufactured products went upon my back also. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States have enjoyed thirty years of protection. What answer does it bring? In 1880 the debt of the foreign nations aggregated \$23,482,000,000. In 1890 they aggregated \$25,636,000,000, an increase in ten years of \$2,154,000,000. The debt of the United States in 1880 was \$1,922,000,000. In 1890 the debt was \$916,000,000, a decrease of \$1,006,000,000. In other words, while the foreign nations increased their debt \$2,154,000,000 in ten years, the United States decreased her debt \$1,006,000,000. Not only so, but the debt of the States and Territories have been reduced during that period \$67,000,000. The per capita indebtedness of the nation, State, and Territories in 1880 was \$46.59; and in 1890 it was \$20.46, less than one-half. The per capita indebtedness of the United States in 1880 was \$38.33 and in 1890 \$14.63. It is much less now.

Under free trade, a Democratic tariff from 1846 to 1860, fourteen years, the balance of trade was against us \$432,000,000. From 1876 to 1890, fourteen years of protection, the balance of the foreign trade was in our favor \$1,669,000,000. Which do you like best in a business point of view? In fourteen years under a tariff for revenue only we were in debt to foreign nations for what we had bought of them \$432,000,000. In 1890, fourteen years under a protective tariff, foreign nations were indebted to us for what we had sold them \$1,669,000,000.

To sum it all up to the period of 1861, when the Democratic low tariff had spent its force, and rendered its final account and the balance struck, we found the Treasury bankrupt, the Government not able to borrow \$1, arms stolen, ships scattered to distant seas, the columns of the Government down, and patriotism at a low ebb. Where in all this broad land did your bleeding, dying nation look for help save to the Republican party? Let it

stand to our immortal honor, as a white shaft to the clouds, that the Republican party, as a party, was the only party that took hold of this nation in the hour of its sore extremity, when it needed a friend, when the child and heir of freedom cried for help, and with the aid of the loyal Douglas Democrats (God bless every one of them), raised this nation up phoenix-like, purified as by fire through rivers of blood, until to-day it is the crowning glory of the civilized world, the bright and morning star in the constellations of the nations of the earth, the very Isaac of the race in which all are to be blessed.

The Republican party has taken the nation's wealth from \$16,000,000,000 to \$63,000,000,000; from 30,000 miles of railroad to 170,000. To-day the internal trade of the United States is \$50,000,000,000; foreign trade less than 3½ per cent. Under this American tariff of 1861, made for the American people, combining the greatest good to the greatest number, we have so developed our resources until we now produce one-third of the world's mining, one-fourth of the world's manufacturing, one-fifth of the world's farming, and we possess one-sixth of the world's accumulated wealth.

Let us protect and defend this civilization; let us arise above the storm of human passion and unaffected by its rage, and realize in its fullness that all sectionalism, all strife, all hatred, all wrong, may banish before the march of freedom's millions, battling for the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people; that the North and the South, the East and the West, under the crossed swords and locked shields of American liberty, clothed with justice and mercy, may meet in everlasting union and kiss each other in peace.

The *pro forma* amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment. I do not intend to detain the committee even the five minutes that is allotted to me under the rule. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] stated that there were about one million farmers engaged in sheep husbandry. The same statement was made in the report on the McKinley bill, or rather it was stated in that report that there were probably 1,200,000 men engaged in raising sheep, and that placing wool on the free list would wipe out that industry.

Now, the aggregate value of the annual wool clip in the United States is about \$75,000,000; so that if there are 1,000,000 men, or 1,200,000 men, as stated in the McKinley report, the gross value of the product per individual engaged in the industry is about \$70 per annum. It must be a very great industry which yields to each man engaged in it and dependent upon it \$70 per annum; and if the statement be true, I would advise the men who are engaged in raising sheep to sell their sheep and buy a cow, or to go into some other business where they can make a little money. [Laughter.] I withdraw the formal amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to modify the amendment, so that instead of proposing to strike out "all wools" it shall strike out merely the word "wools," after the word "all," in line 5.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of putting in the RECORD the census statement with reference to the number of pounds of scoured wool carpet as well as clothing that were used by the woolen mills of this country in 1890. The number of scoured pounds was 215,001,813. There were used at the same time, as I have already said, 61,626,261 pounds of shoddy. There were 171,880,831 pounds of scoured wool used by our woolen and carpet mills in 1880, together with 52,163,926 pounds of shoddy.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Can the gentleman tell us how many pounds of wool in the grease it takes to make a pound of scoured wool?

Mr. DINGLEY. There were 372,873,713 pounds of clothing and carpet wool as it was purchased by the mills in 1890, most of it in the grease, some of it washed, and some scoured, and it made the quantity of scoured pounds that I have stated, 215,001,813 pounds, with 61,626,261 pounds of shoddy. In the same year, or rather in 1889, a year earlier, according to the report which I have here, the mills of the United Kingdom, including England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland, used 162,380,559 pounds of shoddy, two-and-a-half times as much shoddy as was used by the mills of this country, and more than three times as much per capita as was used in this country.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. How much scoured wool was used in the United Kingdom?

Mr. DINGLEY. According to tables published by the Boston Journal of Commerce, compiled from the latest reports, in 1889 the woolen mills of Great Britain used 247,200,000 pounds of scoured wool against 215,001,813 pounds of scoured wool used by the woolen mills of this country in 1890. Eighteen hundred and eighty-nine and 1890 were peculiarly unfortunate years for the woolen mills of this country on account of the large importations

of foreign manufactures of wool, but very prosperous years for foreign mills. In 1891 the woolen mills of this country were prosperous, and used about 235,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, probably very nearly as much as the woolen mills of Great Britain.

Now, the charge has been made, and it has been argued with a great deal of pertinacity, without a single fact to support the charge, that the fact that we place a protective duty upon wool tends strongly to cause a much larger use of shoddy in this country than exists in a country like Great Britain that has free wool; but the fact is, and the census statistics in this country and the parliamentary statistics in Great Britain show that the use of shoddy per capita is decreasing in the United States and increasing in Great Britain, until, per capita, it is three times as great there as it is here.

Why is it that shoddy is used in the manufacture of woolen cloth as an adulterant? It is for the purpose of cheapening the goods. Shoddy costs in this country, for example, from 10 to 18 cents per pound; but scoured wool costs from 50 to 70 cents per pound. Hence shoddy is used for the purpose of cheapening the manufactured article. Now, shoddy can not be used to any great extent in woolen goods without the knowledge of the wholesale dealer, the man who is accustomed to handling goods.

The fact of this admixture is known to the retail dealer; and it becomes known to the consumer sooner or later. And when shoddy is used the article must be sold at a much cheaper price than if it were not used. Now, the people of this country are much more prosperous than the people of Great Britain; they have more money to expend; they adopt a higher standard of living; they demand better clothing; and the result is that they will not buy shoddy clothing to the extent that it is bought in Great Britain.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. By the use of the word "shoddy" does the gentleman mean to include not only what is technically known as "shoddy," but all other substitutes and adulterants which go into the manufacture of so-called woolen goods?

Mr. DINGLEY. As a matter of fact very little of anything outside of shoddy is used as an adulterant.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I submit that that does not answer the question. I desire to know if the gentleman meant in using the word "shoddy," to include these other articles, whether much or little of them may be used?

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman refer to cotton?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Cotton, camel's hair—

Mr. DINGLEY. Camel's hair, mohair, and goat's hair are not adulterants; they are valuable textile materials used in the best goods.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I said substitutes and adulterants.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move to strike out the last word; and I give the gentleman from Maine the benefit of my time to answer my question. I resubmit the question: When the gentleman used the word "shoddy" did he mean to include or exclude such other substitutes and adulterants as are used in the manufacture of articles which are called woolen?

Mr. DINGLEY. When I used the term "shoddy" I used it as meaning rag wool and similar materials; and they are the only adulterants, properly speaking, that can be used. It is impossible to use cotton as an adulterant without its presence being at once disclosed. Cotton is, therefore, very slightly used as an adulterant, most of the cotton used in so-called woolen goods being used for warps. There are cotton-warp goods, such as the old-fashioned satinet and repellents, which wear a great deal longer than all-wool goods.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I only desire that the gentleman and I should understand each other in the use of the word. I did not mean to say that shoddy is the only substitute used here or in England; nor did I mean to say that shoddy may not be honestly used so that everybody knows what it is. The statement I submitted was that not only shoddy, which is largely wool, but other substitutes and adulterants which are not wool were used in America; and it is no answer to my statement to say that shoddy is used in England.

Mr. DINGLEY. My general statement is this, and the facts on careful examination will sustain it: adulterants are used to a smaller extent per capita in this country than in the United Kingdom.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Now to avoid any misunderstanding I deny that statement; and the gentleman may put the proof, if he has it, in the RECORD. In denying the statement I want to say another thing. The gentleman speaks of a per capita use of these articles in America and the British Isles. He ought to understand that that is not a fair method of stating the matter. We do not sell woollens to anybody except

Americans; but the British manufactures of wool are sold pretty nearly all over the world.

Our export trade in woollens is so little as to be practically nothing; but the British export of all forms of woollens is very large; and as to a certain character of goods known, generally speaking, as woollen goods, made by the English manufacturer to be sold in comparatively warm climates, substitutes are publicly put in so as to make the goods more suitable for those who are to use them.

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, they are always purposely put in.  
[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BURROWS. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that my friend from Tennessee will postpone the vote until morning on this amendment, as it is a kind of test vote.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think we ought to have one vote to-night, to see how it lies. I would like to have a vote on this question, and will then move that the committee rise.

Mr. BURROWS. I would say to my friend from Tennessee that several gentlemen have asked me quite recently if we would have a vote on this to-night and I said probably not. A number have gone, I think, from the Hall. It will not expedite it much to take the vote to-night and it will accommodate us very much to postpone it. We have no desire to delay action.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have no objection to this going over until morning if it can be understood that debate is now closed.

Mr. BURROWS. I have no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. You mean debate on this amendment?

Mr. McMILLIN. On this amendment.

Mr. BURROWS. We have no disposition whatever to delay proceeding.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that this go over until morning, with the understanding that the vote shall be taken as soon as we go into Committee of the Whole again without further debate.

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly,

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the committee now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it can not enforce an agreement between the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. McMILLIN. I understand that; but there is no doubt that the agreement will be lived up to, and that it can be carried out in the manner suggested.

The motion of Mr. McMILLIN was then agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6007, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois (on motion of Mr. SMITH of Illinois), indefinitely, on account of business; and

To Mr. COX of New York, for the remainder of the week, on account of important business.

And then, on motion of Mr. McMILLIN (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution referring to the Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 5352) for the relief of Margaret Virginia Maddox. (Report No. 970.)

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee, from the same committee:

A bill (H. R. 3002) for the relief of John T. Brown. (Report No. 971.)

A bill (H. R. 4402) for the relief of John A. Bates. (Report No. 972.)

By Mr. COX of Tennessee, from the Committee on Claims: A bill (S. 43) for the relief of the personal representatives of Adelia Cheatham, deceased. (Report No. 974.)

By Mr. WILSON of Missouri, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 6936), granting a pension to Perry G. Ware, Florida war. (Report 973.)

Also, from the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 6547) to grant a pension to Henry S. Bethards. (Report No. 975.)

A bill (H. R. 4378) granting a pension to Benjamin Churchill. (Report No. 976.)

By Mr. PARRETT, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (H. R. 5012) to increase the pension of Thomas Enlow. (Report No. 977.)

#### BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, and a resolution of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 7844) for the enlargement of the volume of the currency and the distribution of the same—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARUTH: A resolution of the General Assembly of Kentucky, favoring the extension of the commissioners of agriculture of the several States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

#### PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALDERSON: A bill (H. R. 7846) for the relief of Dr. Mat Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7847) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Clinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7848) granting a pension to James A. Wiggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7849) granting a pension to E. G. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7850) granting a pension to Harvey and Mary Ann Walls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7851) granting a pension to Isaac Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7852) granting a pension to Marshall Cottrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7853) for the relief of G. W. Ratcliff—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7854) granting a pension to James H. Matheney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7855) for the relief of W. T. Appling—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BACON (by request): A bill (H. R. 7856) for the relief of Julius Stahel—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRETZ: A bill (H. R. 7857) for the relief of Cornelius Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 7858) for the relief of the House of the Good Shepherd—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COX of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7859) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Pulaski, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 7860) for the relief of Enoch Voyles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 7861) for the relief of Anna Ella Carroll, and to place her name on the pension roll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKERSON: A bill (H. R. 7862) granting a pension to John B. Younger, of Grant County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNPHY: A bill (H. R. 7863) to increase the pension of Annie M. Charsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 7864) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Hayes, deceased, late of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7865) for the relief of Thomas M. Wadley, for back pay and bounty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EPES: A bill (H. R. 7866) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to T. J. Jarrett, collector and custodian of customs at city of Petersburg, Va., the sum of \$60 per month for his compensation from January 1, 1890—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 7867) for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Manfee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER of Georgia: A bill (7868) for the relief of Charles V. Neidlinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCCREARY: A bill (H. R. 7869) for the relief of S. Collier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7870) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Fountain S. Gough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARRETT: A bill (H. R. 7871) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William W. Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNTER: A bill (H. R. 7872) for the relief of John G. Lee and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7873) for the relief of M. H. Johns—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7874) granting a pension to Sarah Smiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7875) for the relief of Thomas J. Graves, of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7876) for the relief of H. C. Kincaid, administrator of John Kincaid, of Corinth, Miss., formerly of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 7877) to grant an honorable discharge to George S. Raymond, late captain Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HORN: A bill (H. R. 7878) granting an increase of pension to William Shelley, late of the Thirtieth New York State Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7879) for the relief of A. O. Williamson, of Madison County, Ill.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7880) for the relief of Matthew N. Grimmett, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7881) for the relief of William McD. Taylor, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 7882) for the relief of settlers upon certain lands within recent reservations in the county of Tulare and State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7883) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Mason, widow of late Julius W. Mason, major Third Regiment United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7884) granting a pension to Vandalia Riddle—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. ABBOTT: Petition of citizens of Ellis County, Tex., remonstrating against the passage of House bill 395, concerning lard and lard compound, and similar measures—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALDERSON: Petition of 23 citizens of Green Brier County, W. Va., for passage of a law regulating speculation in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 37 citizens of West Virginia, in favor of adoption of resolution offered by Mr. DURBOROW on January 11, 1892, for a new system of spelling—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of 23 citizens of Charleston, W. Va., asking passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent any State from appropriating any money for any purpose to any institution under sectarian contract—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREW: Petition of the Metropolitan Steamship Company and others, to widen and deepen the main ship channel in Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BABBITT: Petition of business men of Watertown, Jefferson County, Wis., in favor of free delivery of mails in rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society, against the free use of the lands of the Government for pasturing stock, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Wisconsin State Cranberry Association, favoring appropriation for telegraph frost warnings—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, to amend the interstate commerce law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Walworth County, Wis., against removal of the duty on barley—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Milwaukee, favorable to uniform bill of lading—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Jefferson County, Wis., opposed to the passage of House bill 2699, known as the Hatch bill, and Senate bill 1757, known as the Washburn bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of farmers of Milton, Mo., in favor of the free delivery of mails through country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of D. P. Clough and others, of Walworth, Wis., against the removal of duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers and business men, of Vienna, Wis., against the passage of House bill 1757, known as Washburn bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELTZHOVER: Petition of Michael Fiscel, Michael Schartz, Josiah Benner, Jacob Benner, Franklin Swisher, estate of Peter Frey and estate of Nicholas Eckenrode—all to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, thirty-five petitions as follows: Petition of Henry Culp,

estate of Peter Raffenspuger, estate of David Zeigler, George W. Rose, Alexander Cobean, George Arnold, Peter Conover, David Blubaugh, John T. Haner, Drusilla Kirbst, Samuel S. Moritz, estate of George Grimm, sr., John Memshow, Sarah E. Weikert, John Martin, John Houck, estate of Dr. David Study, Peter Orndorff, Eliza Felterhaff, Solomon J. Wilty, Lydia Loyster, John Group, Michael Frey, Elizabeth Wible, Jacob Baker, Lewis A. Bushman, Nathaniel Lightner, and William Patterson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of members of the Presbyterian Church, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., for the closing of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Newville, Pa., and its vicinity, in favor of the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution providing against any law respecting the establishment of religion—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELKNAP: Four petitions of citizens, as follows, of Michigan, containing in the aggregate 147 names, praying for the enactment of a law by Congress, subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, favoring amendment to the naturalization laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLAND: Petition of George Elmon of Texas County, Mo., asking to have his claim referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE: Resolutions of citizens of Millridge, Me., protesting against the passage of the Lapham bill for the taking of menhaden and mackerel with purse seines in bays and inlets of the United States—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of citizens of Plymouth, in favor of House bill 120, to exclude impure matter from the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Penobscot County, Me., in favor of the pure-lard bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWERS: Petition of Grass Valley Grange, California, asking the passage of a law prohibiting dealing in options—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of George W. Barnett and others, of Salem, Ind., for relief of George W. Barnett and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of New Albany, Ind., in regard to a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Seymour, Ind., in favor of Senate bill 254—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution relating to establishment of religion—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, against opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BRICKNER: Petition of citizens of Random Lake and vicinity, Wisconsin, against repeal of duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Milwaukee (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, asking for amendment to the interstate-commerce law, so as to prevent unjust discrimination—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Wisconsin Cranberry Growers' Association, praying for an extension of the telegraph weather service, so as to protect cranberry and tobacco crops from frost—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Cato, Manitowoc County, Wis., favoring the Hatch option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Wisconsin—one from Calumet County and the other from Sheboygan County—against the passage of Senate bill 1757 and House bill 2699—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, two protests of citizens of Wisconsin; one of Sheboygan County and the other of Ozaukee, against the repeal of the import duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSEY: Thirteen petitions bearing 295 signatures of citizens of Illinois, praying for enactment of law by Congress subjecting oleomargarine to the provisions of the laws of the several States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYNUM: Petition of J. W. Girton and others, of Shelby County, Ind., for free delivery of mail in country districts, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CATE: Petition of 22 citizens of Pocahtontas, Ark., against gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPEHART: Petition of Allen C. Vickers, for special act granting a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: Protest of Rev. C. J. K. Jones and the Church of the Messiah, against closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, and favoring free admission to workingmen on that day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CHAPIN: Memorial and petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., and others, in favor of the passage of an amendment to the Constitution, to be known as the sixteenth amendment, prohibiting the establishment of any religion, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming: Three petitions, as follows: One by John C. Friend and 82 others, of Wyoming; the second by John Henry and 70 others; and the third by Thomas Hendley and 17 others, all praying for the establishment of a branch home for disabled volunteer soldiers and sailors at Fort Fred Steele military reservation, in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLOVER: Remonstrance of citizens of Southern Kansas, protesting against passage of the Perkins Indian educational bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Alabama (by request): Petition of W. G. Brewer and others, of Macon County, Ala., for passage of an act regulating speculation in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOMBS: Affidavits of S. Colten and others, in support of her claim to a bill—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAIG of Pennsylvania: Petition of 44 citizens of Washington County, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution that no State shall pass a law concerning the establishment of any religion—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSBY: Petition of Chestnut Hill Grange, No. 191, of Massachusetts, in favor of free delivery of mails in rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the same body, in favor of pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the same body, in favor of a bill to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the same body, in favor of pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of Watertown Grange, No. 7, of Watertown, N. Y., against establishing religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Two petitions of sundry citizens of Alleghany County (Twenty-second Congressional district), in favor of amendment of the naturalization and immigration laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Allegheny Day Nursery, in favor of withholding appropriation to the World's Fair unless on condition that it be not opened on the Sabbath day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petition of citizens of Cass County, Mo., for the passage of the anti-option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKERSON: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John B. Younger, of Grant County, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMUNDS: Petition for closing World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Petition of 6 business men of Mount Erie, Ill., asking the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petition of Edward N. D. Walker of Blossburg, Jefferson County, Ala., for pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Rev. W. T. Allen, and others, of Gallodega, Ala., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 362, providing against the removal of the Southern Utes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of citizens of Kincaid, Kans., against passage of bankrupt law—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of citizens of Jewell County, Kans., for passage of anti-option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GANTZ: Two petitions, one by Center Grange, No. 87, of Ohio, and the other of Captown Grange, No. 1150, asking for the extension of the free delivery of mails to rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, two petitions of Center Grange, No. 87, one asking for legislation for the encouragement of silk culture, and the other to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Center Grange, asking for the passage of an act making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment

of all debts—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GREENLEAF: Petition of professors and students of the Rochester Theological Seminary of New York, that the Commissioners of the Columbian Exposition do not open the doors of the Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, two petitions of Brockport Grange, No. 93, of New York, one for a law to prevent adulteration of food and drugs, and the other to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Gates Grange, No. 421, of New York, urging passage of an act making certain issues of money a full legal tender in payment of debts—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEARD: Petition of citizens of Polk County, Mo., praying that Congress grant a pension to Morgan A. Russell, son of Samuel Russell, a soldier of the war of the American Revolution—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOAR: Petition of Horace Austin, ex-governor of Minnesota, and 84 others, asking for laws and a means of enforcing them on the Indian reservations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of 27 citizens of New York, favoring a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting establishment of any form of religion or appropriating money to any institution wholly or in part under sectarian control—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 87 students of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, that if aid be given the Columbian Exposition it shall be conditioned that said Exposition be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of E. Brown and 36 others of Steuben County, Ind., for regulating speculation in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCREARY: Memorial and petition of William B. Stewart and John G. Fee and others, in regard to amendment of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of William B. Stevens and John G. Fee and others, asking Congress not to aid the World's Fair with an appropriation of money unless the managers first agree to debar the saloon and observe the Lord's day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. McDONALD: Petition of John E. Reid and others in regard to immigration and naturalization—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKEIGHAN: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, in favor of the passage of a law to prevent dealing in options—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSUR: Papers in the claim of William Heryford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mason Wilconsin, of Vernon, Tex., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of William Simons and 16 others, of New Cumberland, Ind., for a pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of shipowners and shipmasters engaged in commerce on the Great Lakes, against placing Chicago River under control of city authorities and removing jurisdiction of War Department over said river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Excelsior Marine Benevolent Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., against depriving the War Department of the control of the Chicago River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of Milwaukee, asking that the Department of Labor be authorized to investigate the slums of large cities—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of 700 citizens of Milwaukee, for complete exclusion of Chinese from all territory within the jurisdiction of the United States—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: Petition favoring bill to prevent dealing in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of William F. Warren, of Boston, Mass., against the opening of the World's Fair at Chicago on the Sabbath—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Hon. Henry O. Fairbanks, mayor, and 11 others of Quincy, Mass., asking Congress to provide courts and systems of law for and in the Indian reservations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking that no appropriation be made for the Columbian

Exposition unless the same be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition of Biggs & Downing, application for relief, to accompany House bill 7800—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Petition of Evangelical churches of Battle Creek, Mich., in favor of an appropriation for the World's Fair provided the same be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, asking for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States preventing States from requiring any religious tests, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'FERRALL: Petition of James H. Kennan, of Clarke County, Va., praying that his claim for stores taken by the military forces of the United States may be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OWENS: Petition of residents of Farnsville, asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PAYNTER: Petition of Z. R. Fletcher and evidence accompanying, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON: Papers to accompany House bill 7745, for the removal of the charge of desertion from the name of James F. Canedy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of citizens of Oswego County, N. Y., for regulating speculation in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of citizens of Columbus, N. Y., for the free delivery of mails in country districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, two petitions, one of Bartonville Grange, No. 589, and the other of Chittenango Grange, No. 688, New York, in favor of House bill 395, defining lard, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, four petitions by the same bodies; two in favor of a law to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs, and two to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Deposit, Broome County, N. Y., for the closing of the Chicago Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Windsor, Broome County, in favor of a law regulating speculation in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Chittenango Grange, No. 688, New York, for a law prohibiting all contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIFE: Petition of the American Defense Association, representing 150 citizens of Harrisburg and vicinity, advocating the passage of a bill to amend the naturalization laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 258, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Fredericksburg, Pa., for the same—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHELL: Petition of the heirs of Robert W. Fuller, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Daniel T. Pope, of Edisto Island, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Robert G. Lamar, of Columbia, S. C., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Joseph J. Pope, sr., for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs and devisees of John J. T. Pope—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John W. R. Pope and heirs of F. P. Pope, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of John A. P. Scott, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of the heirs of James B. Seabrook, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the ministers of the evangelical churches of Laurens, S. C., protesting against the opening of the Columbian Exposition on the Lord's day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the students and faculty of the South Carolina Presbyterian College, in reference to the opening of the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SHONK: Petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Twelfth Pennsylvania district, asking that no exposition or exhibition for which appropriations are made

by Congress shall be opened on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Washington Camp No. 144, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Eckley, Luzerne County, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the passage by any State of a law establishing any religion, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Memorial of Tampa Board of Trade, asking continuance of the fast mail line from Tampa, Fla., and a mail steamship line to Colon—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of White Plains, N. Y., favoring the passage of the proposed sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, providing that no State shall pass laws either respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor in making appropriation for the aid of any church, institution, or society, wholly or in part under sectarian control—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. Dewey, asking that the metric system be used exclusively in the customs service—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of mass meeting at Cooper Union, New York, asking that a law be passed absolutely and perpetually excluding the Chinese from the United States (except diplomats, etc.), and providing for the enumeration and registration of those already here—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John Conway, asking the repeal of the Yosemite National Park law—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of practical astronomers concerning a change of management—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, communication of Theodore Gilman, asking that the World's Fair be denied the appropriation unless closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, protest of Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce against the passage of the Washburn option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, two protests, one of the New York Cotton Exchange, and the other of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, against the Hatch bill (H. R. 2699), the Washburn bill (S. 685), and the Peffer bill (S. 1268)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of the Minneapolis Business Union, against the passage of the Washburn option bill 1757—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of the twenty-fourth assembly district in favor of passing the proposed sixteenth amendment to the Constitution that no State shall pass any law regarding the establishment of any religion, or restricting the same, nor make an appropriation for any church, institution, or society in part or wholly under sectarian control—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, communications of Rev. Hobart in regard to the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. VINCENT A. TAYLOR: Petition of 867 citizens of Wellington, Ohio, that no appropriation or loan be made for the World's Fair, except on condition, first, that the same be closed on the Sabbath; second, that the sale of liquors be prohibited within the exposition; third, that the art department be managed according to the American standard of purity in art—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, two petitions, one of citizens of Penfield, and the other of Cleveland, Ohio, for proposed form of sixteenth amendment to the Constitution regarding appropriation for sectarian instruction—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Kirtland Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring silk culture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Lake County, favoring the passage of House bill 11 as amended—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Protest of citizens of Fair Play, Colo., against the passage of a bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 30, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Fairplay, Colo., in favor of bill reported by the Judiciary Committee to amend the naturalization laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 53 citizens of La Veta, Colo., in favor of a law to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Horse Creek Grange, No. 91, of Colorado, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions by the same body; one to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs, and the other for the encouragement of silk culture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of Mary C. Smith, to accompany



a bill granting to her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. WARWICK: Petition of J. B. Baltzy, and many other citizens of Wooster, Ohio, against opening the World's Fair on Sunday, and against the sale of liquor on the grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WILLCOX: Paper in regard to self-registering instruments for New Haven—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mansfield Post, Connecticut, marking the battle lines at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Meriden, Conn., for closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of Isaac Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers in claim of William F. Sotory, of Jefferson County, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Daniel Briant—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of John J. Yahne, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Nancy Drigmore, widow of Wilson Drigmore, of the Black Hawk war in 1832—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of North Carolina: Petition of J. Van Lindley and others, of Guilford County, N. C., to prohibit the opening on Sunday of any exposition where United States funds are expended—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: Resolution of Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash., asking Congress to give the States certain unsold public lands for public parks—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Chelan Board of Trade and citizens of Chelan, and also citizens of Chelan Falls, Wash., for the early completion of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Railroads and Canals.

Also, petition of Maple Grove Grange, No. 45, of the State of Washington, for pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Whatcom County, Wash., praying the passage of House bill 401, relating to immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 21 citizens of Skagit, Wash., for the enactment of the antioption bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 5, 1892.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### EMPLOYÉS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, inclosing, in response to a resolution of the 24th ultimo, a list of subordinates employed in that institution on March 1, 1892; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of J. H. Garman and sundry other citizens of the United States, relative to the proposed loan to the World's Columbian Exposition on condition that the same be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of citizens of Marion, Iowa, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the First Congregational Church, of Cresco, Iowa, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday, and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of Division 226, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, praying for the passage of House bill 7512, to promote the safety of railway employes and travelers; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pennsylvania, signed by 399 members; petitions of 38 congregations, organizations, and meetings held in Pennsylvania, embracing about 5,750 members, and the petition of G. M. Sloan and 394 other citizens of Allegheny, Pa., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat, and that the art department be managed accord-

ing to the American standard of purity in art; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Vessel Owners and Captains' Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the bill to transfer the revenue-cutter service from the Treasury to the Navy Department; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of Harry Suplee and 40 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the Faulkner, Caine, and Teller bills to provide home rule for Utah Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the city council of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the early completion of Fort Brady; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the iron ship building companies of the Great Lakes, praying for the early and complete abrogation of the treaty of 1817 with Great Britain; for legislation to construct a 20-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic, and for the repeal of section 4136 of the Revised Statutes, granting a registry to foreign-built vessels under certain conditions; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Joseph L. Hudson and 77 other citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the passage of legislation for the relief of Theodore Memger, of Detroit, Mich.; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented the petition of Alanson Niles and 42 other citizens of Flushing, Mich.; a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Flushing, Mich.; a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bear Lake, Mich., containing 313 individual signatures; and petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lapeer and Belding, Mich., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the following petitions of Sherwood Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Michigan:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAVIS presented resolutions of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Board of Trade, favoring an appropriation for a survey and estimate of the cost of opening up communication from the Great Lakes to the sea for vessels drawing 20 feet of water, and also indorsing the efforts of Senator DAVIS to secure the construction of a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the seacoast; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Coldwater, Ohio, praying for the passage of Senate bill 641, to adjust the pensions of those who have lost limbs or the use of them or have additional disabilities; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for a survey of a practicable line for a canal to unite Lake Superior and the Mississippi River at the Twin Cities; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented resolutions of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Board of Trade, indorsing resolutions passed by the Board of Trade of Aitkin, Minn., requesting such change in the plan of construction of the Government dam at Sandy Lake, Minn., as will permit the free passage of steamboats in and out of that lake; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of citizens of York County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Cambria County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Montgomery County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Montgomery County, Ohio, and a memorial of citizens of Seneca County, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Faulkner, Caine, and Teller bills to provide home rule for Utah Territory; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DOLPH presented a memorial of citizens of Oregon City, Oregon, remonstrating against licensing the sale of liquor in Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Perrin H. Cardwell,