

of a law to prevent gambling in farm products, and in favor of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of members of the Christian Union of Young People's Societies of Huron County, Ohio, asking Congress to make no appropriation for the World's Fair except upon condition that the Exposition be closed on Sunday and that no liquors be sold on the grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): Petition of W. L. Griffins and others of Franklin County, Ark., against committing the Government to a course of religious legislation by act to close the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Colorado, to pass the bill to prohibit opening of any exposition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, resolutions of Senior and Junior League of Methodist Church, Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Presbyterian Church, and many other citizens of Central City, Colo., in favor of appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the World's Fair on condition that the Fair be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition of John Larkin, mayor of Middlesex, Mich., and others for the passage of House bill 8925—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WIKE: Petition of J. W. Hewett and 50 others of Greene County, Ill., against committing the United States Government to a union of church and state by act to close the World's Fair on Sunday, or in any other way committing Government to a course of religious legislation—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Massachusetts: Petition of D. Fitzgerald, of Brookline, Mass., that on and after July 1, 1893, the metric system of weights be used in the customs service—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of North Carolina: Petition of citizens of Burlington, N. C., against opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Rome, Pa., against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 28, 1892.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

ADJOURNMENT OVER DECORATION DAY.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FORNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 9040) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1893; which was read twice, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is understood that all points of order are reserved.

CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, inviting attention to the necessity for an appropriation for the enforcement of the act approved May 5, entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States;" which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PAY OF BAILIFFS, UNITED STATES COURTS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General, submitting for an appropriation a voucher of expenses incurred under the appropriation for pay of bailiffs, etc., United States courts, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

POSTAL SERVICE INCIDENT TO COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the

Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Postmaster-General for the postal service incident to the World's Columbian Exposition for the fiscal years 1893 and 1894; which was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

L. A. BARKER VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of L. A. Barker, deceased, against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN WARREN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of John Warren, with an amendment of the Senate thereto.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 2, strike out all after "to," down to and including "service," line 6, and insert: "Revoke and set aside so much of Special Orders numbered 245, War Department, Adjutant-General's Office, Washington, September 17, 1882, as dishonorably discharged Capt. John Warren, Sixty-third New York Volunteers, the service of the United States, and grant him an honorable discharge from the service as of date September 17, 1882."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair laid before the House several Senate bills, and the titles having been once printed in the RECORD, if there be no objection the Chair will have the bills referred without the titles being again read.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

A bill (S. 223) for the relief of George A. Barnes—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1008) granting a pension to Abasha Risk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1186) granting a pension to Joseph H. Weltey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1254) granting a pension to Anson Northrup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1536) to increase the pension of Leroy Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1691) granting a pension to Josephine I. Ofley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 1743) for the relief of the legal representatives of William D. Wilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 1962) granting an honorable discharge to William Pierce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Samuel Collins—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2114) for the relief of William H. Rhett—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2260) for the relief of the trustees of Isaac R. Trimble—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2407) for the relief of the legal representative or representatives of Franklin S. Whiting, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 2304) to reclassify and prescribe the salaries of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

A bill (S. 2612) granting a pension to Tendoy, chief of the Bannocks, Shoshones, and Sheepeaters tribes of Indians—to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2778) granting a pension to Anna E. Barnard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (S. 3011) to amend "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A joint resolution (H. Res. 47) authorizing the subdivision of square 673, in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. COX of New York, for five days, on account of important business.

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

To Mr. CURTIS, for one day, on account of important business.

ESTATE OF JOHN W. WHITFIELD.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill (S. 242) for the relief of the estate of John W. Whitfield, late register of the land office in the Delaware land district of Kansas, be taken from the Private Calendar and put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the suit now pending in the circuit court of the

United States for the western district of Texas, at the November sessions, 1887, numbered 346, brought by the United States against Sarah B. Whitfield, as widow of the late John W. Whitfield, and her son, John A. Whitfield, sole heir at law of the said John W. Whitfield, deceased, late register as aforesaid, on the official bond of William W. Dennison, as an Indian agent, to recover the amount of the penalty on said bond, the said John W. Whitfield being a surety thereon, shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent of both parties thereto; and in and at the trial of said cause the said court shall hear and determine all disputes and differences between the United States and the said John W. Whitfield, in reference to his various accounts as register of the land office in the Delaware land district of Kansas, and also in relation to his accounts as special register and superintendent of the sales of the Delaware and of the Iowa Indian trust lands, under the treaties of May 6, and of May 17, 1854, as well under said Indian treaties as under the laws for the compensation of registers and receivers; and the said defendants in the trial of said cause shall be permitted and be entitled to make defense and claim set-off in favor of the said John W. Whitfield, in said court, if said court shall determine him to be entitled thereto, with the same effect as if said suit were commenced by an individual against the said defendants as widow and heir of the said John W. Whitfield, and said set-off shall not be barred by any statute of limitations; and the said court shall determine the amount of the fees received from the assignees or holders of military bounty-land warrants, by the said John W. Whitfield, late register, as aforesaid, for the location of said warrants, and shall also determine, by the acts of Congress providing for the location of said warrants, what portion of said fees, if any, belonged by said acts of Congress to the said Whitfield for his services in having located the same, and any such sum so found shall be allowed as an offset in said cause; and the said court shall file a written opinion in said cause and render judgment therein, subject to the right of appeal by either party; and any balance that may be found due to the said John W. Whitfield, late register and special agent as aforesaid, over and above the amount that may be found due by him on said bond of William W. Dennison, as Indian agent, shall be certified by said court to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall pay the same to Mrs. Sarah B. Whitfield, administratrix of the estate of the said John W. Whitfield, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and it is hereby made the duty of any Department or of any bureau to furnish said administratrix, free of charge, with certified copies of any official letters, papers, documents, or accounts appertaining to a proper trial of said suit, which she or her duly appointed agent or attorney may apply for in writing.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that this bill be now put upon its passage?

MR. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be some explanation of the bill.

MR. SAYERS. I will explain it.

MR. BELTZHOOVER. Mr. Speaker, is there a report accompanying this?

MR. SAYERS. There is. I will first explain the bill.

MR. BELTZHOOVER. I would rather have the report read.

MR. SAYERS. It can be read afterwards.

MR. BELTZHOOVER. Very well.

MR. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed through both Houses at the short session of the Fiftieth Congress, but failed to reach the President in time to become a law. The facts as reported by the committee are, substantially, that on March 10, 1857, John W. Whitfield became a surety on the official bond of William W. Dennison as an Indian agent in Nebraska Territory. Afterwards Whitfield was appointed register of the land office in the Delaware land district of Kansas, and also a special register and superintendent of the sales of the Delaware and other Indian trust lands in Kansas.

On March 28, 1861, the Secretary of the Interior ordered all moneys due Whitfield as register to be withheld, subject to the settlement of the accounts of Dennison as Indian agent. In April, 1861, Whitfield, through his attorney, requested the Secretary of the Interior to bring suit on the official bond of the said Dennison and have the matter adjusted, which was not done. In 1869 Whitfield died. In 1884 Mrs. Sarah B. Whitfield, his widow and administratrix, through her duly appointed agent, applied for a settlement of the account of her husband, which was refused.

In an official communication to Mrs. Whitfield's agent of December 6, 1884, it was admitted and stated that for nine quarters Whitfield was not paid any commission on the moneys received for public lands sold by him, nor was he allowed any of the fees for lands located by military bounty land warrants in his office during that time, and that for three quarters he had not been paid anything for salary due to him, and the agent was further informed in said communication as follows: "In the case of Whitfield you must look to Congress for relief." The agent also made application for a further adjustment of the accounts of said Whitfield as special register and superintendent of the sales of certain Indian trust lands, under certain Indian treaties, as construed by the Supreme Court of the United States, on March 3, 1884, in the case of one of the four special agents appointed to sell those Indian trust lands, which request was refused, on the ground that it required an act of Congress authorizing or requiring it to be done. She then proposed to compromise with the Government the claim which the United States hold against the estate of her late husband by reason of an alleged defalcation of the said Dennison, which compromise the Solicitor of the Treasury refused to recommend.

In 1887, more than a quarter of a century after Dennison had ceased to be an Indian agent, the Solicitor of the Treasury instituted a suit against Sarah B. Whitfield, as surviving wife, and her son John A. Whitfield, as sole heirs at law of John W. Whit-

field, on the official bond of Dennison, in the circuit court of the United States for the western district of Texas, November sessions, 1887. This suit is still pending, and has been continued by the Government from term to term in order that the defendants may be authorized by Congress to make defense and claim as a set-off in the trial of the suit any and all sum or sums of money due John W. Whitfield as register and as special register and superintendent of the sales of Indian trust lands.

The Fifty-first Congress authorized one-half of the trust moneys received for lands sold by Whitfield and other special agents, together with the accrued interest thereon, to be paid over to one of the tribes for whom a portion of the trust lands were sold. The Delaware Indian treaty of May 6, 1854, and the treaty with the united tribe of Wea, etc., Indians of May 30, 1854, under which the trust lands were sold, expressly stipulate that the expenses of the sales of the trust lands shall be deducted from the proceeds of sales and that the net proceeds only shall be paid over by the trustee to the Indians. Therefore, in order to protect the interests of the United States, the account of Whitfield as special agent should be finally settled before said trust moneys pass out of the hands of the trustee.

The heirs of John W. Whitfield do not ask to be released from their responsibility in consequence of his being a surety on the official bond of Dennison as an Indian agent. They merely desire a final settlement of the question, and in the trial to be permitted and entitled to make defense and claim set-off in favor of Whitfield, as provided for in the bill.

MR. OATES. This bill only changes the rule of evidence in this particular case, and permits this amount to be brought in as an equitable set-off?

MR. SAYERS. That is all. It simply allows a set-off of what is due him from the Government.

MR. BURROWS. As a set-off to this particular claim?

MR. SAYERS. That is all.

MR. DINGLEY. That is all right.

MR. BURROWS. There is no objection to that.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the question being upon its third reading.

The question was taken; and upon a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 82, noes 1.

MR. BAILEY. No quorum.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum has voted.

MR. McMILLIN. I hope the gentleman from Texas will withdraw the bill.

MR. BELKNAP. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MR. BELKNAP. Is it too late to interpose objection to the consideration of this bill?

THE SPEAKER. It is. The gentleman asked unanimous consent to consider the bill, which was given. We were proceeding to do so and the question was being taken on the third reading of the bill when the point of no quorum was made.

MR. McMILLIN. I hope the bill will be withdrawn.

MR. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Let us have the regular order.

THE SPEAKER. The regular order is the vote on the third reading of this bill, and the Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

MR. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if the House will permit me to do so, that this bill may be allowed to retain its present status until Tuesday morning, after the approval of the Journal, and that we may then take a vote upon it; the bill remaining in its present position.

MR. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I will have to object to that.

THE SPEAKER. The tellers will take their places.

MR. SAYERS. I hope the gentleman will not object to the request. It will not consume any time.

MR. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I am informed that the purpose is only to take a vote; and if so, I withdraw my objection.

MR. SAYERS. That is all.

THE SPEAKER. That is all it will take now. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the pending bill may retain its status, and go over until Tuesday, to be voted upon immediately after the reading of the Journal?

MR. WILSON of Washington. I do not rise to object, but to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MR. WILSON of Washington. Granting the unanimous consent, to which I have no objection, could I couple with it a request that I may call up my bill, and have conferees appointed immediately after this is disposed of?

THE SPEAKER. The Chair can only submit the request of

the gentleman to the House. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. The bill will retain its present status, and go over until Tuesday morning.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

Mr. DURBOROW, from the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition, reported, as a substitute for House bill 3620 and House joint resolution 125, a joint resolution (H. Res. 136) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to make proclamation recommending to the people the observance of a general holiday in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America on October 12, 1892; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The bill H. R. 3620 and joint resolution H. Res. 125 were laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DECATUR, ILL.

Mr. NEWBERRY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment a bill (H. R. 87) for the erection of a public building at the city of Decatur, Ill.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. GILLESPIE, for one week, on account of important business.

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

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to; there being, on a division (called for by Mr. TARSNEY)—ayes 91, nays 0.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. BUCHANAN of Virginia in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the post-office appropriation bill.

Mr. BERGEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, has referred in glowing terms to the growth of the country and the revenues of the Post-Office Department as compared with its expenses. I have enjoyed these allusions, more especially because they come from a gentleman on the other side of the House, to which I shall feel called upon in discussing this bill to state some matters connected with the legislation proposed which seem to me incompatible with this growth of country.

I do not know that I shall be able in any way to change this legislation, yet I feel called upon to bring the subject to the attention of the House somewhat in detail, at the risk of not always being interesting, for appropriation bills are not very attractive, and the discussion of figures connected with the revenues and the finances of the country can not always be specially inviting.

This bill, seemingly, has two objects—to create an unusual deficiency and to cripple the Department. I do not see why any party occupying the lofty position of holding three-fourths of the membership of this House should feel called upon to undertake to cripple a Department of the Government. But such seems to be the meaning and intention of this bill. Yet it is a delusion to set forth this bill as reducing the amount of money appropriated for this branch of the service to the extent claimed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

There are three items of the bill which include about half the appropriations made by it. The branches of the service covered by these items would still go on if we should not appropriate a dollar; there would simply be a deficiency recorded against the Department; and these deficiencies would all be paid. In the last two of those three items this bill proposes to make a deficiency. They are the appropriation for advertising, \$18,000; the appropriation for compensation of postmasters, \$15,250,000; and the appropriation for mail routes, \$23,483,675.51. On the first of these there is no deduction from the estimate of the Department. In the second there is a deduction of \$115,000, and in the third a deduction of \$500,000.

I have here a statement in detail of the expenditures on this last item in previous years. In 1882 the expenditure was \$10,286,085; 1883, \$11,155,179.74; 1884, \$12,131,950.35; 1885, \$13,558,-

313.78; 1886, \$14,149,401.85; 1887, \$14,717,281.74; 1888, \$15,790,841.51; 1889, \$17,843,357.70; 1890, \$19,087,274.57; 1891, \$20,980,920.28. I have no statement, of course, for the fiscal year 1892, which will not conclude until the end of next month. An examination of these figures shows that the growth of expense in this item is about 17½ per cent in two years. There is 17½ per cent of increase of expense in 1891 over 1889; and that is a fair proportion of growth in each period of two years.

In estimating for the next year there ought, it would seem, to be carried in this bill 17½ per cent over the expenses of 1891. That would make this item \$24,652,681, \$1,169,024 more than the bill proposes to appropriate and \$669,024 more than the estimate. This last amount was cut off by the Postmaster-General in making his estimates. I state this to show that he undoubtedly made a close estimate, as close as past experience would warrant, and to cut off half a million more, except with light which the committee does not possess, must be injurious to the service.

The bill carries a total of \$78,728,228.70, according to the Postmaster-General, and according to the chairman of the committee \$78,216,067.92, a difference of \$512,160.78.

There is evidently a very strenuous effort on the part of the majority of this committee to reduce the amount which this bill proposes to carry in order to present to the country, I presume, the idea that an actual reduction has been made. The statement of the chairman is misleading.

This difference between the Postmaster-General's calculation and the calculation of the chairman of the committee comes entirely from the foreign mail service and from the Confederate records, two sums which are claimed to have been appropriated, and by this bill are reappropriated.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I wish to say to the gentleman that the \$10,000 for Confederate records is not reappropriated. It was appropriated by the Fifty-first Congress, and all that this bill does is to instruct the Postmaster-General, with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney-General, to buy the books that he was authorized to buy by the appropriation made by the last Congress. The appropriation is still in the Treasury, still available. We do not appropriate anything.

Mr. BERGEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that if the Postmaster-General does not use that money it goes back into the Treasury at the end of two years.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. But it does not go back now?

Mr. BERGEN. No.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. It does not go back for two years to come.

Mr. BERGEN. Well, it is a small matter of \$10,000; but it is necessary in order to show the difference of calculation between the chairman of the committee and the Postmaster-General. What is presented on the part of the chairman of this committee? That there is a surplus for the year 1891 of \$91,013.23, and for 1892 of \$411,174.58, making a total of \$502,160.81.

Now, add to that the \$10,000 which is appropriated for the Confederate records, and you make up the exact difference between the calculations of the Postmaster-General and the calculations of the chairman of the committee in his report.

But let us take the figures of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], chairman of the committee. He says the total of the bill is \$2,303,946.81 less than the estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. The gentleman is mistaken. I stated expressly that if you add the appropriation for special facilities to the Postmaster-General's estimate, and then deduct the amount, it would make a difference of \$2,203,000; but if you will leave out the appropriation for special facilities then the difference will be \$2,107,000.

Mr. BERGEN. The gentleman is correct, and I have it before me. I do not mean to do him any injustice. I am content to take his estimate of \$2,107,332.59 as the amount which he figures as carried by this bill less than the estimate. He also goes on to say that this bill carries the sum of \$294,845.31 more than the act of 1892.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he seems to point with pride and satisfaction to these last figures. I point to them with humiliation and shame that this House will undertake, in order to put before the country a seeming reduction of a small amount, to cripple the postal service of the country, a service which goes into every home in the land.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. If the gentleman from New Jersey will allow me to interrupt him—

Mr. BERGEN. I will.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that if he will carefully read what I said, he will see that my statement is simply a statement of facts. I do not exult over them, and I do not cry over them. I just simply state the facts to Congress and the country. The gentleman, of course, has a perfect right to suggest what he thinks my feelings were.

Mr. BERGEN. But the facts which the gentleman refers to are those which he has made himself by his own bill, and the shame and humiliation I feel are because the gentleman from North Carolina will introduce a bill upon which he can base such facts. Now, what has been the increase, the natural growth of this bill in the years gone by? It is about \$5,000,000 a year, the increase of one bill over the bill of the year before. Yet the gentleman boasts that this bill only increases \$294,846.

I will call attention to the figures:

In the year 1888 the total of the appropriations was \$55,798,801.63; 1889, \$60,982,285.11; 1890, \$66,746,927.19; 1891, \$72,401,156.13; 1892, \$77,921,222.61.

Here is a natural growth of a Department in which there is, as shown by the report of the gentleman from North Carolina, a deficiency each year. Notwithstanding these appropriations there is still a deficiency.

I do not see in the report of the gentleman the figures to which I desired to call the attention of the House.

I say he makes by this bill an appropriation of only \$294,845.31 beyond the appropriation of last year, notwithstanding he knows that every year heretofore there has been a deficiency in this Department. The effort evidently therefore is to make an increased deficiency.

I now have the figures to which I had reference. They appear in the speech of the gentleman on yesterday, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this morning. According to his statement there was a deficiency in the year 1889 of \$6,227,919.43, in 1890 of \$5,706,414.25, in 1891 of \$6,160,205.19, and in 1892 of \$3,948,392.38, and he estimates that there will be a surplus in the year 1893 of \$12,949.33, based on the calculations of the Postmaster-General as to revenues.

Yet he is told also by the Postmaster-General that his estimates of revenue are based upon his having a certain amount for expenditures, in order to enlarge the Department, and if he did not have them he could not produce the revenue. But if he were not told that by the Postmaster-General, any one who knows anything in any department of business knows nothing can be made more successful than ever before except by that expenditure of money and that enlargement which are calculated for here by the Postmaster-General. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] knows it will.

These three items, I said, include about one-half of the expenses of the Department. Nearly one-half of this bill goes to them. The largest two items of the other half of the bill are compensation to clerks in post-offices and expense of the free-delivery service. The first in this bill is \$300,000 below the estimate, and the second more than \$300,000 below the estimate.

I come now to that branch of the service in which there can be no deficiency. If the money is not supplied by the bill the Postmaster-General has to restrain the service. This remark applies to the whole of this half of the bill. The amount asked for compensation of clerks in the post-offices is \$8,460,000. The amount named in the bill is \$8,160,000, a clean cut of \$300,000. Why is it done, what for, on what basis, no information is given to the House.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. If the gentleman will permit me, I will ask him if he does not know that in the bill which was reported to the first session of the Fifty-first Congress the amount recommended for compensation of clerks by the committee was \$7,200,000, and that the estimate of the Department at that time was \$7,590,000, and that the committee, that very same committee of the Fifty-first Congress cut down the estimate at that time \$390,000?

Mr. BERGEN. I do not know that that has much to do with it. The gentleman, however, is probably correct. What I wish to call attention to is that from the nature of the service its growth depends on the expenditure. They go together and probably will until the country is fully developed. The actual expense of this branch of the service in 1882 was \$3,908,396.60; 1883, \$4,367,079.41; 1884, \$4,735,058.42; 1885, \$4,873,853.19; 1886, \$4,977,663.47; 1887, \$5,385,812.74; 1888, \$5,505,519.07; 1889, \$5,944,301.69; 1890, \$6,515,943.23; 1891, 7,361,983.96. The percentage of increase in the two years, 1891 over 1889, is 23.8 per cent.

If this percentage continues for the current two years the amount necessary for the service in 1893 will be \$9,114,134, almost a million more than provided by the bill. Something, no doubt, is due to the fact that the expenses of business generally do not increase in accordance with its volume, but that has been allowed by the Postmaster-General in the estimate of \$8,460,000. To make a further reduction from this of \$300,000 is unreasonable. It is not warranted by any calculation based on the previous expenditure of the Department; and the Postmaster-General calls our attention to what will be the effect if this is done. He says:

I am advised that if no larger sum than this be granted it will not only prevent any additional allowance for clerk hire in post-offices in 1893, but will necessitate a reduction.

Consequently, if this is done, it must reduce the advantages brought to the people by the postal service.

The amount asked for the free-delivery service is \$10,754,983. The amount provided by the bill is \$10,450,000. This service is spasmodic in its growth. I do not think a calculation based on the annual increase is entitled to the same consideration as would be in other cases. It can be doubled or tripled in a single year if we want to. It grows according to the warrant of Congress, as we authorize an increase in the service. The estimate, however, of the Department is based on the actual need of the service according to existing law. It shows that to-day 10,743 carriers receive under the law \$9,536,850. The other items I will not read. They relate to substitutes, promotions, and incidental expenses, and the total is \$10,102,165, \$50,000 more than is provided by this bill. That is the condition to-day. Now, the Postmaster-General says:

This sum leaves out of the calculation any estimate for an increased business at existing offices, for suburban additions, and for the establishment of the service at new offices where it has never yet been in operation. If this appropriation passes without change it will deprive many offices of the benefit of free delivery, to which they would be entitled under the provisions of the law. It will prevent the appointment of additional letter-carriers, and will probably require a reduction of the present force. It will also possibly prevent the promotion of a number of carriers who become entitled under the law to promotion at the end of one year of satisfactory service.

Besides that it makes no allowance by which the law limiting the service of these carriers to eight hours a day shall be put in operation. Many of the carriers are now serving beyond the limit of eight hours a day. It makes no allowance for the extension of the rural free-delivery service, in which so many members of this House, including myself, are interested. I should like to see the free-delivery service brought generally into operation in the rural district as far as possible. I hope to see that service gradually extended down until it reaches to every inhabited portion of this country.

To-day under the law only cities having either 10,000 inhabitants or \$10,000 of postal revenue per annum are entitled to free delivery. There is a bill pending, which has already passed the Senate, which extends the system to places having a population of 5,000 inhabitants or postal revenues of \$5,000 per annum. I have a letter from the Superintendent of the Free-Delivery Service, which I will append to my remarks. It sets forth, among other things, the places that would receive the benefit of free delivery under that legislation.

As to the item for foreign mail service there is only a seeming reduction of the estimate of the large amount stated in the report. The Postmaster-General is correct in his estimate of the amount of money carried by this bill, and the effort on the part of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] to show that the bill carries only \$78,216,067.92 is not well founded. It carries \$512,160.81 more. The amount actually appropriated in this item comes within something like \$100,000 of the estimate, although the suggestion is that there is a reduction of \$502,160.81. It comes about in this way: The settlement of this item in all bills runs through three years before it is covered back into the Treasury, and although the account for the year 1891 seems to show a surplus there is not an actual surplus to-day. Nothing can come out of that amount except the expenses belonging to the year 1891, and the balance of \$91,013.23 which appears for the year 1891 is all consumed to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I did not know that the Postmaster-General was making any point on that.

Mr. BERGEN. I do not know what points the Postmaster-General is making. I am making my own points.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I thought the Postmaster-General was perfectly satisfied with the appropriation for the foreign mail service?

Mr. BERGEN. I am drawing attention to the fact that when the chairman of this committee says that he makes a reduction from the appropriation of the preceding year of \$2,107,332.59 he is incorrect. There is not that amount of money there to-day. The indebtedness of the year 1891 is first to be paid or has been paid, which amounts to about \$91,000. The continuing indebtedness of 1882 is, I believe, estimated by the gentleman from North Carolina according to the estimate of the Postmaster-General: so that I have no doubt he is correct in that portion of the item.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state in this connection that ever since 1885 there have been very large unexpended balances from this item. For instance, in 1885 the balance was nearly \$71,000; in 1889 it was about \$23,000; in 1890 it was nearly \$92,000; in 1891 it was over \$91,000. So it is fair to suppose that there will be a surplus again in the year 1892.

Mr. BERGEN. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I inquired at the Department, and whilst the reports for the current years do show the figures which the gentleman states, yet this indebtedness is a continuing indebtedness, as before stated, settled only through the course of several years, and unless the

gentleman refers to figures which have been made three years and three months after the appropriation, he is dealing with matters which are not certain, because the Department has not closed the account and can not determine, except at the end of that period, whether there is a surplus or not.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Still, judging by the past, it is reasonable to expect that there will be.

Mr. BERGEN. I am told at the Department that the balance for the year 1891 is already exhausted, although the gentleman states it as being \$91,000.

Of the appropriation for the year 1891 there seems, according to the statement of the Department adopted by the gentleman from North Carolina, to be a balance of \$411,147.58; but this could only be used to pay the liabilities of the year 1892 unless reappropriated. Hence this bill reappropriates the same and makes it available for the purposes of 1893. It should therefore be considered in calculating the amount carried by the bill.

I have here a list of the deductions which have been made from the other items of the bill:

Miscellaneous.	\$500
Rent, light, and fuel, first and second class offices.	15,500
Rent, light, and fuel, third-class offices.	110,000
Miscellaneous.	32,000
Wrapping paper.	3,378
Stamps, pads, ink, etc.	20,000
Packing boxes, etc.	580
Blanks, books, etc.	2,000
Mail messenger.	120,000
Mail locks, keys, etc.	5,000
Mail bags.	500
Railway post-office car service.	52,500
Miscellaneous.	500
Due foreign countries.	81,000
Manufacture of stamps.	16,700
To distribute stamps.	500
Manufacture of wrappers, etc.	28,555
To distribute wrappers, etc.	800
Manufacture of postal cards.	12,000
Registered package, etc., envelopes.	8,000
Ship, etc., letters.	600
Engraving drafts, etc.	800
Miscellaneous.	500
Mail depredations and post-office inspectors.	70,000
Total.	581,843

Add this total of \$581,843 to the amounts to which I have already referred and you have the total of the actual deductions in this bill from the estimates; and these last items are some of the most important in the service. They are smaller in amount, but they are no less important. Without the money to make the stamp the Government can not sell it. Without the money to pay the mail messenger or for the postal car or for any of the innumerable smaller things necessary to the service the Government can not have them. Without the money to pay rent and light and fuel of first and second and third class post-offices the country must do without or the people themselves contribute without compensation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the effect of this sort of legislation? It is simply to restrict and cut down the service. The feeling of the country to-day is in favor of enlarging and increasing this service; the people want to extend it into every district throughout the land. Yet here is an effort to cut it down, to diminish it, to deny to the people the advantages which they now enjoy, to bring stagnation where there is now growth, and, literally, to stop the wheels of progress. The effect of this legislation is to give one mail a day or week where we now have two.

I can not imagine that the people of the country want any such thing. I know, on the contrary, from the petitions which have been laid before the committee, that the people are crying for an increase of this service. They do not want the service cut down. There is no necessity for such legislation. It is a move backward—a movement which does not correspond with the spirit of the age.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there is considerable effort in this House to strike at the head of this Department, as if thereby something was to be gained. I have seen that spirit exhibited in many resolutions and remarks, many wrong inferences and statements. I do not now refer to remarks of the chairman of the committee, but to the spirit manifested by other gentlemen on that side of the House, who are seemingly determined, without proper examination, and, I think, proper self-respect, to bring into this House and before the country reflections upon the head of this Department.

Yesterday something was said as to the character of this book which I hold in my hand, embracing an argument before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads of the last House by the Postmaster-General, in which he referred to the telegraphic system, using many quotations from different papers, many resolutions of different bodies, in short all the material that he could find in Congress and out of Congress, to support the position he took before the committee. He was assailed as

if that were an improper thing. I do not understand it is any more than has been done repeatedly by members of this House, when they have presented newspaper clippings, small or large, which they have had printed in the RECORD, and then circulated over the country under their frank.

Again, sir, some allusion was made to the meeting of postmasters held in this city—as if a Department of this Government has not a right to call together its public servants for consultation—as if it were not done every day in the different branches of the Government, calling together from different sections of the country men of experience in the particular Department for consultation and advice. That is all that was involved in that meeting of postmasters here in this city.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion allow me to say that no one wants to economize in the administration of the Government more than myself, but what this service needs is not retrenchment, but enlargement. We do not want to stop any branch of this Government in its growth by a false economy. We are about entering upon the fiscal year in which the quadro-centennial of the discovery of America will be celebrated in this land; and in connection with that event this particular branch of the public service will be especially called upon to carry the correspondence of the people, and to transport articles of value. Shall we, under these circumstance, show ourselves a mean nation? I hope not.

APPENDIX.

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL, (Superintendent Free Delivery System.) Washington, D. C., April 23, 1892.

SIR: In compliance with your verbal request I have the honor to submit a list of the post-offices at which the free-delivery service was, on the 15th instant, ordered to go into operation June 1 proximo, viz:

Huntington, W. Va.	Maysville, Ky.	Tyler, Tex.
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa	Canton, Ill.	Huntsville, Ala.
Parsons, Kans.	Eureka, Cal.	Huntington, Ind.
Americus, Ga.	Painesville, Ohio	Hoosick Falls, N. Y.
Bloomfield, N. J.	Wakefield, Mass.	Joplin, Mo.
Coldwater, Mich.	Greeley, Colo.	

Also a list of the offices in the United States which exceed the present statutory prerequisites of 10,000 population or \$10,000 gross receipts at which the free-delivery service has not been authorized, as follows:

Bristol, Conn.	Leominster, Mass.	Laredo, Tex.
Greenwich, Conn.	Weymouth, Mass.	Floral Park, N. Y.
St. Augustine, Fla.	Newtonville, Mass.	Kingston, N. Y.
Key West, Fla.	Greenville, Miss.	Morristown, N. Y.
Tampa, Fla.	Chillicothe, Mo.	New Rochelle, N. Y.
Pullman, Ill.	Louisiana, Mo.	Northport, N. Y.
South Chicago, Ill.	St. Charles, Mo.	Penn Yan, N. Y.
Michigan City, Ind.	Anaconda, Mont.	Port Chester, N. Y.
Peru, Ind.	Great Falls, Mont.	Port Richmond, N. Y.
Decorah, Iowa.	Missoula, Mont.	Rondout, N. Y.
Baton Rouge, La.	Englewood, N. J.	Stapleton, N. Y.
Waterville, Me.	Newton, N. J.	Tonawanda, N. Y.
Gardner, Mass.	Perth Amboy, N. J.	Bellefontaine, Ohio.
Amherst, Mass.	Rutherford, N. J.	Bucyrus, Ohio.
Attleboro, Mass.	Washington, N. J.	Troy, Ohio.
Chicopee, Mass.	Westfield, N. J.	Media, Pa.
Greenfield, Mass.	Catskill, N. Y.	Bristol, Tenn.

While all the foregoing offices and cities have either the gross receipts or population required by the statutes, some of them have not the requirements prescribed by the postal laws and regulations, such as lighted and numbered streets, numbered houses, etc., and some have not at present suitable buildings to accommodate the carriers' service, at others, having two independent post-offices within the corporate limits, the local differences of the citizens as to which office shall be discontinued has prevented the introduction of free delivery.

To establish and maintain the free-delivery service at all the above offices during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, would require an appropriation of \$153,000.

Below you will also find a list of the offices in the United States, which would be entitled to the free-delivery service if the pending Senate bill becomes a law, authorizing the establishment of free-delivery service at cities with 5,000 population, or at post-offices which produced a gross revenue during the preceding fiscal year of \$5,000, viz:

ALABAMA.			
Bessemer, Eufala,	Florence, Fort Payne,	Gadsden, Opelika,	Talladega, Tuscaloosa.
Phoenix,	Pima,	Prescott,	Tucson.
ARIZONA.			
Eureka Springs,	Fayetteville,	Helena,	Texarkana.
ARKANSAS.			
Bakersfield, Berkeley, Chico, Grass Valley, Marysville, Merced,	Modesto, Napa, Oroville, Petaluma, Pomona, Red Bluff,	Redding, Redlands, Salinas, San Luis Obispo, San Rafael, Santa Ana,	Tulare, Vallejo, Ventura, Visalia, Watsonville, Woodland.
CALIFORNIA.			
Boulder, Canyon, Durango,	Fort Collins, Glenwood Springs, Grand Junction,	Highlands, Longmont, Manitou Springs,	Ouray, Salida.
COLORADO.			

CONNECTICUT.				NEBRASKA.			
Clintonville, Colchester, Danielsonville, Greenwich, Groton,	Enfield, Killingly, Manchester, Moodus, Naugatuck,	New Milford, Putnam, Rockville, Southington, Stonington,	Thompson, Torrington, Wallingford, West Winsted, Winchester.	Blair, Columbus, Crete,	Fairbury, Holdrege,	North Platte, Plattsmouth,	York.
FLORIDA.				NEVADA.			
Gainesville, Ocala,	Orlando, Palatka,	Sanford,	Tallahassee.	Carson City,	Reno,	Virginia City.	
GEORGIA.				NEW HAMPSHIRE.			
Albany, Gainesville,	Griffin, Marietta,	Sandersonville,	Thomasville.	Claremont, Exeter,	Laconia, Lebanon,	Littleton, Milford,	Rochester, Somersworth.
IDAHO.				NEW JERSEY.			
	Moscow,	Pocatello.		Bordentown, Burlington, Cape May, Dover, Freehold, Gloucester,	Harrison, Lakewood, Lambertville, Long Branch, Madison, Mount Holly,	Ocean Grove, West Hoboken, Phillipsburg, Rahway, Red Bank, Salem.	Somerville, Summit, Weehawken, Woodbury.
ILLINOIS.				NEW MEXICO.			
Austin, Batavia, Belvidere, Bushnell, Carlinville, Centralia, Charleston, De Kalb, Dwight,	Galena, Geneseo, Grand Crossing, Jerseyville, Kewanee, Litchfield, Macomb, Mendota, Morris,	Mount Vernon, Nat. Stock Yards, Normal, Oiney, Pana, Paris, Peru, Princeton, Ravenswood,	Sandwich, Shelbyville, South Evanston, Sycamore, Taylorville, Tuscola, Pontiac.	East Las Vegas,	Santa Fe.		
INDIANA.				NEW YORK.			
Bloomington, Bluffton, Brazil, Danville, Franklin, Greencastle, Greensburg,	Hammond, Kendallville, Lebanon, Mishawaka, Mount Vernon, Newcastle, Noblesville,	Notre Dame, Plymouth, Portland, Rushville, Seymour, Shelbyville, Union City,	Wabash, Warsaw, Washington, Winchester.	Albion, Baldwinsville, Ballston Spa, Bath, Brewster, Brockport, Canajoharie, Canton, Carthage, Cazenovia, City Island, Clifton Springs, Clyde, College Point, Cooperstown,	Dansville, Ellenville, Ballston Spa, Bath, Brewster, Brockport, Canajoharie, Canton, Carthage, Cazenovia, City Island, Clifton Springs, Clyde, College Point, Cooperstown,	Herkimer, Huntington, Iliion, Jamaica, LeRoy, Lowville, Lyons, Malone, Fulton, Genesee, Goshen, Gouverneur, Greenbush, Hamilton, Haverstraw, Hempstead,	Salamanca, Saugerties, Silver Creek, Suspension Bridge, Tarrytown, Tompkinsville, Warsaw, Waterford, Warterloo, Watkins, Wellsville, Westchester, Westfield, Whitehall, White Plains.
IOWA.				NORTH CAROLINA.			
Algona, Boone, Carroll, Centerville, Chariton, Charles City, Cherokee, Clarinda,	Corning, Emmettsburg, Fairfield, Grinnell, Independence, Le Mars, Lyons, McGregor,	Manchester, Maquoketa, Marion, Mason City, Newton, Perry, Red Oak, Shenandoah,	Spencer, Toledo, Vinton, Washington, Waverly, Webster City.	Fayetteville, Goldsboro,	New Berne,	Salisbury,	Statesville.
KANSAS.				NORTH DAKOTA.			
Beloit, Chanute, Eureka, Clay Center, Coffeyville, Columbus,	Concordia, El Dorado, Holton, Independence, McPherson, Garnett,	Great Bend, Hiawatha, Junction City, Larned, Manhattan, Minneapolis,	Olathe, Oswego, Paola, Pittsburg.	Bismarck,	Jamestown,	Minot.	
KENTUCKY.				OHIO.			
Ashland, Catlettsburg, Danville,	Georgetown, Hopkinsville, Lebanon,	Mt. Sterling, Paris, Richmond,	Shelbyville, Winchester.	Ada, Ashland, Ashtabula, Athens, Bellaire, Bellevue, Bowling Green, Bryan, Cadiz,	Cambridge, Circleville, Conneaut, Coshocton, Gallion, Gallipolis, Geneva, Greenfield,	Greenville, Hillsboro, Jackson, Lebanon, London, Martins Ferry, Marysville, Medina,	New Philadelphia, Ravenna, Upper Sandusky, Van Wert, Wapakoneta, Wellington, Wellsboro, Wilmington.
LOUISIANA.				OKLAHOMA.			
	Lake Charles,	Monroe.		Guthrie,	Oklahoma.		
MAINE.				OREGON.			
Bar Harbor, Belfast, Brunswick,	Calais, Cape Elizabeth, Deering,	Ellsworth, Westbrook, Oldtown,	Saco, Skowhegan.	Albany, Baker City,	Eugene,	Pendleton,	The Dalles.
MARYLAND.				PENNSYLVANIA.			
Easton,	Salisbury,	Westminster.		Ambler, Ashland, Athens, Bedford, Bloomsburg, Braddock, Bristol, Brookville, Bryn Mawr, Catasauqua, Clarion, Clearfield, Coatesville,	Connellsville, Conshohocken, Dunmore, Mount Carmel, Danville, Doylestown, Du Bois, Gettysburg, Greenville, Hanover, Homestead, Indiana, Irwin,	Kane, Kittanning, Latrobe, Lewisburg, Lewistown, Mauch Chunk, South Chester, Tamaqua, Mechanicsburg, Mercer, Middletown, Milton, New Brighton,	Phillipsburg, Phoenixville, Plymouth, Ridgway, Scottdale, Steelton, Stroudsburg, Sunbury, Tyrone, South Easton, Waynesboro, Wellsboro, West Grove.
MASSACHUSETTS.				RHODE ISLAND.			
Adams, Andover, Arlington, Athol, Auburndale, Blackstone, Campello, Chicopee Falls, Concord, Danvers, Dedham,	Easthampton, East Weymouth, Franklin, Norwood, Grafton, Great Barrington, Hudson, Lee, Marblehead, Middleboro,	Milton, Montague, Nantucket, Newton Center, North Attleboro, Orange, Palmer, Reading, Rockland, Southbridge,	Spencer, Stoneham, Ware, Watertown, Webster, Wellesley, Westboro, West Newton, West Springfield, Winchendon.	Bristol, Johnson, East Providence,	Oineyville, Cranston,	Cumberland, South Kingston,	Burrillville, Coventry.
MICHIGAN.				SOUTH CAROLINA.			
Allegan, Benton Harbor, Big Rapids, Cadillac, Charlotte, Cheboygan, Dowagiac, Escanaba,	Grand Haven, Greenville, Hancock, Hastings, Holland, Houghton, Hudson, Ironwood,	Lapeer, Ludington, Marshall, Monroe, Mount Clemens, Negaunee, Niles, Red Jacket,	St. Johns, St. Joseph, Sault St. Marie, Sturgis, Tecumseh, Three Oaks, Three Rivers, Traverse City.	Anderson,	Spartanburg,	Sumter.	
MINNESOTA.				SOUTH DAKOTA.			
Albert Lea, Austin, Brainerd,	Crookston, Fergus Falls,	Lake City, Owatonna,	Northfield, St. Peter.	Deadwood, Mitchell,	Pierre, Rapid City,	Watertown,	Yankton.
MISSISSIPPI.				TENNESSEE.			
	Columbus,	Yazoo City.		Columbia, Johnson City,	Murfreesboro,	St. Elmo.	Union City.
MISSOURI.				WASHINGTON.			
Boonville, Brookfield, Butler, Cameron, Carrollton,	Clinton, Columbia, Fulton, Independence, Kirksville,	Lamar, Lexington, Macon City, Maryville, Mexico,	Rich Hill, Trenton, Warrensburg, Webb City, Marshall.	Centralia, Colfax,	Ellensburg,	Vancouver,	Whatcom.
MONTANA.				TEXAS.			
Billing,	Bozeman,	Livingston.		Abilene, Beaumont, Belton, Bonham, Brenham, Brownwood,	Bryan, Cleburne, Greenville, Hillsboro, Lampasas, Marshall,	Brownsville, Orange, San Angelo, Taylor, Palestine, Temple,	Texarkana, Vernon, Waxahachie, Wichita Falls, Weatherford, Corpus Christi.
VERMONT.				UTAH.			
				Barre.	Belows Falls,	Middlebury,	Colchester.

VIRGINIA.			
Bedford City, Fredericksburg, Hampton.	Harrisonburg, Lexington, Manchester,	Newport News, Salem, Suffolk,	Winchester.
WEST VIRGINIA.			
Clarksburg,	Martinsburg.		
WISCONSIN.			
Baraboo, Beaver Dam, Berlin, Fort Atkinson, Hurley, Lake Geneva,	Kenosha, Manitowoc, Merrill, Menasha, Monroe, Neenah.	Oconto, Portage, Ripon, Sparta, Stevens Point, Stoughton.	Watertown, Whitewater, Menomonie.
WYOMING.			
	Laramie.		

An appropriation of \$1,000,000 would be necessary to establish and maintain the 638 offices named in the foregoing list during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

Very respectfully,

WM. J. POLLOCK,
Superintendent Free-Delivery System.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER A. BERGEN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

[Mr. CALDWELL withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members who have already addressed the committee, or who may hereafter address the committee upon this subject, may be given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD if they so desire.

Mr. DINGLEY. Only upon this subject?

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Only upon this bill, the post-office bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have agreed with the gentleman from North Carolina to yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL].

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Chairman, there comes to the Congress of the United States of America the petitions of thousands of our citizens for a right due them—the free delivery of mails in rural communities. There are 4,750,000 farms in this country, and the owners and tenants appeal to this House for what they feel is their due—that they shall be placed on the same footing as the people of the cities and towns; that the Postal Department shall extend to them the same privileges accorded to the urban residents of the nation. There is great unanimity in this demand, and it is based on simple justice. If the Government delivers the letters and mails to the denizens of cities the same treatment should be extended to the farming community. The Postmaster-General, realizing the right in this matter, favors the extension of the service to the dwellers on farms.

Thousands have petitioned for this action on the part of Congress. The farmers have supplemented the resolve of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, representing a membership of millions, for this improvement. Every State Grange has joined in the demand, as did also the National Farmers' Congress, representing thirty States, and the National and State Farmers' Alliances have united with their brethren in impressing upon the lawmaking branch of the Government the desirability and equity of the proposed law in the interest of the tillers of the soil. The Patrons of Industry proclaim the same sentiments. In addition to these strong appeals for justice, which alone should cause prompt recognition, the press of all shades of opinion is almost unanimous in seconding the demand. The public prints have taught all our citizens the advantages that will accrue to the people and Government in treating all classes of citizens alike by providing free delivery of mails to the occupants of farms.

Although over one-third of our population is engaged in farming pursuits, and the farmers pay the same rate of postage as others, they are given few of the improvements in our postal system. It is a regrettable fact that rural communities have about the same facilities, comparatively, as they did in early days. For less expenditures the people of other countries have a postal service for the farmers infinitely superior to ours. There is no logic or reason in delivering mail to the inhabitants of cities who are easily within reach of the post-office, and denying the same facilities to the people of the country, who are often miles away from the office. The people of the whole country sustain the Post-Office Department, and there is no reason why all should not be served alike, without regard to locality or conditions. The farmer knows that he contributes to the sustaining of the postal service, and is unable to account for the fact that his class of citizens have not shared in the great improvements in postal matters. He naturally holds that the facilities of that branch of the people's Government should be as good

in the rural districts as in the large towns. He is beginning to make demands for his rights, and it is hoped they will be conceded in the shape of suitable legislation to afford him the convenience so much desired—a convenience in keeping with the progress of the age and in consonance with the policy of most advanced nations as well as those who have not attained our high civilization. Safe transmission and prompt delivery of mails to all the people, town and country, is what is required and expected of the great Postal Department.

THE COST.

It is urged that the cost of free delivery in rural communities will prevent the system being adopted in the United States. It may cost something for a time, but I believe in the end the plan would be self-sustaining. If it was expensive it would yield large dividends of benefits to the great number engaged in agriculture. It should be fostered until it can become self-supporting. The resultant advantages of the accommodation would certainly produce larger revenue. The prime object is to afford the people greater convenience in the mail service; when that is done we can discuss the revenue question. The most enlarged mail service is essential to prosperity and advancement. The Congress appropriates millions yearly for various objects, some of them not absolutely demanded, and no one stops to inquire if any financial return is to result. Then why question on account of expense such methods as are demanded and due to a class of people like the farming interests? The first idea is to give the people greater convenience in their mail facilities; we can consider the cost afterward. Certainty, celerity, and frequency in mail delivery and collection for all the people should be the primary motive. The cost thereof should be the secondary consideration. When great appropriations are made for the Army, Navy, river and harbor, and the various departments of the Government, the inquiry, will it pay? is never propounded. Why should this question always be raised when affording proper mail service is considered? We would be glad if the system proposed will be self-sustaining. I expect it will be, but it seems to me we should not shape legislation for the postal service entirely dependent upon receipts. Treat this division of the Government as others are looked after.

It is the history of our national post-office that the extensions and improvements have at first resulted in loss to eventuate in large gain. Such will be the outcome of free mail delivery among the farmers. Eventually it will aid to support the Department by increasing the amount of mail to a large extent. Experience has shown that whenever facilities in the postal service are enlarged and promptness promoted there is a rapid increase of business in the circle of improvement. Compensation for the outlay follows in many ways beside monetary. There is no economy in depriving the people of the farms of their rights. There are 2,808 counties in the United States, divided into 30,600 precincts, hundreds, militia, magisterial, and civil districts, jury wards, beats, justice precincts, and townships, all of these divisions being the same as our townships in the Northwest. There are 8,500 incorporated villages, boroughs, and cities. All the rest of our inhabitants reside on farms.

There are 65,000 post-offices in villages and in the country. To give one carrier for each country post-office, say at a salary of \$200 per year, would involve an outlay of \$13,000,000. This would be equivalent to 20 cents for each inhabitant, \$1 for a family of five each year, less than one-half cent per week for each person. If the cost was that much it would be money well invested. It is not probable so many carriers would be required; when the carrier system was established there would be a decrease in the number of post-offices, as many could be abolished, for thousands now existing would not be needed. The carriers of star-route mails could be made collectors and distributors. It is certain that the receipts of the Department in rural communities would at once increase and the revenues be greatly augmented. The people would use the mails vastly more than ever, and this improvement would result in justifying the Government in establishing the same. The benefits that would accrue would be very great.

I believe the enlarged receipts would counterbalance the expenditures. Every time the scope of the postal arrangements have been enlarged the revenues have grown. All over the world it is evidenced in postal affairs that "wherever the accommodations are great the business is great; where they are scanty the income is small." This statement is borne out by recent experiments. October 10, 1890, Congress authorized the Postmaster-General to establish free-delivery at small towns and villages and appropriated \$10,000 for the same. Forty-six offices in thirty-one States were established. The result was that the people were greatly pleased and accommodated. There was an increase in receipts at forty of these offices of \$9,701.05, and a decrease at six of \$457.74. The total cost of the carrier service was \$8,428.27, and the increase of business aggregated \$9,701.05, of

which sum the postal authorities estimate \$1,190.33 was due to natural causes. These free-delivery offices, many of them in small villages, paid a profit to the Government and gave much satisfaction to the inhabitants of the respective towns. In these places the patrons were not far away from the office and it was no great task to call for mails, and yet the service grew very popular. If the villagers, who had but a few rods to go for mails increased their postal business on account of free delivery, how would it be in the country, where the inhabitants have to traverse miles to reach the post-office, if they were given the same system of delivery and collection of mails? It stands to reason that the country people would prize the method more than the dwellers in hamlets, and their appreciation would take the form of enlarged business in the postal line. Free delivery in rural sections means a rapid diffusion of intelligence and a decided increase in comfort and enjoyment among the farmers and their families.

The Post-Office Department is a great monopoly of the Government, to which no one objects. Indeed, private enterprise could not successfully carry it on. Blackstone held that placing postal affairs in the hands of the Government was "absolutely necessary, for nothing but an exclusive right can support an office of this sort; many rival independent offices would serve to ruin one another." The expense of free delivery might be reduced by combining the parcels-post system and making the rate on merchandise the same as on books and kindred charges. A uniform rate of 1 cent for each 2 ounces or fractional part thereof would cause the mails to carry much merchandise in the way of small packages. It would be a great convenience to the farmer and an accommodation to the merchant and dealer, besides increasing the revenue.

THE POST-OFFICE.

The post-office is the institution of the people. Ahasuerus, King of Persia (B. C. 456), is the first recorded monarch who sent letters into every province of his vast empire, informing his subjects that it was his imperial will that "every man should bear rule in his own house." The King did this on account of being piqued at the Queen. A questionable beginning of a great system. The first recorded riding post was established in the Persian Empire by Cyrus (B. C. 536). Under the Roman Republic posts were established for the government, but they were forbidden to carry private letters. Charlemagne planned a postal service for the German Empire in 807, but the service did not survive him. The first regular European letter post was established in the Hanse towns by the Hanseatic League in the early part of the thirteenth century. Travelers in China in the fourteenth century found the government post similar to that of Persia under Cyrus, and these Chinese posts had existed from the earliest times. Under the Emperor Maximilian a line of letter posts was established connecting Austria with Lombardy, followed by a line from Vienna to Brussels. In France, in the fifteenth century, Louis XI revived the system of Charlemagne. In England the general post dates from the Stuarts (1625). The regular riding post was organized under Edward IV (1470). It was not, however, until the time of Charles I (1632) that the post was allowed to be used by merchants and private persons under certain conditions. The King appointed Thomas Witherings chief postmaster in 1632, and that officer began the improvement in postal affairs. These have gone on ever since, until England has an almost perfect postal system. In 1840 penny postage was adopted, with the advent of the postage stamp. The first post-office in America was established in 1672, and New York was the office; in 1710 the postmaster-general of Great Britain designated that office as the chief letter office of the country. Franklin, as postmaster-general of the colonies, introduced many progressive features, but was removed by orders from England on account of his advanced service.

THE WORLD'S POSTAGE BILL.

It is interesting to look at the postage paid by the people of the world, as exhibited by the postal expenses in the large governments of the various nations. It appears that in the civilized governments \$300,000,000 is disbursed every year in postage. Of this amount the largest share is paid by the people of the United States, \$65,000,000. Next comes Germany, spending on postage and telegraphic communications \$52,000,000. Great Britain expends \$51,000,000 on postage alone. France spends \$28,000,000 on postage and telegraph. Russia pays out \$19,000,000, and Austria-Hungary \$17,000,000 on postage and telegraph. I have not been able to obtain the expenditures in China and Japan. The smaller governments expend from \$8,000,000 downward.

THE UNITED STATES POST-OFFICE.

For many years the rate of postage in the United States was fixed by the distance the letters were to be carried. The first reduction was in 1845, when the letter rate was established at 5 cents. In 1851 the postage was again reduced from 5 to 3 cents,

and there were reductions also for second and third-class matter. In 1883 the reduction from 3 to 2 cents took effect. Since that time the unit of letter postage has been doubled, so that an ounce letter goes for 2 cents where only half an ounce went before. The charge upon newspapers has been lowered from 2 cents to 1 cent per pound. Notwithstanding all these reductions the business has increased so that but a small deficit occurs each year. The postage stamp was first used in this country in 1847, and for the first five years but \$274,710 worth were issued. In 1852 stamps to the value of a million and a half dollars were issued, increasing yearly since, until last year the issue of stamps by the Department amounted to over \$46,000,000 in value, being 2,400,972,690 of all denominations; 424,216,750 postal cards were also used.

The wealth of our country and the magnitude of the post-office business are made apparent by the statement of one fact—the amount of money transmitted by money orders and postal notes is about \$140,000,000 annually. It is estimated that the total value of money orders and postal notes will amount to \$200,000,000 per year when the work of extending the money-order system is completed.

THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT NOW.

It seems fitting, while discussing this question, that I should speak of the efforts of the present Postmaster-General, Hon. John Wanamaker, to make the service more effective. He is a business man and has conducted his great department on business principles, extending its usefulness wherever possible. He recognized the injustice done the farming community by the lack of facilities for delivering mail to their abode, and promptly espoused their cause. He has increased the efficiency of every branch of his Department. The mail service in the West has been extended nearly 1,500,000 miles; the Railway Mail Service has been enlarged more than 25,000 miles; 2,129 new mail routes have been authorized; the money-order service has been extended to 10,000 new offices; 6,421 new post-offices have been established; the total increase in miles traveled in transporting mails is 44,479,517. All sections of the country have had their postal conveniences enlarged. All these improvements have taken place in three years. His administrative capacity has been of the highest type, progressive and in keeping with the wishes of the enterprising people of our land whom he aims to serve. The record of John Wanamaker at the head of the Post-Office Department has been alike useful and brilliant, and when he leaves that branch the people will bear him in grateful remembrance for the good he achieved for his countrymen and the large benefits conferred by his administration on all our inhabitants.

RURAL FREE MAIL DELIVERY IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

The United States of America is far behind other nations in affording mail accommodations to dwellers in the farming communities. England, Germany, France, China, Japan, and India have long had this system. The United States, with an area of 3,501,404 square miles and a population of 65,000,000, have made wonderful progress in providing mail facilities for cities and towns, but the farming community has been allowed to jog along with the same conveniences of early days. It is objected that our great area, over three and one-half million square miles, makes delivery of mails in rural sections impossible. Let us establish the system and it will be found that the alleged impossibility is among the possibilities. Great Britain, with an area of 120,537 miles and a population of 37,803,058, has long enjoyed the system of country mail delivery. For a century the people of England have had this privilege. England and Wales have 58,186 square miles, with a population of 29,081,047; Ireland has 32,531 square miles and 4,681,173 inhabitants; Scotland has 29,820 square miles, inhabited by 4,040,838 people. Mounted postmen an hundred years ago delivered mail to the farmers of England. They were assisted by village messengers and sons of the yeomen, who met the prompt postman. Leaving his mail and taking the letters and parcels handed him he galloped to the next crossroad, where he again left mail and took up such postal matter given to him. Mounted postmen traverse those sections where the mail is large, and the farmer all over Great Britain has his mail delivered at his door. Strong and safe boxes for the reception of mail are placed on the highways. The railways throw off mail at rural points, and it is taken by mounted or walking messengers for delivery in the section where their routes lay.

The rural post-messengers, as the country letter-carriers are officially designated, have long been a useful adjunct of the British postal service, and it is the glory of Britain's post-office that a letter addressed to anyone in that section of its dominion will be delivered. Anthony Trollope began life as an English rural postman, and his descriptions of the country folk on his circuit are among his entertaining writings. Edward Capern, the way-side poet of England, was also a rural post-messenger, who re-

ceived 10s 6d (\$2.63) per week, including Sundays, for his seven days' trips with mail. One of his poems, describing his duties through heat, rain, sleet, snow, and flood attracted attention; his salary was increased, Sunday delivery was abolished, and the poet rural postman was granted a pension from the royal bounty fund. The free delivery of mail in Great Britain works admirably and satisfactorily.

France has an area of 204,096 square miles and a population of 38,218,903, and those living outside its cities also have their mail delivered at their homes. In every arrondissement of that Republic the farming community is served expeditiously by mail carriers. The post runner often goes on stilts over the low grounds to expedite the delivery and collection of mails to the farmers. Germany, with a territory of 208,725 square miles and a population of 47,103,000, maintains the system of free-mail delivery to those engaged in tilling the soil. All through Germany postal stations are numerous, while the traveling German post rapidly distributes and receives mail, heralding his approach by blasts on the horn. The Empire has admirable postal facilities. Japan, with 147,697 square miles and 40,000,000 inhabitants in its borders, a few years since (1872) established a postal system, copied after ours, but added to it the feature of rapidly delivering mail to all residents of the country. In that land of progress fleet runners are employed to quickly distribute mail. In those sections where the people are not accessible on the regular routes the mails for a section are placed in safe boxes high up in trees by the roadway. At these receptacles the mails are deposited by the running postman, at the same time gathering up what is left for transmission by the Japanese letter-writers. The Chinese have a system of free delivery to the rural inhabitants. That country has an area of 1,297,889 square miles, with the great population of 382,000,000. In China proper the runner goes from station to station, rapidly transporting mails for the rural residents, announcing his approach by the ringing of bells or bugle blasts; he is met by messengers from the farms who receive and distribute the mails. The Mongolians are far in advance of us in this method of delivering mail to the country inhabitants.

India has an area of 944,604 square miles, with the dense population of 220,490,980. The rural delivery service there is very thorough, and it is stated there is not a person in that great Empire whose mail is not delivered at his place of abode. The Hindoo post runner carries the mail in bags, goes through jungles, prodding his way with a spiked stick, while the clamor of his bells serve to frighten reptiles away and announce his coming to the farmer and villager. On the desert the camel is utilized to transport the mails, the driver serving as distributor, his loudly ringing bells telling of his approach. Switzerland, with an area of 15,991 square miles and a population of 2,933,334, has the rural post. In that republic letters are delivered at the door of the farmer or left at the stations in villages, where agents take them for delivery. The Helvetian postal system for its mountaineers is quite perfect, and every one in its cantons knows the exact hour of arrival and departure of the rural post. The Alpine horn echoes through the Alps, announcing the coming of the mail.

THE PLAN OF ROUTES.

The postal authorities can be trusted to inaugurate plans that are practicable to form routes over which mails are to be delivered in the agricultural sections. I notice the Postmaster-General inclines to the Contra Costa plan of dividing counties into blocks. This system is so termed from the fact that it originated in Contra Costa County, Cal. It divides the county into blocks, provides for names for all roads and highways, and numbers the residences located thereon. By this plan, as briefly described, names are given to the roads of a county for as great distances in a general direction as practicable, the roads being first listed and numbered on the map under the following rule: Commence on the east side of a line extending due north from the county seat and work around in a circle to the east, south, west, and back again to the north, always facing outward from the county seat, and working from the left to the right. Those roads touching the county seat are first listed; next the first left-hand branch road, and left-hand branches of these; continue with the right-hand branches; follow with the remaining trunk roads and their branches, left-hand branches first, right-hand branches next, omitting nothing on the left until the entire circuit has been made and all the roads of the county are listed.

This method is said to work satisfactorily. Each road has an appropriate name, taken from prominent features of the locality. In the system the names of both termini and residents on the road are avoided.

After the roads are classified and arranged for record the residences along the same are numbered. By this means mail is directed to the number and block where each resident is located.

This system is stated to be so practical that a further descrip-

tion will be of interest. It is a ten-block system, and it is claimed exceeds any other in usefulness and accuracy; it gives not only the location but the exact distance of every house from a given point, starting from a convenient center, usually the county seat. Each mile is divided into ten equal parts or blocks, having a frontage of 32 rods. Two numbers are assigned to each block, the odd ones on the left and the even ones on the right. Whenever country houses are near enough to be situated within the same block they have the same number, but confusion is avoided by distinguishing them in this manner: Nos. 525, 525A, 525B. Distances can be easily and rapidly calculated from the county seat or from one dwelling to another by the simple method of dividing the difference by 2 (there being two numbers in each block) and the result by 10 for answer in miles. As the second step is instantaneous by the decimal method of pointing off one place, the entire process is very rapid. To illustrate: No. 425 is 213 blocks or tenths of miles, equivalent to 21.3 miles from the point of departure, usually the county seat of a county.

Inasmuch as the system of free delivery and collection of mails in the country is bound to come, I give above the details of the plan favored by the Postmaster-General. This plan enables the Government to afford rapid and accurate service in rural delivery of mails.

ROADS AND POSTAL ROADS.

The farmer has seen for years millions of acres of land given by the nation to railway corporations in return for constructing railroads; he has noted for a long period each year millions of dollars are expended by the Government in improving rivers and harbors; he notes the products of the farms, of millions in value, which mainly supply the railways and ships with business, are transported over highways which must be kept passable by his own labor, the roads neglected alike by State and Nation. When he has to maintain the roadways he marvels that the Government and State, while oblivious of the needs of the roads over which passes the wealth of the nation in the products of the farms and yield of the mines, should look after water ways with a generous hand. Nor is he reconciled to this state of affairs when he learns that Great Britain expends \$20,000,000 annually in maintaining the macadamized roads in its borders. He looks across the channel and observes that the French Republic spends \$18,000,000 each year in the care of the common roads. He finds that in Italy, Belgium, Baden, Hesse-Darmstadt, and other European states millions of dollars are expended annually to systematically repair the roads, and the governments of those countries hold that such action is indispensable and in the line of governmental economy. The main roads of those states are kept in thorough repair by the governments thereof. He knows that good roads materially benefit all industries and will soon be inquiring why this country is so backward in this regard. With free delivery of mails to the farmer would come the greater need of good roads. Perhaps the advantages of free delivery will result in better roadways. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished. This subject will be further agitated in the near future.

THE WISHES OF FARMERS.

The farming community ask that they be treated as other citizens are. They know they bear their share in sustaining the Government. They believe in reciprocity and ask that the Government return their support by enlarging and increasing the postal facilities in the portions where they reside. In the cities the mail is delivered free to all the people. The farmer must go to the post-office for his mail, and also has to pay box rent. Six years ago, on this floor, I called attention to this manifest injustice. Last year \$2,360,768 were collected from box rents at the different post-offices. A good share of this came from the farmer. In the mail service the farmer asks to be put on an equality with his fellow-citizens. Free delivery of letters and papers will increase the attractiveness of the farm, will bridge the isolation of farm life, enhance social life in the country, and lead to a far larger circulation of newspapers and magazines, 18,536 of which are published in the United States. This question is a practical matter of the highest value to the farming community. There is no doubt this accommodation would add to the value of the farms. The agricultural interest is the foundation upon which rests the success and stability of the nation, and a daily mail delivered to farmers would be of incalculable advantage. This system would not only be of value to him, but would prove advantageous to the merchant, manufacturer, trader, and publisher. It would bring the producer and consumer in closer relations. All interests would be conserved, for the city and town flourish by the business of the country flowing to them and building up their traffic. This scheme would be an economical one for the farmer. Hundreds are obliged to go far to the post-office each day, spending hours in the journey, in the aggregate counting many years that could be devoted to developing the country, and the work of the many going for mails could be performed by

the few. A friend of this free delivery terms it "a mission of enlightenment and education beyond any money value." In a commercial sense it would be of great importance to the farmer.

I have outlined the reasons why the farming interests should have this improvement in mail arrangements. I am firmly impressed that the scheme is feasible and will be profitable. On account of its justice, at the opening of this Congress I offered a bill to enlarge the free-delivery service to include the agricultural communities. That bill should pass, and the sum of \$13,000,000 should be appropriated, instead of six millions, as provided therein. I trust, in the interest of agricultural progress, that such a law will be enacted. It would promote the prosperity of the farmer, brighten the home, enhance farm values, and contribute to the general advancement of all our people and industries. These would far more than compensate for the outlay required, which in a short time would come back in increased business of the Department of Mails. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the following occurred:

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I would like to ask the gentleman why it is, if this experiment in the small towns and villages was so satisfactory—and I do not say it has not been satisfactory, I take it for granted that it has been—I want to know why it is that the Postmaster-General last year failed to expend \$452,000 of the amount appropriated for star-route service in the rural districts? Why did he not utilize it to the utmost extent, thereby preparing for rural free delivery?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I am informed that the Postmaster-General expended all that was deemed necessary for that class of service.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I understand; but still there were \$452,000 unexpended, which he did not deem it necessary to use.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But that money under the law could not be utilized for the purposes concerning which the gentleman is now speaking. That was for a specific purpose, and the Postmaster-General had no authority under the law to use it for free delivery in the country.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I understand that perfectly well; but there are applications upon applications to the Postmaster-General to improve the present postal facilities in the country, and they are denied, notwithstanding there was the sum of \$452,000 which was not expended.

Mr. CALDWELL. Let me ask the gentleman why it was, then, that he did not reduce the appropriation for the star-route service?

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. For the reason that we did not wish to reduce the rural district facilities.

Mr. CALDWELL. If you reduce the amount for the free delivery, and cripple the free-delivery service, why not do the same thing for the star-route service?

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. No, we do not. The present free-delivery system only applies to towns of 10,000 inhabitants or \$10,000 postal receipts.

Mr. CALDWELL. It applies to 20,000,000 of people in this country, and you have reduced it.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. The Postmaster-General admits that there are fifty-one places which he has not supplied, which he ought to have supplied.

Mr. CALDWELL. Simply because that appropriation was not sufficient.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I wish to say that the records will show that during the administration of the present Postmaster-General, the star-route service has been as efficient as it has been at any time during the last twenty years.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. And there was a larger surplus last year in that item than there had been during the history of the country.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Then that shows that under his administration the service has been administered more economically than during the Cleveland Administration.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for one moment to me?

Mr. O'DONNELL. I will yield for a moment to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina] to the fact that while I speak for a locality only, in the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, North and South Dakota, for the year ending January, 1891, the star-route service was increased in those States 2,418,371.34 additional miles traveled per annum, showing that the Postmaster-General is increasing the service all the time and pushing it as rapidly as possible. That enormous amount of mileage was increased in those States alone.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I congratulate the gentleman—

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I will show that later on.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I hope this is not coming out of my time. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan does not yield.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I simply wish to congratulate the gentleman on his success in applying to the Post-Office Department for these increased facilities; but I do not understand why the other portions of the country have not been granted the same facilities, and I know perfectly well that if the Postmaster-General was anxious, or if the Post-Office Department was anxious to use this star-route fund to increase the facilities in rural districts, the people of the rural districts would be very glad indeed to get the increased facilities.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I think I will be able to show the gentleman that all are treated alike.

Mr. BERGEN. The gentleman certainly does not mean that the Postmaster-General can use the funds which have been appropriated and set aside for the particular purposes of the star route service, for free-delivery purposes in the country? He can not divert a fund from the purpose for which it was appropriated.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Not at all; but I mean to say that communities which now have one mail a week might get two, those that get two mails a week might get three, or there might be new routes established all over the rural districts, extending in every direction. That is what I mean.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, when the proper time comes, to move to strike out section 3 of the Post-Office appropriation bill now under consideration, and I desire to state very briefly some of the reasons that impel this action upon my part, and which I believe leads to the conclusion that it should be done. This particular section is the one that provides that the compensation of land grant roads for transportation of the mails shall be fixed by the Postmaster-General, and at a sum not exceeding 50 per cent of what may be estimated as just and reasonable compensation for the service as compared with that paid to other roads for like service.

I will say that the effect of striking out this provision will be to leave the law as it now stands, which is the law passed in 1878, and which fixes the compensation of this class of roads for this service the same as this law does, except that it puts the maximum charge at 80 per cent instead of 50.

Now, in presenting the reasons for this proposed action, I will say that I do not expect to be able to bring forward anything original or particularly new in this regard. The parties interested in this particular section and who are interested in this relief were heard extensively before the Post-Office Committee and advanced arguments that were full, complete, and no doubt exhaustive, and they ought to be brought to the attention of the House, and I propose to do so somewhat. They were to my mind cogent and convincing, and have satisfied me, and I believe there are a large number of the committee that stand in the same attitude, and believe that their position is just, right, and proper. Now, the reason why this limitation is put here at all—

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman allow an interruption? Is that report recommended by the Department?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. No, sir; and not only that, but, so far as the report of the committee is concerned, there is a mere statement that it is recommended by the committee and no argument is advanced in its support.

I will say the claimed power under which this is to be done grows out of the provisions of the land-grant acts under which lands were given to these railroads, running back to the time between 1850 and 1860 practically. There may have been some exceptions in other than those years, but that was practically the time in which the land grants were made. The provision of the law, so far as it affects the rights of Iowa, and in which I am particularly interested, of course, is this:

The United States mail shall be transported over said roads under the direction of the Post-Office Department at such price as Congress may by law direct: *Provided*, That until said price is fixed by law, the Postmaster-General shall have power to determine the same.

And that, or substantially that, so far as it affects any question of legality, or any question of equity or right, is the provision of all the land-grant acts. Now, in considering the question of the power of Congress and the duty or right of Congress to deal with this subject in this way there are two questions which arise; one the question of abstract right—the question of the legal authority to sustain this provision; and then after that is determined, if it is determined that the right exists, the question of its expediency, the question of its right, the question of its justice, is to be determined.

Now, so far as the legal or judicial question is concerned, I am fully of the opinion, speaking, of course, for myself, that we have no such legal right. I do not believe, judging from the interpretations of similar laws, and especially that which the Supreme Court of the United States has given in analogous cases, that this was the intention or is the meaning of that provision, and this idea is strengthened, and very materially strengthened, by the debates upon that provision at the time when these land-grant acts were under consideration in the Congress of the United States. Now, then, my idea of the meaning of that provision is this, that the United States provided simply against a contingency of an absolute refusal upon the part of these roads to carry the mails at all, or if they did not do that, in captiously fixing the compensation so that it would be prohibitory. In other words, it was meant to provide that the mails should be carried over these roads and that Congress should to a certain extent have control of them and power to provide that it should be done for reasonable compensation. But I do not believe that it was ever intended that it should extend any further, or that Congress should have any right to determine that these roads should do this for nothing, or for any compensation less than fair, reasonable, and just compensation or pay for the service.

Now, I say that, judging from other cases and other decisions made by the courts that, in my judgment, is what the courts would say upon this question. But going outside of that—for that is a mere legal question in regard to which every man may have, and is entitled to have, his own opinion until it is actually determined in a direct case involving the consideration of this particular law—going outside of that, I say there is nothing in the reason of these land grants; there is nothing in the debates or the arguments at the time they were under discussion and consideration in Congress to lead to any contrary conclusion. It is very commonly supposed, and I know arguments are based upon the idea or theory, that these grants of lands were a gratuity, that the lands were given to these railroads merely as a bonus, and at a cost or loss to the Government, and that it was understood that in some way the Government should afterwards receive substantial compensation for the grants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any such doctrine. I find no justification for any such idea or theory in the arguments which were made in Congress at the time those laws were passed. The transaction was simply a bargain between the railroad companies and the Government. It was a bargain in which the Government received at the time ample and full consideration; a bargain in which the Government was an actual gainer in fact. What was the fact? At that time the Government had a great amount of unoccupied land, for which there was no market; land that had been in the market for years without finding a purchaser, for the reason that while a great deal of it was good in quality it was so far removed from market, so far from means of transportation to market, that nobody wanted it. The Government wanted to sell the land, not only for the money that was in it, but for the purpose of settling up, developing, advancing, and improving the country.

Now, I understand from the debates at the time and from the assertions that are made in connection with the subject now, that the Government itself was the party that first made this proposition. The railroad companies were not asking it particularly, but the Government itself proposed that if the railroad companies would go on and build their roads into those sections of country, they would grant them one-half of the land upon each side of the road for a space of six miles, giving them alternate sections.

In that same connection it was provided, not that this policy should cost the Government anything, not that the Government should receive one-half less money because of this land bonus, but that the alternate sections, which were reserved from the railroad companies, should be advanced to double the price at which they were then held, so that the Government actually received for half of the lands within the 6-mile limit which it reserved to itself, exactly the same amount of money that it would have received if it had sold every acre of land at the regular price, or that it would have received from the railroads themselves if they had bought all of the lands within the 6-mile limit. The Government, by reason of the transaction, found a market for all of its land at full price, which land before had no sale and was a drug in the market.

So much for the question of abstract right and the legal right of Congress in the premises. What was the intention of the parties to this transaction, the roads upon the one side and the Government upon the other? When we have found that intention, we have, of course, found the correct interpretation of this law. I say so much for that, not by any means that I have exhausted the whole argument upon the subject, or have given all the reasons that could well be advanced to show that the con-

struction for which I have contended is the fair and proper construction of this legislation. But I have presented enough, considering the limited time at my disposal, and I think it is beyond argument—beyond fair argument—that that was the intention of the parties, that that was the meaning of these laws, and that the Government has no further right, from the legal standpoint, in regard to these lands, or in regard to the carrying of the mails by reason of the giving of the land to the railroad company under such circumstances.

But, outside of that question, conceding for the sake of argument that the Government has the right, that this Congress has full power, to legislate in regard to this matter and to determine what compensation these railroads shall receive for carrying the mails, still there is a further question. There is a question of right; there is a question of justice; there is a question of equity, as between these railroads and the Government that we can not afford to ignore, and we certainly, in dealing with this question, should deal with it honorably and fairly and from the same standpoint that an individual would act in dealing with another. We can not afford to do less than that. Now, from that standpoint, I say there is no justification for any such provision as that in section 3 of this bill. It is general in its scope. It figures all the roads alike, regardless of what they got from the Government or the Government from them, in the first instance, and regardless of what has been paid back by them by virtue of the 20 per cent deduction that has been made ever since 1878 in the payment to these roads, and if we are to consider the question at all from the standpoint of right and justice between these parties, we shall have to deal with these roads separately.

We would have to take into consideration the circumstances connected with each, and see what lands they have received; what the value of the lands is, or rather was; see how much had been paid back to the Government by reason of the 20 per cent reduction already made, and determine each particular case by itself and on its own merits.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Has the gentleman a list of the railroads which are affected by this legislation?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. No, I have not.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I have a list here, if the gentleman desires to inspect it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I would like to examine it.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. In the printed report made by the committee there is a list of the States, and in a general way a list of the railroads; but I do not think the list specifies how each particular road is affected. There are several roads in Iowa, including some portion of the Northwestern road, affected.

Mr. OATES. I think I can give the gentleman from Illinois the information he seeks as to the railroads in his State. To what railroad does the gentleman especially refer?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I wish to know what railroads are affected in the States?

Mr. OATES. All of the land-grant roads except the Pacific roads, which come under the Thurman act.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Well, take for instance the Illinois Central. What would be the effect of this provision on that road?

Mr. OATES. The present compensation of these roads is \$214,915.73. This bill fixes the amount at \$134,348.60, being a reduction of \$80,609.13 from their present compensation.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Does that affect the Illinois Central Railroad?

Mr. OATES. Of course; it is one of the land-grant roads.

Mr. REED. On what ground?

Mr. OATES. Simply on account of being a land-grant road. It is a reduction from 80 per cent to 50 per cent.

Mr. REED. Having got the money, they want to get it back?

Mr. ANDREW. They have got a kind of a string tied to it.

Mr. OATES. I do not want to get it back. I am not in favor of this provision.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The provision with reference to the Illinois Central would be an unjust one, for the reason that that road pays into the treasury of the State of Illinois a certain percentage of its income, which under the original stipulation was regarded as a fair compensation for what the State did for the road.

Mr. OATES. I gave the gentleman the correct figures as to the amount of reduction in the pay of land-grant railroads in Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If this provision goes into effect with reference to the Illinois Central Railroad there is a manifest injustice committed, because, by the original stipulation, 7 per cent of the gross earnings of that road are paid into the treas-

ury of the State of Illinois. When that arrangement was made it was regarded at the time that the State was getting the good side of the bargain, and I think the people of Illinois are satisfied with it as it is.

Mr. REED. But this is only taking money from the railroads; and that, you know, is always right. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Well, not always.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit me, I wish to interrupt him for an inquiry, as he has been already interrupted, although I dislike very much to do so.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I wish to ask this question: If this law goes into effect will it affect the Union Pacific Railroad Company from Omaha to California, the same as it will affect the Northern Pacific or the St. Paul?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will say in answer to the gentleman from Washington that my understanding is it will not so affect the Union Pacific road, and that by reason of the very provision itself, which reads:

SEC. 3. That hereafter railroad companies which have not received aid in bonds of the United States, and which obtained grants of public land to aid in the construction of their railroads on condition that such railroads should be post-routes and military roads, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and all other Government service, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose, restricting the charges for such Government transportation, shall be paid only on the basis of such rates for the transportation of the mails as the Postmaster-General shall deem just and reasonable, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation for such transportation of the mails as shall at the time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such companies for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted in full for all demands for such service.

The Union Pacific Railroad Company did receive bonds, and therefore it is excepted by the terms of this provision.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Would it not have been more just, or at least as equitable, to say nothing more of it, to have applied this provision to the railroad companies which did receive bonds from the United States?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Probably more so.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. There was no authority to do it.

Mr. OATES. The Pacific roads are not included, they having received bonds, and are governed by the provisions of the Thurman act as amended and now in force.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I understand that they are on our books, but we do not get much from them.

Mr. OATES. They are not reached by this provision, because they are governed by the other law.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. I have no desire, Mr. Chairman, to make a very extended argument at this time or attempt to cover the whole ground. I will doubtless have more to say under the five-minute rule when this matter comes up for consideration and amendment.

But at the present time I simply want to add to what I have already stated by saying that there is no justification from any standpoint, or from any information that the committee had, or from any information that Congress has, so far as I know, for making any such sweeping provision. If there is any reason existing inside or outside of this Hall, why any reduction from a reasonable and just compensation for the carrying of these mails by these roads should be made, it should be done upon consideration, it should be done upon some basis; it should be done, taking each road by itself, and in such a way that it should be fair, equitable, and just, taking into consideration the work that is actually performed by these roads, and the compensation that they have received, if anything, for doing it, by reason of the granting of these lands to them in the first instance.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has there been any departmental recommendation, or has there been an appeal by petition to Congress for this change?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. I understand not. There has been nothing of the kind that I know of.

Mr. BINGHAM. Nothing of record that you know of?

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Nothing that I know of, and I do not know at whose instance this provision was put in the bill. I was not present during the sessions of the committee when this matter was under consideration, and I have never heard any reason given or justification attempted.

Mr. CALDWELL. On the contrary, the Post-Office Department recommends that there be no reduction in the service.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. It seems to me, to say the least, that if we are going to enter into this scheme, we ought to do it with our eyes

open. We ought to do it from a standpoint of knowledge as to what the facts are, and with a view to the effect upon each road that would be affected by this class of legislation. It may be proper to investigate the question and find out the exact facts and then to legislate as may be justified by these facts, but there is no excuse for a sweeping provision such as this that has no known basis or fact to support it. If these roads are to be forced to do work for the Government and the people at one-half of just and reasonable compensation, there should be a valid reason for it and something to justify it. We have no right to be capacious and unjust even if we have the power.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] now, if he wishes to speak.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I propose to submit some remarks to the House, but I wish to submit them to the members of the House, and not to the desks and chairs; and inasmuch as there are so few persons here to-day I believe I will seek another opportunity. I wish to express my thanks to the gentleman from North Carolina, and to other gentlemen who have so kindly consented to give me a part of their time.

Mr. CARUTH. Does the gentleman from South Carolina mean to ignore those of us who are here?

Mr. HEMPHILL. No; I think that those who are here know enough about the subject without further instruction.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I suggest that my friend from Ohio [Mr. CALDWELL] occupy some of the time of which he has control by yielding to some gentleman on that side.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen on the other side ought to consume some of their time.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as most of those who have expressed a desire to address the House are not present, I think it would be well to move that the committee rise.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that possibly the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], or the other representatives of the People's party, might occupy some of the time allotted to them.

Mr. SIMPSON. We are not ready yet.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. There seems to be an absenteeism of all the gentlemen who desire to speak. Would it be in order to move that the committee rise?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. If the debate is to be concluded, I am perfectly willing to let the committee rise and let the House adjourn.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in my limited experience that I have ever known the House to be without an orator. There seems to be a lack of them here to-day.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used one hour and thirty-seven minutes of his time.

Mr. BERGEN. How much time have the other side consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. Eighteen minutes to-day. The Chair does not know how much was used yesterday.

Mr. BERGEN. The time consumed yesterday does not enter into the computation.

The CHAIRMAN. Only eighteen minutes have been consumed, of the time under the control of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. WILSON of Washington. If I can be recognized I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CALDWELL] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. CALDWELL. I insist that some of the time be consumed on the other side.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KENDALL].

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, my honored predecessor pledged the convention that nominated him that he would lift their banner in fire against the money changers, the money lenders, and the Shylocks of Wall street; the tariffs of the East and the railroads of the West; questions which were pressing then for settlement, but which are pressing now, as they never pressed before, upon the heart and brain of a Federal Congress for solution in a spirit of absolute fairness to all interests, all sections, and all men. In a much humbler way, but with an equally fearless and unflinching zeal, not caring what the consequences may be upon my own fortunes, sir, I am here to redeem that pledge. It matters not what political party has the President and Congress, so long as a high protective tariff and a contraction of the currency obtains (both saddled upon the American people by the

Republican party), just so long will the poor people of this country continue to complain and suffer.

It seems to me that the two problems with which we are confronted are, first, how to get more money into circulation; and, second, how to prevent what we do get from following what we have gotten into Wall street and Pennsylvania. It can not be successfully denied that the volume of money is insufficient to carry on the business transactions of the people. We must either increase the circulating medium to meet these demands or business will be cut down to the compass of our present circulation. The industrial interests of the country can not thrive by reason of this lack of money, and must inevitably perish unless something is done.

It is, indeed, high time, Mr. Chairman, that we should pause and reflect. Let us glance at the history of the past and adorn our present lesson with the wisdom it teaches. For example, look at England. For centuries the British Government has made war upon silver and debased it, and what has been the result? Sir, the question hardly requires an answer. It is a well-known fact that nearly all the lands of that nation have passed into the hands of the few. Over two-thirds of her 72,000,000 acres belong to less than 11,000 persons. This is, to a great extent, the result of making money scarce and high, and consequently products and labor low and cheap. In this way they managed to get the lands and labor of the former owners, and now these lords and masters of their own creation compel them to pay annually more than \$550,000,000 in rents, and to-day it goes without saying that England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland are ruled by an aristocracy of wealth wrung from the toil and sweat of oppressed, down-trodden, discontented labor.

Sir, I speak in no spirit of demagogery when I warn you that in the same way the same thing is being attempted here. It is astonishing what gigantic strides they have made in that direction in the last eighteen years. From 1792 to 1873 we had free bimetallic coinage and very few millionaires. In 1873, however, the Republican party, under the leadership of Senator SHERMAN, in imitation of England, secretly and clandestinely struck silver in the dark, and millionaires have sprung up in great numbers, and on the other hand the poor have mostly become paupers. The attempt made in the Senate on last Wednesday by Mr. SHERMAN, in reply to Mr. MORGAN, to shirk the responsibility for that direst calamity ever inflicted upon the American people by Congress was the weakest utterance in the nature of an apology that ever fell from the lips of Ohio's very able and ingenious senior Senator.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the people will regard him as the head of the column, having been chairman of the Committee on Finance at that time, as the Senator was. The history of this matter has been gone over very often, and there is a man now sleeping in his grave in Kentucky who made statements in the presence of the Senator from Ohio here upon that question, which were placed in the RECORD; and for the purpose of getting him a little more conspicuously before the country, I took upon myself the perhaps unwelcome task at the moment of rereading to the Senate of the United States in a later debate and after he was in his grave all that he said.

The evidence presented by the then Senator from Kentucky convinced my mind, I think it convinced the minds of the people of the United States generally, that the Senator from Ohio had greater responsibility for the destruction of silver in 1873 than he now seems disposed to admit. I applaud that feeling in the Senator's heart which causes him to try to rectify the wrongs that he has done to the people of the United States, but if he were speaking with manliness to us on this side of the Chamber and to the friends of silver to-day, and had reflected for a moment how elegantly and beautifully manly it would be in him to come out and put some distinctive measure into operation that would restore the people of the United States to the constitutional rights of which they were bereft by him in 1873, I could admire him even more than I do; and yet I admire him very much.

Undoubtedly there is something wrong in our financial system when after thirty years of Republican legerdemain legislation less than thirty thousand persons own more than one-half of the wealth of this superb Republic, inhabited by 65,000,000 population, commonly called, and supposed to be, free.

The times are out of joint, but the Republican party is responsible for the fact. These laws were made by the Republican financiers and the Democratic party has come up through great trials and tribulations to repeal them. Unless they are repealed, Mr. Chairman, at the present rate it will only be a few years more when they will not only own the money, but they will own our lands and liberties as well. But we have inherited the spirit of freedom and, unlike continental Europe, we are not ready to be enslaved.

The outraged and the indignant have called a halt. The public servant who permits their protests to go unheeded does so at his own peril. All indications point, like index fingers, to the fact that the political revolution of 1890 is permanent if the Democratic branch—the people's branch—of Congress only does its duty. The fact, I think, ought to be understood that the onward movement of the masses will camp in the saddle until the circulation is augmented to \$50 per capita. Sir, they have been trampled under foot in some of our Western States, and we are somewhat oppressed ourselves, but we are coming to their relief.

Sir, one of the strongest counts in the indictment upon which we arraigned, tried, convicted, and sentenced the force bill and the billion-dollar Congress (and I observe with satisfaction that the leader of that Congress [Mr. REED] honors me with his attention) before that great jury, composed of their own constituents, in that memorable uprising in which the Democratic banners danced in the Kansas breezes, unhorsing the politically emasculated, sarcastic Ingalls and waved triumphantly over the three great Commonwealths that have given to the constitutional Democracy of the Union, the sage PALMER, the wizard-lipped VILAS, and the diplomatic Dickinson, was the charge that they had stifled the silver bill passed by the Democratic and silver-State Senators. Whatever may have happened since, there was not at that time, sir, any dark division in the Democratic ranks. I do not believe we are at the parting of the ways, but should such a fact develop I shall follow, but not blindly, along the path blazed by the illustrious Beck. The many brilliant statesmen "out of a job" ought to admonish gentlemen on this floor to look well to their financial bearings, even though the justice and humanity of the cause do not command itself to them.

We are told, Mr. Chairman, that the Bland bill is an infamous measure, in the interest of silver-owners, and that a silver dollar is only worth 70 cents. I must admit that I am astonished at that assertion, coming from the source it does. Why, sir, silver was as good as gold until 1873, when the Republican party demonetized it. If it is now worth only 70 cents to the dollar they made it so. I am unable to see the consistency of any Democrat advocating this radical wrong and its perpetuation. If Congress has reduced the value of silver 30 cents, and consequently made a dollar worth only 70 cents, it seems to me that we should now restore to silver the 30 cents of which it was robbed by nefarious legislation. I am unable to see anything wrong in this position. If there is, I have read and studied this question to no purpose. If we robbed the silver men of 30 cents on the dollar let us be honest—let us give it back.

Mr. Chairman, the enemies of silver talk about the old exploded idea of the intrinsic value of money. We all know that gold and silver have intrinsic values as commodities in the markets, but not as money. If it were otherwise we could not make money out of paper at all, for comparatively it has no value. It is not the value the thing is made of that makes it money, but the stamp of the Government, and when it issues its fiat and says "this is worth a dollar," and places its stamp upon it, it becomes as good as gold, whether it be gold, silver, or paper.

Sir, it is held by some that paper money must have specie or bullion to back it to make it good, and this bill is based upon that idea. I make no objection to it upon that ground, but, sir, this is not absolutely necessary. The Republic of Venice had nothing but paper money, issued upon the faith of the Government alone, for six hundred years, and it was perfectly good. And, sir, did not France only a few years ago, when she, by reason of war, became indebted to Prussia a billion of dollars, after all her specie was exhausted in the payment of the same, issue five hundred millions of paper money on the credit of the Government alone? And she grew prosperous and happy and paid her debt before it was due. I am neither a repudiator nor an inflationist, but with all our wealth and credit it seems to me that we can issue as much money on paper as we really need—that is, increase the actual circulating per capita to its old standard, and that it would be as good as gold, but with silver equality restored this, in my judgment, would be unnecessary.

Some of our Democratic friends tell us that this bill is all right, but that it is bad policy to pass it now. I am no friend to policy, because I regard it as the natural enemy of principle. Mr. Clay, our great commoner, once said that he would rather be right than President. But aside from this the emergency is upon us. Our constituents are in distress, and I feel that this bill will give great relief. If Congress ignores the people, the people might ignore Congress. I challenge any gentleman on this floor to point to a time when the Democratic party failed to strike a blow for financial freedom. But it is claimed that the President will veto this bill if we pass it. That is no excuse for us. Let us do our duty; let us still be true to the people, to the history, traditions, and legends of the Democratic faith, and he can do as he pleases.

Again, it is said that if this bill passes, our country will become the dumping-ground of all the silver in the world. Sir, we had free bimetallic coinage from 1792 to 1873, a period of eighty-one years, and no calamity overtook us. Such arguments are chaff, sophistry, and the sheerest nonsense. The world has no more silver than we can use in our business. Our experience for those eighty-one years prior to 1873, in my humble judgment, hangs a bow of promise in the political sky which assures us that this country will never be destroyed by a silver deluge. We can coin all that comes, place our eagles upon it, and send it forth with our fiat on its mission of mercy to the laboring masses. By

giving them adequate return for their products and labor we can enable them to discharge their mortgages and debts. Then, sir, the eagle engraved upon an honest, constitutional dollar, containing 412½ grains, may be truthfully styled the emblem of our liberty.

If you continue to legislate to increase the purchasing power of money by making it scarce and consequently decrease the price of labor and production the ultimate result will be the pauperism and degradation of our people and their lands will go where their money has gone. Then we, like England, will be owned by a relentless landed aristocracy; and, as their tenants, bear the yoke of slavery and disgrace. The history of the world demonstrates conclusively that when the farming classes lose their lands they lose their liberties. The republic may then exist in name, but in name only. We should not only encourage our farmers to hold their homes, but as far as we can we should enable them to do so.

No nation, Mr. Chairman, can maintain a financial system based upon its debt, as we have attempted to do under our miserable national-banking system by suffering them to issue money upon the bonds we owe them. Because, when the bonds are paid the banks must cease to exist. Besides, we have grown weary of paying these pets of the Government the interest on their bonds in gold and at the same time of paying them more than double interest on the money they are allowed to issue on the bonds. Sir, I was not astonished whilst this House was discussing one of its great appropriation bills, to observe the disputation suddenly turn upon the infirmities of our financial system. We can not long live, much less prosper, under such a system. Outside of Wall street and its tributaries that fact is generally understood. The Western people, upon whom their rapacity has fed and gorged until they are well-nigh exhausted, much as they love their children, would rather see them devoured by the wolves of the West than to see them become serfs to the money kings of the East. They know their rights, and under God and a free ballot they are going to have them. European history will not be allowed to repeat itself here. The hour of deliverance is at hand. The stars in their courses are fighting the battles of the poor, plain people.

Mr. Chairman, when I heard the honorable gentleman from Kansas upon this floor describe how the money-lenders were extorting upon his people and taking from them their homes, and I can personally testify from actual observation to the fact upon which he rests the gravamen of his complaint, it brought to my mind a stanza from that sweetest and tenderest of all the poets, Robert Burns, the mountain bard of Europe, who, when he, like my friend, saw his fair, rugged Scotland, to him the loveliest land on earth, its very soil polluted by the coach wheels of some ancient Carnegie or Blaine, some mushroom landlord, amid the humiliation and gloom that fell upon his great, warm heart, exclaimed:

If I'm designed yon lordling's slave,
By nature's law designed,
Why was an independent wish
E'er planted in my mind?
If not, why am I subject to
His cruelty and scorn?
Or why has man the will and power
To make his fellow mourn?

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that such may never be our own fate, and that the Bland bill, or a similar measure, may become a law. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. KENDALL having expired, Mr. SIMPSON yielded him three minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STOUT].

Mr. STOUT. Mr. Chairman, I have received a great many petitions from the agricultural districts, requesting some legislation looking to the free delivery of mails in the country, and having myself no interests whatever other than those connected with agriculture, I feel called upon to do what I am able to secure that result; but I appreciate this one condition of things, that our Treasury is becoming depleted; that unless we can secure a revenue from the free delivery of the mails to compensate for the expenditure, we will be compelled for a time at least to postpone this action. There exists throughout the country a wrong impression as to the relation of the General Government to the people.

Many are led to suppose that the General Government is a wealthy donor who will bestow any bounty he may see fit, to those who are to be his beneficiaries. But this is not the relation of the Government to the people. Every cent that we receive from the General Government, somebody has to pay, and we are ourselves contributors. It becomes then a question of importance to us to determine how much additional taxation this increase of expenditure would impose upon us; and I am not

here to suppose that anyone would favor a policy that would not give an equal distribution of mail facilities throughout the country. It is utterly impossible for us to seek out some favored locality where we would make free delivery operative, and exclude the more sparsely settled portions.

We must be uniformly generous if we are to adopt a different policy from that which we have heretofore pursued. Now, it occurs to me that while our annual expenditure is something like \$70,000,000 for the purpose of affording mail facilities, and by a system not yet self-supporting, we can not just at this time increase the outlay by the amount that would be necessary to yield to this demand of the people.

How much, Mr. Chairman, is it to be supposed that this would increase the cost of our mail service? It is fair to suppose that every township would require at least two persons to properly deliver the mails; certainly if there was a daily mail—and as these townships are generally 6 miles square, we can not suppose that less than two persons would be necessary, and these supplied with horses and vehicles to properly do the service—it would then certainly require \$1,000 to each township, and this would make the cost \$1,000,000 in each State, or \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 in the United States. Now, I am ready to vote for any measure that will secure this result, just as soon as it can be done consistently with the revenues of the service when enlarged. It seems to me that it is necessary that we should then adopt some policy which shall be uniform and afford equal facilities—

I am opposed to any measure which seeks out a particular town and gives to such as have a Representative in Congress the favor of the free delivery of the mails. Free delivery for towns other than the country should be restricted to those that furnish a sufficient amount of income from the mails. It should also be restricted to those that have at least 12,000 to 20,000 inhabitants.

The limited time, Mr. Chairman, allowed will not permit me to enter into a lengthy discussion of this question; but let me here say that I am ready to do all I can to grant favors to the people in the country, just so soon as it can be done consistent with the revenues to be derived from that source.

One important question for us to determine at this time is, what shall be done in relation to the payment for carrying the mails on the land-grant railroads? We have heard a plausible argument from those who are in favor of continuing the present system against the reduction to 50 per cent of the sum paid other roads. But it occurs to me that, having so bounteously granted the public lands to aid these railroads, they should make no profit out of the carrying of the mails. They should be paid only the cost of transportation. It should then be a matter of strict investigation to determine what the cost of carrying the mails may be, and that amount—a fair one—I am willing to vote, but to give them a large profit, under the circumstances, is certainly not good policy.

In the matter of land-grant roads, Mr. Chairman, it has been especially provided that the Postmaster-General should have a right to limit the amount to be paid for mail transportation within reasonable bounds; and the railways having taken the land grants subject to that condition, it seems to me that it is no hardship for us to adopt a policy which intelligent observation and investigation may determine to be just and right, and pay that amount whatever it may be, and more than this the railroads have no right to ask at our hands.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN].

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Chairman, I listened this morning with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the question of extending the free-delivery system to the rural districts by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL]. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers and those who live in the rural districts are as much entitled to have the free-delivery system extended to their homes as those in the larger cities who enjoy the benefits of that system. The great difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that our present revenue system is not yielding sufficient to extend that system, and is not in fact yielding sufficient revenue to carry on the ordinary expenses of the Government.

The McKinley tariff is a protective measure, pure and simple. The framers of the bill were not concerned about the prices of articles to consumers. Nor were they concerned about the revenues to the Government. The object of the bill was to check imports, and give home manufacturers a monopoly in domestic manufactures. The effect was to reduce revenues and increase prices to the consumer. Maj. McKinley said in the Fifty-first Congress in reporting his bill:

The exact effect upon the revenues of the Government of the proposed bill is difficult of ascertainment. That there will be a substantial reduction, as we shall show, admits of no doubt. It is not believed that the increase of duties upon wools and woolen goods, and upon glassware, will have the effect of increasing the revenues. That would, of course, follow if the im-

portations of the last fiscal year were hereafter to be maintained, which, however, is altogether improbable. The result will be that importations will be decreased, and therefore the amount of revenue collected from these sources will be diminished.

In every case of increased duty, except that imposed upon tin-plate (which does not go into effect until July 1, 1891) and upon linen fabrics, the effect will be to reduce rather than enlarge the revenues, because importations will fall off.

In the same report he also said:

We have not been so much concerned about the prices of the articles we consume as we have been to encourage a system of home production which shall give fair remuneration to domestic producers.

From the above quotations we have it from the mouth of the author that—

the result will be that importations will be decreased, and therefore the amount of revenue collected from these sources will be diminished.

Again:

In every case of increased duty * * * the effect will be to reduce rather than enlarge the revenues, because importations will fall off.

It was not intended that articles should be made cheaper, as Maj. McKinley said that "we have not been so much concerned about the prices of articles we consume."

As a result of the McKinley law the revenues have been decreased, not by lowering the duties upon articles in common use, but by raising the duties to a prohibitory point so as to shut out foreign imports, decrease the revenue and give a monopoly to our own selfish and greedy producers. The Secretary of the Treasury is constantly staring in the face a Government deficiency by reason of this unwise legislation. Unless relief comes to our depleted Treasury in this Congress, it is my prediction that our Treasury officials before many months will be seeking Government loans in Wall street to meet the current obligations of the Government.

A few days ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] put himself to the trouble to explain that the Democratic party was not a free-trade party. As between McKinley protection and free trade I should prefer the latter. I had long since thought that such an explanation, in view of the present meaning of free trade, was unnecessary. What is free trade? This is the definition of one of the ablest defenders of protection, the Philadelphia American, of August 7, 1884:

A protective duty has for its object to effect the diversion of a part of the capital and the labor of the people out of the channels in which it would run otherwise, into channels favored or created by law.

A country may collect its entire revenues by duties on imports, and yet, be an entirely free-trade country, so long as it does not lay those duties in such a way as to lead any one to undertake any employment, or make any investment, he would avoid in the absence of such duties.

If free trade means fair trade I am for it. If it has any elements of protection in it I am opposed to it. If I had my way I would pull down the walls that imprison commerce. I would break the chains that enslave it. I would give commerce its freedom. I would levy no tax that was not for revenue, and if that be free trade you have the liberty to call me a free trader and make the most of it. Free trade means the opposite of protection. A Democrat can not be a protectionist. A protectionist can not be a Democrat in principle. We have free trade between the States. Bananas can be grown in Illinois in hot houses. Does it pay to do it? Suppose we did not have free trade between the States and the Illinois Legislature had the power to lay a tariff duty upon this article of fruit that would prohibit Florida bananas from coming into the State on the principle that the people in Illinois should grow bananas and thus encourage a new industry.

Suppose the Florida Legislature should tax Illinois apples in retaliation so as to prohibit them from going into the State. Illinois can not grow bananas profitably. Florida can not grow apples profitably. It is better therefore that the people of each State should be permitted to exchange the product that they can profitably produce for the product that they can not profitably produce. If we did not have free trade between the States we might have protective idiocy in the States not unlike some of the workings of the present system. Suppose Illinois had the power to tax Louisiana cotton, and Louisiana in retaliation should tax Illinois corn. It would be a losing transaction to the people of both States. An industry that is not self-supporting without every man's labor—the industry and thrift of the country—being taxed to sustain it, ought to perish, and the sooner the better for all those who must bear the burden of keeping it alive. Such an industry is a public curse. It is a destroyer of prosperity and a wrecker of homes. It bodes good to no man. It is an evil to be avoided. It exacts tribute from all the resources of the people to maintain it. Like vampire it saps the lifeblood of the nation.

While the several bills reported by the Ways and Means Committee may not be thought the best way to attack the "financial monster" known as the McKinley tariff law, and while some Democrats and tariff reformers may believe that it should be attacked as a whole rather than by separate bills, all Democrats and tariff

reformers will give the several bills their hearty support, for the reason that they are in the line of tariff reduction and Democratic principle. If the Democratic party was in power in both Houses of Congress and had the President there would be no division in an effort to wipe from the statute books the present unjust and burdensome system of tariff taxation and the enactment of a revenue tariff law stripped of all features of protection. The time, in my judgment, has come to boldly declare for progressive free trade and commercial freedom or a tariff for revenue only, which in modern terms means free trade.

Gentlemen who favor a continuance of the present system of protection are deaf to reason and blind to facts. Just now sheep husbandry is the one great industry about which they have much concern. Just now we are warned to beware of the farmer's wrath if a single woolen fiber shall be touched upon the sheep's back. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. HENDERSON] has sounded this warning. I call his attention to the fact that since protection laid its heavy hand upon the sheep industry in 1867, our flocks have disappeared as if smitten by a plague. From 2,700,000 sheep in 1868 in our own State of Illinois we have only 700,000 in round numbers in 1891. The showing in many other States is no better. Ohio, which in the year 1867 had 7,159,000 sheep, in 1890 had but 3,943,000. Michigan, which in 1867 had 4,000,000 sheep, in 1890 had but 2,240,000. Pennsylvania, which in 1867 had over 3,400,000 sheep, in 1890 had only 945,000; and New York, which in 1867 had above 5,300,000 sheep, had in the year 1890 only 1,548,000. In 1868 the number of sheep east of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers was 37,685,000. In 1891 in the same territory the number was 18,476,400.

When the tariff act of 1867 became a law the price of wool was higher than it ever has been since. The following from a speech by Senator JOHN SHERMAN in 1883 will be read with much interest:

In 1867 the price of wool was 51 cents; in 1870, 46 cents; in 1878, which was an abnormal year, 40 cents per pound; this was the result of the policy of protecting the wool-grower.

Under the operation of the existing law (the tariff of 1867) the price of wool has gradually gone down.

No one has better stated the fact of how protection does not protect in the case of wool than Senator ALLISON. He says:

I allude to the wool tariff, a law the effect of which has been materially to injure the sheep husbandry of this country. In a single county in the State of Iowa, between 1867 and 1869, the number of sheep was reduced from 22,000 to 18,000 in two years; and what is true of that county is true of other counties in Iowa, and during that time the price of wool has been constantly depreciated.

* * * As the law now is, the tariff upon fine wools of a character not produced in this country is 100 per cent in their cost. * * * Before the tariff of 1867, our manufacturers of fine goods mixed foreign fine wools with our domestic product, and were thus able to compete successfully with the foreign manufacturers of similar wools. But being prohibited from importing this class of wools, these fine goods can not now be produced in this country as cheaply as they can be imported. Consequently mills that were formerly engaged in producing these goods have been compelled to abandon business or manufacture the coarser fabrics. If they could afford to manufacture these fine goods, they would make a market, which we do not now have, for our fine wools to be mixed with other fine wools of a different character from abroad. The want of a market, as I understand it, is the reason why our fine wools now command so low a price.

Protective duties have not helped the wool-grower. They have brought our domestic wool in competition with shoddy. They have denied to our manufacturers access to foreign wool, which is needed to mix with our domestic wool. They have caused shoddy, mungo, and cotton to be used as substitutes for needed foreign wool. The following article from the Chicago Tribune of March 14, 1892, as explanatory of this will be instructive:

WHY WOOL SHOULD BE MADE FREE.

In 1880 the total quantity of domestic and foreign wool retained in the United States for home consumption was 356,000,000 pounds. In 1890 the amount was 386,000,000 pounds. The increase in ten years was a little over 3 per cent. During that period the population of the country increased nearly 25 per cent, and its consumption of woolens should have increased in an even greater ratio, because the ability of the mass of the people to buy goods is greater than it was in 1880.

It is known that the woolen mills turned out a far greater quantity of goods in 1890 than in 1880. While the stock of wool they used increased only 3 per cent in ten years their output increased enormously. It follows that the woolen goods they sold contained an increasing quantity of shoddy, mungo, and cotton, and that the people actually used a smaller quantity of woolen goods per capita than they did in 1880.

The manifest reason for this was that the manufacturers were denied access to the foreign wools which they need to mix with the home-grown ones. Not having those wools at reasonable rates they have had to blend the American fleeces with cotton and other substitutes. Every increase in the wool duties means the use of a greater quantity of these substitutes, and a smaller use per capita of all-wool goods by Americans. If the manufacturer can get a wool at 8 cents a pound for mixing purposes he will use it, but if a duty of 5 or 6 cents a pound is clapped on that wool he will not buy it, but will take cotton at 7 or 8 cents a pound. The consumer gets a fabric for which he pays no more than for the old one, but it is not an all-wool one.

The duty on wools makes woolen goods dearer and discourages their use. The duties on the Australian wool, of which American manufacturers are using large quantities, is 11 cents a pound. If they got it duty free they would sell at a lower price the goods made of mixed Australian and American wools. As the price fell consumption would increase. The manufacturers would buy more of the Australian wool, but that would necessitate the purchase of more home-grown wool to mix with it. There would be an increased demand for the latter. Its price would advance and more would be grown.

The mill man, paying 11 cents less for part of the wool he used, could afford to pay more for the American fleeces and yet ask the consumer less than he did.

The removal of the duties from wool would be a blessing to manufacturer, wool-grower, and the consumer of woolens, who would get cheaper, warmer, and more durable goods.

Thomas Dolan is the president of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia. He is a protectionist, and in an article in the *New York World*, of August 12, 1891, said:

It is an interesting fact, deserving much emphasis of statement, that the prices of wool are lower now than they were one year ago. This decline was distinctly promised by protectionists during the discussion which accompanied the framing of the McKinley tariff.

I quote the following from the speech of Hon. JOHN DE WITT WARNER, one of the best informed men on the wool question in this country:

I know it has been claimed here that there is no more shoddy used in the United States than there was a short time since, or before the tariff went into operation, and the census statistics have been quoted to show that, whereas in 1880 we used in the manufacture of cloths 52,000,000 pounds of shoddy, equivalent to 156,000,000 pounds of wool, which it has displaced, we are now using annually about 61,000,000 pounds of shoddy, equivalent to 183,000,000 pounds of wool, in the manufacture of the same kind of goods—or a less amount than formerly in proportion to the amount of wool used.

First, Mr. Chairman, I ask our friends whether they will dare to go before the farmers of these United States—the wool-growers of Ohio, whose interests, if we would believe them, occupy their sleeping as well as their waking dreams—and tell them that under the encouragement of a tariff which has brought upon the wool-growing industry the burdens of the shoddy industry, there is used here each year, according to their own calculation, an amount of shoddy which displaces nearly three-fifths as much wool as the entire annual product of this country?

Again, sir, although the statistics of 1890 upon the shoddy question alone might bear out somewhat the contention of my friends upon the other side; yet when you come to look into the question you will find that the use of other adulterants is so increased that shoddy has got to be an aristocratic department of the wool-manufacturing business, and that the main difference between the use of adulterants now and ten years ago is that the increased use of shoddy is to a greater and greater extent in the more expensive classes of goods, and that in the other cheaper grades of goods jute and cotton are used to an extent which greatly raises the percentage of shoddy and the other adulterants or bogus wools now used by the American people as compared with ten years ago.

Again I state it, without fear of contradiction from anybody who knows the fact, that the census figures, made as they were before the McKinley bill had been able to affect that industry, but feebly represent the results of American industry and enterprise in counterfeiting woolens as stimulated by the McKinley bill; and it is a fact, which I have ascertained by examination of cloth tests, by inquiry among manufacturers, themselves, that during the last two years the use not merely of shoddy and the other degraded forms of wool, but of cotton and other things worse than shoddy, has so increased that, compared with our present stocks, the cloths we used to buy two years ago were far better to wear.

"A cheap coat makes a cheap man." This is the cry of the advocates of the protection barons. These are the words of no less a person than the author of the McKinley law. If a "cheap coat makes a cheap man" this law makes all poor men "cheap men" by raising the price so high upon all woolen clothing that none but the rich and well to do can wear anything but a "cheap coat" made of rags, mungo, cotton, and shoddy. "Cheap men" are better suited to the purposes of the protected mill-owners. When a man asserts his independence and refuses to be a cheap man he votes against tariff robbers. The duties under the McKinley tariff and administrative act passed by the last Congress on some of the coarser woolens range from 100 to 300 per cent, but rags come in free of duty to make "cheap coats" for "cheap men." With the poor man it is a "cheap coat" or no coat at all. But how have they provided for the rich man, the rich man's wife, and his sons and daughters? "Wearing apparel and other personal effects (not merchandise) of persons arriving in the United States" come in free of duty. There is no limitation as to the amount in value. It may be \$10,000 worth, or it may be \$100 worth. If the articles are "necessary and appropriate for the use of such persons" they come in free.

"Cheap coats make cheap men," and the McKinley law denies to the poor man a good coat, and forces upon his back a "cheap coat" or no coat at all. Under this law persons visiting foreign countries may bring into the United States wearing apparel and personal effects without limit, provided the same is appropriate to the use of such persons. This provision of the law is an unjust discrimination against the poor in favor of the rich. Poor people can not avail themselves of this provision, for the reason that they are not possessed of the means necessary to pay the expenses of a trip to Europe. The present law places too much power in the hands of the customs officers in deciding what apparel and personal effects are appropriate for the use of the persons importing the same.

Suppose one of my farmer constituents should go to Europe and buy a hundred-dollar suit of clothes, thinking that, when he landed in New York, Joshua Whitcomb like, he would have a time with the boys, and when met at the port of entry by a customs officer with a demand for duty, should insist that under the law his finery should come in duty free. The customs officer would say: "No, Joshua, that is not necessary and appropriate for an old jay like you."

What would be appropriate for one person might not be considered appropriate for another. For example, Andrew Carnegie and Jay Gould and their wives and daughters might think that wearing apparel and personal effects to the value of \$10,000 would not be inappropriate for them, while \$100 worth of clothing might be considered inappropriate for a person who from necessity has become accustomed to wearing cheap shoddy clothing purchased in the United States at protection prices. The poor man is compelled to buy his clothing in the United States for the reason that he has not the money to go abroad to buy it. The rich man should be compelled to buy his clothing in the same market. The rich would still have an advantage over the poor, for the reason that the duties under the McKinley law upon the more valuable fabric are much lower than on the cheaper fabric worn by the poor.

But, Mr. Chairman, the poor should not be heard to complain. The framers of the McKinley law have provided for them. Have they not made acorns, raw, dried or undried, but unground, free?

If we were a race of Lilliputians we could subsist upon acorns and use the hulls for "cheap coats." We should be thankful and not complain.

Bladders, including fish bladders or fish sounds, crude, and all integuments of animals, not specially provided for in this act (the McKinley act), are free.

May their magnanimity never grow less! When it comes to a question of sink or swim, free bladders will help us keep our heads above water.

We should not be heard to complain. Balm of Gilead comes in free. Let us offer up a prayer to the tariff barons.

Bologna sausages come in free. "Cheap coats" and "bologna sausages" are good enough for the poor man in the estimation of the tariff barons. I pity the pauper dog of Europe, however, that may become the victim of the sausage-grinder and free bologna sausage.

Next we have free cat-gut, whip-gut, or worm-gut, unmanufactured, or not further manufactured than in strings or cord. Small favors thankfully received and larger ones in proportion. We at least will pay no tax upon fiddle-strings when we play "Over the Hills to the Poorhouse."

All farmers' daughters in my district wear diamonds. We are thankful, therefore, to have placed upon the free list "diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut, including glaziers' and engravers' diamonds not set, and diamond dust or bort, and jewels to be used in the manufacture of watches." I know gentlemen will be surprised to learn that our farmers' daughters churn, wash dishes, and milk the cows with diamonds on their fingers.

For the next addition to the free list of the McKinley law I do complain. Guts, salted, come in free. I do not think we should have been denied the fresh article on the same terms, but as they have given us divi-divi and dragon's blood free, I am willing to call it even.

And next we are given fossils free. As we have many fossils who vote to tax themselves for the benefit of somebody else in my district I beg to be relieved from any more.

Leeches also come in free, without regard to the kind. The crawling, slimy, blood-sucking leech, and the Carnegie leech come in free. There is not much difference in the two. One sucks the blood of the individual, and the other sucks the blood of the whole nation. They discriminate against our Irish friends and in favor of our German fellow citizens. They put a duty of 25 cents a bushel on potatoes and admit sauerkraut free, but as they give us sausage skins and snails free, we all should be thankful.

Agricultural implements should be made free. The duty entering into the construction of agricultural implements should be removed. The manufacturers of implements sell to the foreign trade cheaper than they do to the people at home. They take advantage given by our tariff laws to keep the price of their goods higher to the American farmer than they are selling to the foreign farmer. Newspapers are published in New York that circulate only in foreign countries and are not allowed to circulate in this country which publish prices current on farm implements to the foreign trade. These prices, on comparison, are cheaper than the same articles are sold for at home. In the fall of 1891 I was informed by intelligent farmers of St. Lawrence County, N. Y., that chilled plows manufactured in the United States could be bought cheaper in Canada, just across the St. Lawrence River, than the same implements could be bought in the United States. I have every reason to believe that their statements were true. But no one should dispute what an implement manufacturer says himself in regard to this question. Mr. A. B. Farquhar, an implement maker of York, Pa., in answering the Home Market Club, said:

I would unhesitatingly favor a repeal of the duty on all manufactured

goods we make. Since we can and do export the duty can be of no possible service, and since it tends to provoke retaliation we find it a serious obstacle.

Mr. Farquhar said in further reply to the Home Market Club:

We sell goods cheaper to customers in foreign countries directly and to jobbers for export than we do to the domestic trade. This I could not truthfully deny or candidly conceal. You would like to learn the process by which the manufacturer can afford to sell the foreign buyer goods for less than he can the home customers. The reply is simplicity itself. We receive the prices current in the market in which we sell. We can not get more, and can not be expected to take less.

If it is true, and no one can truthfully deny it, as Mr. Farquhar asserts, that implements made here are sold for less to foreign farmers than to our own farmers, does it not demonstrate that our manufacturers of farm implements are not in need of protection? If our manufacturers of implements are now competing with foreign-made implements under our present tariff laws, if they had free raw material they could supply our own people with implements much cheaper and capture the markets of the world in the implement trade. The raw material from which most of our agricultural implements are manufactured, both for the domestic and export trade, is the product of the United States, which is enhanced in value to the manufacturer by reason of the tariff duties on the imported article. With this burden to the manufacturer, and with no advantage to him by reason of the drawback provision of the McKinley law, which Mr. Farquhar satisfactorily explains, still our manufacturers, to use Mr. Farquhar's own words, sell agricultural implements "cheaper to customers in foreign countries directly, and to jobbers for export, than to the domestic trade."

I call the attention of members of the other side of the House who have been laboring to prove that implements made in this country are not sold in foreign countries at lower prices than in this country, to the following from the pen of the Secretary of Agriculture:

I had an opportunity to take some stock in the combination (American Harvester Company), and I know what inducements were offered. An investigation will show that this same combination is now selling, or offering to sell, machinery in Russia and Austria and other wheat-growing countries at a lower figure than they do in this country. This won't do, and I need not offer any argument to prove the weight or truth of the assertion. The first thing the farmer will do when he is acquainted with the facts will be to make a howl against trusts and protection that does not protect. Whether justly or not, he will charge it to the Republican party. I am as certain as I can be of anything that this mower and reaper trust will cost the Republican party hundreds of thousands of votes at the next Presidential election unless it takes a firm stand against it and trusts in general.—*Jeremiah M. Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture, 1890.*

I especially call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to this statement of our Secretary of Agriculture. The proof is positive that every kind of an implement, from a thrashing machine to a hoe, of American manufacture, is sold cheaper to foreigners than the same are sold to the farmers of the United States.

Hon. TOM L. JOHNSON of Ohio, is a manufacturer of steel rails, and Hon. MICHAEL D. HARTER, of the same State, is a manufacturer of agricultural implements. Both favor putting the goods they manufacture on the free list, as the following remarks by these gentlemen in the debate in the House, on the 31st of March, 1892, from the speech of Mr. JOHNSON, will show:

And for the same reason that I want free trade in raw materials I want free trade in manufactured goods. Just as duties on raw materials narrow and lessen the natural world to us, so do duties on finished products narrow and lessen the human world—if, indeed, the line can be drawn between what are really raw materials and what are finished products, so commonly do the products of one industry become the materials of another industry. The American people are not idiots, nor fools, nor babies, that they will make bad bargains in their trade with the rest of the world, unless the superior wisdom of the men they elect to Congress restrains them. Leave them free to trade with whoever they please and you may be certain that they will trade with no one unless there is an advantage to them in the transaction.

And I am for free trade, not merely as a matter of wise policy, but as a matter of natural right. I hold that the right to freely trade with whoever he pleases and on whatever terms he pleases is one of the most important of those natural rights asserted by our Declaration of Independence, and that to deny this to the American citizen is to that extent to enslave and rob him. To the open enunciation of this clear principle I hope to see the Democratic party come. When it does it will be invincible.

I hope to see this Congress, before we adjourn, pass a bill putting lumber, coal, and iron ore on the free list; and to show that as a manufacturer I am ready to take just what I propose, I am willing to put steel rails also on the free list.

Mr. HARTER. And agricultural implements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Yes, and agricultural implements. My colleague, who is one of the largest of agricultural implement makers, has, too, the spirit of true free trade, and stands ready, and more than ready, to vote for the abolition of every duty that applies to what he makes.

If the delusion of protection on agricultural implements should still linger in the minds of the farmers of the United States, this testimony should forever dispel it. The farmer sells all his products in the free-trade markets of the world. He competes with the cheap labor, and free-trade plows in India, and sells his wheat and other products side by side in competition with products not only from India but in competition with all the world. The farmer who votes to continue the tax upon his implements deserves no sympathy.

To those who believe that the tariff is not a tax, and that the foreigner pays the duty to obtain our trade I commend to them the following from the New York World:

The annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department for 1890 has just been issued. It contains a detailed report of each item imported into the United States, with the foreign cost, the amount which the American purchaser paid for it, and to this is appended the duty, or amount which the protectionists say the foreign seller contributes to the United States Government for the privilege of selling in this market. Here are some of the items:

Imports in 1890.	Cost paid by Americans to foreigners.	Duty paid by foreigners to United States.
Window glass	\$1,402,796.01	\$1,538,228.23
Tannic acid	207.00	499.00
Ethers	413.00	424.00
White lead	889.00	1,119.90
Brown lead	58.00	61.36
Lime bor	800.00	888.24
Chloroform	2.00	2.50
Opium	428,880.00	589,825.00
Santonine	22.00	51.00
Essences	7,274.19	20,656.10
Bay rum	37,827.18	63,914.34
Silver leaf	964.00	1,162.50
Firecrackers	273,001.15	273,001.15
Iron wire	1,598.00	1,765.68
Spirits	1,840.00	5,537.50
Am. oil	317.00	2,527.11
Grain spirits	456,121.14	1,329,307.89
Other spirits	127,395.34	496,177.05
All liquors	2,171,935.09	3,129,424.44
Nickel	11,687.00	16,680.15
Castor oil	2,910.00	5,520.80
Cognac ether	87.00	376.00
Fruit ether	434.00	1,425.00
Whiting	5,262.66	7,701.82
Playing cards	6,353.61	6,353.61
Rice	967,880.06	1,123,505.61
Starch	23,827.00	23,924.10
Tobacco	4,046,231.98	4,189,312.02
Wool tops	10,124.00	12,478.80
Wool scoured	65.00	72.00

If it be true, as the protectionist affirms, that the foreign seller is as generous as this shows him to be, that he is not only willing to give away his products, but to pay us to accept them, protection certainly offers us an easy way, not only to become the richest nation on earth, but to absorb all the riches of other nations.

It may be that the foreigner only pays the duty where the duties do not quite amount to the sum that he receives, as in items like the following:

Articles imported.	Cost: What we paid the foreigner.	Duty: What the foreign seller paid us back.
Sugar	\$87,602,907.72	\$55,166,703.40
Acids	74,835.50	46,461.62
Cotton cloth	38,526.90	25,003.47
Demijohns	64,422.00	46,550.45
Crown-glass	954.00	688.00
Rails	62,284.42	46,250.08
Iron beams	69,027.34	60,608.94
Iron sheets	65.00	48.34
Filles	68,234.00	42,843.05
Rice	2,220,759.39	1,632,078.43
Blankets	9,551.12	6,795.44
Clothing	1,800,347.39	1,010,134.21
Dress goods	32,668,292.91	16,490,948.29

But in this case why should the duty be taken off sugar if the foreigner pays it? Why should the foreign cloth cost us so much more in New York than in Liverpool, if the foreigner pays the duty? On all the really protected products the tax last year ran from 50 to 800 per cent, and averaged 44 on the total dutiable, which included both the duties levied for protection and revenue. It requires stronger faith to believe that the foreigner paid back to the United States 44 per cent of all he received from his goods than it does to believe that on the third day the great fish vomited Jonah out on the dry land. The Republican voter is expected by the protectionist editor to have a much stronger stomach than the "whale."

I believe that the Government should only tax the people to raise money for one purpose and for one purpose only. When the Government has raised the necessary revenue by taxation to carry on the affairs of Government honestly and economically administered, then its taxing power should cease and not another penny should be taken from the people. I favor the repeal of the sugar bounty, because it is class legislation, and I may add, that I will not vote for any bill that takes a dollar out of the Treasury that is not strictly for governmental purposes.

I believe that a tax for other than Government purposes is unconstitutional. I regret that the Supreme Court of the United States, in its recent decision, did not pass upon the constitutionality of the sugar bounty instead of avoiding it, as the following from the decision will show:

Appellants contend that Congress has no power to appropriate money from the Treasury for the payment of these bounties, and that the provisions for them have such connection with the system established by the act of 1890, that the entire act must be held inoperative and void. The question of constitutional power thus raised depends principally, if not altogether, upon the scope and effect of that clause of the Constitution giving Congress power

"to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." (Article I, section 8.) It would be difficult to suggest a question of larger importance, or one the decisions of which would be more far-reaching. But the argument that the validity of the entire act depends upon the validity of the bounty clause is so obviously founded in error that we should not be justified in giving the question of constitutional power, here raised, that extended examination which a question of such gravity would under some circumstances demand.

Even if the position of the appellants with respect to the power of Congress to pay these bounties were sustained, it is clear that the parts of the act in which they are interested, namely, those laying duties upon articles imported would remain in force. "It is an elementary principle," this court has said, "that the same statute may be in part constitutional and in part unconstitutional, and that if the parts are wholly independent of each other, that which is constitutional may stand, while that which is unconstitutional will be rejected." (Allen *vs.* Louisiana, 103 U. S., 80, 83.) And in Huntington *vs.* Worthen, 120 U. S., 97, 102, Mr. Justice Field, speaking for the court, said: "It is only when different clauses of an act are so dependent upon each other that it is evident the Legislature would not have enacted one of them without the other—as when the two things provided are necessary parts of one system—that the whole act will fall with the invalidity of one clause. When there is no such connection and dependency the act will stand, though different parts of it are rejected."

It can not be said to be evident that the provisions imposing duties on imported articles are so connected with or dependent upon those giving bounties upon the production of sugars in this country that the former would not have been adopted except in connection with the latter. Undoubtedly the object of the act was not only to raise revenue for the support of the Government, but to so exert the power of laying and collecting taxes and duties as to encourage domestic manufactures and industries of different kinds, upon the success of which, the promoters of the act claimed, materially depended the national prosperity and the national safety. But it can not be assumed, nor can it be made to appear from the act, that the provisions imposing duties on imported articles would not have been adopted except in connection with the clause giving bounties on the production of sugar in this country. These different parts of the act in respect to their operation have no legal connection whatever with each other. They are entirely separable in their nature, and in law wholly independent of each other.

One relates to the imposition of duties upon imported articles; the other to the appropriation of money from the Treasury for bounties on articles produced in this country. While, in the general sense, both may be said to be parts of a system, neither the words nor the general scope of the act justifies the belief that Congress intended they should operate as a whole, and not separately for the purpose of accomplishing the special objects for which they were respectively designed. Unless it be impossible to avoid it, a general revenue statute should never be declared inoperative in all its parts because a particular part relating to a distinct subject may be invalid. A different rule might be disastrous to the financial operations of the Government, and produce the utmost confusion in the business of the entire country.

Hon. JOHN G. CARLISLE, one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in Congress, in submitting the minority report on the McKinley bill, speaking of the sugar bounty, said:

We protest against the gross favoritism and injustice of such a policy and we deny the moral or constitutional right of the Government to tax the people who grow corn, wheat, cotton, rye, oats, and other agricultural products for the purpose of raising money to be given to those who produce sugar or any other article. The bounty provisions contained in this bill are confessions that the whole system which it seeks to strengthen and extend is a system of discriminations between the various productive industries of the country—a system which imposes charges upon some for the support of others, and disregards every principle of justice and equality in distributing the burdens of taxation.

Daniel Webster in his great Faneuil Hall speech in 1820 said:

To individuals, this policy is as injurious as it is to government. A system of artificial government protection leads the people to too much reliance on government. If left to their own choice of pursuits, they depend on their own skill and their own industry. But if government essentially affects their occupations by its systems of bounties and preferences, it is natural, when in distress, that they should call on government for relief. Hence a perpetual contest, carried on between the different interests of society. Agriculturists taxed to-day to sustain manufacturers—commerce taxed to-morrow to sustain agriculture—and then impositions, perhaps, on both manufacturers and agriculture to support commerce. And when government has exhausted its invention in these modes of legislation it finds the result less favorable than the original and natural state and course of things. He could hardly conceive of anything worse than a policy which should place the great interests of this country in hostility to one another—a policy which should keep them in constant conflict, and bring them every year to fight their battles in the committee rooms of the House of Representatives at Washington.

Raw sugar, or sugar up to and including 16 Dutch standard, is placed on the free list, and a bounty of 2 cents per pound paid in lieu of the former duty. The placing of raw sugar on the free list struck down about \$55,000,000 of revenue annually, and entailed an annual burden upon the Government of about \$10,000,000. Sugar up to 16 Dutch standard is the raw material out of which the refined article is made. It gives the refiners their raw material free, and they only have to combine to put up the price of refined sugar where it was before the McKinley law was passed. A few days ago it was announced in the public press that the last sugar refinery in the country had yielded to the combine and gone into the trust. The sugar trust is protected by a duty of one-half cent per pound upon their product, and they have a natural advantage of one-quarter cent per pound. The minimum yearly production is 12,600,000 barrels, the net profit upon which would be \$25,593,000. Under the natural advantage that they have without any protection on 12,600,000 barrels on the minimum yearly production they would have \$10,237,500 profit per year. Quite enough. The amount of extortion per annum off of the people is \$15,356,000. Let us have free refined sugar and repeal the sugar bounty. I clip the following from the New

York Commercial Bulletin of April 7, 1892, which fully illustrates how the people are fleeced by the sugar trust:

THE PEOPLE AND THE SUGAR TRUST.

With the tariff.

The sugar trust is "protected"—
(a) By duty of one-half cent per pound upon refined sugar.

(b) By natural advantage or protection of one-fourth of a cent per pound.

Present price of raw sugar, 96° centrifugal, 3½ cents per pound.

Present price of refined sugar, granulated, 4½ cents per pound.

Difference between above prices, 1½ cents per pound.

Cost of refining, not over five-eighths cent per pound.

Net profit on refined sugar, five-eighths cent per pound.

Net profit per barrel, \$2.03.

Net profit on 12,600,000 barrels, or minimum yearly production, \$25,593,000.

Actual value of sugar trust properties, about \$35,000,000. Rate of profit on actual valuation, 73.08 per cent.

Sugar trust capitalization: 7 per cent preferred stock, \$37,500,000; common stock, \$37,500,000; 6 per cent bonds, \$10,000,000.

After paying 7 per cent on preferred stock and 6 per cent interest on bonds, the above rate of profit would yield 59.65 per cent on the common stock.

Present rate of extortion from the people by means of the tariff, three-eighths cent per pound, or \$15,356,000 per annum.

To the end that we may do equal and exact justice to all, and grant special privileges to none, I favor placing all articles of necessity, used by all the people in the land, on the free list and the raising of the Government's revenue by the taxation of all articles of luxury and by a graduated income tax.

A tax upon consumption is radically wrong in principle. It makes the poor man bear more than an equal share of the burdens of Government. It relieves the rich man of the burdens that he owes it to the Government to bear.

An income tax places burdens upon accumulated wealth where they can be most easily borne. It is right, because it exacts tribute of accumulation and not of endeavor. A tariff tax allows no one to escape. The taxgatherer is at every door. The washerwoman, the seamstress, the hod-carrier, the day laborer, and all, however poor and unable to pay, must pay and continue to pay at the constant demand of the Federal taxgatherer under our tariff system. The washerwoman must pay tax on her soap and starch: the seamstress on her needle and thread; the workingman on his tin bucket; the farmer on his plows, and all on articles in daily use. They all pay taxes or tariff tribute to build up colossal fortunes for the privileged classes.

Those who owe the greatest obligations to the Government should be made to pay in proportion to the obligations they owe. The Government is instituted for the protection of life, liberty, and property. For the securing and enforcement of these rights all the machinery of the Government is kept in motion. The executive, judicial, and legislative departments of the Government are organized for these purposes. The Congress to make the law, the courts to declare the law, and the Executive to enforce the law. To keep all this machinery of government in motion is it just, is it right, that the poor man should pay an equal share with the millionaire? This he does when he pays his Federal taxes upon the articles he consumes.

What is the proportion of the demands of the poor man to the millionaire upon the Government for the securement and enforcement of property rights? Not one in a thousand. The poor miserable tramp, that begs a crust of bread from door to door, if he buys a pair of overalls must pay more upon the value of the article necessary to his use than the millionaire pays upon his diamonds, and yet this is said to be a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people. What does the corporate wealth of the country pay in taxes to the Federal Government? Corporations neither have to be fed nor clothed.

The artisan who goes forth to labor for his daily bread must pay upon the tools he works with; the brickmason upon his trowel, the carpenter upon his chisel and plane, the wood-chopper upon his ax, the miner upon his pick, and so on through all the list of wage-earners, yet none escape taxes upon what they eat and wear. The wealth of corporations escape all this tax to support our Federal Government. They bear none of the other burdens that the citizen is compelled to bear. The citizen owes

Without the tariff.

The natural advantage or protection to sugar trust, is one-fourth cent per pound.

Price of raw sugar, 96° centrifugal, 3½ cents per pound.

Price of refined sugar, granulated, A, 4 cents per pound.

Difference between above prices, seven-eighths cent per pound.

Cost of refining, not over five-eighths cent per pound.

Net profit on refined sugar, one-fourth cent per pound.

Net profit per barrel, \$1½ cents.

Net profit on 12,600,000 barrels, or minimum yearly production, \$10,237,500 per year.

After paying 7 per cent on preferred stock and 6 per cent on bonds, the above rate of profit would yield 18.7 per cent on the common stock.

Proposed rate of saving to the people by means of free sugar, \$15,356,000 per annum.

In the compilation of these figures we have treated the trust very liberally.

Is it not time that the wholesale extortion now practiced by the trust be stopped? Let us have free sugar in reality, and not merely in name.

to the Government military and jury duty, but corporations bear neither of these burdens.

How often do the wage-earners, the bone and sinew of the country, call for the machinery of the Federal Government to be put in motion for their aid? Scarcely at all. Yet this industrial class go on day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year toiling for daily bread, asking nothing of the Government but to be let alone and given a chance to gain an honest living. In times of peace they are the busy bees who create the wealth upon which the idle and indolent feed, and in times of war they are the patriots who fight the battles of the nation. Under the Constitution they are all subject to be called by the President to do military duty to protect the property of aggregated wealth that under our present system escapes its just proportion of taxation.

How is it with corporate wealth? The Congress, the courts, and all the branches of the Government are almost daily engaged in dealing with the affairs of corporate wealth. And to protect the property of these greedy corporations the whole Army and Navy of the United States is at their command. A tariff tax is unequal and unjust. The day is not far distant when it will become odious. An income tax is right, it is equitable and just. The people demand it. The voice of the people cries out for it, and the "voice of the people is the voice of God."

The McKinley tariff increased the duty on tin plate from 1 cent per pound to 2.2 cents per pound. What is the result? The report of Tin Plate Consumers' Association, dated December 10, 1891, shows that the increased duty up to that date had cost the consumers over \$10,000,000 more for the tin plates used in the factories and workshops than they otherwise would have had to pay had it not been for the increased duty. The same report says that this increase of duty will add over \$15,000,000 annually to the cost of tin plate. This increased burden is only one of the many burdens laid upon the people by the McKinley law. It must all finally be paid by the people. Fruit and vegetable canning is becoming an important industry in nearly every county in Illinois.

Millions of dollars' worth of fruit and vegetables are being canned annually in this country. Coke tin is the material from which cans for canning purposes are manufactured. It is indispensable to the fish, meat, poultry, fruit, and vegetable canning industries. These industries furnish a cheap and wholesome food for the rich as well as the poor. The fruit and vegetable canning business furnishes a market at home to the farmer for thousands of dollars' worth of fruits and vegetables that otherwise would decay and become a total waste. While the McKinley tariff has added this burden to the people and struck a serious blow at the canning industries and the farmers and added to the price of canned food, it is said by the Tin Consumers' Association that up to the time of making the report not one sheet of coke tin had been put on the market by the American manufacturers, and that the present output of all kinds of American manufactured tin does not constitute 1 per cent of the entire consumption in the United States. The increased duty on tin plate went into effect July 1, 1891. S. G. Brock, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, says:

It is shown * * * that about 300,000 pounds of the plates in excess of the normal demand were imported during the year ending June 30, 1891. It is likewise observable that the most of this excess falls within the six months ending June 30, the day before the increase of duty went into effect.

The purpose of the increased duty was to compel the use of sheet iron for roofing purposes in preference to tin. The McKinley act was approved October 1, 1890, but the increased duty on tin did not take effect until July 1, 1891, as I have before stated. The importations of tin plate, terne plate, and tagger's tin for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, was 680,369,925 pounds. The importation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, was 1,039,489,074 pounds. The last month under the old law, the month of June, 1891, there was imported 197,604,333 pounds, and the month of July, 1891, the first month after the McKinley bill took effect, there was imported only 12,561,141.

The postponement of the McKinley law as to the tin-plate duty to July 1, 1891, invited speculation and caused large importations and resulted in an increased price to the consumers of tin. It was a harvest for those who reap profit and accumulate large fortunes through the means of favorable legislation. The whole tin-plate industry of the world is not as great as the tin roofing, tinware manufacturing, and tin-canning industries of the United States in volume of labor employed, wages paid, and capital invested. The St. Louis Republic charged and proved that before the McKinley law went into effect Hon. F. G. Niedringhaus, a member of the last House, who voted for the McKinley law, imported large quantities of Welsh tin. A son of the ex-Congressman admitted that his father had placed an order for 50,000 boxes, expecting the price to go up. The prices did go up, and if the junior Niedringhaus was right as to the

quantity imported it netted the ex-Congressman the snug little fortune of \$50,000.

Mr. Niedringhaus was a gentleman possessed of broad statesmanship, but ordinary people may think that his Congressional services came pretty high. It may, however, have been the way Mr. Niedringhaus had in getting back the large contribution he made to the campaign fund to elect protectionists to the Fifty-first Congress. It is proper for me to say here that while Mr. Niedringhaus favored protection upon everything else he was ardently devoted to free borax.

The following, which I clip from the Chicago Tribune of March 14, 1892, I regard as appropriate in this connection:

THE TIN-PLATE BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES.

A local prohibitory protection paper says that "Americans are going into tin-plate making very fast and on a very large scale." It has been singing that same song since the summer of 1890, when it became certain that the McKinley law could pass. Since then it has been busied in the erection of tin-plate mills. There are few States north of the Ohio and west of the Mississippi in which it has not built one or more mills and stocked them with machinery. But for some odd reason the tin plate does not materialize. These mills with their machinery are visible to the eye of faith alone. The tin plate made is as phantasmal as the plants.

The Tin Plate Consumers' Association, which includes the great packing and canning firms which use tin plate, has sent out circulars to its members asking them how much of the domestic article has been offered to or bought by them. Replies have been received from 115. Of these 100 say they have bought none. Some have been unable to find any. Fifteen report that they have bought in all 665 boxes of the home product. The yearly consumption of the country has been as high as 6,500,000 boxes. If, nearly two years after the passage of the new tariff law and over eight months since the higher duties were imposed, American tin-plate mills are turning out 665 boxes, how long will it take them to produce ten thousand times that quantity?

And yet there is, commercially speaking, no American tin plate. There are indications, however, that manufacturers desire to go into the business, though not in a manner which will be pleasing to those who believe in maintaining the wage scale of the American workman. In 1890 Messrs. Crone-meyer, Niedringhaus, and others said that "if a sufficient duty were put on tin plate to cover the difference between the English and American wage scale they would be ready to turn out plates on short notice." They said, further, that the duty of 2.2 cents a pound was sufficient to cover that difference. The great item of cost in tin plate is the black plates or steel sheets which are coated with tin. The labor expended on those sheets is the chief item of the labor cost of the finished article. Those Pennsylvanians who think of going into the manufacture of tin plate have notified their men that wages on black plates must be reduced, or otherwise the proposed manufacture can not be carried on at a profit. Why this late discovery? What has caused the manufacturers to change their minds during the last two years? If they had stated in 1890 that tin plate could not be made here with a protective duty of 2.2 cents a pound unless the wages of the steel workers were cut down, would Congress have given them this increased duty?

If the manufacturers beat down their men the American tin-plate industry may be born. But it will owe its existence to a forcing down of the wages of a large number of skilled workmen to provide employment for a much smaller number of unskilled ones. That is hardly to be desired.

The following tables, taken from the report of the Ways and Means Committee of this Congress, will show how the McKinley tariff has affected the prices of tin plate and the tin-plate business.

APPENDIX A.

Reports into the United States of tin plates, terne plates, and taggers' tin for each month from July, 1890, to December, 1891, inclusive.

Months.	Tin plates, terne plates, and taggers' tin.		
	1889-1890.	1890-1891.	1891.
July	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>
67,889,420	\$1,990,235	\$2,277,942	12,561,141
August	63,595,062	1,861,677	13,993,524
September	48,927,029	1,441,027	17,861,839
October	65,698,789	1,948,631	76,956,185
November	51,956,431	1,857,222	59,033,538
December	49,367,342	1,587,420	64,151,840
January	54,809,779	1,722,756	52,942,064
February	54,055,297	1,764,038	2,356,853
March	48,609,423	1,561,774	3,046,509
April	53,077,974	1,734,149	92,363,462
May	46,914,081	1,511,825	119,442,015
June	74,270,293	2,297,096	4,421,304
Total	680,000,925	20,928,150	1,036,489,074
			35,746,920
			*103,723,776
			*3,218,732

* Six months.

S. G. BROCK, Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Bureau of Statistics, January 28, 1892.

Hon. B. F. SHIVELY.

It is shown by the above table that about 300,000,000 pounds of tin plates in excess of the normal demand were imported during the year ending June 30, 1891. It is likewise observable that the most of this excess falls within the six months ending June 30, the day before the increase of duty went into effect.

APPENDIX B.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1892.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your request I inclose to you a memorandum showing the amount of duty collected on tin plates under the act of March 3, 1883. Very respectfully,

Hon. B. F. SHIVELY, M. C.

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

S. G. BROCK, Chief of Bureau.

Amount of duty collected under act of March 3, 1883, on tin plate, terne, etc.

Fiscal year—	
1884	\$5,278,813.21
1885	5,055,590.76
1886	5,740,924.05
1887	5,706,433.89
1888	6,322,242.96
1889	6,746,644.58
1890	10,577,115.01
Total.	45,527,824.46

APPENDIX C.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1892.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your recent request I have the honor to inform you that according to the returns rendered to this office by collectors of customs the duty collected on tin plates was as follows:

Six months ending December 31—

1889	\$3,456,243
1890	2,129,003
Year ending December 31—	
1889	7,839,869
1890	8,731,991

Very respectfully,

S. G. BROCK, Chief of Bureau.

Hon. WM. M. SPRINGER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX D.

[Charles S. Trench & Co., No. 54 Cliff street, tin plate and metal brokers, New York, Baltimore, Chicago.]

NEW YORK, April 2, 1892.

COMPARATIVE PRICES OF TIN PLATES.

The Senate began consideration of the McKinley bill in July, 1890, and we begin our comparison then in table below, being prices of 10 C 14 by 20 Bessemer steel coke tin, at New York, compared with 1888 and 1889.

[Average prices each month.]

Month.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.
January		\$4.20	\$4.65	\$5.35	
February		4.20	4.50	5.45	
March		4.25	4.45	5.50	
April		4.30	4.40	5.55	
May		4.30	4.35	5.60	
June		4.25	4.40	5.65	
July	\$4.50	4.25	4.50	5.80	
August	4.55	4.25	4.75	5.70	
September	4.60	4.30	5.15	5.70	
October	4.50	4.50	5.35	5.65	
November	4.30	4.70	5.40	5.65	
December	4.25	4.60	5.20	5.60	

APPENDIX E.

Prices of coke tins.

[From Charles S. Trench & Co.]

Year.	Highest.		Lowest.		Average.	
	New York.	Liverpool.	New York.	Liverpool.	New York.	Liverpool.
1870	\$7.75	\$5.47	22 6	\$7.20	\$4.99	20 6
1871	8.30	6.08	25 0	7.15	5.23	21 6
1872	12.50	9.73	40 0	8.20	6.69	27 6
1873	10.35	8.76	26 0	7.40	7.06	29 0
1874	8.60	7.79	32 0	7.35	6.33	26 0
1875	7.60	6.81	28 0	6.25	4.99	20 6
1876	6.65	5.23	21 6	5.85	4.44	18 3
1877	5.90	4.62	19 0	5.35	4.08	16 9
1878	5.35	4.14	17 0	4.65	3.16	13 0
1879	7.15	5.84	24 0	4.70	3.47	14 3
1880	8.50	7.30	30 0	4.80	3.53	14 6
1881	5.65	4.38	18 0	4.80	3.47	14 3
1882	5.60	4.38	18 0	4.95	3.95	15 0
1883	5.25	4.01	16 6	4.85	3.71	15 3
1884	4.90	3.71	15 3	4.45	3.35	13 9
1885	4.60	3.53	14 6	4.25	3.12	12 10
1886	4.45	3.28	13 6	4.15	3.04	12 6
1887	4.85	3.59	14 9	4.20	3.08	12 8
1888	4.80	3.59	14 9	4.20	3.08	12 8
1889	4.73			4.20		4.34
1890	5.40			4.35		4.75

APPENDIX F.

[Extract from report of the Tin-Plate Consumers' Association of the United States, issued December 10, 1891.]

OUR OBJECT.

The acquirement of reliable information respecting the progress and development of the manufacture of tin plate at home and abroad; the careful watching of all legislation affecting the interests of consumers of tin plate; the compiling of reliable statistics concerning the trade; and also the securing of such united action for the defense of the trade interests as may be necessary.

OUR POSITION.

Our position is not one of antagonism to the establishment of the tin-plate industry in America. Representing among our members both political parties, we claim for ourselves as large a share of patriotism and desire for the

material and industrial prosperity of our country as those who, from ignorance or for political ends, are claiming that the increased McKinley duty on tin plates has resulted in the establishment of a new industry, which has been accomplished without harm to the various industries in which we are individually engaged. Our position enables us to be the best judges on this subject, as the article, which is a raw material to us, is the subject of the experiment that is being made.

We claim a right to give this experiment the closest watching, and to inform the public and Congress, from time to time, of the effect it has on our business and of the results achieved. This can better be done as an organized body of tin-plate consumers than as individuals, and explains our organization, and we desire to have associated with us all consumers of tin plates, in order that our body may be thoroughly representative, and be enabled to speak with knowledge and authority. If the industry can be transferred to our country within a reasonable time, and without damage to our business and the hundreds of thousands of American workmen employed in our factories, giving us as cheap raw material as we obtained before the increased tax was levied on it, we realize we will be the greatest beneficiaries and, therefore, naturally most anxious for its success. Our desire is, if possible, to transfer the question from one of politics to one of business.

It is a matter of business that since the McKinley bill was passed we have had to pay over \$10,000,000 more for the tin plates we use in our factories and workshops, and that the present duty will add every year over \$15,000,000 to the cost of our raw material. It is a matter of business, and not of politics, that up to the present moment not one sheet of coke tins, which constitutes over half of our entire requirements, has yet been put on the market by the American manufacturers, and that the present output of all kinds does not constitute 1 per cent of the entire consumption of tin plate in America. Again, it is a matter of business that the small lots produced have only been obtainable at prices considerably above what the same quality can be imported at, even under the increased duty. We consider, and all will agree with us, that the whole question is a most serious one to our interests, and the interests of the entire country, and open to the closest scrutiny and careful business watchfulness.

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks Mr. FITHIAN'S time expired, and Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina yielded him ten minutes more. At the expiration of the ten minutes

Mr. FITHIAN said: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Permission has already been given for the extension of remarks by gentlemen who speak on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Permission was given for the extension of remarks on the subject under consideration, but not upon other subjects. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If the remarks are the gentleman's own, I will not object, but my colleague is one of the gentlemen who printed in the RECORD some time ago portions of a work by Mr. Henry George, and I should object to a repetition of that performance.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I do not, if my colleague says that the remarks that he desires to print are his own.

Mr. FITHIAN. I did not understand the observation of my colleague.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. You ask consent to extend your remarks in the RECORD. If they are your own remarks I have no objection, but I do object to a repetition of what we had a few weeks ago, the publication of a book.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentlemen fear that something more of Henry George's writing will get into the RECORD. They are very much afraid of that.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Henry George is all right in his place, but he has no right in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. FITHIAN'S request was granted.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the speech just delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN], and which is to be extended in the RECORD, is a further confirmation of the old saying that "a man can cuss his enemy until he falls in love with him." The Democratic party have cursed the McKinley law until it has come to be the object of their fondest affection [laughter]; because they have been here now five months and they have not attempted to pass a bill to repeal that law. [Laughter.] If there is anything upon which the vials of Democratic wrath have been poured out, it is the McKinley law, and if there is anything that the Ways and Means Committee pulls up its skirts and carefully avoids touching when it comes to introducing legislation in this House, it is the McKinley law. If there is anything that has been riddled by analysis and denunciation from head to heels, so far as the Democratic stump and the newspapers are concerned, it is the McKinley law; but if there is any monument of Republican glory to which the Democrats all take off their hats, so far as attacking it by legislative enactment is concerned, it is the McKinley law. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] goes out of his way in discussing this Post-Office appropriation bill to strike another blow at the McKinley law. Why on earth does he not do as I did the other day, take the House, under one of its own rules, and say: "You shall not have anything done here by unanimous consent until the Ways and Means Committee re-

port a public measure which I have introduced?" Why does not the gentleman from Illinois do that?

Mr. FITHIAN. I will say to the gentleman that I do not regard myself as bigger than all the other members of the House. I do not set myself above my fellow-members in that way.

Mr. WATSON. That is a discovery, Mr. Chairman, which we would not have made if the gentleman from Illinois himself had not announced it. [Laughter.] I will say this, with the greatest good humor, to the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] introduced a bill at the very opening of this session to repeal that McKinley act. Every Democratic newspaper in the land, every Democratic orator in the land, applauded and believed that this Democratic majority would crowd over one another in almost indecent haste to tear the McKinley bill off the statute book. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman allow me to make a remark?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. ENLOE. I will say to the gentleman that if he can tell me how I can compel the Committee on Ways and Means to report that bill, or any bill for that purpose, I will do so to-morrow.

Mr. WATSON. I will give it to you and charge you nothing. [Laughter.] Just put yourself in the way of this private legislation that comes in here every morning.

Mr. ENLOE. Oh, no.

Mr. WATSON (continuing). As I am told you have done on former occasions.

Mr. CALDWELL. In the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. ENLOE. Yes; but there is quite a difference between stopping business that is done here by unanimous consent and the business regularly on the Private Calendar which we consider on Fridays.

Mr. WATSON. Oh, yes; there is quite a difference between stopping somebody's little "grind" and really forcing the Democratic majority of this House to face the issue on which they got their seats in this Chamber.

Mr. ENLOE. The gentleman wants to be correct, I have no doubt?

Mr. WATSON. Quite.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, I did succeed in the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. WATSON. I do not yield for a history of yourself.

Mr. ENLOE. I will not give a history of myself. I will leave the history altogether out and I will say this: That you can not demonstrate under the rules of the House, or by assertion, that there is any way by which you can compel the Committee on Ways and Means, or any other committee of this House, to report a bill which they do not want to report.

Mr. WATSON. It has been done, and can be done again.

Mr. SIMPSON. They did not want to have the rules in a shape that would enable you to compel them to report.

Mr. Chairman, we are here as equals. No man and no committee has a right to ride ruthlessly over any member on this floor. We come here to discharge a public trust. We come here instructed; and I say again that the Democrats have a majority of 148 members on this floor by virtue of the fact that they did denounce the McKinley bill. Mr. Chairman, the things that they want to get through—the little private bills passed morning after morning, the bills for the erection of bridges, the bills removing charges of desertion, the bills establishing subports of entry a thousand miles from salt water—these go through and the other does not. Why? Because the Democratic majority does not want to face the music.

Mr. REED. Hear! hear! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WATSON. The Democratic party do not want to face the music on that subject any more than they do on the free-silver bill which ten millions of people are appealing to this Congress to pass and for which we can not get consideration on the floor of this House.

Mr. REED. Oh, they are an awful lot! [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I must not earn too largely the applause of the gentleman from Maine, or I will weaken on my own position.

Mr. ENLOE. You will lose it, too.

Mr. WATSON. That much, Mr. Chairman, by way of preface. I have been drawn into these remarks by my genial friend from Tennessee. My real purpose in rising was to discuss the pending bill; and I shall now proceed to do so briefly. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] in his able address, which is to be extended in the RECORD [laughter]—in his dissecting-room attack on the McKinley bill—alleges that we have not sufficient revenue to deliver the mails of this country to the people who pay its taxes. I deny that assertion. We are collecting enough money in this country by taxation to extend this free-delivery system to every hamlet and every cottage in all the broad limits of the Republic. Why do we not do it? Because the money is diverted from an equal and just distribution, and dumped almost as a gratuity at some few places. For instance, Mr. Chairman,

and I challenge any gentleman on either side of the Chamber to meet what I am about to say; here, perhaps, I shall not get the hearty indorsement of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] as I did a few moments ago—

Mr. ENLOE. I may give you my indorsement. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. Tell how that money was dumped.

Mr. WATSON. I am going to do so. We spend about \$3,000,000 a year in collecting our tariff taxes, not at ports of entry upon the sea coast, where it can be reasonably claimed we must be strong in custom-houses, no matter what the size of the collections, but at ports of entry hundreds and thousands of miles from the sea, where we have to purchase a site and erect a building costing from ten to fifty thousand dollars, with an outfit of officers drawing many thousand dollars a year, and sitting around, collecting perhaps a few dollars or cents of tax. Now, why is that done? To accommodate a few rich importers, to afford convenience to a few millionaire merchants. Will any gentleman on the floor dispute the proposition and tell what other explanation can be afforded for such a policy?

In the city of Atlanta, the capital of my own State—a city some 200 miles from the seacoast—there is a custom-house building, with its complement of officers costing some \$2,000 per year. They collect the same duties which would have been collected at Savannah or Brunswick at no additional cost to the people. Now, let me ask the gentleman from Maine, why we do that except to accommodate a few rich men in the city of Atlanta? Is it done for any other purpose? The gentleman is not so ready with his reply as he was a few moments ago when I spoke of the McKinley bill. It makes a little difference who owns the ox. Now, gentlemen, I say that under the system carried on throughout the country you are spending in Indiana, in Texas, in Georgia, in Illinois, at points hundreds and thousands of miles distant from salt water about \$3,000,000 a year of the people's money to accommodate a few millionaire merchants.

First, you have to purchase the land and erect the houses. Then you have to provide a large expenditure in the shape of salaries for the officers in these establishments, renewing them year after year; and every year the appropriations for that purpose are in excess of the preceding year. The expenditures become more and more enormous in the progress of time.

Mr. REED. But why do you not specify?

Mr. WATSON. I have specified.

Mr. BINGHAM. How do you get the figures you have given?

Mr. WATSON. If the gentleman from Maine will pardon me—he asks me to specify. I call his attention to the facts which I gave on this floor some time ago. I cited, for instance, the city of Alexandria and other towns in Virginia, towns in West Virginia, towns in Maine, interior towns in that State, interior towns in New York, interior towns in Indiana, and interior towns in Georgia and Florida and other States, a great list of them, and I specified the collections at the various places and the salaries paid according to the official reports of this Government. Was that not specifying?

Mr. REED. When was that?

Mr. WATSON. I referred to the collections of last year and the expenditures.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. WATSON. Here is the statement, if the gentleman will pardon me for a moment. You look over the list of expenditures, the whole of it, and you will find that 48 per cent cost more to run them than the amount collected. That is to say—

Mr. REED. But that is another proposition.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania tell me how much he thinks it is?

Mr. BINGHAM. A mere bagatelle in comparison with the amount that you put it at.

Mr. ENLOE. I rise to a question of order.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ENLOE. I make the point of order that it is not fair for two gentlemen of their size to attack one of the size of the gentleman from Georgia. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I object to the settlement of this question on any such basis as that, either by the number of gentlemen attacking, or their combined avordupois weight.

Mr. REED. I hope the gentleman will give us a specific statement now.

Mr. WATSON. Now, in justice to myself, and in that spirit of fairness which should characterize the discussions on this floor, I wish to say that I shall not pretend to be absolutely accurate as to the exact figures in gross, for I have not added them up. But I speak in a general way, and I say that every gentleman here recognizes the fact, and must recognize the fact, that many millions of dollars are spent annually at custom-houses in interior towns and subports of entry throughout the United States, not for the purpose of collecting the revenues of the Government, but for the mere convenience of merchants and other persons who may transact business through them.

Mr. FITHIAN. Will the gentleman now please proceed and tell us his position as to the McKinley law?

Mr. WATSON. I would repeal the whole thing. I would eliminate the dog's caudal appendage just back of his ears. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. Then you are in favor of free trade?

Mr. WATSON. I am, right out.

Mr. FITHIAN. Then you ought not to criticise me for my position.

Mr. WATSON. Ah! I was not criticising the gentleman, but I was criticising the Democratic party, which had not the courage to do what it was elected for.

Mr. FITHIAN. But were you not also elected as a Democrat to this Congress?

Mr. WATSON. I was elected as a Democrat, pledged to the special principles known now as the Ocala platform.

Mr. FITHIAN. Not as a Democrat then?

Mr. WATSON. On the special principles set forth in the Ocala platform, and the gentleman who on this floor or elsewhere says that I have not stood to them with religious fidelity states that which is not true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems that this thing is growing uncomfortable to those who get these little subports of entry for interior districts. Not long ago two or three bills passed this House for subports of entry in the interior. The point I make is that if we would save these millions of dollars which are evidently spent for the mere convenience of the importers of interior towns, we could afford to distribute our mail to the people who pay the taxes.

Now, one other point where we could save. We could save on these lavish river and harbor bills. The other day there passed through this House an appropriation bill, the most lavish that was ever known in the history of this Government, a bill which carries over \$47,000,000. It may be secreted under contract features. It may be hidden away by saying it will not be expended this year. But the fact is that it carries over \$47,000,000, and we could save from that a sufficient sum to distribute this mail in the country.

Mr. FITHIAN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a further question?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. FITHIAN. Were you nominated as a candidate for Congress on the Ocala platform?

Mr. WATSON. I was.

Mr. FITHIAN. Will you read this statement which I find in the Congressional Directory?

Mr. WATSON. I wrote it myself. I have a very clear recollection about it.

Mr. FITHIAN. Will you read it?

Mr. WATSON. If you will extend my time, you may read it.

Mr. FITHIAN (reading):

Thomas E. Watson, of Thomson, was born in Columbia County, Ga., September 5, 1856; received a common-school education—

Mr. WATSON. Very common.

Mr. FITHIAN (reading):

And was then sent to Mercer University, Macon, Ga.; at the end of the sophomore year left college for lack of funds; taught school for two years; read law for a few weeks under Judge W. R. McLaws, of Augusta, Ga., and was admitted to the bar; commenced the practice of the profession at Thomson, Ga., his old home, November, 1876; was a member of the Georgia Legislature, 1882-'83; was Democratic elector for the State at large in 1888; besides the practice of law has been and still is largely interested in farming; was elected to Fifty-second Congress as a Democrat, receiving 5,456 votes against 597 votes for Anthony E. Williams, Republican.

Mr. WATSON. Every word of which is true and every word of which I wrote.

Mr. FITHIAN. If you were elected then on the Ocala platform as a Farmer's Alliance man, did you tell the truth when you wrote for publication in this book, for the information of this Congress and the country, the statement that you were elected to this Congress as a Democrat?

Mr. WATSON. Does my failure to state in there that I am red-headed and freckled-faced keep me from being both red-headed and freckled-faced? [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. You ought to have told the truth when you wrote this for the Congressional Directory.

Mr. WATSON. Every word of it is true, and every word I stand upon to-day.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] is objecting because you are not his kind of a Democrat. There are Democrats and Democrats, you know.

Mr. FITHIAN. What kind of a Democrat are you?

Mr. REED. A gentleman who is "agin" everything is a good Democrat everywhere. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman alludes to the

brief biographical sketch which is in that book. I wrote every word of it and every word of it is true, and every word of it is modestly true. It is true that I received a common-school education, the best my parents could give me. It is true that I went to college and had to leave in the middle of the term for lack of money—

Mr. FITHIAN. There are no comments necessary on that part of it.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I will not allow you to select your comments. I will comment on it to suit myself.

Mr. CARUTH. Did the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] get admitted to the bar after studying just a few weeks?

Mr. WATSON. How does that illustrate the McKinley tariff? [Laughter.]

Mr. CARUTH. I give it up. I wanted to know how you got admitted to the Georgia bar.

Mr. WATSON. It is not very hard to get admitted to the Georgia bar—not much harder than it is to get admitted to the Kentucky bar. I believe you are a member of that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARUTH. I am in the Kentucky bar, and it is very hard to get into it.

Mr. WATSON. It is true that I had to leave college at the middle of the term for the want of money. It is true that I "hit the ground" and commenced teaching school for a living. It is true that I studied law a few weeks under Judge McLaws and was admitted to the bar. It is true that I maintained an honorable position at it, although I only studied those few months, which so disturb my genial friend from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH].

Mr. CARUTH. No; I was just admiring your genius. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. I think the gentleman ought to explain this statement here—

Mr. WATSON. I will get down to the bottom of the alphabet now before I stop, as sure as you live. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is true that I ran as a Cleveland elector in 1888.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to say that during the year I ran as Cleveland elector, in 1888, it is true that the entire campaign in Georgia was fought upon that magnificent issue which these very Democrats have dodged in this Congress—tariff reform as interpreted by the Mills bill, a magnificent, real reduction, which the Democrats were too cowardly to stand by after they committed their party to it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Did Mr. Cleveland's silver views at the time you were running as his elector coincide with yours?

Mr. WATSON. Bless your life, I did not know Mr. Cleveland's silver views then any more than I did yours. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARUTH. Oh, the whole country know the views of my friend from Illinois on that question, and I protest. [Laughter.] We red-headed men have got to stand together. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has got too little red in his hair for me to stand by.

Mr. CARUTH. I am getting a little gray, it is true, but I was red-headed and freckled, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. But you have lost it.

That campaign was fought on one issue. I had been too busy trying to make a living, Mr. Chairman, to know very much about political history at that time. I had been compelled to devote all the time I had to the study of my law books, and attend to my cases, and had not time to study political history then. Now, I know more about it, because I have studied it. I stand by the record of 1888, and I stand by it just as far as it went to the country, and just as the country understands it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in 1888 this great reform movement commenced, in which people made complaint that the legislative system of this country was not dealing fairly with all classes; that its banking system benefited the rich and oppressed the poor; that its tariff system benefited the rich and oppressed the poor; that its tax system benefited the rich and oppressed the poor. Like a thousand other young men in Georgia, I had had my hands too closely to the work of making a living to know much on these questions. I began to understand governmental policies, which I had never understood before. To those policies outlined in the St. Louis platform of 1889 and readopted at Ocala I have brought the best energies of my nature; to those policies I have concentrated every power of tongue and pen, of speech and thought and action which I was able to give. In the campaign of 1888, like thirty or forty I see opposite me on the other side, I was elected on the Ocala platform, as it is now called.

Mr. FITHIAN. Now, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. WATSON. Let me complete this. I was elected on the

Ocala platform. Gentlemen will understand there were thirty or forty good Democrats put out of this House from the South against whom no objection was raised except that they did not indorse the Ocala platform.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE] led off with a strong letter against the Ocala platform. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] followed with a strong letter; further on the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] followed, and the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Clements, Mr. Barnes, and the balance, rejecting and denouncing the Ocala platform. We, Mr. Chairman, who represent the Georgia districts to-day on this floor (other than the old members of the delegation) were elected here, not on account of the national Democratic platform, but on account of that qualification of it known as the Ocala platform.

Mr. FITHIAN. Now, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. WATSON. Let me finish this. Let us not make hash of a good thing like this. [Laughter.]

I say, like thirty or forty other men on this floor, we were elected on that platform. Now, what has happened since? Mr. Chairman, that was in the line of our campaign, to come out on the Ocala platform, repudiated by the regular rock-ribbed Democrats.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mossbacks.

Mr. WATSON. Mossback Democrats. If the other man can stand that, I can. Now, Mr. Chairman, there was a diversity between the Democratic and the distinctly reform platform. Why, Mr. Chairman, the great industrial movement referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MOSES] at Indianapolis, the very men who aided in my election, instructed me in the conference by a resolution, as I understood it, to stay outside of any caucus where these Ocala demands might be compromised by caucus action.

Mr. FITHIAN. Now, will my friend allow me?

Mr. WATSON. No; not just yet.

Mr. FITHIAN. Are you not through with that hash yet?

Mr. CARUTH. He is still dishing it out.

Mr. WATSON. I am still dishing out the main course, if you please. [Laughter.]

At the very convention where I was nominated, if my friend from Illinois will allow me to come to that—at the very convention that I was nominated at, those delegates who had gone there in favor of Mr. Barnes, who heretofore represented that district on this floor, attempted to have the Ocala platform repudiated by the Democratic convention of my district.

They introduced a resolution—not to denounce the national bank repeal, because they knew they could not pass it; not to denounce the income tax demand, because they knew they could not pass it; not to denounce the repeal of the tariff on the necessities of life, because they knew they could not pass it; but they thought they could repudiate and denounce and put the bar sinister across the subtreasury plan, the extremest exposition of the reform movement, and in that very convention where I was nominated and received the standard of those people the nominating convention told me to stand by the subtreasury plan, to stand by the Ocala platform, subtreasury and all, no matter where it carried me, whether with the Democratic party or out of it. Now, that is the record in the Tenth Congressional district. It is not in the Congressional Directory, because I did not suppose that all of that detailed history of my Congressional campaign would be interesting to the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITHIAN. Did the convention which nominated the gentleman adopt the Ocala platform, and did the Democracy of the State of Georgia adopt the Ocala platform?

Mr. WATSON. Now, that is the most unfortunate question you ever asked in your life. [Laughter.] Everyman, woman, and child in the Tenth district knew that I ran upon those principles known as the Ocala platform. I received a majority of votes in that district upon the Ocala platform. I received a nomination from a convention composed of Ocala platform men, and in that convention they sat down upon the attempt of the regular Democrats to have reproach cast upon that platform.

Mr. FITHIAN. But did they adopt that platform?

Mr. WATSON. Wait a moment. Is it a fair question to ask me whether I was nominated on the Ocala platform, when the Ocala platform was the rock on which I stood during the whole campaign? Nearly every newspaper in the State had denounced the Ocala platform as the "Ocala fraud" while I was making the race upon it. No terms of contempt were too strong to pour out upon it; no denunciation was too bitter, no ridicule too scathing; but the other day in Atlanta, the rock-ribbed Democracy of the State, knowing that the scepter was departing from that Israel, turned around and adopted the very principle which, when I ran for office, they had denounced as fraudulent and pernicious.

Mr. KILGORE. But did they adopt the subtreasury plan?

Mr. WATSON. I do not mean to say that they adopted the whole platform.

Mr. KILGORE. That is all there is in the Ocala platform.

Mr. WATSON. Wait a moment. You can not expect them to take it all at once. We are giving it to them gradually, and they will get there after awhile. [Laughter.] They have this year adopted the very principle for which we pleaded last year, and on account of which they poured out contempt upon us. This year they met and accepted a part of it. In South Carolina they have met and accepted most of it. In North Carolina they have met and accepted most of it, and the time is coming when the Democratic party of the South, if it wants to save its life and reach the City of Refuge, will wrap the Ocala banner around it and "come in out of the wet." [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent Mr. WATSON'S time was extended.

Mr. WATSON. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] is an honorable man. I trust I am another. He asks me a question which impugns my loyalty to the people who elected me to a seat upon this floor.

Mr. FITHIAN. Oh, no. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. WATSON. It is well enough to have these things understood, you know.

Mr. FITHIAN. I think the gentleman is drawing upon his imagination when he says that.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I am glad to know that I am mistaken about it.

Mr. ENLOE. Perhaps the question is as to loyalty to the Democratic party.

Mr. WATSON. Now, let us understand that, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Tennessee takes up the gauntlet, and let us understand what he means. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee this question as a fair and square question, looking each other in the eyes and standing face to face and foot to foot: If you had been elected by a constituency of farmers upon the Ocala platform, subtreasury and all, and you had seen that platform denounced by the very Democrats who organized this House, would you have stood by your principles or would you have stood by your party?

Mr. ENLOE. I would not have accepted a nomination that would have pledged me to such principles.

Mr. WATSON. That is not the question; but, after taking the medicine, would you not have let it have time to work? [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. I would not have let it have time to work if I had been able to see in advance, as I see to-day, the effects which it would produce. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. That is a mere matter of taste, which depends altogether upon how a man is raised. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. And the kind of medicine he is in the habit of taking.

Mr. WATSON. It is a question of taste, a question of what kind of a doctor you employ.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, I always employ a Democratic doctor. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Then you will discharge the one you now have.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the gentleman from Maine have called me to account for a long list of custom-houses, which I introduced into a speech which I made here on the 1st day of April.

Mr. REED. Well, what sum would you say—because the point of the statement is in the amount.

Mr. WATSON. That is a fair question, and I will give it a fair answer. I think, as I thought then, that the money wasted in sustaining the custom-houses at these subports of entry which do not pay anything like their expenses is very considerable, and that if it was saved and applied to mail delivery it would furnish mail facilities to thousands who do not now have them.

Now, in all fairness, let me couple the statement I have made with this—that there are 48 per cent of those custom-houses where the receipts are greater than the expenditures. Will not my friend admit, if I am correct in this statement, the Government wastes a large sum of money in that direction which, if put into this bill, would be of great benefit to the people of the country? [Applause.] I have not heard the gentleman answer that.

Mr. REED. My answer to that is, if it is better to do one way than to do another, of course it is; that is a matter of argument.

Mr. WATSON. That is very much like the remark of Mr. Lincoln, in regard to an essay which was sent him from the West—

Mr. REED. Precisely like it.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Lincoln said that for a man who liked that sort of thing, it is exactly the sort of thing he would like. [Laughter.]

Now, I say, when there are 48 per cent of the custom-houses

of this country which cost more to maintain them than they collect, it must be apparent that those custom-houses, maintained sometimes at a distance of a thousand miles from the seacoast, are maintained for the special benefit of the importers, and not for the general benefit of the citizens at large.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman kindly allow me a word in reference to the statement he has made? I have gone to the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations and made inquiry with reference to the expenditures for the collection of customs. I have also consulted the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The appropriation for collection of customs is made under a permanent appropriation law. Prior to the passage of the administrative McKinley act, the expense was a little over \$7,000,000 annually; now it is between nine and ten million dollars for the entire service. I think I am right (addressing Mr. SAYERS).

Mr. SAYERS. I think the estimate now is something over \$12,000,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. Under the McKinley administrative act.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman's statement as to the expense of collection, prior to the passage of the McKinley act, is correct.

Mr. BINGHAM. I merely wanted to put that on record to go along with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman is correct about that. But, Mr. Speaker, that does not at all impair the force of the point I was making, which is this—if you will save the 48 per cent which is thrown away on these interior custom-houses, as a matter of favoritism to the importers, and apply it to the further extension of mail facilities, the spreading of intelligence, education, and refinement among all the people you will benefit the taxpayers much more than by an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for a few custom-houses in the interior.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I desire to bring to my friend's attention a fact rather than to ask him a question, if he will allow me.

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I wish to remind the gentleman that the custom-houses on the coast and on the frontier, for instance on the coast of New England and on the frontier of Maine, are a corps of sentinels; they are really a police force for the protection of the revenue—

Mr. WATSON. Quite true.

Mr. MILLIKEN. And while there may be a good many custom-houses that do not pay their expenses in the amount of their collections, yet at the same time they save a great deal more in revenue to the Government than the cost of maintaining them.

Mr. WATSON. That is quite true; that is a very pertinent statement. But in all fairness I put it to the gentleman from Maine whether his explanation and avoidance of the point I make as to those custom-houses applies to custom-houses a thousand miles away from the seacoast, custom-houses in Texas, in Indiana, in Atlanta, and in various interior towns? Does it apply to them?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will answer the gentleman by saying that so far as I know I think it does not.

Mr. WATSON. Then the gentleman fairly and frankly admits my point to be good, as to the entire customs question, that with great cost to the Government it is maintained in places to simply distribute its benefits to a few rich merchants and importers.

Mr. MILLIKEN. If the gentleman will allow me a moment to set myself right—

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I simply wish to say I do not acknowledge that the point is good. But I do not desire to be understood as disputing it without understanding the facts.

Mr. WATSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, to proceed hurriedly, I say that if we save \$3,500,000 a year on the entire customs service, and a fair percentage that could be saved on river and harbor appropriation bills, for instance, we would have an aggregate sum of between five and ten millions of dollars at our disposal with which we would be enabled to distribute the mail to all parts of the country.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL], in his address in favor of free delivery, estimated the cost of this service at \$13,000,000 a year. That was not making any allowance whatever for the increased returns from the service so extended. I believe that the increased returns from the service would provide for half of that cost. In my own district, in the little village of Hephzibah, gentlemen would be astonished to know the returns from the free-delivery system under a competent and efficient officer, who is in love with the discharge of the duties of his office; and if that system were adopted generally, the increase in the service and in its returns would be very great. If it were done in all the counties throughout the State, and a resident of every county was appointed for the purpose of distrib-

uting the mails to every hamlet and every village, there would be not only an immense saving of time, of convenience, of labor, and of money to the people, but there would be an increase of the revenues of the Government, and at the same time extend the blessings of culture, refinement, and education through magazines, books, newspapers, and letters, which would be sent out to the remotest confines of the Republic.

I am not speaking, Mr. Chairman, for class legislation; I am not asking for special favors to be granted to a few. But I would like to see a general system inaugurated that would provide an equal distribution of the mails all over the land, in cities, in towns, in hamlets, and at the cottages of the people, where all the taxpayers would get some of the benefits of that magnificent system. Let us have one efficient system for the rich as well as for the poor. Let us have a system which will be equal and beneficial to all. Let us have one tax system which treats the poor at least as fairly as it treats the rich. Let us have one system of mail delivery which confers its benefits alike upon the poor as well as the rich, not upon the rich to the exclusion of the poor. In other words, let us enthronize in our laws that real principle of equal and exact justice to all men, the only ruler which the American people ought to obey or to respect. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, we have certainly been largely entertained this afternoon by the history of politics in the South, and for one I was delighted with the speech of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON], where he so justly charged upon our Democratic friends the fact that they had not exhibited the courage in this House they displayed upon the stump, and had not redeemed the pledges they made to the people. His mistake of several millions in the expense of collecting the customs duties can be overlooked in enjoyment of his description of Democratic promise and performance.

As a matter of fact the ports of immediate delivery located in the interior of the country add very little to the expense of the Government. The offices are located in public buildings already built and the additional officers are paid in fees, which amount to the same one place as another.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that my friend from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] has read the history of this country to but little purpose when he uses as an illustration of his theory of free trade the idea of commerce between the States. It does seem to me that any man in the United States should recognize the fact, in this age, that the people of the United States are one in all of their interests as contradistinguished from the people of other nations.

To get back to the bill before us: I believe that the time will come when even the Democratic party will recognize the principle of free delivery of mail, not only to the small towns and villages but to the people of the country districts. It is said that we can not afford it now; that the McKinley bill has cut down the revenues of the country. Our Democratic friends in 1888 demanded the reduction of revenue and now cry out because of the reduction. We have ample revenues to commence the experiment. It is proposed to feel our way gradually, not do it all at once, but start in the older communities, and let it gradually broaden out until every part of the United States shall be served as are the cities and larger towns which now have this service.

You must remember, Mr. Chairman, that when the free delivery system was first inaugurated the opponents of that theory at that time opposed it on the ground that the Government could not afford it; and the first year it was tried, after extending it to towns of less than 40,000 inhabitants, there was a deficiency of \$548,215. That deficiency diminished each year until last year the service showed a surplus of \$2,102,594.

The same result will come if you extend the benefits among all the people by stimulating the use of the mails. By increased facilities you will have increased revenues. The people of this country can serve the humblest man in the country with free delivery as easily and as certainly as they can the dwellers in the cities by continuing the experiment of the Post-Office Department and gradually extending the system.

Mr. FITHIAN. If the gentleman will allow me to interrupt him—

Mr. HULL. I have only ten minutes.

Mr. FITHIAN. You ought to allow me to interrupt you. You interrupted me.

Mr. HULL. I did not interrupt you. If I have time at the close of my speech, or after time is called, I will be glad to be interrupted, and answer questions.

There is another feature of this bill, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me this Committee of the Whole House should wisely and carefully consider. This post-office appropriation affects a service which goes out into every part of the United States, serving all the people regardless of politics, so that it should be considered upon its merits.

There is not anything in the bill itself to arouse political feelings or political antagonism. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that if adopted as submitted to us it will cut down the estimates of the Post-Office Department in every specific appropriation, and your people and mine will feel the effects of it as the business increases in our towns and cities without being able to get increased facilities to transact that business. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but it strikes a blow at the fast mails of this country. We have a country great in extent, a country that requires the most rapid facilities of exchange, not only for trade and commerce, but also for our letters and our social and political affairs, and this bill strikes a blow at the fast mails which have been built up within the past ten years in this country, shortening the time between the Atlantic and the Pacific until we are to-day a smaller country in point of time than the original thirteen Colonies.

The third section of this bill strikes at the land-grant railroads and reduces their pay so that every fast mail will be taken off these roads if that section shall become a law.

It is as follows:

SEC. 3. That hereafter railroad companies which have not received aid in bonds of the United States, and which obtained grants of public land to aid in the construction of their railroads on condition that such railroads should be post routes and military roads, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and all other Government service, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose, restricting the charges for such Government transportation, shall be paid only on the basis of such rates for the transportation of the mails as the Postmaster-General shall deem just and reasonable, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation for such transportation of the mails as shall at the time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such companies for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted in full for all demands for such service.

In the State which I have the honor in part to represent we have five land-grant railroads, traversing the State from the Mississippi to the Missouri River—the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy; the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific; the Chicago and Northwestern; the Illinois Central; and the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul. These roads having received aid of grants of lands are now receiving only 80 cents for the same service the Government pays 100 cents for when performed by roads built after the country had become more densely populated, and which had received no grant of lands. I submit herewith a table showing how this section would affect these roads in Iowa:

	Present pay.	Proposed pay.
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.....	\$202,564.68	\$129,352.92
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific.....	55,664.29	34,790.15
Chicago and Northwestern.....	67,408.20	42,130.15
Illinois Central.....	60,309.68	37,693.55
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.....	26,673.36	16,970.85

Or a total reduction on these five roads in Iowa of \$151,982.59. One of these roads could recoup itself by taking the fast mail train from its land-grant line and sending all mail over its through line, built without a grant of lands.

The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads have not attempted in this bill to cut down the compensation on roads receiving full compensation. They have by their report declared that the wealthy strong roads in the old, thickly-settled States of the East shall continue to receive full compensation, while they declare that the 80 per cent heretofore paid on Western roads shall be cut still further, and hereafter only receive one-half what this committee declares by its report to be fair pay for service.

If this bill shall become a law you will drive all the through mail on the fast trains to the nonland-grant roads and deprive the people in my district of the benefits of the fast mails. So that to my mind it would be the hardest blow that could be given to the business of the people of Iowa, and especially of Central Iowa, to enact into a law the provisions of this bill. I know that it is claimed by the advocates of this measure that Congress has the right to prescribe any compensation they may please for these roads, for the performance of this duty. I believe that they can prescribe a rate that will reduce it below the cost of service even, and compel them possibly to take the mails.

But the Supreme Court (116 United States, 307) has held:

Under pretense of regulating fares and freights, the State can not require a railway company to carry persons or property without reward; neither can it do that which in law amounts to a taking of private property for public use without just compensation or without due process of law.

But Congress can not prescribe the speed and number of trains. While the question of fair compensation is being decided in the courts the number of mail trains would be reduced and the people of my district would, I am afraid, have only the slow mails carried on day trains, stopping at all the stations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe the people of this country can afford to deal fairly by every interest in this country. If these

contracts for carrying the mails are too high amend the law prescribing pay for this service and let there be restrictions thrown around the Post-Office Department that will insure only a fair compensation to all carriers regardless of whether they are land-grant roads or not. Let there be such restrictions as to insure to the people of this country honest and economical but also efficient service. Do not make such a glaring and unjust discrimination as is shown in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we in the West want, above everything else, improved mail facilities. This bill is no place for false economy. According to the report of this committee, they estimate that the Government will receive from the people more than two millions and a quarter of dollars in excess of the amount appropriated by the bill. Is it not fair to ask the Congress of the United States to give, if necessary to insure first-class facilities, at least the amount received from postal revenues? No other Department of the Government is expected to be self-supporting. Is it not fair to say that this Government can not afford in this day and age to get a reputation for economy at the expense of every man, woman, and child in this country using the mails?

I know that my Democratic friends are trying to make a reputation for economy. The Presidential election comes this year, and a false economy is one anchor of their hope. They are intending after the election to let the deficiency acts of the next Congress make up for the shortages of this; but that is simply juggling with the great interests of this country. It is not a fair way to treat them. Our Democratic friends came into this Congress with a cry for economy. They came in with a cry for free trade, and they have so legislated as to lose the faith of the people in their ability to successfully administer the affairs of Government.

Mr. Chairman, in the beginning of the debates of this session I heard rejoicing on this floor that the Democratic party had a majority of one hundred and forty-eight members. I think they are not so jubilant now. When this Congress closes you will hear a rejoicing that there is a certainty that the people of the United States will not have a Democratic majority in the next Congress. This appropriation bill you are now considering, if it shall pass as reported from the committee, will aid largely in reducing the number of Democratic seats upon the floor of the Fifty-third Congress. You have strained at every point to try to keep your pledges and failed in all. You have tried to attack the tariff by simply introducing bills on particular subjects.

But as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] has so forcibly pointed out, you have not dared to attempt the repeal of the Republican tariff law.

You have introduced and passed this House one bill to give the manufacturers free wool, thus striking a blow at the farmers of this country. You left the full tariff on woolens. This you did in the name of free raw material.

You have introduced and passed this House another bill, striking from the protected list the finished product while leaving the duty on the raw material entering into its manufacture. This you do not explain.

You have tried to practice economy at the expense of the Government, as in this bill, and spent millions uselessly in another bill. Every effort you have made, every start you have taken, you have simply put your party in a worse position than it was before.

You, gentlemen of the Democratic party, illustrate the poetry of the old Arkansas flatboatman. His boat was in the storm, as your boat is to-day, my Democratic friends. When his boat finally succumbed to the wind and waves, and he described its fate:

She heaved and sot, and sot and heaved,
And up her beam she flung;
And every time she heaved and sot,
A wusser leak she sprung.

[Great laughter.]

So it is with you, my Democratic friends; you "heave and sot, and sot and heave," and with each effort "a wusser leak," you spring. [Great laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CARUTH. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended. The gentleman has sprung aleak, and I hope he will have further time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALDWELL. I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavor to follow the custom of the House in Committee of the Whole and confine myself to the question after the order of the Committee of the Whole.

In reply to the report made by the committee on April 23, so many interruptions occurred that I lost thirty-five minutes of the time allotted to me. I will try to conclude my remarks in less time. On March 16 I made some observations to the House on the tariff question and extended my remarks in the RECORD

upon that subject and others, and on March 18 there were some criticisms of those extended remarks by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On March 21 a report was made by a committee, which I replied to on the 23d of April. I have now precisely what I have had with three added citations and two paragraphs of remarks.

Mr. CARUTH. Is this on the Post-Office appropriation bill?

Mr. WALKER. No, not at all.

Mr. Chairman, the committee are very much exercised by my alluding to the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] as the "effigy of John Harvard," and call it discourteous. Does not the Chairman know that the Mugwump always seeks for some word not in general use to express his idea. It is the fashion to speak of the statue of John Harvard, the founder of Harvard College, as the "effigy of John Harvard." Furthermore, that statue is at once an ideal and a portrait statue; ideal as to John Harvard, but a portrait statue as to the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who posed to the artist, and is said by his intimate friends to be ever conscious of that fact. I supposed I was paying the honorable gentleman a high compliment in the form of my allusion to him. But for the action of his Mugwump colleague my allusion to him would have moldered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and a cold world might never have known of his glory.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MALLORY. The gentleman is not discussing the question before the House.

Mr. WALKER. Again, the chairman of the committee [Mr. RICHARDSON] pretends to be shocked that I did not "allude to members by their seats."

Mr. FITHIAN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what gentleman he is speaking about. There are several gentlemen here on the floor from Massachusetts, himself being one of them.

Mr. WALKER. I wish to say that by the assumptions of that report I am forbidden doing so.

Mr. CARUTH. Is he here or hereabouts?

Mr. WALKER. And the gentleman pretends to be shocked when a gentleman "alludes to members by their seats."

Mr. MALLORY. I would like to ask the Chairman to rule upon the point of order which I made. The gentleman is not discussing the measure before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question has not been discussed very much to-day.

Mr. CARUTH. The point of order was not raised.

Mr. MALLORY. I raised the point of order. I will say that this matter has been settled. I voted to send this thing to the Committee on Rules for the purpose of getting rid of it; and I do not think it ought to be brought in here now.

Mr. WALKER. Thirty-five minutes of my time were taken from me at that time, and I ask that I may have my time now.

Mr. MALLORY. I ask the Chair to rule upon the point of order I made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled upon the question before, but will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to proceed in order.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think in this general debate it is understood that the Chair is required to restrict gentlemen who have the floor to the matter before the House. It never has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the rule.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. It has been but a very short time since the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KENDALL] spoke on the silver question, and I noticed the other gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] congratulate him on his speech.

Mr. CARUTH. I am not raising any point of order.

Mr. WALKER. He knew when he wrote that report that when that rule was operative the rules of the House required every "member to speak from his seat," and that now members may speak "from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk," and there is no way of designating a member, excepting by adding his name after the words "the honorable gentleman," etc., and that the custom I followed is now necessary and universal.

He also knows Rule VIII requires every member to "be present within the Hall of the House during its sitting." Will he single me out and punish me alone for going out of the Hall without leave?

He knows Rule VIII requires every member to "vote on each question put." Will he single me out and punish me if I fail to vote on any question?

He knows that when the Speaker is putting a question clause 7 of Rule XIV forbids a member "to walk out of or across the

Hall." Will he punish me alone for moving from my place during a vote?

The same rule and clause forbid "smoking upon the floor of the House." Will he punish me alone among all the members who smoke on the floor of the House, did I smoke, which I never do?

He knows Rule XV says "the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair after the roll has been called." Will the gentleman make a report harshly condemning the Speaker, and recommend the adoption of a resolution for his punishment upon the motion of some member of the House new to its duties and its rules?

And so on to the end of the chapter.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the candor of the chairman and his love of justice leads him to say:

These sentences and unparliamentary phrases are so interwoven with the text that the committee do not believe that they can be expunged and leave any remainder of that portion of his remarks where they appear that would be intelligible.

As I have before said, there is no warrant for this statement in the text, and as the remarks objected to by the chairman are read, I am sure all candid men will decide with me and against the report.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the reading, it is my duty, as well as my right, to call attention to a fact, very material to the right decision of the question of mutilating the record, as the committee recommend, viz., that while the committee make an observation on "good taste," etc., it does not make the untenable claim that words "extended in the RECORD" thereby become obnoxious to the rules of the House, which, if "spoken on the floor of the House," would have been "in order." The decision of the question by the House lies wholly in the same condition as it would be in had the words in question been spoken on the floor of the House, in actual debate, and not "extended in the RECORD."

Again, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to make a further observation, very material to this case, viz., that there are no more clearly defined rules observed by gentlemen, in debate or otherwise, than the following:

First. That a man has a right to say what his words were, when there is any doubt about their being correctly reported; and

Second. That where a person uses words having two or more meanings, he has a right to say which meaning he attached to them when he used them.

It clearly appears that in my use of the words objected to they were used in their least objectionable sense, inasmuch as my remarks were not directed to persons nor about persons as such, but to their party and to their political action as such.

Out of their own mouths I proved that these Mugwumps believed they were elected to this House because their constituents were made to believe that the national Democratic party was opposed to the free coinage of silver, and that if the people of their respective districts find out that such is not the fact they will be discarded because of the deception of the people by the Mugwumps.

Furthermore, I do not make any allusion to New England Democrats on this floor, in the remarks in question, any further than to accept and comment on the alleged Mugwump facts in their case, as you will notice as they are read. If anyone deserves censure it is they, and for bearing false witness against themselves and their neighbors, not I, for drawing legitimate inferences from and commenting on their teaching.

Mr. Speaker, I now send to the desk to be read the parts of my speech claimed in the committee's report to be obnoxious to the rules of the House with the synonyms supplied in place of the words misunderstood. This I have a right to do, if I find my words are misunderstood by my friends or tortured by my enemies into a sense I did not intend. This right to substitute a synonym, to obviate the injustice done me by the reader or listener, is never denied by one gentleman to another.

This matter includes all those parts of the speech the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] moved to exclude from the permanent RECORD.

[I will delay the reading, however, until I finish my citations and remarks.]

Mr. Speaker, let me say again that there is absolutely nothing but politics, no personal, private criticism in the remarks now in question, and I say it in all respect to this House, that if they are stricken from the RECORD it seems to me candid men can only regard it as two hundred and thirty-five men using their authority, not their reason, to overcome one who is in their power. Remember this is not a question merely of good taste or bad taste, in the words spoken. Neither is it a question of obedience or violating the letter of the rules of this House. It is a question of obeying, not the letter of the rules, but the actual rules as

defined by the universal custom of the House under the rules. It is wholly a question of allowing a member of the minority party on this floor the same freedom in following his own judgment in the use of words that is allowed the members of the majority party. The honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] stated the real question correctly in his remarks before quoted in the case of the insertion in the RECORD of the Henry George book, but upon a different issue.

Every citation I have given, or shall give, argues that the universal practice of members—the custom of the House decide against striking out.

The further citations from words used by leading members of long experience, as well as those already used, will remove every doubt, I am sure, if all doubt has not already fled, and cause this House to adhere to its custom, "from time immemorial," to trust to the constituents of members to pass judgment on such matters.

I owe it to this House, to the country, and to every student of this House, to complete the citations necessary to develop the facts in this case, and I submit this, in which the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] broadly intimates to the Republican party that they are "Scribes and Pharisees" and "the child of hell."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Massachusetts. * * * I commend the gentleman's party to that notable sermon to which he has referred: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves." [Great laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]—*Congressional Record*, March 19, 1892, page 2302.

Nothing said by me of the Mugwumps approaches in severity this, said to Republicans. Please compare the words of scripture quoted by the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] with my modest allusion to scripture, viz:

The Great Reformer of eighteen hundred years ago said words of great severity of men who were the leaders of society, morality, of benevolence, and of religion, whose character, by the then standards, was as high as that of Boston Mugwumps.

In which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] arraigns Republicans, accuses the Republican party of being "false to the country," and shows that Mugwumps are not as other men are. Rules he lays down for me to follow he touches not with his little finger.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Massachusetts * * * arraigned the Republicans because their party had passed a bad law and had proved false to the best financial interest of the country.—*Congressional Record*, March 19, 1892, page 2302.

In which the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH] likens the action of the Speaker to that of the managers of "snap" conventions, and accuses him of "snapping a resolution upon the House".

Mr. FITCH. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of talk just now in the State from which I come about premature or "snap" conventions. If there ever was anything that was premature or unexpected to those of us who oppose, as it is our right to do, what we believe to be unjust legislation for our people, it is the snapping of this resolution on us here before even the reading of the Journal, and this attempt to cut off debate.—*Congressional Record*, March 8, 1892, page 1889.

In which the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] criticises the "arbitrary manner of the Speaker" and declares Congress guilty of crimes:

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to occupy but a few moments. It has been called to the attention of the House by my colleague from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD] that we are on the point, as a Democratic House, of enforcing a more arbitrary rule in a more arbitrary manner than any that was made or enforced by the Fifty-first Congress, by virtue of whose crimes most of us are here. [Laughter and applause.]—*Congressional Record*, March 8, 1892, page 1895.

Again I am accused of being guilty of unmanly or cowardly conduct because the members criticised by "extending in the RECORD," instead of speaking the words on the floor, had no opportunity of then and there replying, as follows:

If not less unparliamentary, it is, to say the least of it, more manly and therefore more easy of justification to utter harsh and severe words when enlisted face to face in warm debate with a fellow member, of and concerning him.

In the one case the fellow member assailed can meet word with word and have the opportunity to defend himself before the same audience, while in the other he can not.

There are hundreds of precedents in words spoken to and concerning Speaker REED, to which he "could not reply" on the floor or off the floor. The floor of the House was open to these gentlemen whose political action was criticised to reply in a "manly way" at any time, as also when the House was in "Committee of the Whole House" they could reply to any extent they chose, while Speaker REED was compelled to be dumb at the time criticised, and every other time. He was estopped by his office. Who were cowards, if there be cowards?

A peculiarity of the Mugwumps is that they always worship at the shrine of men who, as party men, are the exact opposite of themselves. Therefore, the honorable gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], are authority for the Boston Mugwumps, and I prize

most highly the citations I make of the vigorous words of these gentlemen. Probably there is no man on the Democratic side of the House, whom every Democrat in the House would be more willing to concede was thoroughly competent to decide what language was within the rules, or more scrupulous to observe the rules of the House as defined and explained by the practice under them, than the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON]. The honorable gentleman made a speech in the House February 5, 1890, devoted mostly to remarks concerning the Speaker, which, of course, every Democrat on the floor approved and applauded. Listen to the following:

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] likens Republicans to a "hoary and notorious sinner," and also the Speaker:

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no more inspiring sight in the eyes of all virtuous and right-minded men, none more full of encouragement for youth, than when hoary and notorious sinners, who have long persisted in wicked ways, publicly acknowledge their sins and transgressions, and promise in the sight of all men to be virtuous, honest, and righteous. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, what a scene, worthy the admiration of gods and men, have we been permitted to witness in this House during the past few days, as the leaders on the other side have arisen, one after another, with such open confessions to the country.—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1038.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] speaks of the "edifying professions of the Speaker:"

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * But, Mr. Speaker, all these edifying professions on the floor of the House were as nothing compared to that which came to us from your own chair. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1039.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] alludes to the Speaker as a "spectacle edifying and inspiring to the youth of America" in his repentance.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * But, sir, can we imagine any spectacle more edifying, more inspiring to the youth of America than that of the Speaker of this great House standing upon yonder high tribunal and calling upon all the people to witness his humble professions of penitence; nay, even his grateful disclosure of the unworthy instruments of his conversion. [Renewed laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1039.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] continues his reference to the Speaker, in conjunction with Balaam and "the lowly beast on which he rode." Probably suggested by reading a book lately rediscovered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS], and presented by him to Democrats.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Sir, theologians are yet disputing whether Balaam, the son of Beor, was finally saved, but no man doubts that Balaam, the son of Beor, to say nothing of the lowly beast on which he rode [laughter], was made the vehicle and the instrumentality by which God's blessing was conveyed to God's people. [Laughter.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1039.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] speaks of the mission of the Speaker in conjunction with the mission of the devil in first corrupting and then converting a village "within the lines of parliamentary law" and Democratic precedents—that is to say, both the allusions to the story and the conversions:

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * Even as I melt into sympathy with them, I can not but liken them to a story I read long years ago of an Alpine village which the devil had so thoroughly debauched and corrupted that it was a terror to all the region round. But as a punishment for his misdeeds the devil was forced to assume the garb of a priest and go among them and preach so eloquently that he converted every one of them into the fold of the true church. I fear it would not be allowable under "general parliamentary law" for me to say in this instance who the devil he is [great laughter], but I think, Mr. Speaker, I have him in my mind's eye. [Renewed laughter.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1039.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] continues his criticism, and hints at the partiality of the Speaker, and more than intimates that the Speaker has left a great name behind him, and that he has fallen in the estimation of men:

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * The Speaker of this House is as much my Speaker as he is yours. He entered that chair with as honest good wishes from me that he might make an able, just, and impartial Speaker, leaving a great name behind him, as from any member of this House. [Applause.]

Sir, in my former blindness I supposed that chastity was no more the virtue of a woman than impartiality was the virtue of the Speaker of the House [loud applause on the Democratic side], and that whatever other graces and accomplishments she might be endowed with, lacking this she fell from the estimation of men. [Renewed applause.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1039.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia intimated that the Speaker ought to have two good eyes, and says the Speaker is a one-eyed man, with the blind eye toward the Democratic side:

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * Heretofore we have supposed that under the rules of the House the Speaker must have two good eyes, so that he could see equally both sides of the House; but it seems that "general parliamentary law" makes it possible not only for a one-eyed man to be Speaker, but in some respects gives to him an advantage by reason of the infirmity, particularly if his blind eye happens to be on the side where the minority sit. [Laughter and applause.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1040.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia broadly intimates that the acts of the Speaker are in close connection with and the debauching of the Speaker's chair to the influence of the lobby.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * Within twenty-five years the lobbyists will come here, not to waste their efforts on the members, but to "see" the Speaker, a much cheaper and more effective way of lobbying, illustrating the great principle of political economy to which my friend from Texas [Mr. MILLIS] has given his later life, that you may cheapen the cost of production and at the same time increase the wages of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1040.

In which the honorable gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] "named personally," as is the custom in the House by all who speak on the floor of the House, but in ridicule of the Republican party, assigning them places in running "the great train of progress in this country."

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. * * * My friend Mr. Butterworth, in one of his speeches here, and I listen to them all with great interest, likened his party to the great train of progress in this country. Let me adopt his figure and urge you to move onward; nobody can sit upon the cowcatcher more gracefully than he. What a heroic figure will the Speaker present standing with his hand upon the throttle. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKinley] will make a great conductor, while my friend from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] will have the undisputed place of fireman. [Laughter and applause.] Sir, I do not think I ought to man this train without doing something for my judicially-minded friend from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON]. I have thought of him, and from his alacrity in laying things upon the table I think he would make a splendid grand master of the buffet. [Laughter.]—*Congressional Record*, February 5, 1890, page 1040.

It is the universal custom of the House, says the chairman of the Printing Committee. Where? When? Universal custom of the House is it? The chairman [Mr. RICHARDSON] says:

It is a universal custom in the House of Representatives to speak of each other and to address each other by a phrase and not by name; that is to say, it is "the gentleman from Massachusetts" and not the member by name, or "describe him by his seat."

If that is so, why the following, in which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] freely uses the names of members of the House, describing the Representatives of "Boston Bay," not "Back Bay"—water, not land—and does not "describe them by their seats":

Mr. McMILLIN. * * * I see before me Mr. SHERMAN HOAR, a distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, with whom I had the pleasure of driving and walking over the battlefields of Concord and Lexington. I see also the Hon. JOSEPH O'NEIL and Hon. JOHN F. ANDREW, who represent Bunker Hill and "Boston Bay."—*Congressional Record*, March 11, 1892, page 2032.

Mr. Speaker, no college contains men more worthy the name of "gentlemen" than the workshops of New England, but the following words of the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] seem to be characteristic and to have been spoken in depreciation of his colleague [Mr. WALKER], and in derision of the "manners" of men who work at the bench, the loom, and the anvil, which he characterizes as "shop manners."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Massachusetts. * * * Let me suggest to the gentleman [Mr. WALKER], however, that whether he came from the bench, the loom, or the anvil, it is no excuse for him that he shall bring in here his "shop manners," with which to regale the members of this House; for even with the honest artisan who indulges in the jibe or the joke or the jeer in a shop, when he comes within the heart of his family and into the bosom of his home, those jibes and jeers and quips are no longer heard.—*Congressional Record*, April 24, 1892, page 3978.

I would suggest in all modesty that it takes something more than high office or fine clothes, though each garment has "Poole, London," stitched inside, or even great culture, to make a gentleman. Take a laborer from the bottom of a trench in Massachusetts, and in nine cases in ten you will find in him the speech of a friend and the heart of a gentleman, as you will in the workman "in the shops of Massachusetts." The following citation from words of the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] indicates that he misapprehends the function of the House of Representatives of the United States as well as the manners of American workmen, in which he calls this Hall the "drawing-room of the country," and that the manners of workingmen are not fitted to the dignity and courtesy of this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Massachusetts. Yes; when he [Mr. WALKER] enters the drawing-room of the country [renewed laughter], * * * into this House, and faces the men and women of the whole country, he should bear in mind that the "manners of the shop" must be left behind; that he has in his keeping the dignity and courtesy of the people of Massachusetts.—*Congressional Record*, April 24, 1892, page 3978.

In a eulogy of one of the most earnest and gallant Democrats that ever trod the floor of this House the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] declared the estimation in which the Mugwump was held by his late friend Gen. Spinola in language much more severe than any I used in the following words:

Mr. CUMMINGS. In his party he believed that he saw the only party of the people. He loved its leaders as he loved his tried friends. Its enemies were his enemies. Entire devotion to the party organization was his rule of political life. The Mugwump he regarded as an unclean bird—a harpy, that reveled in the feast uninvited, and contaminated every dish that it touched.—*Congressional Record*, March 27, 1892, page 2705.

How delicious it must be to the taste of the Democratic party,

this submission to the reproofs, the taunts, and the jibes of the Mugwumps, and to what length they are asked to go in violating the rights of Republicans to protect their Mugwump mentors from just criticism. Balaam's ass was not more patient under the blows that smote him than the Democrats in New York, New England and Richmond and in this House are presumed to be under the whacks of the Mugwumps. It seems to be a test of loyalty to the Democratic party to kiss the Mugwump foot that kicks them; but Republicans on this floor or elsewhere are not getting their principles from Mugwump teachers or baring their backs to Mugwump masters.

In which the honorable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] illustrates the freedom of personal allusion, personal criticism, and personal compliment under the rules of the House, as practically and without exception administered:

Mr. WATSON. * * * On the side of the Republicans they chose Mr. DOLIVER, from the State of Iowa, young, handsome, and brilliant. * * * His entire speech might be labeled "DOLIVER'S extract, or a new way of treating an old complaint." [Laughter.]

On the other hand was our handsome and brilliant friend from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], who was put forward as the "darling" of the Democratic side of the House, the prettiest man in all the bunch, and his entire speech, which ranged from Tom Moore's poetry to Joe Miller's jest book, was the sum and substance of the old Democratic position on the tariff, that we will practice what is wrong while we know what is right. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Will the gentleman permit me a moment? Mr. WATSON. Do you come in as one of the pretty men?—*Congressional Record*, April 2, 1892, pages 3005, 3006.

In which the honorable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] does some plain and descriptive talking to THOMAS B. REED and Lewis E. Payson, and does not "describe them by their seats."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. * * * His royal highness, the distinguished field marshal, THOMAS B. REED, the supreme commander of the Northern Pacific forces, bravely leading his well-equipped and thoroughly organized army; its commissariat well stored; its quartermaster's department intact, and a pay bureau so inexhaustible as to boast comparison with the Treasury of the United States.

But look at the undaunted hero who crosses swords with the giant general from Maine. It is the distinguished generalissime of the forces of the people, Capt. Gen. Lewis E. Payson, of Illinois.—*Congressional Record*, September 26, 1890, page 10432.

In which the honorable gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] confines himself within parliamentary rules in hinting that the honorable gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Payson, is the "head of a banditti lugging off the property of the people."

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. * * * Where is this man? Why, Mr. Speaker, he is at the head and front of the hosts—if it were not unparliamentary and were it not for the respect I have for and confidence in the gentleman's integrity I would say—of the banditti who are lugging off the property of the people.—*Congressional Record*, September 26, 1890, page 10432.

I submit the following citation, in which the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] appears to change the precedents of this House and infringe the rights of a fellow-member [Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois] while temporarily acting as Mr. Speaker, in declaring the member "out of order" and that he had used an "unparliamentary phrase," because that member had designated another member [Mr. WILLIAMS] by using the name of the party of which he was a member instead of "describing him by his seat," which party name had been commonly used and used on this floor for years, and furthermore, by this apparently usurpatory decision the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] laid himself open to the suspicion of making it as Mr. Speaker, on the day following his making a report severely condemning another member [Mr. WALKER] for using the same common party name to designate the same member [Mr. WILLIAMS], for the purpose of prejudicing the House against, and still further condemning, the member reported against.

Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois. I deny the right of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] to speak for the Republican party. I deny the right of the gentleman to speak for the minority of this committee. When this bill reaches the other end of the Capitol and is up for a vote, their candidate whom they will probably nominate at Chicago will conveniently be in the cloakroom or out on an excursion somewhere. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And then their platform will straddle this question, and my friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] will tell his people that he is for free coinage, and my Mugwump friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] will tell his people that he is against free coinage. Such is the facility with which this party gets both sides of the question.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The SPEAKER *pro tempore* [Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair]. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LIND. The gentleman from Illinois referred to a member of this House as a Mugwump, and I suggest that that is out of order, according to the report presented yesterday by the present occupant of the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELIE. I think the Speaker *pro tempore* must have failed to observe the utterance or he would have called the gentleman to order. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair sustains the point of order. Gentlemen must refer to each other by a phrase which is parliamentary.

Mr. TAYLOR of Illinois. My understanding is that the gentleman from Massachusetts confessed it in his speech the other day.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Yes; and gloried in it.—*Congressional Record*, March 23, 1892, page 2471.

In which the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] is very much shocked at the "schemes of infamy" to which the Republican party is committed, not the Mugwumps.

Mr. ENLOE. * * * The Republican party finds itself with such a narrow majority in the House that it is unable to carry out the schemes of infamy to which it is committed without resorting to revolutionary methods to increase that majority.—*Congressional Record*, February 16, 1890, page 1303.

In which the honorable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] speaks to the Republicans within the rules, as defined by the practice of the House, and denounces them as "hypocrites."

Mr. BLAND. It is the beam in your hypocritical eye that I am after. The question is not about my record, but about your hypocrisy, and I denounce you all as hypocrites. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCCOMAS. I, too, will do some denouncing. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLAND. It is your hypocrisy I am after. My record has nothing to do with it, but your party is an organized hypocrisy.—*Congressional Record*, June 28, 1890, page 6679.

In which my esteemed friend the honorable gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN], in the discharge of his constitutional duty and right, hints in not particularly gentle strains upon this sacred floor that the Republican party is a party of deception, fraud, and false pretense, and discovers Rhode Island:

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. * * * No, Mr. Chairman, it needs no prophet now. We have been hearing the result for the last two or three weeks all the way from Rhode Island to Montana. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] It is not a matter of prophecy now, sir. The returns are coming in, the people are being heard from; they find they were deceived, and from all over the country the glad tidings are coming that they are going back on the party of fraud and false pretense.—*Congressional Record*, April 23, 1890, page 3685.

In which the honorable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] arraigns the Republican party for hypocrisy on public measures:

Mr. MCCOMAS. Do I understand my friend from Missouri to be indicting the Republican party for extravagance and sustaining his indictment by a list of appropriations that they do not make?

Mr. DOCKERY. I think my friend does not misapprehend my position. I am arraigning the Republican party for hypocrisy upon these public measures. [Applause on the Democratic side, and cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.]—*Congressional Record*, June 17, 1890, page 6145.

In which the honorable gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] accuses the Republican party of stealing the Presidency and of attempts to steal two Senators, and accuses the Federal judiciary of trampling on laws to screen from punishment great political criminals, by the side of which my criticism of the Mugwump party seems like faint praise:

Mr. BYNUM. They [the Republican party] may consummate these proceedings as you did similar ones before, when at the hour of midnight a Federal judge made a ruling to perpetuate the Republican party in power, and his name has dropped out of history [Applause on the Democratic side.] And more than that, it is but in keeping with the practices of your party when you stole the Presidency and counted in a man who was not elected. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is in keeping with the practice of your party in the State of Montana, where you have attempted to steal two Senators. It is in keeping with the acts of the Federal judiciary to-day, which has violated the law, which has trampled on laws to screen from punishment the greatest political criminal and the greatest political outlaw of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And you look and laugh at this scene.—*Congressional Record*, February 1, 1890, page 998.

In which the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] more freely criticises the "protectionist party" than the Mugwump party was criticised by me, saying it was moved by "extortionate greed," and "wickedly covets."

Mr. McMILLIN. * * * While protection was holding forth one hand with alleged benefits to the people, it had the other thrust deep down in their pockets grasping the last dollar that extortionate greed could wickedly covet.—*Congressional Record*, March 11, 1890, page 2030.

In which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] severely criticises the Ways and Means Committee in denouncing the McKinley bill, made by it, as "conscienceless favoritism" and oppression, using his right, under the rules of this House, to describe it as he saw fit, and calling the attention of the country to it. That his vision is defective in this matter of protection does not abridge his rights on this floor:

Mr. McMILLIN. Sir, the whole [McKinley] bill was characterized by a conscienceless favoritism for the few and a merciless oppression of the many. In the consideration of the bill the manufacturer alone was favored.—*Congressional Record*, March 11, 1890, page 2031.

In which the same gentleman further criticises the Ways and Means Committee in the Fifty-first Congress, and the McKinley bill and the Republican party, and talks of "larceny" and "highway robbery."

Mr. McMILLIN. * * * The greed of the seller and not the need of the buyer was the measure of the rate of duty. The uncalled for and unconscionable duty differs from larceny in that it is openly taken. It differs from highway robbery in having the sanction of the law.—*Congressional Record*, March 11, 1890, page 2031.

In which the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] speaks his mind freely in a dialogue:

Mr. WALKER. Now, if the gentleman from Tennessee will just keep still for a minute, and just quit bossing the House and everybody else for a few minutes, I will explain this matter.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to boss anybody. I just want the gentleman to give that information. No man needs "bossing" more than the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALKER. I will attend to this business, and I would like the gentleman to allow me to proceed in my own way.—*Congressional Record*, March 19, 1892, page 2303.

In which the honorable gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTHUR] pays a very doubtful compliment to the honorable gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] entirely within the rules as construed in action in the House. In not a single case that I have quoted or shall quote has the Speaker of the last House or the present House, called any gentleman to order for any words he chose to use, as he has sworn to do under his oath of office if the rules are violated under the construction practically given them in the House. Neither has any member done so until the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS] came down among us. Not a word or phrase uttered by me approaches the language used by these gentlemen or by the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILLIAMS]:

Mr. CARTHUR. * * * I have heard a good deal upon the subject of lobbies. My eloquent and distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. Anderson], to whom the name of a railroad corporation is as a red flag in a bull's face—whenever the word "lobby" is used that gentleman rises upon his hind legs and howls.—*Congressional Record*, August 20, 1890, page 8836.

In which the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] and the honorable gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Coleman] have a little colloquy, under the rules, identical with those of the present Congress, as regards the speech and conduct of members:

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that, gagged and bound by the Republican majority in this House, I am an unwilling passenger upon this McKinley-tariff-contracted-limited express train.

Mr. COLEMAN. Let her go, Gallagher."

Mr. CUMMINGS. Its down-east engineer, its Buckeye conductor, and its Illinois stoker are running the train upon their own hook and in defiance of the will of the people. I utter my protest. It is all that I am allowed to do. [Here the hammer fell.]—*Congressional Record*, September 16, 1890, page 10037.

Mr. Speaker, it is the resort of small minds to "mutilate the RECORD." Others sometimes do so, but thoughtlessly. There is one record, at least, honestly made up. It honestly is what it purports to be, viz., the Book of Books. In that record the judgment of posterity through endless ages is courageously sought. The heroes of that record fearlessly seek the charitable judgment of posterity and only appeal for favors to a forgiving God.

Mr. Speaker, thus endeth a not altogether pleasant chapter of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am very sure most members would not select the citations that have been read from their words to be judged by, either as to their courtesy or their ability. I am also quite sure that the young men of the country, as they read them in the RECORD, will study to avoid rather than repeat them.

They show that my words, condemned by the Committee on Printing, are clearly within the rules as practiced, and that the resolution reported by the committee is unjust to me and to every member of this House and ought not to pass.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. WALKER. I should like a few minutes more.

Mr. PENDLETON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be allowed to proceed.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to be allowed time to defend himself. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Let the gentleman have leave to print.

Mr. WALKER. If there is no objection, I will print the remainder of my extracts.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Let the gentleman proceed in his own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CALDWELL] have control of all the time for general debate upon this bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. I can not yield the gentleman any more of the time on my side.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I can not yield him any of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLARKE] is recognized.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few more of these extracts, and I ask leave to print them.

Mr. MALLORY. I object.

[Mr. CLARKE of Alabama withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If I understand the position of the chairman of the committee, it is this: that this section is put in the bill with the intention of allowing each individual member of the committee to exercise his own individual judgment,

the committee having no further information on this subject than the House has.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. The House will have all the information that the committee has, as I am going to publish a lot of documents in reference to it.

Mr. LOUD. But it must be the act of the committee, and it can not come in here as the action of the individual members of the committee. It is here to-day, and it is the act of the committee, and if the majority of the committee pass this amendment, then it will stand as the action of the committee. You can not get away from that.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman misunderstands me upon that. The idea that I desire to develop by the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads is this: That while the committee has put this section in the bill, it is not prepared to give the House any more information as to the reasons for the cut from 80 to 50 per cent than the House already possesses, and that each individual member must decide for himself as to whether it is reasonable or not.

Mr. CALDWELL. I believe the majority of the members of the committee at the present time are of the opinion that this reduction should not have been made. The motion was made in the committee, but it was not considered.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. That is a matter for each member of the committee, of course, to determine. Congress will have just the same information as the committee will have. Congress will have just the same information about these land-grant railroads to-day that they had when Congress granted the lands to them. They have got the same power to do to-day what they could have done then.

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama. It is not the question of power that is troubling me, it is the question of the exercise of that power and the reasons that exist for exercising it.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Of course this matter will be discussed when the bill is under discussion by sections.

Mr. LOUD. I hope that it will be arranged that there shall be an hour for the discussion of this subject when it has to be decided.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE].

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to take part in this debate, but when I came into the Hall the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] was occupying the floor and was indulging in some criticisms of the policy of the Democratic party in the government of this House; and in that connection I understood him to be indirectly arraigning me because I had not been able to get the Committee on Ways and Means to report to the House a bill which I introduced repealing the McKinley tariff bill.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman allow me? I did not intend it as an arraignment of the gentleman; I simply alluded to the fact that there had been such a bill referred to the committee; and I had no intention of charging the gentleman from Tennessee with any lack of attention.

Mr. ENLOE. I understood the gentleman to suggest that if I followed the policy he had pursued, of obstructing unanimous consents in the morning hour, in that way I might be able to accomplish my purpose.

Mr. WATSON. That was in answer to your question.

Mr. ENLOE. As I stated to the gentleman at that time, there is no rule in this House, nor has there been power in this House since it adopted the rules, to compel any committee to report back a measure. I am very sincere in my desire to see that question brought before the House; and I am equally sincere with the gentleman from Georgia in the desire to see the House have an opportunity to place itself on record on the free coinage of silver. I am in full sympathy with the interests of that section of the country which he and I in part represent, and with every other agricultural constituency. I sometimes think he indulges in extravagant statements, but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the condition of his people to say positively that they are extravagant. The condition of agriculture generally is such that there ought to be legislation to give to the farmers relief, so that they may enjoy a fair share of the general prosperity. That is the mission of the Democratic party. It alone has the will to do it, and I believe the people intend to confer upon it the power to do it. Now, the gentleman from Georgia stated that he was elected to Congress on the Ocala platform. I understood him to say he was elected on that platform. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. WATSON. Yes, I was elected on the Ocala platform.

Mr. ENLOE. If I remember correctly, the convention at Ocala did not meet until December and the gentleman was elected in November.

Mr. WATSON. If the gentleman will allow me, I will state to him that the Ocala platform is simply a repetition of the St.

Louis platform, adopted in 1889. We had gotten into the habit of alluding to it as the Ocala platform. It is true that at the time I was nominated those same principles went under the name of the "St. Louis platform" of 1889. It is the same platform.

Mr. ENLOE. It may be the same in substance, but I do not think it is identical.

Mr. WATSON. It is identically the same.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, it is not very material.

When the gentleman was on the floor he had a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FITHIAN] about the party which nominated him, in which I understood that gentleman to question his loyalty to the Democratic party. I quote from the Reporter's notes the suggestion:

Mr. ENLOE. Perhaps the question is as to loyalty to the Democratic party.

Mr. WATSON. Now, let us understand that, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Tennessee takes up the gauntlet, and let us understand what he means. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee this question, as a fair and square question, looking each other in the eyes, and standing face to face and foot to foot: If you had been elected by a constituency of farmers upon the Ocala platform, subtreasury and all, and you had seen that platform denounced by the very Democrats who organized this House, would you have stood by your principles or by your party?

Mr. ENLOE. I would not have accepted a nomination that would have pledged me to such principles.

Mr. WATSON. That is not the question. But after taking the medicine would not you have let it have time to work? [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. I would not have let it have time to work if I had been able to see in advance as I see to-day the effect which it would produce. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. That is a mere matter of taste which depends altogether upon how a man is raised.

Mr. ENLOE. And the kind of medicine he is in the habit of taking.

Mr. WATSON. It is a question of taste; a question of what kind of a doctor you employ.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, I always employ a Democratic doctor. [Laughter.]

When I suggested that perhaps the question of the gentleman from Illinois went to the question of loyalty to the Democracy, I did not mean to impugn the gentleman's motives or to question his conduct on this floor, for I am satisfied that he is sincere in what he is doing, and he is responsible to his people for his acts here. He affords every evidence of his sincerity. I think at times he becomes overzealous.

According to my views, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is unquestionably wrong. He should not arraign the Democratic party as he does after he has been so long associated with it and when he claims to have been a Democrat all his life. He has only recently adopted the extreme doctrines which he now advocates and which he should know can not prevail. He should be just to the party from which he has wandered and not arraign it for the failure to change existing conditions. The fault is with the American people, who have not given it full legislative power. If individual members have violated the will of their constituents in dealing with public questions their constituents will attend to that.

Now, the gentleman knows, as everyone else knows, that it is much easier to criticise the merits of a production than it is to produce something of merit; it is much easier to criticise a bad law than it is to make a good law; it is much easier to criticise the administration of this House than it is to administer its authority; and time will teach the gentleman that to criticise a policy is much easier than to formulate a better policy. Congress is not governed and can not be governed by the will of any single member. Our parliamentary system is a system of committee government. The legislation is in a great measure determined, if not entirely governed, by the make-up of the committees. The gentleman will find it a much easier task to point out defects in the public policy of another political party than he will to convince any considerable number of the American people that his party, the third party, offers any practical solution of the difficulties which confront the great body of the producers and taxpayers of the country to-day.

Mr. WATSON. Let us set aside a few days and discuss the Ocala platform.

Mr. ENLOE. I discussed it very thoroughly in my Congressional district last year.

Mr. WATSON. You had better get ready to discuss it again.

Mr. ENLOE. I am ready. I will say to the gentleman that I took the stump in every county in my district last summer and fall and discussed these questions. I opposed some of the Ocala demands. I represent an agricultural constituency, and the Democracy of every county in my Congressional district to-day hold opinions adverse to the third-party features of the Ocala platform.

I draw a distinction between the Democratic and the third-party principles in the Ocala platform. All the declarations except those relating to the subtreasury scheme, and the Government ownership of railroads and telegraphs, woman suffrage, and the payment of the soldiers the difference between the value of greenbacks and gold, I regard as Democratic. The declarations mentioned are the most extreme doctrines of centralization, and so far exceed anything that the Republican party has proposed, except the force bill, that they belong to the

clusively to the third party. The demand was made on me by a portion of my constituents last year that I should define my position on these questions. I addressed my constituents on the 4th of July last, and published that address, from which I will quote, and when I was assailed for that I took the stump and canvassed my district against these doctrines, determined to vindicate the principles of Democracy or to go down with them.

The Democrats in my district are not made of such weak material that they run off after every new doctrine that comes along. They are not of that kind who revel in an imaginary state of hopeless misery and then attempt to better that state by feeding their imaginations on manufactured facts and fictitious figures. I believe if the men in public positions in the Democratic party in every State had upheld the principles of the party instead of temporizing that the party would have been stronger in its organization in every State in the Union to-day than ever before in its history.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY.

Attacks upon the Democratic party because it has not corrected the evils of which the gentleman complains are unjust. The only party which has had the power to repeal or to enact a law for the last thirty years is the Republican party. The Democratic party has never for one hour of that time had the House, the Senate, and the Presidency at the same time, and the gentleman well knows that all three are necessary to the passage of a law. When the thunderbolts of popular wrath are forged and placed in the hands of a mighty son of thunder to be hurled at the authors of the unjust and wicked legislation which oppress the great body of the people, they should not be aimed at the only defender and friend of the masses of the people—the Democratic party—but they should spend their force on the party of the classes, which is sheltered behind the monopolies, the trusts, and the class interests which it has created. When the people give the Democratic party the House, the Senate, and the Presidency it will deserve to be abandoned if it fails of its duty to the people, but it does not deserve condemnation without a trial.

Under Republican rule the nation has grown rich beyond the dreams of avarice, but the great body of the citizens whose toil created this wealth have not shared in it. Providence has blessed the hand of toil, but legislation has cursed it and robbed it. Wall street is bursting with a plethora of money while the South and West are starving for it. Manufacturing is paying from 15 to 30 per cent and commerce is flourishing while agriculture is declining. In some sections it is only paying a very small profit on the capital invested, and in some sections it is paying nothing. It is not because agriculture is neglected. The statistics of our production testify to the industry and patient toil of our farmers. It is because the farmer is robbed by law to enrich other classes.

The millionaire and the monopolist, the pauper and the tramp, are alike the children of Republican legislation. The palaces of the pampered millionaire rise above the hovels of protected labor. The farmer's crop is bought and sold a thousand times before it is planted, by gamblers in agricultural products. Eastern capital, gained through legislative enactments, taxed out of the people's pockets, is reaching out and gathering in its grasp the farming lands of the South and West.

When we know the causes which have produced this depression in agriculture, and which are to-day causing such widespread financial distress among farmers, there ought to be unity of action in applying the remedy, especially among those who complain of the system and profess friendship for the farmer.

THE REPUBLIC IS SICK.

"It has been sick for thirty years, and its condition is becoming more dangerous every year. It has been made drunk with artificial stimulants until it borders on delirium tremens, and the Republican physicians are constantly giving it more and stronger stimulants. It is threatened with death from apoplexy. The money which performs the functions of the blood has nearly all left the extremities and gone to the head, and the imperfect and insufficient circulation produces general distress. We want to change the treatment. We can not undo the wrongs of thirty years in a day, but we can adopt the right treatment. We need more money, and a more equitable distribution of it. To issue more money without changing the laws which effect the distribution would but afford temporary relief, and in the end aggravate the evil. It would simply be putting more grain in the hopper without changing the set of the mill. The mill would grind exactly the same grist, and at last it would all go into the Wall street bag. What we want is to set the mill right and get an honest miller who will grind with equal and exact justice for all. In other words, we want to return to first principles. If we would lay the ax to the root of the evil we must strike the first blow at taxation.

UNJUST TAXATION THE CAUSE.

"Just so long as the tax laws take from the pockets of the people their surplus earnings, whether that be much or little, just

so long will the return of prosperity be postponed. I would not make financial reform wait on tariff reform, but they should go hand in hand, the one to cut out the eating cancer, the other to heal the wound. I have so long heard the idea of relieving the people by reducing the tariff ridiculed that I expect nothing else from the friends and advocates of the monopolies and the trusts. It is a familiar song to the people, but the people are learning to associate cause with effect. It has been argued for years that the tariff is not a tax on the consumer, and that it does not increase the cost of articles on which it is imposed. Millions of money and oceans of ink have been expended to give this falsehood the complexion of truth, and the muddy stream of corruption still flows on. Eloquence and sophistry, backed by prejudice and ignorance, coupled with bribery and corruption, have carried the day for thirty years, but the light of truth is breaking on the minds of men everywhere. Free quinine and free sugar are beacon-lights.

"Mr. Blaine, with his policy of reciprocity, has bored a free-trade hole in the bottom of the ship Protection that will sink it. Reciprocity in its practical application means free trade for the manufacturers with the farmers of South America, where there is no demand for our agricultural products. That enriches our manufacturers, but does not help our farmers. Our farmers now want to know why free trade with the European countries which buy our surplus agricultural products would not be a good thing for them. One fact in the scales of truth outweighs a thousand fictions invented to overturn it. Listen! When Congress removed the tax from quinine it had been selling at from three to four dollars an ounce. The price soon fell to fifty and sixty cents an ounce. The friends of monopoly have been explaining ever since that taking the tax off had nothing to do with the decline in price.

"When Congress removed the tax from sugar the consumer bought 20 pounds of granulated sugar the next day for \$1, whereas he could only buy from 9 to 12 pounds before the tax was removed.

TARIFF REDUCTION THE REMEDY.

"The friends of monopoly may sneer at the idea of relieving the farmer by taking the hand of the taxgatherer out of his pocket, but his wife will tell him that if it made quinine cheaper, and it made sugar cheaper to take off the tariff tax, that it would make clothing and agricultural implements and a thousand other things cheaper to abolish the tax on them. The effect of taking the tax off sugar is to leave over \$50,000,000 a year in the pockets of the people which before was paid to the Government for taxes. That is not much compared with the taxes which they are compelled to pay on other things, but it will help some. It is estimated that the people of the United States pay \$1,000,000,000 annually as a gift to the manufacturers, besides the \$229,000,000 paid as a tax to the Government on imported articles. Cut the tariff to a revenue basis, and several hundred millions of this money would remain in the pockets of the people, instead of going, as it now goes, into the pockets of the manufacturers to swell their already overgrown fortunes. Such a policy would not make so many millionaires and tramps but it would make millions of people a little richer, and make many a home brighter and happier.

"We might increase our circulation to \$50 per capita or reduce it to twenty, and the operation of our tariff and other class laws would effect the same result. The many would earn the wealth and the few would get it. The only difference would be that with more money the many would earn more, and get to use a part of it a little longer, but in the end the few would get nearly all of it. There would be greater activity, better prices, and greater general prosperity for a time, but the law of unequal taxation and the operation of other class legislation, with a certainty as unerring as the fixed laws of the universe, would concentrate the wealth in the hands of a few millionaires, and the sooner enable them to count their wealth by the billions.

"Our tariff is a political Pandora's box. It is the foundation of class legislation, that curse of the people in all governments, and the most insidious and deadly foe of republics. Class legislation is the prolific mother of those trusts, monopolies, and combines which created the millionaires and the tramps. If the people will go to work and reduce the tariff to a revenue basis for the ordinary expenses of the Government, and impose a graduated income tax to pay pensions and the public debt, they will cut the tap root of class legislation, and this more deadly than upas tree will wither and die. If we turn from the true principles of government, and condone the wrongs inflicted upon us in the past, and enter the struggle of class against class, to secure the sanction of law for the promotion of class interests at the expense of the interests of the whole people, we might as well burn the Declaration of Independence, abolish the Constitution, and write down in history the failure of self-government by the people.

"For a quarter of a century the Republican party has been legislating on that line, and the opposition to its policy has grown stronger and stronger every year, until it stands condemned by the overwhelming sentiment of the people. After having struggled against this policy for so many years, and faced defeat so often for principle, is this a time to barter our heritage for the promise of a mess of pottage?"

"THINK OF IT.

"When the war closed the Republican party ruled every State in the Union but seven. It had a two-thirds majority in both branches of Congress, the Presidency, and all the patronage and power of the Government behind it. It had cut slavery out of the Constitution with the sword, and pinned the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to it with bayonets. It had placed the heel of the slave on the neck of the master in eleven States, and turned them over to the tender mercies of the thief, the carpetbagger, and the adventurer.

"The Democratic party lifted up the white man and armed him with the ballot. It restored home rule and honest government. It has fought the battles of the masses against the classes, growing stronger even in defeat, until the hearts of the majority of the people are with it in the struggle. Twice it has elected the President, and in the last Presidential election it recorded a large majority of the popular vote, though beaten in the electoral college by the most shameless bribery and corruption in the pivotal States. It has controlled the Senate once, and has held power in the popular branch of Congress twelve out of the last sixteen years. In the last State elections it elected thirty out of forty-four governors of the States. Repeatedly it has formed the lines and led the forces of the people right up to certain victory, but on the eve of every struggle we find men going through our ranks saying: 'The Democratic party has done nothing for you.' 'It is not much better than the Republican party.' 'It can not win.' 'It is not making the fight on the right principles.' 'It will not do to trust its leaders.'

"As long as the people permit themselves to be divided up by such talk the Republican party will retain power in some branch of the Government, if not in all. We have so often seen certain victory turned into disastrous defeat by such methods that it would seem every voter in the United States ought to be able to see through it by this time, and to understand that we must either win the fight by adhering to certain well-defined principles, or we can not win at all. Having fought the Republican party for thirty years and educated the people to believe that class legislation is a crime against the masses, it is not reasonable to believe that they can be changed on the eve of battle into an army to demand and fight for class legislation. The people hurled the party of class legislation from power last year by an unprecedented majority, and those who did it will not be ready to abandon the principles next year on which they won that splendid victory."

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] drew a graphic picture of the protected classes coming to the Committee of Ways and Means in the Fifty-first Congress and demanding the right to exact tribute of the people according to their own greed under the McKinley bill. The Republican programme in that Congress contemplated the passage of the McKinley bill, the permanent establishment of the gold standard, the depletion of the Treasury by a pauper pension bill, and by subsidies to sugar-producers, steamship lines, and other favored interests, and all this was to be fastened upon the people in perpetuity by the passage of the force bill.

THE FORCE BILL NOT DEAD.

Through the silver men in the Senate the force bill failed, and the people only returned a handful of its advocates to this House.

Defeat did not alter the programme. It is the same now that it was then. The same leaders are in the saddle to-day who controlled it then, and they proclaim on this floor and elsewhere their devotion to and their determination to pass the force bill should they be restored to power.

"They only wait for the people to relax their vigilance. Do they wait in vain? Let us turn back a few pages of recent history and see. When the Republican party committed that stupendous crime against the people in 1873—the demonetization of silver—the people overwhelmed it with defeat at the next election. After waiting six years for that storm to pass it returned to power in the House in the Forty-seventh Congress, ever since stigmatized as the Keifer Congress. It enjoyed the distinction for ten years of having been the most dishonest, corrupt, and extravagant Congress in our history. The people were again stirred with indignation, and they again banished the Republican party from power in the House, and many then believed it would never return again. The storm of popular wrath spent its fury in ten years."

In the Fifty-first Congress it returned to power again. It

bankrupted the Treasury in two years and the people smote it with their ballots and buried it. It appropriated more than a billion dollars, a sum so vast that the imagination can scarcely grasp it, a sum that if it were collected in one day would "take nearly two-thirds of all the money in the United States to pay it, and it would wreck every merchant, every bank, and every financial institution in the country. A rate of taxation which would meet such expenditures would absorb every dollar of money in circulation in the United States in a fraction over three years. In the face of these facts it is not surprising that the last election resulted in the most overwhelming defeat for the Republican party ever recorded against any political party, but it is surprising to find the army of the people threatened with disintegration in the face of such a powerful, unscrupulous, well-disciplined, and dangerous foe.

THE SPIRIT OF DISCORD.

"What is the cause of these dissensions? It is a quarrel over the financial policy which shall be adopted when the forces of reform get complete control of the Government. That is about as wise as it would be for the prospective heirs of a strong and vigorous man to quarrel and fight over the division of his estate before his death and in his presence." It would be wise to take the robber hand out of the people's pocket first, and then consider the means of putting back the money. To pursue the opposite course would only give the robber more money to take away.

"What would have been the fate of the Prussian army if it had quarreled over the division of the spoils in front of Paris, divided into two factions, and these two factions had turned their guns against each other? Napoleon routed the allied armies in detail and made the crowns of kings his playthings until he educated all Europe in the art of war, but when they concentrated their forces at Waterloo the star of his destiny set to rise no more. That is a lesson from history for us. The Republican party was born a minority party, it has lived a minority party, and it will die a minority party; but for thirty years it has beaten the great army of reform whenever it found it divided. It still holds the Presidency and the Senate. It is organized and disciplined as thoroughly as Napoleon's army ever was. It is led by bold and brilliant men, thoroughly schooled in the arts of political warfare, and is backed by millions of money, which we have seen, to the shame of the American people, is a mighty power in politics as well as in war.

"Why is it that every time the Democratic party makes the issues for the people and Republican defeat seems certain, why is it that some new issue, some new scheme, some apple of discord is brought forward to distract, mislead, and divide our people?"

"Those who want reform in legislation would do well to get control of the Government before they begin to quarrel about the details of administration. They should remember the Englishman's rule for cooking a rabbit: 'First catch your rabbit.'

"Those who advocate tariff reform, free coinage of silver, an increased volume of currency, Government supervision of the means of transportation, the abolition of class distinctions in legislation, the suppression of monopolies and trusts, the suppression of gambling in agricultural products, an income tax to pay pensions, an honest, clean, economical administration of the Government, and the policy of 'equal rights to all and special privileges to none,' belong with the Democratic party. They are at war with the Republican party on every material issue, and they must know that Republican success would be the death of their hopes.

"They are with the Democratic party on every material issue, and in its success lies their only hope of relief. The man who does not know that either the one or the other of these parties will elect the next President does not understand the alphabet of politics. The so-called People's party had the double misfortune to be a misconception and prematurely born.

THIRD PARTY DOCTRINES.

"There is but one 'people's party' and that is the Democratic party.

"This new party declares for the Democratic policy on nearly all the material issues, and adds to it the subtreasury idea, woman suffrage, Government ownership of the railroads and the telegraph lines, and adds the following significant resolution:

"Resolved, That while the party in power in 1869 pledged the faith of the nation to pay a debt in coin that had been contracted on a depreciated currency basis and payable in currency, thus adding nearly \$1,000,000,000 to the burdens of the people, which meant gold for the bondholders and depreciated currency for the soldier, and holding that the men who imperiled their lives to save the life of a nation should have been paid in money as good as that paid to the bondholders, we demand the issue of legal-tender Treasury notes in sufficient amount to make the pay of the soldiers equal to par with coin, or such other legislation as shall do equal and exact justice to the Union soldiers of this country.

"These resolutions will not commend it to our people.

"Woman suffrage, under the most favorable conditions, would

not suit our people, much less under the existing conditions. On the latter resolution there will be an almost universal sentiment against it.

"The Southern States are now being drained of between forty and fifty million dollars annually to pay pensions to these same soldiers, and that money never returns.

"If the pensioners were equally distributed in every State, county, and town the general prosperity would not be so much affected, but with the South paying such vast sums every year, which never return to her people, she suffers a financial depletion which will be a serious obstacle to her prosperity and progress for the next half century unless an income-tax is imposed to pay pensions.

"But the third party advocates say it will not cost the people a cent to pay the soldiers; that the resolution provides that they shall be paid by issuing Treasury notes. True it would not cost much to print the notes, but it would cost somebody something to issue them. It did not cost much to print Confederate money, but it cost the people who received it something. Such argument is too absurd to require an answer.

"A very small quantity of that brand of reform which would begin by looting the Treasury to bribe soldiers will go a long way with our people.

"We have had too much of that already.

"It is passing strange that this exclusively patriotic party especially charged with the welfare of the farmers of the United States, did not adopt a resolution to pay the farmers the difference between the value of greenbacks and gold for the supplies which they furnished to feed the armies and the people while the war was going on, and after it closed, up to the resumption of specie payment in 1879. They might have searched around for some tender spot in their hearts toward their unfortunate brethren of the South who furnished supplies to the Army for which they have never received anything, and passed a resolution to pay them the gold value of the supplies they furnished, but they are evidently not looking South for aid."

They are willing to give the soldiers of the late war an additional billion of dollars, which would levy a tax of about \$16 a head on every man, woman, and child in the United States. Their sympathies go out to the soldiers to whom the people have paid in pensions alone \$1,329,105,844.10 since the close of the war, besides pay and bounties. If they mean to right the wrongs of the past, why did they not propose to pay to the unfortunate farmers of the South the \$66,000,000 cotton tax unconstitutional collected from them at a time when the ravages of war had entailed untold hardships on them? Why did they not declare for paying out the ten millions of dollars now in the Treasury to the credit of the captured and abandoned-property fund, which the Supreme Court has decided belongs to the Southern people? They seem to think the soldiers need a bribe to accept their doctrines, but they compliment the honesty of the Southern farmers at the expense of their intelligence by taking it for granted that the subtreasury plan will be sufficient to seduce them from their party allegiance.

THE SUBTREASURY PLAN.

The subtreasury plan is one of those loose, undefined, and indefinable suggestions which is not there when you attempt to put your hand on it. It is held up as a general panacea for every ill, but as a measure for legislative consideration it is practically "without form and void."

"I have regarded the measure as clearly unconstitutional and absolutely impracticable, and the discussion of it as irrelevant. I would not be disposed to consider it now but for the fact that it is being used to divide the people who want reform, thus endangering the success of those reforms which are in reach, by directing their attention and their efforts to the attainment of imaginary benefits not at all practicable.

"When we see a very rich and powerful Republican leader suddenly stricken with a violent love for the people in the face of the imminent danger of annihilation which confronts the party of plutocracy and the classes, of which he has so long been a shining light, and when this affection becomes so strong just before a Presidential election that he puts his machine to work to divide the South and West with his theories of reform, and when we see so many foreign missionaries on the stump painting rainbows for the people, and telling them that there are bags of gold at the ends of them, it is time for Democrats to go to work and see that this country is not delivered into the hands of the Republican party for another four years by any of the tricks of political diplomacy.

"There were two bills introduced in the last Congress embodying the subtreasury plan, one by Mr. PICKLER of South Dakota and one by Senator VANCE of North Carolina. The bills were identical except that the Pickler bill provided for the election by the people of the managers of the proposed warehouses, and

the Vance bill provided for their appointment by the Secretary of the Treasury, the latter being the constitutional method of selecting such officers.

"For convenience I will quote from the Pickler bill.

"It provides that subtreasuries shall be established in any county in any State where the average gross amount per annum of cotton, wheat, corn, oats, and tobacco produced and sold in that county for the last preceding two years exceeds the sum of \$500,000."

"It provides further, that the Government shall build warehouses in such counties on lands donated for that purpose, and that owners of cotton, wheat, corn, oats, or tobacco may deposit the same in the subtreasury nearest the point of its production, and receive therefor Treasury notes hereinafter provided for, equal at the date of deposit to 80 per cent of the net value of such products at the market price."

"It further provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue legal-tender Treasury notes in such amounts as may be required for the purposes of the bill.

"It further provides that the manager of the Subtreasury shall give a warehouse receipt for the commodities stored, showing the amount and grade or quality of the commodity, its value at the time of deposit, the amount advanced on it, that the interest on the money advanced is at the rate of 1 per cent per annum, and expressly stating the amount of insurance, weighing, classing, warehousing and other charges that will run against it, which shall be negotiable by indorsement, and shall entitle the holder to redeem the commodity upon repayment of the principal, interest, and charges. It further provides that the managers shall receive salaries not exceeding \$1,500 per annum, and that all commodities not redeemed within twelve months shall be sold at public auction and the proceeds applied first to the payment of the Government claim against it, and the balance, if any, to the holder of the warehouse receipt.

"This I believe is a full and correct statement of the substance of the provisions of the Pickler bill. It is but fair to state that I understand that these bills will be amended by other provisions providing for the loan of Treasury notes on land at one-half its assessed value, as well as on crops.

NOT A RELIEF MEASURE.

"I am heart and soul with the effort to secure just legislation for the farmer, but I could not give my support to this measure, because I do not believe it is a relief measure.

"I will not call in question the sincerity of those who believe differently, but with my knowledge of the subject, after a patient and careful investigation and study of the situation with an earnest desire to find the true remedy, I would be guilty of a deliberate deception and fraud upon my constituents were I to tell them that they ought to look to this measure for relief. When they ask for fish I am not willing to give them a serpent. When they ask for bread I am not willing to give them a stone. I am not only convinced that the measure will never become a law, but I am convinced that it ought not to become a law. The very moment we adopt a class measure we furnish a club to beat out our own brains. We can not be for class legislation and against it in the same breath. We stand convicted of insincerity when we demand 'equal rights to all and special privileges to none,' and at the same time demand for ourselves privileges which we deny to others.

"The people of the United States can not be induced to change the convictions of a lifetime in the twinkling of an eye, nor will they trust their dearest interests in the hands of any party that sets its sails to go in two directly opposite directions at the same time.

"This bill would create a great army of new and expensive officers to be appointed by the Administration. It is already hard enough to change a dishonest and corrupt administration, and this bill would make it next to impossible. It would not only open wide the door to fraud and favoritism in the grading and classification of cotton and grain, but it would afford the surest and most dangerous medium for the corruption of our elections. It would be the means of placing the cotton-planters at the mercy of the spinners, who would stop their mills, or run on short time, until their stock of cotton on hand would be exhausted, knowing that at the end of the year the cotton stored would be forced on the market and sold at public auction. It would give them the opportunity and the excuse to sell their stock of manufactured goods on hand at higher prices so that the profits on that would pay them better to be idle for one year than to run their machinery.

"Higher prices for cotton goods would diminish consumption, and the consumer would suffer with the cotton-planter. At the end of the first year the cotton which had been stored for the year would be forced into the market to compete with and lower the price of the second crop. If the second crop should be stored

it would be stored at the reduced price, and the mills would have plenty of the first crop to supply the demand and wait for another Government sale. So the last condition of the planter could be worse than the first. If this bill had been in force as law last fall (1890), and farmers had stored their cotton they would have lost about 2 cents a pound on it by the decline in prices without any artificial influences to lower the prices, and the Government would have been a loser, too."

If the Government had locked up the cotton in the fall of 1891 at the market price in Memphis, which was 9½ cents a pound, October 1, 1891, it would have suffered a loss of over 30 per cent by April 1, 1892. The farmer would have received 80 per cent and lost 20 per cent. The Government would have lost 10 per cent and the charges on it. I am informed that New York alone sold over 20,000,000 bales of futures during this time, and the market was steadily forced downward by sales of "wind cotton" against the actual product of the farmer.

To stop speculators from selling cotton futures, making "wind sales," in competition with the cotton-planters would, it seems to me, be better than to help the speculators by locking the cotton up in warehouses and making the Government furnish the money to carry it. If the farmer deposits his cotton and gets the money, 80 per cent of its value, he or somebody for him must return that money to get the cotton, and in addition he must pay the charges on it. He must return more than he receives. If getting the money out in the fall increases the volume of money and puts all values higher, returning it will again reduce values to the former level. He must buy his supplies in the fall and winter or he could hold his cotton himself and pay no charges. He then will be forced to buy his supplies at the higher prices caused by depositing the cotton crop and adding the money borrowed on it to the volume of currency. But when the cotton crop is taken out of the warehouse the volume of money would be no greater than it was when it was deposited, and the price would be no better, though the farmer would be out the charges.

I have already shown how the spinner and the speculator would take advantage of it. If they can command the capital to control the market now by future sales, how much easier they could control it by buying up the 20 per cent receipts held by depositors of crops. They could then have 80 per cent of the amount carried by the Government without interest, and they would only have to furnish the other 20 per cent.

"HOLD YOUR WHEAT."

Last summer and fall there was an abundance of disinterested advice to farmers to hold their wheat for \$1.50 a bushel. Wheat was selling at 97 cents a bushel in Chicago when the third "hold your wheat" circular was issued. It is now selling at 84 cents a bushel. If the Government had been in the warehouse business and the farmers had deposited at 97 cents instead of selling, they would have sustained this loss of 13 cents a bushel. No doubt many who took the gratuitous advice to hold their wheat last fall are now "holding the bag" while those who advised it are enjoying the profits.

"It might in certain contingencies advance the price of grain to lock it up, for people must eat; but until the South becomes a seller instead of a buyer of grain she would be the victim and not the beneficiary of such a measure. I believe that instead of stopping gambling in agricultural products it would be a great help to it, in causing fluctuations in the markets by interfering with the natural laws of trade. If the farmers want to stop that they would do better to insist on such legislation as will break up the option business.

"The Pickler bill is objectionable because it discriminates against the smaller and poorer counties, where help is most needed, in favor of the larger and richer counties.

"If it were a good measure I would not be willing to confine it to one or two counties in my district, but would want to give all an equal showing. I am opposed to any measure which would authorize or enable the Federal Government to lock up and hold the grain of the country.

PHARAOH'S SUBTREASURY SCHEME.

"I have never wanted the Government to carry the key to the corn crib since I read how Joseph, Pharaoh's subtreasury agent, beat the Egyptians out of their lands and their personal property by establishing government warehouses.

"It is objectionable, because if the Government is going to extend help to those who need it by loaning money on agricultural products and mortgages it should begin with the laborer on the farm, the tenant, and the cropper, who are compelled to mortgage their growing crops for the supplies necessary to enable them to create the wealth which lays the groundwork for the prosperity of the whole country. It is objectionable because it is class legislation, and at war with the fundamental principles of the Government as laid down by Thomas Jefferson and promulgated by the farmers in their resolutions at St. Louis and

Ocala, in which they declare that they favor 'equal rights to all and special privileges to none.'

"To make this measure square by that declaration it would have to be amended so as to authorize any owner of any species of property, which would furnish equally good security for a debt, to turn it over to the Government and make the Government take proper care of it for one year, or a shorter period, and loan him 80 per cent of its value. That would add thousands of articles to the list upon which money might be borrowed, and would expand the business of the Government until Federal officials would be as thick as skippers in an old cheese, and the Government would be about as rotten as the cheese.

"It is not necessary for me to repeat what I have said about class legislation. I know it is urged by some that we should adopt this plan unless we can speedily repeal the class legislation now in force. That is not a sound argument. A sick man might with as much consistency take poison because he is despondent about immediately regaining perfect health. If we stand by principle we will not fail. We have been in the wilderness a shorter time than the Israelites were, and they reached the promised land. Every time they turned from principle to worship golden calves they lost their way and protracted their wanderings. If our people abandon principle and hunger after the flesh-pots of Egypt when we are in sight of the promised land, self-government by the people will fail, and plutocracy will build an empire on the ruins of the republic. God made right the remedy for wrong. Let us pursue it. The doctrine that wrong rights wrong or that two wrongs make a right will not bring happiness or prosperity to individuals or to nations."

I believe the later exponents of the subtreasury plan are laying particular stress on the idea of issuing irredeemable Treasury notes, to be loaned on land to farmers. The history of the man who is forced to mortgage his homestead to borrow money is usually briefly recorded in the courts, showing that he lost his home.

In Tennessee the Democratic party put into the constitution a provision exempting a homestead of the value of \$1,000 from execution in the hands of each head of a family, and no creditor can turn a family out of doors which has once acquired a homestead. The wife may join in a deed to convey it, but without her consent her husband can not sell it, and his creditors can not touch it. Such, I understand, is the law in many other States. I think it a wise provision, and one of the surest safeguards of the Republic.

You can not make a slave of a free citizen armed with the ballot and protected by the Constitution of his country, in the enjoyment of a home for his family. He may not live sumptuously, he generally has to struggle hard for a living under the present unjust system of taxation and finance, but he can sleep soundly after his toil, because he knows that the Constitution guarantees to his wife and little ones a shelter from the storm.

SAVE THE HOMESTEAD.

The home is the foundation upon which society and government rest. It should be protected and preserved. If I could be heard by every woman in the land whose husband has provided a homestead, I would say to her, "Never mortgage the homestead." As a Democrat and as a friend of those who need financial relief I am opposed both to irredeemable money and to establishing Government agencies to loan money on lands. I do not want to see the homes of the people mortgaged to the Government to borrow money. I do not want to see the Government either sell the lands to land syndicates or become the owner of them. I do not want to see the Government lease it or rent it to the people, or repudiate the money loaned on it. I want to see the homesteads of the people sacredly preserved from Government ownership and corporate control.

These subtreasury propositions of the third party are not constitutional.

"There is not a word or a line in the Constitution which authorizes the Government to loan money to the people, and there is nothing in it from which such power can be implied. We are told that it has loaned money, and that Congress may do anything under 'the general welfare' clause which the majority may think would promote 'the general welfare.' If that be true, then the other provisions of the Constitution are meaningless and useless. We had the very same argument when the Blair bill bribe was put forward to divide our people and put the Republican party in power. We have seen what a hollow mockery and shallow fraud that was. The Republican party no sooner had the power to pass it than they repudiated it.

"To argue that the Republican party has loaned the public money, and therefore it is constitutional, is false logic. If that is true, Congress has the right to overturn the State government of Massachusetts and to drive her Legislature from the State capitol, because the Republican party did that in Louisiana. If that proposition is true, you can drive a four-horse wagon through

every provision of the Constitution and never touch it. The Federal Government has no money to loan. It puts a stamp on gold and silver which makes it money, because the Constitution says Congress shall have the power 'to coin money.' It issues legal-tender Treasury notes which it redeems in gold and silver, but the gold and silver to redeem them is the money of the people, collected by taxation. They circulate on the credit of the Government because the holder can go to the Treasury any day and get gold or silver for them, or pay any debt to the Government with them.

"The United States is not a money-making institution. It does not create a dollar of wealth. The Constitution says 'that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises, to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.' If this language of the Constitution can be stretched to authorize the loan of money to the people it can be stretched to authorize the gift of it. I think precedents may be found for giving away the public money, but I suppose it will hardly be argued that we ought to follow such precedents and give the public money to individuals or to classes. The argument for a gift is equally as strong from a constitutional standpoint as it is for a loan, for if the decision of the majority that the 'general welfare' demands it would make it constitutional to loan money, the decision of the majority that 'the general welfare' demands it would make it constitutional to give it. It requires no argument to show where that would lead us.

"Following in the same line, the decision of the majority that 'the general welfare' demands it would make it constitutional for the Government to engage in farming, manufacturing, mining, merchandising, running hotels, keeping livery stables, or any other branch of private business now conducted by private persons. Such a policy would soon make the sovereign citizen a Government slave.

PATERNAL GOVERNMENT.

"If this is sound public policy it would seem that the Government might act the paternal part better by dispensing with the idea of exacting security of its children and give money to them according to their necessities, commencing with the most needy and continuing its benefactions until everyone would have his needs supplied. One trouble about all this is that to give paper money any value when issued it must be redeemable, and to redeem it the Government would have to turn around and tax the people as much money as it had issued paper. It certainly would not be profitable to pay tax-collectors to collect money from the people and then pay other officers to give it back to them, much less to loan it to them and charge them interest on it. If somebody else paid the taxes it might be different, but the very people who need the money most are the same people who pay the taxes and who bear the burdens of the Government.

"Even if the Government were to engage in issuing money to loan, would it be right to give one man the privilege of borrowing on his property as security, and to deny that privilege to his neighbor, who has property of a different kind, which affords equally good security. That sort of unfair discrimination would not be tolerated.

"To make it conform to the principle of 'equal rights to all and special privileges to none,' the Government must loan to all who offer equally good security, or it must not loan to anybody. I presume if the Government should embark in the business of loaning money that everybody would want to borrow, especially if it would be profitable to the borrower.

"How much money would be loaned on crops? The value of the crops mentioned would approximate \$2,000,000,000. The assessed value of lands was in the neighborhood of eleven billions in 1880, and is much greater now. Suppose one-half the crops should be stored, and \$1,000,000,000 be issued on them, and that money should be loaned on land at one-half its assessed value to the full amount, that would give us over six billions of greenbacks in addition to the billion and a half of money we now have. The per capita circulation, which is now a little over \$24, would be increased to something like \$116. While I am a sincere advocate of more money I do not think we could stand anything like that.

"The Argentine Republic tried to float a currency based on land, and it resulted most disastrously. It was like a marriage aid association—it worked beautifully as long as the period of inflation lasted, but when the climax was reached it collapsed, and the whole financial world was shaken to its foundation. Some of the strongest financial institutions in Europe and in this country went down in the crash, and the Bank of England was only saved by the intervention of France.

"It came very near causing a panic in the United States, and if Secretary Windom had not opened the doors of the Treasury and poured \$200,000,000 into Wall street we would have had the most disastrous panic this country ever experienced."

He poured that money into Wall street by purchasing bonds at a premium, and demonstrated the connection between Wall street and the Treasury of the United States, a connection which must be dissolved by a change in our financial system in the interest of the people.

"While we escaped a panic it caused many financial disasters in this country, and we are still suffering from the effects of it. France tried a land-loan currency once in her history, with disastrous results. Tennessee tried the experiment of establishing a bank to issue money to loan on lands, in a time of great financial distress, and it was a failure.

MORE MONEY AND GOOD MONEY.

"We want a larger volume of currency, but we do not want a depreciated currency. The inevitable effect of putting in circulation a greater volume of currency than the Government could float at par by making provision for its redemption at the pleasure of the holder would be to depreciate its value. The evils of such a currency always afflict the laboring man most. It could only benefit the speculator. The fewer dollars a man has the more important it is to him that they shall have a certain fixed value. When the laboring man goes to bed at night with the dollar in his pocket which he has earned by the sweat of his brow he wants to know that it will still be a dollar when he wakes up in the morning.

"I agree that we want our greenbacks to be as good as gold or silver, but if we were to make land notes, or cotton notes, or wheat notes they would sell at a discount like individual time notes based on such security. If the Government were to stand between the borrower and the noteholder, taking the proposed security from the borrower, and giving him twelve months' time in which to pay, while it promised the noteholder to redeem in gold or silver on demand, its paper would be discredited before it could put the first billion dollars afloat, and by the time it could supply the demand of the borrowers its credit, I am afraid, would be little better than that of the Argentine Republic.

THE TRUE PLAN.

"The way to financial relief appears plain to me. The first step is to adopt a just system of taxation. The next is the free coinage of silver. The next is to substitute legal-tender notes for national-bank notes, or to supplement the present circulation with sufficient volume of legal-tender Treasury notes to transact the business of the country without special advantage or injury to anybody. To that I would add the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on the issue of State banks so as to permit free banking. The advocates of more money can get out of the woods by abandoning the unconstitutional and impracticable loan feature of the subtreasury bill and making the naked issue of more money. That fight they can win. The other they can not win. They will find before the fight is over that they will need to concentrate their forces on the lines where they are all united. They will not have any strength to waste in chasing rainbows."

The gentleman refers to the platform adopted in South Carolina by an alleged Democratic convention. I invite the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the platform of the Democratic party of my State just adopted at Nashville, and if he will compare it with my views expressed last year, and reiterated here to-day he will see that I am in harmony with my party, and that the Democratic party in Tennessee has not departed from the teachings of the fathers.

A DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

We, the Democratic party of Tennessee, in convention assembled, believe that the powers delegated by the people should be strictly construed; that the autonomy of the States and the rights of local self-government and home rule should be jealously guarded; that no money should be taken from the people under any pretext for other than public purposes; that the strictest economy should be exercised in all governmental expenditures, whether local, State, or national; that legislation should be confined to the legitimate objects of government; that public office is a solemn public trust. We are uncompromisingly opposed to the enlargement and concentration of Federal powers; to the usurpation by the central Government of the functions of the States; to bounties and subsidies in every form; to every species of class legislation and government partnership with private enterprises; to the whole theory and practice of paternalism.

The Democratic party is the fast friend of the farmer and laboring man. We recognize the fact that they are unjustly burdened; and we sympathize with them in all proper attempts at relief; but we regard as illusory, impracticable, and unconstitutional all such measures as the subtreasury, land-loan schemes and governmental ownership of railroad and telegraph lines. We think many good men have been misled in Tennessee by erroneous teachings on these points, and therefore, in utmost kindness, we invite all classes to join with us in persistent efforts to restore the prosperity of the country by legitimate means. The Democratic party is alone able and willing to adopt and pursue a course of legislation that would secure the equal rights of all classes.

We denounce the course of the last Republican Congress to whose record we call attention, as showing the dangers of Republican rule. We condemn its wasteful and corrupt expenditure of public money by reason of which the appropriations have not only reached the unparalleled sum of \$1,000,000,000, or about \$8 per annum for every man, woman, and child in the country, but laws have been enacted making a satisfactory reduction of expenditures impossible except by a repeal of those laws which can not be done until the Democratic party comes into full control of the Government. We condemn the passage of the McKinley act as a base surrender of the greed of tariff built trusts.

We condemn its reciprocity policy as a temporizing scheme intended to soothe the people with a measure of partial free trade, delay the downfall of monopoly and throw a sop to New England. We condemn its attempt to pass that monstrous and infamous measure known as the force bill, by which it was sought to rule the people of the South by the bayonets of Federal power rather than by the ballots of its own citizens. We condemn its policy of building up private industries and private fortunes by means of largesses from the public Treasury.

While we favor liberal expenditures for pensions, we utterly condemn the reckless granting of pensions to sixty-day sutlers, camp followers, and bounty jumpers, and the making of the whole pension system a huge machine for the distribution of party spoils. We condemn it as a part of the general policy of the Government under the Republican rule to drain the South of its wealth and carry it to more favored sections. We favor the enactment of a law levying a graduated tax upon the swollen incomes of the rich to be held and used as a trust fund for the payment of pensions.

We favor currency of gold, silver, and of paper convertible into coin at the option of the holder, and in such amount as will meet the business necessities of internal trade and commerce among the people; and we further favor a parity of the two metals as a common unit of value and as a legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private, as existed under the laws of the United States down to the infamous and surreptitious demonetization of silver in 1873 by the Republican party; and we further favor the continued coinage of both silver and gold bullion in such manner as that every dollar so coined shall be equal to every other dollar.

The Democratic party believe that the Federal Government alone has the right and power under the Constitution to coin and issue its money circulation; that the national banking system is a monopoly, conferring unequal and unprecedented privileges upon the rich and land-holding classes, enabling them to draw interest from the Government and from the people, both upon their capital and upon their debts at the same time.

The Democratic party is opposed to secret political organizations as subversive of good government.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the moment a Republican gets up there are plenty of gentlemen ready to say that he is not talking on the question before the House.

Mr. ENLOE. I am sorry that the gentleman made that remark.

Mr. WALKER. I only wanted to call attention to the fact. I think the gentleman has a right to make the speech he is making.

Mr. ENLOE. Nobody has ever, to my knowledge, charged the gentleman with talking about any subject that was before the House at the time. [Laughter.] I generally do say something about the subject under consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] is perfectly consistent in advocating a rural free-delivery system which would mount carriers on horseback and send them to every habitation in the land to deliver and collect the mails. That idea is consistent with the idea of having a subtreasury in every county where every farmer can go and deposit his produce and borrow money from Government agents. It is consistent with the idea of having loan agencies established in every portion of the country to loan money upon land. It is consistent with the idea of the Government owning all the railroads, so that every railroad employé in the United States would be a "striker" for the administration. It is consistent with the idea of having the Government own all the telegraphs, so that we should have the whole telegraph force of the country added to the list of Government officials.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that if the gentleman from Georgia follows out his own argument to its legitimate conclusion—and he says that such are his instructions from his constituency—he will soon find himself not merely in the Republican camp, but he will find that he has charged right through the Republican line, and is leading it, in the work of centralizing the Government. [Laughter.] I admit, however, that the gentleman is perfectly consistent in all this, if he wants a strong centralized government controlled by the office-holding and tax-eating classes instead of a republic controlled by the uncorrupted and patriotic suffrages of the majority of the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to rural free delivery as advocated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLARKE], which would establish boxes along the star routes where the mail carriers have to travel so that they could stop to take up the mail and carry it to and from the centers for the convenience of the people. I think that is a wise suggestion. But I would object very seriously to having added to the 66,384 postmasters we already have three times as many more postal officers, or perhaps a much larger number than that, all of whom would be administration strikers.

I do not want agents of any administration, like a mounted police, visiting every man's house to deliver and collect the mail. They would become active agents for the administration in power, as our postmasters generally are. Why, sir, they held a convention down in my State the other day—I believe my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] was present. That convention indorsed the Administration and appointed delegates to Minneapolis to make a nomination for the Presidency, and I am told that when that convention assembled the post-offices were deserted all over the State by the postmasters and the offices were left in charge of assistants. I am told that the postmasters were at Nashville. I am told that the district attorneys were

there with their assistants. I am told that the internal-revenue collectors with their forces were on hand. I am told that all the United States marshals rallied their forces there.

Now, suppose the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] could have his various schemes which he proposes for the relief of the people carried out; suppose he could have Government ownership of the railroads and telegraphs, with subtreasuries and loan agencies in every county, and also this rural free delivery, with a carrier or two attached to each rural post-office, and half a dozen men at some, going from house to house to deliver and gather the mail, does he believe, does any sane man man in this House believe that it would ever be possible, under such a system, to change a national administration, whether it was Republican or Democratic?

Mr. Chairman, if the Democratic party had control of this Government to-day, if it had the Presidency and both branches of Congress, I should still oppose this character of legislation, because I would not be willing to see the Democratic party, or any other party, placed in a position where it could not be held accountable to the people, because of the vast army of Federal officeholders behind it.

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama. If that were the case not only would it be difficult to turn out a political party, but it would be almost impossible to make a change in the personal incumbent of the Presidency, a change which it is understood is very much desired by some of our friends on the other side. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. It would be impossible to correct any abuse in the administration of the Government. No matter what abuses might exist, no matter what dishonesty or corruption might exist, with such a concentration of power in the hands of the President of the United States, under the control of a political party with such able and ambitious managers as the Republican party has, it would be impossible ever again to change the administration. The force bill, so boldly championed by the Administration through its spokesman, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, in the debate on this floor a few days ago, would be abandoned as superfluous if the gentleman from Georgia could get these measures adopted. The army of officers which the "force bill" would require to carry it into execution would be insignificant in comparison.

OUR FEDERAL PAY ROLL.

I have been at some trouble to collect, in order that I might lay it before the House and the country, as definite information as possible in relation to the scope and bearing of these measures. I invite attention to a tabulated statement by Mr. Ames, superintendent of documents, Department of the Interior. It is a summary from the first volume of the Blue Book for 1891, and shows the number of persons in the civil service of the Government, except postal service, including military and naval officers and cadets, and exclusive of the men of the line in the Army and Navy:

	In Washington.			Elsewhere.			Grand total.
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	
Congress.	933	3	936	—	—	—	936
Executive Office.	22	1	23	—	—	—	23
Department of State.	75	11	86	549	—	549	635
Treasury Department.	2,730	1,359	4,089	12,534	760	13,284	17,373
War Department.	2,134	161	2,295	14,464	230	14,694	16,989
Navy Department.	1,452	55	1,507	7,674	44	7,718	9,225
Department of the Interior.	4,503	2,303	6,806	3,364	963	4,327	11,133
Department of Justice.	529	26	555	—	—	—	555
Department of Agriculture.	366	153	519	1,039	19	1,058	1,577
Department of Labor.	49	9	58	25	2	27	85
Fish Commission.	59	11	70	135	2	137	207
Interstate Commerce Commission.	108	—	108	1	—	1	109
Civil Service Commission.	22	—	22	—	—	—	22
National Soldiers' Home.	—	—	—	3,324	66	3,390	3,390
Government Printing Office.	1,065	968	2,033	—	—	—	2,033
Government of District of Columbia.	1,081	807	1,888	—	—	—	1,888
Miscellaneous offices.	546	88	634	8	—	8	642
Judicial branch of Government.	117	1	118	2,540	8	2,548	2,666
Total.	16,391	5,946	22,337	45,647	2,094	47,741	70,098

I also invite attention to the following table, furnished me by the chief clerk of the Post-Office Department, showing the number of persons employed in that branch of the service, and how employed:

[Memorandum for Hon. B. A. ENLOE, M. C.]	POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK,
	Washington, D. C., January 30, 1892.
Summary of the number of persons employed in connection with the postal service.	
Post-Office Department in Washington.	647
Mail-bag repair shop in Washington.	291

Post-office inspectors	140
Post-office inspectors' clerks	24
Postage-stamp agency	8
Stamp-envelope agency	15
Postal-card agency	4
Postal agency at Shanghai	5
Postmasters	65,094
Assistant postmasters	62,700
Clerks in post-offices	8,708
Letter-carriers	10,630
Sea post-office clerks	12
Star and steamboat service:	
Professional contractors	261
Local contractors	3,819
Subcontractors	12,174
Carriers other than contractors or subcontractors, estimated	1,973
Special office carriers	1,903
Regulation wagon service:	
Contractors	22
Subcontractors	15
Carriers other than contractors or subcontractors, estimated	300
Railroad service, contractors	2,311
Railway postal clerks	6,341
Mail-messenger service	7,034
Total	184,431

The number of postmasters has been increased, since the above statement was made up, to 66,384, which would increase the number of assistant postmasters to about 63,900. As explained to you personally, however, the greater number of these assistants (at third and fourth-class offices) do not receive pay from the United States.

W. B. COOLEY, *Chief Clerk.*

The men of the line in the Army number 25,000. The men of the line in the Navy number 8,250. This shows a total of 287,779 Government officials and employés.

WHAT IT COSTS.

It is interesting to note what amount of money this places at the disposal of the Administration annually. The total appropriations for all purposes for the year ending June 30, 1892, were \$525,018,672.55, to which must be added an indefinite appropriation of \$15,000,000, making the total \$540,018,672.55. Deduct \$135,214,785 appropriated for pensions for 1892, and deduct in round numbers \$85,000,000 for payments on the sinking fund and interest on the public debt, and we have left \$319,803,887.55 to run this immense governmental establishment.

I have not been able to ascertain exactly how much of this is used in paying salaries, but it is safe to say that it is not far from \$175,000,000 annually.

The pension rolls carried on the 1st of this month 840,185 names. The Commissioner of Pensions is now asking for a deficiency appropriation of \$7,674,332 for the present fiscal year. That will bring the amount for pensions for the year ending June 30, 1892, up to \$142,889,117, and it is safe to say that we will be called on to appropriate \$160,000,000 for pensions the next year, and it promises to go on to \$200,000,000 per annum if not checked.

The net public debt May 1, 1892, was \$970,248,153.11 of the Pacific Railroad bonds. We are paying \$48,000,000 annually on account of sinking fund and about \$37,000,000 interest on the public debt proper and the Pacific railroad bonds. Now, if we should buy the railroads and telegraph lines and make the employés Government officials, let us consider the cost and the effect: The value of the railroads in the United States as given by the Superintendent of the Eleventh Census is \$8,500,000,000; the value of the telegraph lines was in 1880 \$116,000,000 and is much greater now. The number of railroad employés in round numbers is 750,000; the number of telegraph employés was in 1880 22,809. The amount of wages paid to railroad employés, exclusive of the officers, is given at \$46,250,000; the amount of wages paid to telegraph employés is not accessible.

So that if the People's party could carry out its plan for Government ownership of railroads and telegraph lines we would have an army of more than 1,060,588 Government employés, drawing salaries amounting to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$240,000,000 annually.

If this third party could carry out its subtreasury and land-loan schemes there would be another large addition to the office-holding class, perhaps twenty thousand more. If it could carry out the idea of its leader in this House, and have a Government official to carry the mail to every house in the United States there would be added between one hundred and one hundred and fifty thousand more to the army of tax-eaters, and the farmers who bear the burden of taxation would have to carry the load.

The possibility of the combined influence of an army of 840,185 pensioners, and a force of Government officials and employés amounting to 287,779 behind a Federal Administration which has the distribution of over \$500,000,000 a year is enough to excite the apprehensions of every true patriot for the safety of the Republic. That is the condition now. Add to this the influence of our present public debt, and the overwhelming addition to it

which the purchase of the railroads and telegraphs would entail, and the power and influence of the army of employés in such service, and it would destroy the liberties of the people.

CENTRALIZATION.

Centralization already presses upon the Republic with a great and increasing power, and such measures as these, which are proposed in the name of the people as relief measures, would precipitate it upon us with crushing force.

It now requires an annual tax of nearly \$8 a head for every man, woman, and child in the United States to run the Government. If we should add \$8,616,000,000 to our public debt by the purchase of the railroads and telegraphs, it would increase the Government employés to three times the present number, and the annual tax, if collected per capita, would be in the neighborhood of \$25 for each man, woman, and child in the United States.

The vast army of officers proposed would be under the control of one man at Washington. It would be absolutely destructive of local self-government by the people. Local self-government by the people means a government directly responsible to the people. Under our Federal system the President is elected, not by a direct vote of the people, but through an electoral college. The ballot is cast for electors and the electors choose the President. Senators are chosen by the State Legislatures and not directly by the people. The House of Representatives is the only part of the Federal system in which the power comes direct from the people, and Representatives in Congress are the only Federal officials who are directly responsible to the people. All the executive and judicial officers are appointed by the President or by his appointees. Federal judges, heads of Departments, foreign ministers and consuls, marshals, district attorneys, and postmasters at Presidential offices are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. All the minor officers are responsible to some man who is responsible to the President, who is supposed to be responsible to the electors. Every Federal officer except a Representative in Congress is from one to three degrees removed from the people except the Federal judiciary, which holds a life tenure.

The people can hold their Representatives in Congress and their State, county, and municipal officers to a direct accountability. Over Federal appointees they have no direct control, and all who have had any experience know how vain it generally is to appeal to the appointing power against the actions of an appointee of the Federal Government.

POPULARIZE THE GOVERNMENT.

We should provide for the election of the President and Senators by a direct vote of the people and bring the Government nearer to the people, instead of running wild after schemes to destroy the liberties of the people by centralizing the powers of the Government. The gentleman from Georgia refers to those Democrats who reject the Ocala platform as "rock-ribbed" and "mossback" Democrats. I do not think a man needs to be very old or very far advanced in Democracy to make him decide against such dangerous doctrines as the third party represents.

If the gentleman means by those terms to indicate unchanging and unchangeable devotion to the true Democratic principles he pays us a compliment. I love a Democrat who is so fixed in his principles, so true to his convictions, so well grounded in his faith in the Democratic theory of government that the fierce and shifting storms of popular passion and popular delusion shall beat upon him in vain. The true Democrat builds his faith on the rock of the Constitution. It is to the mossback and rock-ribbed Democrats that we owe the restoration of local self-government in the South. It is to their courage and devotion to principle that we owe what we have left of free constitutional government in this country. Their ballots to-day guard the ark of the constitutional covenant from the destroying hand of centralization. God speed the coming of the glorious day of their complete power in every branch of this Government.

Mr. CALDWELL. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any statement which I may make in this debate will change the judgment of this House upon the appropriations embodied in the bill. It has been my distinguished honor during my Congressional life to be twice chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads—in the Forty-seventh Congress as well as in the Fifty-first Congress. In the latter Congress that committee brought into the House bills for the maintenance of the postal service for the past and the present fiscal years.

In those two appropriation bills we increased the allowances for postal service \$21,700,000 beyond the appropriations of the Democratic Congress immediately preceding. We brought those bills into this House approved by the unanimous judgment of the committee; and it is of record that in the first session of the

last Congress we brought in a bill appropriating between seventy-two and seventy-three million dollars, incorporating upon it seven distinct items of new legislation for the convenience of the people, and passed it undisputed through the House in exactly nineteen minutes. The bill was based upon a full and complete appreciation of the wants of the people, and the wisdom of the House accepted it.

In the second session of the same Congress we brought in a bill appropriating nearly \$78,000,000. It came to the House with the unanimous indorsement of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, without regard to party; and outside of the general debate, which embraced many subjects not pertinent to the bill under consideration, we passed the bill proper in less than one hour, without the change of a single item. During those two years we added to the appropriations of the preceding Congress, I repeat, \$21,700,000.

What to-day seems to be your policy as a party? It was not your policy with reference to this bill in the last Congress. At that time the minority side of the House never resisted by word or act a single item in either of these appropriation bills of the first or the second session. What do you propose to do to-day? The exhibit of the Postmaster-General tells you, "If you give me the appropriations I ask for, so well established is this service under the generous and wise legislation of a preceding Congress, so healthy and so fruitful a plant have I in my great Department that I will do that for you which has not appeared since 1882; I will exhibit to you and pay into the Treasury upon the best judgment of the experts of the Department, a profit under existing law for the next fiscal year."

What do you do? You cripple him in the most vital parts of his administration; you cripple him where the service needs money for its efficient administration, and this rare and unlooked for financial result, instead of trying to make your service complete, you, for party policy's sake alone, make your post-office bill, which in nowise taxes the people—in nowise taxes them as we understand taxation—you frame your post-office bill so as to add revenues to your Treasury by a reduction below the estimates, in order that the deficiency next year may run into millions. If you give us good legislation, all this would be proper; but you give us no chance for efficient administration. You curtail the service in its living, active, working parts.

I quote nothing new; perhaps familiar to all. The aphorism—and you gentlemen can take it to yourselves, you will have to meet it—the aphorism of Abraham Lincoln in the debates with Stephen A. Douglas. It should have some force and weight in this Congress. His language was simply this: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time; but you can not fool all the people all the time."

I say to you again that when you come to the second session of this Congress you will present to the people a larger body of deficiencies than has ever been presented since the war days to an American Congress. What have you done? I have from the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations a statement which I will read. Estimating the report of the Committee on Agriculture for the maintenance of that Department at half a million dollars more than has been estimated, in accordance with publication in the morning papers, we find this to be the fact:

Table showing the law of 1891 and 1892 of appropriations for the several Departments of the Government, the estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and the amounts reported to the House from the several Committees on Appropriations for the next fiscal year.

Title.	Estimates, 1893.	Reported to the House.		Law, 1891-'92.
		Date.	Amount.	
		1892.		
Agricultural	\$3,360,965.50		\$3,500,000.00	\$3,028,153.50
Army	25,949,207.59	Mar. 5	24,197,899.82	24,613,529.19
Diplomatic and consular	2,138,466.14	Mar. 28	1,599,545.00	1,656,925.00
District of Columbia	5,602,125.17	Mar. 1	4,987,555.27	5,597,125.17
Fortification	9,386,607.00	May 3	2,412,376.00	3,774,803.00
Indian	8,603,907.76	Feb. 13	7,464,219.44	16,386,284.86
Legislative, etc.	22,754,038.05	May 28	21,683,752.05	22,027,674.75
Military Academy	506,320.18	Jan. 25	465,735.18	402,064.64
Navy	27,194,639.80	Mar. 10	32,726,773.00	31,541,654.78
Pension	147,064,550.00	Mar. 4	134,825,066.00	135,214,785.00
Post-Office	80,323,400.51	Apr. 16	78,216,088.92	77,907,222.61
River and Harbor		Apr. 9	21,200,975.00	
Sundry civil	35,183,955.91	Mar. 24	25,157,787.27	37,410,363.99
Total	368,068,213.61		349,527,812.95	359,500,586.49

The estimates of the Department are \$368,068,000. Bills have been reported to the House giving to-day, including the river and harbor of \$21,290,000, the sum of \$349,527,000. In other words, including the river and harbor bill of \$21,000,000 and upwards, you are \$10,000,000 less in appropriations than the law of the years 1891 and 1892, and nineteen millions less than the estimates of the Departments for 1893, including the river and harbor bill.

While you have, seemingly, on the face of the exhibits a reduction from the laws of 1891 and 1892, it is well known to every man in this House who considers the subject, and was stated in debate in another part of the Capitol by a distinguished representative of the Democratic party, that the river and harbor bill in carrying contract obligations incorporated therein, instead of carrying, as against the Treasury of the Government, an expenditure of \$21,000,000, really carries \$47,000,000.

There is no trouble about the revenues of this Government for the present fiscal year or in the fiscal year to follow this. It is a matter of fact well known to all gentlemen here, that since the establishment of the law paying into the sinking fund—since 1862—for some six or eight years during that time, or for a number of years no funds were paid into it at all. Forty-nine millions annually are now required for the sinking fund, but that fund is now between three hundred and four hundred million dollars beyond its obligations, and can be allowed to run without a single payment for the next eight years and the law will be obeyed in every particular. It has been stated elsewhere in debate that at the close of the fiscal year there will be a surplus in your Treasury of \$30,000,000 and over.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, emphasize the assertion that whatever may be your recommendation, whatever may be your line of policy for reducing expenditures or raising revenue, you ought to allow this one Department of the people, which pays its own cost practically, a capable and business administration by sufficient appropriations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the free-delivery matter. This is a subject in which I am very much interested. I represent, closely confined within city limits, over a million of people. Thousands and thousands of business men and interests in my city are directly concerned in this matter, leading hurried business lives and quickly acting interests. If the mails fail of delivery, delay occurs in business; and in a matter of this kind, where the business hours are short, a business man can not afford, in view of the demands made upon him, in view of the exactions and obligations of his work, to incur any delay in the mail service. So that my people have a great stake in the free-delivery system; and for that reason in both bills I had the honor to offer in the last Congress this system was fully cared for, and an additional sum of \$10,000 was offered for the purpose of making experimental free delivery in smaller towns at the discretion of the Postmaster-General.

The committee has seen proper in the present instance to exclude this item from the bill. But they present and recommend favorably to the House another bill wherein they suggest an appropriation of \$100,000 for the purpose of experimenting in this line in other ways. I have no objection to that. I have no objection to any experiment in this service so long as it does not impair the business interests of my people.

Mr. Chairman, what is the history of our free-delivery system? Since 1863 we have had free delivery. What is its record? I need hardly tell you that for ten years after its inception it was a loss to the Government, and there was paid the usual deficiency. But since then, since 1874, it has been growing, has become self-sustaining, and exhibits a profit to the Government. The statement of the Postmaster-General embodied in his report for the last fiscal year gives you for local free delivery a profit of two millions and upwards of one hundred thousand dollars. That profit is given to this great service of five hundred and fifty offices by about twenty of the offices in the great cities, of which my city of Philadelphia is one. Twenty offices threw into the Treasury of the Government upwards of \$2,000,000 clear profit for local free delivery. What is local free delivery? The basis is established on a population of 10,000 or a revenue of \$10,000. You have before you a bill to reduce that to 5,000 population or \$5,000 of revenue. But what is the condition to-day even under the \$10,000 basis and the 10,000 population? In reply to my telegram I have the following response:

I have the honor to inform you that there are now fifty-one offices which have statutory requirements for free delivery—

That is, the 10,000 population or the \$10,000 of revenue—of which number twenty-eight have made application for the service. There are six hundred and twenty-four offices that either have a population of 5,000 or a gross postal revenue of \$5,000 for the last fiscal year.

Therefore, to-day, with the generous appropriations of the last Congress, we have not been carrying the free-delivery service to all the cities of 10,000 population and the \$10,000 revenue basis. But you have before you a 5,000-population basis and \$5,000 of revenue.

I am in accord with it. I want the people of these cities to have all of these conveniences, but in doing so and in extending free delivery to the rural sections which I believe in qualifiedly, well adjusted, and well protected, I do not want the free-delivery service of the great cities that are turning into the Government Treasury millions and millions of dollars for the main-

tenance of the service in sections where it does not pay—I do not want that service impaired, and I do not think there is a man on this floor who will criticise my position in connection with the general proposition.

What is the other item that I take exception to? I take exception to your nonallowance of the necessary amount for clerk hire. The clerk hire of the post-offices goes to first and second class offices, and to what are called separating offices of the third and fourth class. I maintain that in your increase of this appropriation for the next fiscal year in this bill, over the appropriation for the present fiscal year, of only \$100,000, you have failed to appreciate either the growth, the demands, the wants, or the convenience of the people.

Where they are willing to pay, where the best estimates show you that there will be a profit, you simply take them by the neck and throttle their efficiency, and deprive them of the opportunity of paying you for the service that you will give them at your own price, because under the law the Postmaster-General can not exceed your appropriation save in the items of the payment of postmasters, and railroad transportation. He dare not exceed the allowances given by this Congress in other items.

In the letter-carrier service and in the clerical service I say you injure the great cities that render to you three-quarters of the income of your postal service, and thereby contribute to its maintenance in the sections of the country where it does not pay; I say that you have crippled them in their vital and absolutely necessary parts. I shall, with the permission of the House, ask the privilege of elaborating my remarks directly upon the issues contained in this bill. I desire to advert to that section of the bill with reference to the land-grant roads. What did you do?

Let us try and get at the history of this railroad legislation. Since the act of 1873 railroads have been paid by weight carried. This method of payment was adopted by Congress against the objection and protest of the railroad companies. We forced upon them the method of paying by weight alone, and disregarding speed and space as proper to be paid for. Under this plan the country is divided into four geographical divisions, and once in four years there is a weighing of the mails in each one of the geographical divisions. The division that is weighed to-day is paid upon the basis of its weights of to-day without any regard to what may be the increase in the weight of mails for four long years. The country is growing, business is increasing, and during four years the weight of the mails upon most divisions is sure to increase, and upon some the increase is very large, but the pay of the companies is not increased. Now, with this plan, working in this way, in 1876 you took the act of 1873 and horizontally reduced their pay 10 per cent.

In 1878 you took the then existing law of 1876 and you horizontally reduced the mail pay another 5 per cent. Those are the only changes that there have been in the transportation of inland mails, over the railroads generally—that is, the nonland-grant roads. What did you do with the land-grant roads? The land-grant roads up to that date, since the act of 1850, had been receiving for carrying the mails the full allowances of the law, up to 1873. But you took the land-grant roads and you cut them 10 per cent in 1876, with all other roads, and you cut them 5 per cent again in 1878, with all others, and in addition to that you made a special cut on them of 20 per cent in 1876. That is, while you have cut everyone else 15 per cent, you have already reduced the land-grant roads 35 per cent, and to-day they are receiving only 65 per cent of the mail pay provided originally under the act of 1873, and only 80 per cent of the pay allowed to and received by all other companies, their competitors in business, for performing exactly the same service. Upon that condition they have remained from that day until the incoming of the suggestion in the bill presented by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Now, I desire to know, and it has not been explained, what was in the gentleman's mind that made him fix upon 50 per cent and not a greater or less per cent, and further what was in the gentleman's mind to suggest the necessity of this change. I presume the gentleman will state that it was the economical line of policy that has been followed by his party. The exhibit shows, as he stated, I think, in the debate, that this reduction from 80 per cent down to 50 per cent reduces the amount paid these land grant roads \$849,000. I am within a few thousand dollars of the amount.

This horizontal cut proposed of 30 per cent additional applies, as I understand it, to all the land-grant companies alike, excepting in express terms the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, and other land-grant roads which received aid in bonds. While the other land-grant roads have been receiving 80 per cent of the amounts paid generally these Pacific corporations have been getting 100 per cent right along, and it is not now proposed to touch their pay. This proposition only affects companies that were not given bonds. They are all Western and Southern roads, for the reason that in 1850 to 1860, when the grants were made, there were no vacant lands except in those localities. It appears from the ex-

hibit that some were in Michigan and a small amount in Wisconsin, and the Illinois Central in the State of Illinois. But, with these exceptions, all the land-grant roads touched by the proposition are west of the Mississippi River or south of the Ohio. The greatest reduction falls on the State of Minnesota, and the next upon Iowa; then upon Missouri, and so on.

But the greatest injustice occurs, it strikes me, when your reduction comes to apply to the particular companies. It seems to operate there with the greatest inequality. It is said, for instance, that one road in Iowa, that is called the Burlington Company, received in lands only about 380,000 acres, while another company whose road was located where there were more vacant lands got nearly a million acres. Now, the singular effect of the proposed method of cutting the mail pay is to reduce that of this Burlington Company \$73,211.76 a year, while the pay of the other corporation, that got three times as much land, is only reduced \$25,278.05.

This comes about because the Burlington Company, at the solicitation of the Government, has undertaken a fast-mail service from Chicago to Omaha, for which it provides special trains, and carries a greater weight of mail. It performs, of course, much greater service, and its pay would be cut probably below cost, although it received a comparatively small amount of lands. This inequality will be very apparent in the South, where the lands granted were, in most cases, very poor. "Pine barrens" they were called. But the proposed cut strikes them in proportion as they are now rendering service in carrying the mails, regardless of the amount of lands they got and regardless of the value of those lands.

If their pay is to be reduced on account of lands given to them, why not make the reduction in some proportion to the amount of lands they received and the value of those lands, instead of in proportion to the service they are now rendering in the carriage of the mails? It seems a positive absurdity to cut their pay because they were given lands, and yet do it upon a basis, as between themselves, which has no relation whatever to the amount or value of the lands or to the benefits conferred by the grants.

In other words, instead of being a case where "the punishment fits the crime," it seems to be a case where the punishment has very little relation to the crime.

Now, the land-grant roads, with reference to your mails, in comparison with the transportation of troops and Government supplies or property, stand upon an entirely different basis, as much so as it is possible for two lines of operations to rest upon. You have put in this bill the identical language that you have put in the military bill for the continuance of the military establishment of the Government and upon a basis that was adjudged years ago by the Supreme Court as the basis of adjustment as to allowances under this statute.

What is the law? The section upon which the army clause is based I will quote from the Iowa land-grant act of May 15, 1856, which is the same, substantially, in all of them. It reads as follows:

And the said railroads shall be and remain public highways for the use of the Government of the United States, free from toll or other charge upon the transportation of any property or troops of the United States.

Now, what was meant by the provision that the Government was to have the right to use these roads for military purposes? It was a reservation in case of war, perhaps, or at any rate the Government had the right to use them. The section did not say that the companies must not only furnish the road, but equipment, and, in fact, transport the troops and Government property, and it was therefore necessary for the courts to decide what proportion of the whole expense of carrying troops and munitions of war the Government could fairly claim a reduction for by reason of that clause. The question was brought before the courts and went to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, in 93 United States, at page 451, said:

In view of the legislative history and practice referred to, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion, when we meet with a legislative declaration to the effect that a particular railroad shall be a public highway, that the meaning is that it shall be open to the use of the public with their own vehicles; and that when Congress, in granting lands in aid of such a road, declared that the same shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, it only means that the Government shall have the right to use the road, but not that it shall have the right to require its transportation to be performed by the railroad company. And when this right of the use of the road is granted "free from all toll or other charge for transportation of any property or troops of the United States," it only means that the Government shall not be subject to any toll for such use of the road. This, we think, is the natural and most obvious meaning of the language used, when viewed in the light afforded by the history of railroad legislation in this country.

It was under this decision that the settlements, I believe, were made with the Illinois Central Railroad, which carried a large number of troops during the late war, and before this decision was made it was claimed that they should have carried them for nothing. The courts decided that under this clause reserving the free use of the roads as highways, the Government could deduct 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of the price. Congress afterwards increased

that to 50 per cent, and forced the companies to accept it, and these roads now get 50 per cent for carrying troops—that is, 50 per cent of their regular tariffs. That is the explanation of the "Army clause," as it is called.

But what has that to do with the question of these railroads carrying the mails? The word "mails" is not used in the clause I quote, nor intended to be used. It is in an entirely different clause, put in for an entirely different purpose. If the intention was that the Government should have the free use of the roads for the mails, why did it not say so?

The fact that mails were excluded from the clause I have quoted and that the subject of the mails was treated separately in another clause shows conclusively that there was no intention to reserve the "free use of the road" for carrying the mails, and yet that is the precise thing proposed by your section 3.

The section in regard to the mails simply provides that Congress shall fix the compensation and can compel the companies to carry the mails.

There was doubt at the time, in 1850, whether the companies could be compelled to carry the mails at reasonable figures—whether they could not refuse if the price did not suit them. It was to settle that question that the mail clause was inserted. The debates show that.

In the Senate Mr. Rusk, who proposed to amend and whose amendment was adopted as it now reads, said: "Congress should require the road to transport the mail at reasonable prices;" and again he said that his proposition was "to prevent them from having entire control of the matter and using it as a monopoly." It was to protect the Government against extortion. That is a totally different provision from giving the Government "free use of the road" for the mails; and how the two clauses came to be confounded and treated as if they were the same is hard to understand.

I could elaborate if time permitted on the general proposition as to what has been the great benefit of the introduction, building and development of the great railroads of this country, to all public lands, either national or State. They were given at a period when the lands were literally worthless, and they became valuable by the railroad developing the lands, the Government retaining the alternate or even-numbered sections which they at once doubled in price. They have not only become valuable to the railroads by virtue of their development of their roads and its operation, but they have brought millions over millions of dollars to the Government that otherwise would not have come there through the enterprise of capitalists and business men in developing the great West and South. The controlling ideas in Congress that led to these land grants are set forth in the great debate in 1850 on the subject, led off by Douglas, and participated in by Clay, Seward, Cass, and others, and I will include in my remarks several extracts from that debate.

Extracts from speeches of Stephen A. Douglas, Lewis Cass, Henry Clay, William H. Seward, Thomas H. Benton, and others, in the Senate upon the land grant to the Illinois Central Railroad Company.

[Congressional Globe, proceedings of the first session of the Thirty-first Congress (page 844), April 29, 1850.]

ILLINOIS CENTRAL RAILROAD.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved that the Senate take up bill No. 23, granting the right of way and making a donation of land to the State of Illinois in aid of the construction of the Central Railroad; which motion was agreed to.

The bill was read a second time, as follows:

The bill granting the right of way and making a donation of land to the State of Illinois in aid of the construction of the Central Railroad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will state that the road is the entire length of the State from north to south, from Cairo to Galena, which is not far from 400 miles, though rather under, I think. The bill proposes to grant the land in alternate sections, increasing the price of the other sections to double the minimum price. It is following the same system that was adopted in reference to the improvements of a similar character in Ohio, Indiana, Alabama, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois in reference to her canal.

It is simply carrying out a principle which has been acted upon for thirty years, by which you cede each alternate section of land and double the price of the alternate sections not ceded, so that the same price is received for the whole. These lands have been in the market from fifteen to thirty years; the average time is about twenty-three years; but they will not sell at the usual price of \$1.25 per acre because they are distant from any navigable stream or a market for produce. A railroad will make the lands salable at double the usual price.

Mr. KING. I am desirous of giving every facility that can properly be afforded to these new States in making works of internal improvement, to give value to the public lands, and afford facilities for carrying the produce of the States to the market. This road terminates at Cairo, on the Ohio River. A charter was granted by the States of Mississippi and Alabama to a railroad company to construct a railroad from the city of Mobile to terminate at the same point, so that if the railroad is completed there will be a continuous railroad communication from the Gulf to the extreme limit of the State of Illinois. Of the great advantages of such a communication it is not necessary now to speak. Every gentleman who knows anything of the States of Tennessee and Kentucky can estimate for himself the immense advantages of such a railroad. The portion of country in the States of Mississippi and Alabama through which the road is to pass is, generally speaking, barren and unproductive.

The lands throughout these States have been in the market from fifteen to thirty years, and some of them considerably more. Owing to the nature of the lands they are of no value, and can never be of any value at the present prices, unless some direct communication by railroad, or some other way, is made. That will give value to the land, without which it is of no value. My object, however, in rising is, before the question is taken upon the amendment, to propose an amendment, as an additional section, so as to in-

clude that portion of the road from the Ohio River, extending the same grants and privileges as are granted in the bill of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CASS. I do not perceive any difficulty with respect to the power of Congress which some gentlemen feel on this subject. The Senator from South Carolina and myself have contested the principle involved in this bill several times. Sir, there is a fundamental difference between the principle of this bill and the Government carrying on a system of internal improvement. There is no proposition in this bill that the Government should build the road; there is no assumption of authority within the jurisdiction of the States for that purpose whatever. That point, therefore, is wholly out of view. The jurisdiction is left entirely to the States to do as they please; to make the road or leave the road unmade. What, then, is the reason why we should make such an appropriation?

To my mind, sir, the reason is manifest. In all the new portions of the United States this Government owns a large proportion of the property. They sell it. They offer it for sale. It is surveyed, thrown into market, and emigration is invited. Tract after tract is sold, roads are made, villages and towns are built up, and all improvements that can be of value to a country go on and increase the value of the lands, and you sit and do nothing. I want to know if this Government, being a great land-owner, is to do nothing? Civil government is there maintained by the people; and yet, when they come here and ask for an appropriation of land, you fall back and ask the cash value. Sir, there is not a Government on the face of the globe that would do that. You ask us, the pioneers of the settlement, to go there and spend our lives in raising the country from a wilderness—a wilderness bowing before the industry of man, without which it would be worthless—and you sit and do nothing.

Why should you not pay your reasonable proportion, as owners of this land, towards its improvement and settlement, leaving the question of jurisdiction to the States respectively? From the foundation of the Government—Gen. Washington's day—this has been done. When I was but a lad a road was made from Wheeling to Limestone under Gen. Washington's Administration. This was the first that ever crossed the Ohio. No man ever seriously doubted that the Government, in the character of a land-owner, has a right to aid in building roads through its own lands to render those lands more valuable.

Mr. KING. Sir, the lands in Illinois have been in the market a length of time. They have value because of their productiveness. Not so with the lands through which the road is to pass in Mississippi and Alabama. Those lands are known to be worthless, so far as cultivation is concerned. They have good timber upon them, to be sure, but that is also valueless unless there be some mode by which it can be transported to market. The opening of this road will increase the commercial facilities of the country, increase the value of the lands through which it passes, and cause them to be brought into market at something like a fair price.

I am desirous of giving, what I think justly due to the new States, some little advantage in the construction of works of this kind, because we have given up much to the General Government. Sir, the very States to which the honorable Senator opposes the giving of these grants, because connected with the Illinois road, surrendered the right of taxing the public domain until five years after it is sold. In this way these States never drew a dollar from taxes on the public domain until five years after they came into the possession of private individuals, thus crippling their resources, producing embarrassment, and preventing them from making any works of internal improvement. And now, when we ask for these refuse lands, which have never been cultivated, merely for the purpose of giving facilities of transportation to market, which will give some degree of value to them, we are met by the objection that this is an immense grant; that it is a great quantity of land. Well, sir; it is a great quantity, but it will be there for five hundred years; and unless some mode of the kind be adopted it will never command 10 cents. It is not susceptible of being cultivated, and no man would spend his labor upon barren soil when he can get good land.

Mr. SHIELDS. For the benefit of the Senators who speak of the loss which the United States Government may suffer in consequence of this grant, I wish to state that when land has been ten or fifteen years in the market, the receipts therefrom do not defray the expenses of the machinery of Government employed in their sale. In this case, therefore, the Government can lose nothing, for these lands generally have been in the market for twenty years, and this road will be the means of rendering them salable. And I am not sure that the Government would not in the end be benefited by laying it down as a general principle that, where lands have been in the market for fifteen or twenty years they shall be appropriated to this purpose, than which I know none more advantageous and beneficial, or making public roads. * * *

If you give away all those refuse lands in every State that have been in market ten, fifteen, or twenty years for the purpose of making roads, you can not appropriate them to any national purpose more advantageous. By referring to the reports of the Land Commissioners, you will find it to be the case that where lands in any land district have been in the market twenty years, the revenue derived from their sale will hardly defray the expenses of the land office. I am not prepared to cipher out this matter just at the moment, but I am assured I can convince any gentleman of the truth of this proposition. Now, the State of Illinois has never derived a dollar from the Government; our rivers and lakes are left without improvement, and we pay into the Treasury a large amount of money every year from which we derive nothing in return. And yet if we come here and ask for a grant of a few acres of refuse lands, we are met with such objections as Senators have urged this morning. You are expending money every day on the seaboard, while this immense State, contributing as largely as it does to the revenues of the General Government, is totally neglected. And even when we ask for this feeble aid from the Government for a work that is to benefit Maine quite as much as it will Illinois—which is to connect Boston with New Orleans, the North with the South—we are met with a mere quibble about a few acres of land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We propose to make a proper constitutional and legal disposition of the lands in a mode that will benefit and increase the trust fund under our charge. The power is expressly given; there is no limitation upon it; but I confess that we are bound to exercise that power in a manner that is consistent with the trust placed in our hands. We must not diminish, but we should increase and improve that trust fund, and make it bring the largest amount that we can. Now, sir, suppose that you had a large section of public lands entirely inundated, so that they were not worth a farthing an acre. Suppose the giving away of one-tenth portion of these lands would render the whole of them available and salable; and if you have not the power to give away the one-tenth on condition that the other shall be rendered available, the whole is worth nothing—it is waste, entirely valueless; but by giving away a portion you render the remainder valuable, and thus gain considerably by it; would anyone say that it was not wise, if it was his own individual property, to make that disposition of a portion of it in order to render the other available? And if wise in his own case, is it not wise and proper in our case also? * * *

But the Senator from Georgia asks me, where is the power to make the purchaser pay double price for the land? Sir, we do not propose to make him pay double for the land. We have land that is comparatively valueless, if not entirely so; that will not sell at the present price, because as at present situated it is not worth it. You can not get a dollar and a quarter per

acre for it, because it is not worth a dollar and a quarter. But we propose now to give away half of it, on condition that the other half shall be rendered worth two and a half dollars per acre. And after this improvement is made, the land being worth two and a half dollars per acre, the purchaser buys it for what it is worth. Is it any hardship on him to sell him land worth two and a half dollars per acre for two and a half dollars, in preference to compelling him to give one and a half dollars for land that is not worth it? It is no tax on the purchaser. If we compel him to pay more money, we give him better land; he gets an equivalent for his money, and therefore it is no tax.

It is no more a tax to give \$10 per acre for land worth that amount than to give one dollar and a quarter per acre for land only worth one dollar and a quarter. Hence that objection vanishes in a moment. * * * We have put in this provision because we believe it is just to the Government to put it there; because we believe it is just to our own people to put it there. We know that the land is not now worth the Government price. We believe it will be worth double, if not treble, the Government price by the construction of this road. That being the case, it will be for the advantage of the settlers and purchasers, as well as for the advantage of the Government, that the value of the land should be increased, and the price increased also.

Mr. CLAY. Sir, with reference to the particular question before the Senate, I have arisen merely to say, in the first place, that I entertain no doubt about the general power, under proper guards and appropriate restrictions, to make the species of appropriations of the public lands which is here contemplated. * * *

A great deal has been said about the trusteeship of the Government. It is true that all government is a matter of trust. Individual men are trustees created by Providence, bound to administer their faculties to the best advantage, not merely for themselves, but for their fellow-men. But if by the use of the term trustee it is proposed to qualify, limit, or restrain the trust so as to resemble the ordinary trusts that are created in the course of human transactions, I do not concur at all in that idea. The Government is a trustee for the purpose administering the affairs of the nation according to its best judgment for the good of the whole and all the parts of the whole.

With respect to the State of Illinois—and I believe the same is true to a considerable extent with reference to Mississippi and Alabama, but I happen to know something personally of the interior of the State of Illinois—that portion of the State through which this road will run is a succession of prairies, the principal of which is denominated the Grand Prairie. I do not recollect its exact extent; but it is, I believe, about 300 miles in length and but 100 in breadth. Now, this road will pass directly through that Grand Prairie lengthwise, and there is nobody who knows anything of that Grand Prairie who does not know that the land in it is utterly worthless for any present purpose—not because it is not fertile, but for the want of wood and water, and from the fact that it is inaccessible, wanting all facilities for reaching a market or for transporting timber, so that nobody will go there and settle while it is so destitute of all the advantages of society and the conveniences which arise from a social state. And now, by constructing this road through the prairie, through the center of the State of Illinois, you will bring millions of acres of land immediately into the market which will otherwise remain for years and years entirely unsalable.

Well, so with regard to Alabama and Mississippi: the road which is proposed will pass through what is called the Pine Barrens. The soil there, except in occasional spots, is entirely valueless, though it is covered with timber which is intrinsically very valuable, but now worthless, because it is unapproachable, and not available for the want of some means of transport to a market. Well, by running this road through those portions of Mississippi and Alabama you will again bring into market an immense amount of lands, increasing their value to the benefit of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SEWARD. * * * I regard this work, which is now under consideration here, as constituting a great national enterprise, a great national thoroughfare. With me, then, the question is, whether it is wise and expedient to devote the public lands for the accomplishment of this purpose; and, if so, whether it is necessary for the public interest that this road should be made earlier than it would otherwise be by private capital. Now, if it be true, as I have said, that all the old States owning lands within their borders, and having unlimited power to tax, have still found it difficult and embarrassing to prosecute these improvements, then it seems to me the case of new States is essentially harder and more difficult and more entitled to the consideration of the Government; for it happens that these new States are founded upon territory belonging to the United States; the United States owns the lands, and the government of the States can not appropriate them. The Government of the United States owns the lands, and they can not be taxed except so far as they are sold; and these new members of the Confederacy are tributaries to the Federal Government, deprived of the resources which the older States have enjoyed for the purpose of completing their public works.

I think, therefore, that the Government owes it to itself and to the States to make liberal, and at the same time judicious, appropriations, to extend its network of railroads and canals over these new regions, where the people and the Government are unable to construct the works themselves. And, if there were any apparent fallacy in this argument, I think I should nevertheless be convinced of its soundness by the fact that all the new States which have undertaken to construct these necessary thoroughfares—necessary not only for themselves, but for the whole country—necessary for the welfare and prosperity, and even the existence of the Union—have all found themselves embarrassed and crippled, and many of them rendered bankrupt, by the attempt to accomplish objects which they were unable to accomplish, and which the Federal Government had ample power to carry into effect.

It is thus that the character of the States has been affected. It is thus that the morality of the governments of the States has been impeached; and it has been done in the manner I have indicated from the circumstance that it was devolved upon the governments of the States to make works of internal improvement while the resources which were applicable to that object belonged altogether to the Federal Government. * * * What, then, is the best and highest interests of the people of the United States in regard to this domain? It is not to derive from it the highest amount of current revenue; it is not to accumulate in our coffers the highest and greatest amount of avails in the sales of the public lands which is attainable. But it is to bring them into cultivation and settlement in the shortest space of time and under the most favorable auspices. And why is this the best interest of the Government? It is because the power of the Government is increased just in proportion as population is extended over what now constitutes the public domain, and that the wealth of the Government increases in the same ratio as the increase of population, and that the taxable ability of the people for purposes of peace and war is increased by the extension of the population and by the increase of wealth.

I can conceive it possible that it is more profitable, more conducive to the interests of the people of the United States, even in a fiscal or purely financial point of view, to make large appropriations from this domain for the purpose of enhancing their more speedy settlement, than it would be to retain them in a miserly grasp for the mere purpose of revenue. It is, therefore, upon the ground that the most expedient and beneficial disposition of this portion of the public lands is to devote it to the construction of public roads beneficial to all the people of the United States, as well as to the States which are immediately traversed by it, that I am in favor of the principle of

this bill, and of all similar bills which are properly guarded in their provisions, and I shall give them my most cordial and effective support. I hope that the bill will be passed.

Mr. WALKER. Sir, I am for giving the land out and out to Illinois, to help make the road. I believe it to be one of the greatest works in the country. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois may know that the Legislature of my State (Wisconsin) have expressed their admiration of the enterprise, and I look upon it as one of the greatest enterprises in which this country could engage. I can think of none greater. Anything that improves the connection between the North and the South is a great enterprise. To cross the parallels of latitude to enable the man of commerce to make up his assorted cargo, is infinitely more important than anything you can propose within the same parallels of latitude. I look upon it as a great chain to unite the North and the South. It is an enterprise of national interest. Nothing, I believe, will more advance its prosperity. I am willing to give this land out and out to this great enterprise, not for the benefit of Illinois merely, but of Wisconsin, of Maine, of New Hampshire, and of every State upon the great line from Maine to Louisiana. I am willing to show the builders of this road a magnanimous and timely generosity without levying a tax upon the consumers of the foreign commerce, upon those who are to pay the revenue upon which this Government is to be supported.

Mr. BENTON. The general principle which the bill before the Senate presents is one which has long been under consideration in both Houses of Congress. As far back as twenty odd years ago the principle of the bill was a part of a general proposition which was then before the Senate, and it was known as the graduation bill. That bill contained three features. The first, to reduce the price of those lands which had been some years in the market; the next was to make donations of lands, in limited quantities, to actual settlers; the third and last was, to cede the refuse lands to the States in which they lay for objects of internal improvement. It is the last of these propositions which is somewhat covered by the proposition now before the Senate.

From the consideration which I gave to that subject at that early day, it appeared to me that it was a beneficial disposition for the United States to make of her refuse lands, to cede them to the States in which they lay. Lands which had been twenty or twenty-five years in the market at the minimum price, and had never found a purchaser up to that time, were classed as refuse, and it was deemed that the States, as a local authority, might be able to make some disposition of them which the General Government, without machinery of land offices, could not. The principle of the bill before the Senate is to take the refuse lands and appropriate them to a great object of internal improvement, which, although it has its locality in a particular State, produces advantages which we all know, spread far and wide; for a good road can not be made anywhere without being beneficial to the whole United States. * * *

But, Mr. President, with respect to the general proposition. This application rests upon a principle that the young States are made desolate, in a great degree, by having lands in their midst that pay no taxes, undergo no cultivation, that are held at a price that nobody will pay, and which, in fact, in some parts of the country become jungles for the protection of wild beasts that prey upon the flocks and herds of the farmers. In other instances the United States hold swamps and marshes at prices that nobody will pay, and they hold on to these swamps and marshes, garrisoned as they are by pestilence, which the people of the country can not drain, because they are held by the Government of the United States. Sir, you may travel a hundred miles through a country of marshes and uncultivated land, which is not only worthless, but far worse; it becomes a place where malaria is generated, and where beasts have their haunts. But this bill proposes to make some beneficial disposition of these lands. Of the general principle of the bill I cordially approve. I believe the General Government will have done well when it gets rid of the administration of these lands. I believe it will have done well when it puts them in a condition to be made useful to the human race, which they are not now.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Does he think it was right for the Government to insist upon these railroads transporting the troops and supplies at 50 per cent?

Mr. BINGHAM. It was right. It was the judgment of a well deliberated, well considered proposition in all its bearings, after investigation by the Supreme Court of the United States, and has been accepted and sustained here for a generation, by these roads. It was done under the distinct reservation that the Government was to have the full use of the road for troops and munitions of war.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. But the Government contended then that it ought not to pay anything.

Mr. BINGHAM. Of course, they had the right of contention.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Did not the Government contend that it ought not to pay anything, and did not the railroads contend that the Government ought to pay them 100 per cent?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am not disputing that. It had a right to enter into contention.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Of course. I want to know whether there was any greater reason for the railroads carrying troops and supplies of the Government at 50 per cent than that they should carry the mails at the same price?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, my friend, there is much greater reason, because the franchises were given originally under different conditions. It is under totally different clauses, as I have shown, and for different reasons. In the one case the Government reserves the right to use the roads for the troops and property of the United States. The question of mail transportation is an entirely different proposition, resting upon a different section of the law; and you yourself, in Congress after Congress, have voted to pay them, when we passed our bills, at 80 per cent; and nobody until to-day has made any proposition to carry the mail for less.

There has not been a good reason given to this House for carrying these mails at 50 per cent. They are carrying troops and carrying munitions of war at 50 per cent. I grant you that. It has been adjusted and settled, and has been accepted under the

judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, which the corporations were forced to accept, and the reasons for it I think I have fairly given.

The troops and munitions of war are used in defending the Government, and it seems a very natural provision to insert, that if the Government aided in building the roads they should have the right to occupy them, the same as any other highway for moving troops over. But the mails are carried chiefly for private persons; the great use of the mails is not by or for the Government directly, but to carry mail for the people, and the people pay for it. Why should the Government require the railroads to perform this service for the people without compensation? Why should it reserve the "free use," or any reduced use of these roads for the mail service? The whole reason for doing so, as to troops and war materials, is wanting when it comes to the mail.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I would like to understand, if the gentleman will permit me, why the Government should pay anything?

Mr. BINGHAM. The reason why the Government should pay is a simple proposition—the donating of these lands to the railroads have enriched the Government millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Then I would ask the gentleman why should not the Government pay them 100 per cent?

Mr. BINGHAM. To be frank with you, I see no reason why it should not. I see no reason why the roads that have had lands granted to them by the Government as a gift, and so construed by the judgment of the Supreme Court, should not be allowed the same compensation for doing the same service, subjected to the same lines of inspection by the officers of the Government, subject to the same obligations under the general statutes that require railroads to carry the mails on every train—I can not see why land-grant roads should not receive dollar for dollar the same as the Pennsylvania Central or New York Central Railroad receive.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. But there is no more reason why the Government should pay only 50 per cent for carrying troops and property of the United States than there is for carrying the mails at the same price.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is part of the original contract.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. And the other is part of the original contract.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, no. You made some investigation of these railroads, and then you reduced them 10 per cent. Then it was that you cut them down to 80 per cent in the act of 1876. I have shown that the contract as to troops and the contract as to mails are two entirely separate and distinct matters—different in language and substance.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Under what rule of law or reason was that?

Mr. BINGHAM. Your party came into power in 1875 for the first time from the inception of the war, and one of your first acts was an assault all along the line upon the great railroad corporations then carrying the mails under the act of 1873, and, for the first time, you cut down the compensation of the land-grant railroads from 100 per cent to 80 per cent, and that has been acquiesced in from that day to this.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. The Republican Senate agreed to it at the time, and you have had two Republican Congresses since then which might have repealed it. Now, why did they not repeal it?

Mr. BINGHAM. I suppose it was simply because it had been accepted by the roads. But if the gentleman makes me give him the answer that I think ought to be given, I will say that I believe it ought to have been repealed and that those roads ought to receive 100 per cent, the same as other roads.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I thought so.

Mr. BINGHAM. However, I am not discussing that question now. I am discussing what you are attempting to do in this bill, and I say you are attempting to cripple that service in such a way that the roads can not afford to carry your mails.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether it is not perfectly natural that if these roads are not adequately paid for transporting the mails they will charge up the difference against shippers and passengers?

Mr. BINGHAM. Of course.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. So that the money will be taken from the people of the country and applied to the benefit of the General Government?

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Then I should think the railroads would not object to it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The railroads are not represented here.

Mr. SIMPSON. Oh, are they not?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the general debate which

took place a few days ago in connection with the sundry civil bill, and the criticisms made on the other side of the House with reference to a reduction in the appropriations for certain scientific work which the Government had been and is now carrying on, I took occasion to call attention to the fact that the Government was now transporting the newspaper mails of the country at a figure 7 cents a pound less than the cost is estimated by the Department; in other words, that we are paying to-day for that form of popular education, in view of the act of 1885, which reduced the newspaper postage from 2 cents to 1 cent a pound—that we are to-day paying largely for popular education; in other words, that we are carrying these newspapers and periodicals at an absolute loss of \$14,000,000.

I advert now to the other fact, that the best estimate of the Department, submitted by the Postmaster-General in his report, is to the effect that we are carrying free for the United States Government mail matter (including the census, which is something more than a million dollars) amounting to \$10,000,000 annually. In other words, the Government to-day is making you and me, by charging us 32 cents a pound for our letters, pay for the carriage of \$10,000,000 worth of Government mail service free, and \$14,000,000 of newspaper and periodical service. The profit which the law makes to-day from your letter and from my letter goes to the benefit of the Government in the transportation, through the mails, of \$10,000,000 of free mail matter, and to the benefit of the publishers in the transportation free of \$14,000,000 of newspapers and periodical matter.

I believe that the Government goes rightly into the field of education, and, as I stated the other day, I am on record in debates in this House years ago in favor of letting the periodicals and standard publications of this country adapted for popular education be carried through the mails free, the same as the country newspaper is permitted to circulate free within the limits of the county. I believe this to be the duty of the Post-Office Department and I would go further. I would make free, at the same rates of postage as the newspapers, the transmission of all money orders and all registered matter.

I would take away from the 65,000 postmasters and the 150,000 subordinate officials of the Post-Office Department the temptation to ever rifle the mails or to think that any letter or package in the mails contained that which would mean dollars and cents to them and ultimately perhaps the penitentiary. I would impress upon the men the fact that the mails contained no money or article of value, but I would provide that all money should go through the channels of registration and money orders without additional or director specific charge, the same as the newspapers go, at a cent a pound, even though it was a loss to the post-office revenues. However, my time has expired, and at a later date I will elaborate this proposition. A high standard of morality and honesty among the people is as important as education.

Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee ought to rise. Gentlemen ought not to be required to talk here to empty benches.

Mr. SIMPSON. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman. We have six hours to debate this bill, as ordered by the House yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, this third section in this appropriation bill seems to be in about the same condition as tariff reform, free coinage of silver, and reduction of public expenditures; that is, without any friends on either side of this House. And, as usual where a special personal or corporate interest is concerned, it finds many defenders, but where the general public interest is concerned, as in this case, there seems nobody to say a word for it except the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, who deserves the support of every member of this House who puts the interest of the people above that of the railroads. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall devote the few minutes I have to discussing this proposition.

I am heartily in favor of section three of this bill. The Postmaster-General in a letter to the committee has fortunately given some light on this subject. And when these gentlemen talk about a reduction of 50 per cent in the rate for carrying the mails, let me call attention to the fact that the rate now paid was fixed in 1878 when, as everybody in this House knows, the charges for carrying everything upon the railroads were very much higher than they are to-day. Under the law of Congress the Postmaster-General is authorized to make a 10 per cent reduction every year. I will read this provision of law, which is to be found in the Statutes at Large 1874-91.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SIMPSON. In a moment, when I have read this law.

That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid from and after the 1st day of July, 1876, for transportation of mails on railroad routes by reducing the compe-

sation to all railroad companies for the transportation of mails 10 per cent per annum.

The existing rate of payment was fixed in 1878, and during fourteen years there has been no reduction made. At that time the rate was fixed, I presume, on the basis of the cost of carrying freight of all descriptions in the United States. Everybody knows there have been great improvements in the carrying capacity of the railroads; there have been important discoveries; new machinery has come into use, and in this way the cost of carrying everything on the railroads has been reduced.

Every gentleman here realizes that the more a railroad has to carry the cheaper it can carry it. The greater the load the cheaper should be the rate of transportation. And the rates are so adjusted that the railroad companies receive less per pound for carrying a great amount of mail matter than for carrying a small amount. Everybody knows that the amount of mail matter carried by the railroads has increased enormously since that time.

I submit at this point an extract from the report of the Postmaster-General for 1891:

NO RAILROAD BONUS NEEDED.

In 1879, when railroad facilities were few and train service slow, Congress appropriated \$295,000 in extra allowances for such railroad companies as could not afford to make schedules sufficiently numerous or fast. These sums were to be in addition to the payments of ordinary rates for railroad transportation. The quantity of mail matter was then perhaps one-half of what it is now, so that each of the companies by the natural growth of mail transportation has, since 1879, doubled its revenue from mail pay. At each weighing, moreover, there is a further increase of pay according to the increase of service.

In a conversation with Postmaster-General Wanamaker not a year ago he told me that the rates paid were enormously too high, that there had not been a reduction since 1878, but when he came to the last Congress he could get no authority to reduce the rates, but it appears that he was authorized.

Mr. CALDWELL. How do you account for the letter of the Postmaster-General recommending a reduction?

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to say that the Postmaster-General is apparently playing a double part; he now wants to throw the responsibility on somebody else, while under the law he has had all the while the right to reduce the rates and should have exercised it. Gentlemen talk about a reduction of 50 per cent. I am satisfied that such a reduction is not enough; it ought to go lower than that.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. The gentleman will allow me to say that the question of the rate of compensation at the time referred to cuts no figure in this case, for the provision of section 3 of this bill applies to the present time and provides that the Postmaster-General shall fix the compensation now at a reasonable and just amount, not exceeding 50 per cent of what is now paid by others for similar service.

Mr. SIMPSON. The provision of the bill implies that this reduction shall be made on the last rate fixed by Congress in 1876.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. SIMPSON. It can not be construed in any other way. We have now an effort on the part of Congress—and I believe the Democrats ought to have the credit for it—to secure a reduction of compensation to the railroads. I hope the Democratic party will now rally to the support of the chairman of the committee, because the reduction proposed is just and right. Railroad companies have received from the Government large tracts of very valuable land. I know that the Santa Fe Railroad, in my State, which will be affected by the operation of this bill, has received enormous quantities of the most valuable land in the State of Kansas, in some cases every alternate section for 10 miles on each side of the road. Portions of that land have been sold at \$5, \$10, and \$12 an acre. Who gave the value to that land? Some gentleman rose here—I forgot who it was—and said that the railroads created the land value.

It occurs to me, gentlemen, that if all the people would leave the State of Kansas the land there would not have any value. The value of the land rises because somebody wants it. It comes from the increase of population. What did the Government do?

While granting this land for railroad purposes it made the alternate sections homestead land, and inside of the railroad limits it made the settler pay \$2.50 an acre for the land. Every settler who came there and settled on these alternate sections increased the value of the railroad lands until they ran up in some cases to ten, twelve, and fifteen dollars an acre. Besides that, the Santa Fe Railroad, running through the State of Kansas, has been enriched enormously because the settlement coming in there has induced the construction of many branch lines through the State, and in some cases \$1,000 a mile has been voted in bonds by the counties and townships through which those roads pass.

Now, here is an effort on the part of the Government to make the railroad companies comply with their contract. They were expected, when this land was given to them, to give some benefits to the community in return for the large portion of the public domain that they received from the people. Mr. Chairman, I shall, with the permission of the House, print with my remarks documentary evidence, gathered by the commission appointed by Congress, showing the benefits that these railroads have received from the country:

Minority report of a commissioner, Robert E. Pattison, appointed under authority of Congress, approved March 3, 1877, entitled "An act authorizing an investigation of the books, accounts, and methods of railroads which have received aid from the United States, and for other purposes."

To the PRESIDENT:

In compliance with the direction of an act of Congress entitled "An act authorizing an investigation of the books, accounts, and methods of railroads which have received aid from the United States, and for other purposes," I herewith submit the following report:

Between the years 1865 and 1869 the Government loaned its credit to six railroad companies, forming parts of a great scheme of transcontinental communication. From the act of July 1, 1862, it appears that Congress contemplated that five lines would start from points on the Missouri River, viz: Sioux City, Omaha, St. Joseph, Leavenworth, and Kansas City; and that they would converge on the one hundredth meridian, forming a trunk line which would be built westwardly. It was also contemplated that the Central Pacific line would start from the Pacific Slope and would meet the Missouri River road near the California State line. Subsequently Ogden was made the point of junction.

By an act of Congress passed in 1866, the Kansas Pacific Company was permitted to pursue a generally western course, from Kansas City up the Smoky Hill Branch of the Republican River to Denver, and to connect with the Union Pacific main line on a meridian not more than 50 miles west of Denver, instead of taking a northwesterly course and striking the main line at the one hundredth meridian. Because of this change of route the Central Branch of the Union Pacific (which started from Atchison, Kans., instead of St. Joseph, Mo., as originally contemplated, and which had been designed to meet the Kansas City line in the Republican Valley, as it proceeded in a northwesterly direction from Kansas City to North Platte) was left without connection, its subsidy in Government bonds having been limited to 100 miles. By designation of the President of the United States, the Sioux City line was also changed in its course so as to meet the Union Pacific line at Fremont, Nebr., about 42 miles west of Omaha, instead of at the one hundredth meridian.

In 1870 the Western Pacific Company, which built a line from Sacramento to San Jose, Cal., was consolidated with the Central Pacific; and in 1880 the Kansas Pacific, which operated the line from Kansas City to Denver, from Denver to Cheyenne, and from Leavenworth to Lawrence (the latter intersecting the main line of the Kansas Pacific a short distance west of Kansas City), were consolidated with the Union Pacific Railroad Company into a new corporation called the Union Pacific Railway Company.

It was originally provided that the Government lien should be a first mortgage on the several lines, but the law was subsequently amended so as to allow the companies to issue their own bonds to an equal amount as a first mortgage on their roads, the Government advance being secured by a second mortgage.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVEN MILLIONS IN AID.

The Government loaned bonds bearing 6 per cent interest, payable in thirty years, to the amount of \$64,623,512, and stipulated to pay the interest on these loans upon condition that at the maturity of the bonds the aided companies would pay both principal and interest, and that, upon the completion of the roads, the companies would pay annually a percentage of their net earnings and a portion of their compensation for Government transportation on account of these annual advances made by the Government. Congress also gave them over 26,000,000 acres of public lands, upon which they have realized \$39,479,213.71, with 12,615,087 acres of land, valued at \$26,054,270, yet unsold, making the total land grant worth \$65,533,483.71.

As the Government annually paid \$3,877,410.72 in interest to the holders of subsidy bonds and does not require repayment by the companies until the maturity of the principal, the bond-aided companies gained a further advantage in the use of such interest money. This advantage itself was worth \$199,700,250.19 at the time of the grant. The Government gave them a right of way 400 feet wide along the length of their lines, the right of eminent domain, and space for depots and turnouts. In addition to these liberal gifts by Congress, some of the States and many counties and public bodies also made large donations in lands and bonds to some of the companies.

Aid was given from all sources, as follows:

Railway company.	Principal and interest advances paid and to be paid by the United States.	Value of land grant.	Aid from other sources.	Aid exclusive of use by companies until maturity of annual interest payment by Government.	Use until maturity in 1895-99 of annual interest payments on basis of 6 per cent.	Total aid.
Union Pacific.						
Kansas Pacific.	893,814,250.94	\$44,911,637.77	\$250,000.00	\$138,005,928.71	\$103,690,859.36	\$241,694,788.07
Central Branch.	4,428,608.26	1,000,000.00		5,426,608.26	4,946,564.96	10,373,173.23
Sioux City and Pacific.	4,509,255.89	239,364.60	265,088.00	5,014,306.49	5,034,119.16	10,048,425.65
Central Pacific.						
Western Pacific.	77,104,604.41	19,832,581.24	2,555,191.24	99,492,376.89	86,118,706.71	185,611,083.60
Total.	178,884,759.50	65,983,583.61	3,070,877.24	247,939,220.35	199,700,250.19	447,729,470.54

Bonds.

Railroad company.	Mileage.	Principal of subsidy bonds.	Interest accrued and to accrue to date of maturity.	Principal and interest paid and to be paid by United States.	Payments on interest account to November 1, 1887.	United States sinking fund November 1, 1887.	Value of debt on July 1, 1888.
Union Pacific	1,038.88	\$27,236,512	\$59,304,778.94	\$92,844,290.94	\$15,444,891.94	\$6,152,683.82	\$60,643,967.10
Kansas Pacific	333.94	6,303,000					
Central Branch	100.00	1,608,000	2,826,608.26	4,426,608.26	316,124.12		3,285,495.65
Sioux City and Pacific	101.77	1,328,330	2,880,935.89	4,509,235.89	131,923.62		3,404,226.85
Central Pacific	737.50	25,885,120	49,248,924.41	77,104,604.41	6,203,379.35	2,710,036.76	55,148,416.72
Western Pacific	123.16	1,970,560					
Total	2,495.05	64,623,512	114,261,247.50	148,884,759.50	22,062,319.03	8,862,720.58	122,482,106.32

The land grants.

	Union Pacific.	Kansas Pacific.	Central Branch.	Sioux City and Pacific.	Central Pacific.	Western Pacific.	Total.
Acres granted	11,300,844.00	6,000,000.00	215,560.00	43,336.00	8,000,000.00	453,794.00	25,029,934.00
Amount realized on land sales to December 31, 1886	\$49,090,672.42	\$11,816,693.35	\$1,000,000.00	\$230,364.00	\$7,333,581.34		\$39,479,213.71
Value of lands unsold	\$2,355,507.00	\$11,608,763.00			\$12,500,000.00		\$26,504,270.00
Acres patented	2,616,178.00	963,714.00	218,250.00	41,398.00	1,040,210.00	447,768.00	5,327,538.00
Selections pending	531,504.00	824,538.00	4,310.00	1,938.00	546,076.00	6,026.00	1,914,392.00
Acres sold	7,986,346.41	3,055,465.00	222,560.00	43,336.00	2,444,120.00		13,751,827.41
Acres unsold	3,175,507.00	3,883,700.00			5,556,880.00		12,615,087.00
Acres sold and unpatented	5,370,168.00	2,091,751.00	4,310.00	1,938.00	1,403,910.00		8,872,077.41
Average price per acre	\$2.39	\$3.86	\$2 to \$6	\$6.52	\$3.00		

*Estimated.

Aid from other sources.

Railroad company.	Bonds.	Lands.	Estimated value.
Kansas Pacific	\$250,000.00	Acres.	\$250,000.00
Sioux City and Pacific	120,000.00	58,533	265,693.02
Central Pacific	2,555,191.24		2,555,191.40
Western Pacific			

By the foregoing tables it will be seen that the aid given to these companies amounted to \$447,739,470.54.

By the bond table it will be seen that the total loan by the Government in principal and interest payments will be \$178,884,759.50 toward the repayment of which the companies, in eighteen years, have accumulated only \$30,995,036.61.

By investing these corporations with the control of a public highway across the continent the Government reposed in them, as a reimbursement for their contemplated outlay in construction, the power to establish rates of transportation; that is, the power to levy toll upon all traffic which might pass over these avenues of trade. At the time when the grants were made grave apprehensions were entertained by Congress and the people respecting the dangers which might follow the creation of corporations of such magnitude, because, in addition to the power to tax traffic and the advantage of limited responsibility which was conferred upon these aggregations of capital, they were endowed practically with perpetual succession and capacity for the accumulation and concentration of wealth and power—privileges which are denied to natural beings whose plans are spanned by the grave.

To guard against possible abuses of these great powers and to insure good management and personal responsibility, Congress enacted that, in return for the nation's liberality, the companies should bind themselves also to build first-class roads; to carry for the Government at fair and reasonable rates (not exceeding the amounts paid by private parties for the same kind of service), and to operate all the lines in the Pacific system as one connected, continuous line, affording to each of the other roads equal facilities as to rates, time, and transportation, and to convey telegraphic messages upon equal terms for all persons. They were also bound to make annual reports, giving the names of their directors and officers and stockholders and information bearing upon the amount of stock actually paid in and upon expenditures, receipts, and indebtedness.

CONSTRUCTION AND CAPITALIZATION.

With these legal obligations and covenants resting upon them, what did these companies do? The Union Pacific Railroad Company actually received, in cash, on account of stock payments, the sum of only \$400,650, while it issued stock to the amount of \$36,762,000.

The Union Pacific (1,038.68 miles) was built for \$38,824,000 and the company issued bonds and stocks as follows:

First-mortgage bonds	\$27,237,000
United States bonds	27,236,512
Land-grant bonds	9,224,000
Income bonds	9,355,000
Stock	36,762,000

Cost of construction

70,990,812

Fictitious capital

One thing is evident. After allowing for discount, the road was built for less than the proceeds of the first mortgage and Government bonds, which had a face value of \$64,485,513, the builders taking as profit part of the proceeds of the sale of those bonds, as well as the income bonds, the land-grant bonds, and the stock, and charging up on the books of the company as cost of construction \$109,814,812.

The Congressional committee of investigation, generally known as the "Wilson committee," which investigated the construction of the Union Pacific, in commenting upon the evidence which it took in 1873, said that every precaution that Congress had taken for the proper management of these great properties had failed of its purpose. Congress had demanded that money be paid in, and that this money should be subordinated to the Government lien. It had provided for the presence of five directors representing the Government in the meetings of the directors of the company; for the appointment of commissioners to pass upon the work of road construction as it progressed;

and it had held the reserved power to alter, amend, or repeal, and yet the road was subjected to the most scandalous mismanagement.

The Wilson committee reported that large sums of money were borrowed by the corporation apparently to provide for the necessities of construction, but which were distributed in dividends among the corporators; that stock was not paid for in money; that some of the Government directors neglected their duties and others were interested in the fraudulent transactions of the company. One of the commissioners appointed to pass upon the condition of the road was paid \$25,000 in consideration of his signing officially a report accepting as first class a section of 120 miles of the road. The chief engineer, Peter A. Dey, resigned because the Hoxie contract was fixed at \$50,000, though his estimates were for \$30,000 per mile. His successor, Gen. G. M. Dodge, was interested in contracts for the construction of the road as a stockholder of the Crédit Mobilier. Oakes Ames, who was largely interested in the construction of the road, sold stock to members of Congress for prices much below the real value of the shares, his philosophy being that, although these particular Congressmen had favored the Union Pacific Road, they would take a livelier interest in its affairs if they were protecting their own property.

The testimony taken by the Wilson committee showed that G. M. Dodge had been given, for services in procuring the passage of the act of March 3, 1871, \$24,500; that C. S. Bushnell had retained \$82,500; that there was paid Gov. John A. Dix, as a purchase by the railroad company of his stock, \$50,000; that there was paid to C. Windell, for signing the report accepting a section of the road, \$25,000; and that an allowance was made to T. C. Durant of \$45,750.21 for expenses in passing through Congress the amendatory act of July 2, 1864.

The Kansas Pacific Company received \$250,000 in bonds from Leavenworth County, Kans., on account of stock subscriptions, issued shares for that amount to that county, and then issued additional shares to the amount of \$4,822,500, for which no cash whatever was paid on account of the construction of the aided portion of the road.

The Kansas Pacific aided portion (333.94 miles) was built for about \$11,800,000, under what was called "an exhausted contract," which took all the bonds and stocks of the company amounting to \$25,028,250, as follows:

First mortgage bonds	\$6,302,000
United States bonds	6,303,000
Land-grant	1,574,750
Second land grant	1,500,000
Income	4,275,000
Stock	5,072,500

Cost of construction

25,028,250

11,800,000

Fictitious capital

The Central Pacific actually received less than \$760,000 in cash and bonds on account of stock subscription, while it issued stock to the amount of \$54,000,000.

The Central Pacific and Western Pacific aided portions (860.65 miles) were built for \$40,000,000, for which bonds and stocks were issued by Messrs LELAND STANFORD, Collis P. Huntington, Mark Hopkins, and Charles Crocker, or under their direction, as follows:

Bonds	\$70,211,680
Stock	54,000,000

Total issue of bonds and stocks

124,211,680

Cost of construction

40,000,000

Fictitious capital

84,211,680

The bonds, reduced to a gold basis, yielded \$52,703,742.55. So that the four men who managed that company profited to the extent of over \$12,000,000 in gold, in addition to \$52,000,000 of the stock which they divided among themselves, and subsequently sold at high figures after declaring dividends to the amount of \$18,453,670.

The Sioux City and Pacific capitalized its road (101.77 miles) in bonds and stocks to the amount of \$5,047,720, as follows:

First-mortgage bonds	\$1,628,000
United States bonds	1,628,320
Common stock	1,791,400

Cost of construction

5,047,720

2,600,000

Profit in bonds

2,447,720

It built its line for about \$2,600,000, of which \$1,791,400 came from stock subscriptions and about \$800,000,000 from the proceeds of the sale of half of its Government bonds. It distributed among its stockholders, without consideration, over \$2,400,000; of which \$1,028,000 was in first-mortgage bonds and the remainder in Government bonds. Every stockholder who paid in \$40 received in return about \$120 in securities and property.

The Central Branch received \$386,700 on account of a stock issue of \$1,000,000.

This road (100 miles) was built for \$2,731,347.23, for which bonds and stocks were issued as follows:

First-mortgage bonds.....	\$1,600,000.00
United States bonds.....	1,600,000.00
Stock.....	1,000,000.00
	4,200,000.00
Cost of construction.....	2,731,347.23
Fictitious capital.....	1,468,652.73
The sale of its securities resulted as follows:	
United States bonds.....	\$1,577,651.55
First-mortgage bonds.....	567,612.14
Stock options.....	392,225.53
	2,537,489.22

Of the first-mortgage bonds \$400,000 were used for purposes that no one has been able to explain. Four hundred thousand dollars more in those bonds was given away as bonus to stockholders for stock subscriptions.

It will be apparent from these figures that the roads were bonded and stocked on an excessive basis, the profits, amounting to \$172,247,115, going to construction companies or inside combinations, as follows:

Cost and capitalization.

Railroad company.	Mileage.	Cost.	Capitalization in bonds and stocks.	Amount of fictitious capital in securities upon completion of road.
Union Pacific.....	1,038.68	\$38,824,000	\$100,814,812	\$70,900,812
Kansas Pacific.....	393.94	11,800,000	25,058,250	13,228,250
Central Branch.....	100.00	2,731,347	4,200,000	1,468,653
Sioux City and Pacific.....	101.77	2,600,000	5,047,720	2,447,720
Central Pacific.....	737.50	36,000,000	124,211,680	84,211,680
Western Pacific.....	123.16	4,000,000		
Total.....	2,495.05	95,955,347	268,302,462	172,347,115

The construction companies or inside combinations that built five of the six roads have destroyed or concealed their books; the exception being the Central Branch, and the Commission has been embarrassed in its work by the refusal or failure of the companies to produce the accounts relating to the actual cost of construction, or to exhibit any paper or documents that would enable the Commission to ascertain the truth as to this most important factor in the investigation. The books of the Crédit Mobilier, which built the Union Pacific from Omaha to Ogden; the books of the Contract and Finance Company, which built the Western Pacific from San Jose to Sacramento, and the Central Pacific from Sacramento to Ogden; the books of Shoemaker & Co., who built the Kansas Pacific; and the accounts of John I. Blair, who built the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad—all these are missing. From the minutes and accounts of the railroad companies, and from fragmentary information gathered from various sources, it is disclosed that the officers of at least three of these companies made false statements under oath, in affidavits now on file in the Interior Department. From these affidavits the following has been compiled:

Stock table.

Railroad company.	Stock actually paid in.	Stock paid in as sworn to.	Names of deponents.	Date of affidavit.
Union Pacific.....	\$400,650	\$36,762,300	Oliver Ames.....	Sept. 27, 1870
Kansas Pacific.....	250,000	5,072,500	R. E. Carr.....	Sept. 28, 1872
Central Pacific.....	760,000	54,283,190	Leland Stanford.....	Sept. 18, 1871
Do.....	386,000	980,600	R. M. Pomeroy.....	Sept. 21, 1869
Total.....	1,797,350	97,098,590		

It is no answer to the Government that the managers of these companies did only that which the managers of other railroads in other sections did. These lines were built upon public credit. The managers were acting as trustees of a national highway, and they can not plead any lawful justification for making false affidavits, which state that \$97,098,590 of stock was actually paid for, when in fact less than two millions had been so paid for.

Their relations to the public.

The original purpose of Congress, as set forth in the act of July 1, 1862, in granting subsidies for the construction of the Pacific roads, was to promote the public interest, and the companies were made trustees for that purpose; but the public interest has been subordinated by these companies to the stockholding interest, upon the claim that the stockholders owned the railroads and could manage their own business in their own way. Nearly every obligation which these corporations assumed under the laws of the United States, or as common carriers, has been violated. Their management has been a national disgrace. Since the date of their inception they have been conducted upon a purely speculative basis. Their permanent prosperity has been lost sight of, while their managers greedily strove for temporary advantage.

For fourteen years the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific were practically free from competition for a stretch of 1,800 miles across the continent. They were independent of many of those disturbing elements which have been pleaded in extenuation of the vicious practices of railroads in other parts of the country, and yet they injected secrecy into their affairs, inaugurated favoritism and corruption into their management, and attempted to destroy competition. They organized pools for the professed purpose of se-

curing certainty, uniformity, and permanency in freight rates, but they did not respect the pools which they entered into when immediate advantages could be obtained by a breach of good faith.

Mr. Huntington testified before the Commission that "competition is killing," and that there ought to be only one railroad for the whole country. The aided companies combined with others to tax the communities which they served, and they forced the consuming classes in all sections of the country to contribute to the payment of interest and dividend upon the fictitious capital which they had created. They increased the cost of living. They laid proprietary claim to the traffic of large sections of the country. They squandered millions of their money to "protect" their territorial claims, while expending other millions in encroachments upon the territories claimed by other companies. They constituted themselves the arbiters of trade. They attempted to dictate the channels that trade should follow, and fixed rates of transportation that were extortive. They charged all that the traffic would bear, and appropriated a share of the profits of every industry by charging the greater part of the difference between the actual cost of production and the price of the article in the market.

They discriminated between individuals, between localities, and between articles. They favored particular individuals and companies. They destroyed possible competitors, and they built up particular localities to the injury of other localities, until matters had reached such a pass that no man dared engage in any business in which transportation largely entered without first soliciting and obtaining the permission of a railroad manager. They departed from their legitimate sphere as common carriers and engaged in mining articles for transportation over their own lines. They exerted a terrorism over merchants and over communities, thus interfering with the lawful pursuits of the people. They participated in election contests. By secret cuts and violent and rapid fluctuations in rates they menaced business, paralyzed capital, and retarded investment and development.

Their relations to the government.

During the five years from 1864 to 1869, upon the claim that their roads were fully completed, these companies obtained bonds from the Government; but when the Government called upon them to pay a percentage of their net earnings into the Treasury, as was stipulated in the original contract, they contended that their roads were not fully completed until 1874, and refused to make any payments to the Government, though one of them, the Central Pacific, had been declaring dividends in the mean time. They resisted the claims and demands of the Government at every point, and resorted to every device their ingenuity could invent in their efforts to evade the plain requirements of the law. In transporting troops and supplies for the Government, they violated the contract obligation to charge reasonable rates by charging more than they charged to private shippers for the same kind of service.

The reports of the Union Pacific show that the average rates paid by the Government to that corporation were higher than those received by that company from other sources. The same is more or less true of the other bond-aided companies. The overcharges upon the Government by the Central and Union Pacific companies since 1880 are estimated to have been as follows:

Union Pacific.....	\$802,407.31
Central Pacific.....	167,558.63

Profits of \$278,023,357.63 in operating the roads.

The reports of these companies show the following figures relating to operation, disclosing a profit or net earnings of \$278,023,357.63, equaling \$15,000,000 a year.

Earnings table.

Railroad company.	Gross earnings.	Operating expenses.	Net earnings.
Union and Kansas Pacific.....	\$315,303,504.66	\$169,916,078.90	\$145,387,425.74
Central Pacific Railroad, from 1863 to December 31, 1886.....	274,139,116.27	149,199,102.40	124,940,013.87
Sioux City and Pacific Railroad, from July 30, 1869, to June 30, 1887.....	9,187,339.50	6,423,596.82	2,763,762.68
Central Branch, Union Pacific.....	12,849,463.47	7,917,308.15	4,932,155.31
Total.....	611,470,443.90	333,456,086.27	278,023,357.63

Over \$25,000,000 for pools, rebates, and overcharges.

In addition to the gross earnings given as above, the bond-aided companies received the following sums, which they subsequently paid out on account of pools, subsidies, rebates, overcharges, etc.:

Pools, rebates, and overcharges.

Road.	Pools.	Rebate and overcharges.	Total.
Union Pacific.....	\$4,004,512.48	\$11,577,091.62	\$15,581,604.10
Kansas Pacific.....			401,832.01
Sioux City and Pacific.....			9,882,797.61
Central Pacific.....			
Total.....			25,866,235.72

Losses sustained by the government.

The Central Pacific and Union Pacific, between them, have paid over \$4,000,000 to the Pacific Mail Steamship Company to maintain high rates. To branch lines the Union Pacific, since 1881, has also given various amounts estimated at \$2,400,000, and the Central Pacific \$520,762.97, on account of constructive mileage. All of the sums paid out for pools, rebates, overcharges, etc., amounting to \$25,866,235.72, were deducted by the companies from the gross earnings actually received by them before stating the amount which was reported to the Government as their gross earnings. In other words, they refused to consider and designate this sum of \$25,866,235.72 as part of their gross earnings, because they subsequently paid it out for pools and rebates. In this respect, as well as in respect to charges for general expenses that should have been charged against auxiliary companies, the reports, as made by the Union Pacific Company to the Government, were erroneous. For the same reasons and also because the Central Pacific Company was charged for and paid expenses incurred by and for the Southern Pacific Company (the case of Senator Norwood being a conspicuous illustration), the reports made by the Central Pacific Company to the Government were erroneous. The losses sustained by the United States on account of erroneous reports and overcharges amounts to over \$8,000,000.

Of 1,200,000 acres in Colorado, surveyed prior to 1870, and granted to the Kansas Pacific Company, it has selected, in seventeen years, less than one-twentieth of the grant therein.

The Central Pacific has selected only one-half of its land grant in California that has been surveyed, and it has failed to select 180,000 acres in that State that have been surveyed since the completion of the road.

Of the grant to the Central Pacific in Nevada, 700,000 acres were surveyed at the date of the completion of the road and about 2,000,000 acres are now surveyed. The company has selected about one-fourth of its land grant in that State.

Of the grant to the Central Pacific in Utah, of which 250,000 acres were surveyed at the date of the completion of the road in 1869, no lands were selected until February, 1884, nearly fifteen years after the completion of the road.

THE MANAGEMENT CONTEMPLATED BY CONGRESS AND THE METHOD ACTUALLY PURSUED.

Had the Pacific railroads been built and managed upon honest methods, had the Government loan been properly applied, these companies, regarded as a whole, could have declared dividends at the rate of 6 per cent per annum for eighteen years from the date of actual completion to the present time, upon all the moneys that they would have been required to pay in to complete and equip the roads; they would have owned 2,495 miles of roads free from all debt, and worth \$124,600,000, upon an original outlay of less than \$35,490,381.44; three of them, the Union Pacific, Central Pacific, and Central Branch, could have repaid every cent of the principal and interest advanced by the Government to date, and could have reduced their charges to shippers to the extent of over \$140,000,000, or nearly \$8,000,000 per year.

For \$1 the stockholders would have realized \$1.07 in dividends in eighteen years and \$1.11 in land sales. The property would have been free from debt,

and for every dollar that they had invested the stockholders would have had in property over \$4; so that in eighteen years each dollar would have yielded \$6.18.

But they chose dishonest methods. At the outset they divided \$172,347,115 of fictitious capital, they dissipated over \$107,000,000 which should have been applied to the payment of the principal and interest of the Government debt, and they taxed shippers to the extent of over \$140,000,000, or nearly \$8,000,000 a year to pay for the inflation of the capital of these companies and for the vicious practices that crept into their management.

The Union Pacific and Kansas Pacific (aided portion) roads could have been built for an original outlay by stockholders of \$17,021,488, in addition to the Government loan, all debts could have been paid, including the Government debt, principal and interest, to December 31, 1886, and from the profits of operating the roads and from land sales aggregating \$176,294,793.53, the stock could have paid regular dividends at the rate of 6 per cent per annum; and by an original outlay of \$17,021,488, which the law required but which was not made, the company would to-day own a railroad worth at least \$79,000,000 and unsold lands worth \$14,004,240, equaling an appreciation of 447 per cent in eighteen years, while shippers would have been benefited and the developments of tributary territory encouraged by a reduction of \$85,130,845.49 in charges for transportation.

In the Central Pacific, for \$16,609,203.76 of stock subscription, which should have been paid in conformity with the act of Congress, all debts could have been wiped out, including the Government debt, principal and interest; the stock would have paid regular dividends at the rate of 6 per cent per annum; and for the outlay of \$16,609,203.76 the company would to-day own a railroad worth at least \$40,000,000 and unsold lands worth \$12,500,000, equaling an appreciation of over 200 per cent in eighteen years, while shippers would have been benefited by a reduction of over \$54,000,000 in the cost of transportation.

Method contemplated by Congress.

	Union and Kansas Pacific.	Central Branch.	Sioux City and Pacific.	Central Pa- cific.	Total.
Cost of construction	\$50,624,000.00	\$2,731,347.23	\$2,600,000.00	\$40,000,000.00	\$95,955,347.23
Advances by Government	33,539,512.00	1,600,000.00	1,628,320.00	27,855,680.00	64,923,512.00
Aid from other sources	250,000.00		265,686.00	2,555,191.24	3,070,877.24
Discount on Government bonds	187,000.00	22,348.45		7,120,075.00	7,329,423.45
Amount required of stockholders	17,021,488.00	1,153,695.98	705,994.00	16,609,203.76	35,490,380.44
Actual net earnings	145,387,425.76	4,932,155.32	2,763,762.68	124,940,013.87	278,023,357.63
Land sales	30,907,387.77	\$1,000,000.00	239,364.60	7,332,581.34	39,479,313.71
Dividend of 6 per cent per annum for eighteen years on outlay to have been made by stockholders	18,383,207.04	1,245,991.33	762,473.52	17,937,940.06	38,329,611.95
Amount of principal and interest to December 31, 1886, which could have been paid to Government	72,780,741.00	3,544,000.00	2,240,653.76	59,825,155.00	138,390,549.75
Extent of reduction of charges which could have been made to shippers	85,130,845.44	1,142,163.99		54,509,500.15	140,782,509.00
Present value of aided portion	79,000,000.00	3,000,000.00	2,600,000.00	40,000,000.00	124,600,000.00
Value of unsold land	14,004,270.00			12,500,000.00	26,504,270.00

* Estimated.

Method actually pursued.

	Union and Kansas Pacific.	Central Branch.	Sioux City and Pacific.	Central Pa- cific.	Total.
Cost of construction	\$50,624,000.00	\$2,731,347.23	\$2,600,000.00	\$40,000,000.00	\$95,955,347.23
Capitalization	134,843,062.00	4,200,000.00	5,047,720.00	124,211,680.00	268,302,462.00
Fictitious capital put on the market	84,219,062.00	1,468,653.00	2,447,720.00	84,211,680.00	172,347,115.00
Actual net earnings	145,387,425.76	4,932,155.32	2,763,762.68	124,940,013.87	278,023,357.63
Land sales	30,907,387.77	1,000,000.00	239,364.60	7,332,581.34	39,479,313.71
Amount credited by Government to November 1, 1887	21,597,575.76	316,124.12	131,923.62	8,913,416.11	30,959,039.61
Net earnings and land sales in excess of the amounts credited by Government	154,697,217.77	5,616,030.88	2,871,203.66	123,350,179.10	286,543,631.41
Dividend of 6 per cent per annum for eighteen years on outlay to have been required of stockholders	18,383,207.04	1,245,991.33	762,473.52	17,937,940.06	38,329,611.95
Amounts dissipated	136,314,010.73	4,370,030.55	2,108,730.14	105,421,239.04	348,214,019.46

Because of the vicious methods actually pursued by the bond-aided companies the Government has been defrauded of the bulk of its advances, shippers have been taxed to the extent of over \$248,000,000, and liabilities to the amount of \$389,517,265 have been heaped upon the properties; the total liabilities of these companies to the public and Government on December 31, 1886, being as follows:

Union Pacific, including St. Joseph and Grand Island guarantee \$203,379,555.00
Central Pacific 171,908,734.00
Sioux City and Pacific 7,392,447.17
Central Branch 6,836,479.16
Total 389,517,265.33

These companies have paid out the following sums in interest and dividends:

Interest and dividends.

Railroad company.	Interest.	Dividend.
Union Pacific	\$82,742,856.28	\$38,650,770
Kansas Pacific	1,882,826.10	150,000
Central Branch	1,709,618.67	189,280
Sioux City and Pacific	53,877,031.15	34,308,055
Total	140,212,332.20	63,208,105

It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that they are unable to pay the Government debt, and that their resources have been diminished to such an extent as to give the Government very little return for its loans.

THE DEBT TO THE GOVERNMENT.

The obligations of these companies to the Government are as follows:

Railroad company.	Principal of debt.	Interest ac- cumulation to December 31, 1886.	Total.
Union Pacific	\$33,539,512	\$39,241,229.04	\$72,780,741
Kansas Pacific	1,600,000	1,944,000.00	3,544,000
Central Branch	1,628,320	1,758,585.00	3,386,905
Sioux City and Pacific	27,855,680	21,869,475.20	59,825,155
Total	64,623,512	74,813,289.24	139,536,801

The Government is also liable for ten years' additional interest on its bonds, or a total of \$39,447,958.26.

The present value of the debts of the companies to the Government, as computed by the Actuary of the Treasury Department, upon his own methods of computation and without reference to instructions received from any source, are as follows:

Union Pacific	\$60,643,967.10
Kansas Pacific	3,285,495.65
Central Branch	3,404,226.85
Sioux City and Pacific	55,148,416.72
Total	122,482,106.32

In considering a method for the adjustment of these debts, the Commission was told that the Union Pacific company would pay \$35,000,000 for the extinguishment of the whole amount of its indebtedness.

The officials of the Central Pacific said that the aided portion of that line

was not worth more than the first mortgage of \$27,855,080, which is prior to the Government lien, thus leaving the Government without any return for its advances.

John I. Blair, who built the Sioux City and Pacific road, offered \$1,000,000 for that line.

The Central Branch was probably included in the offer of \$35,000,000 made by the president of the Union Pacific.

So that it will be seen that the Commission was offered only \$36,000,000 in settlement of a claim the present worth of which is \$122,452,106.32.

WHAT POLICY SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT PURSUE?

What should the Government do? A mere money recovery is the least of benefits it should consider in deciding upon its course of action. To redeem these roads from the perverted uses to which they have been applied in order that the beneficial public purpose Congress had in view in their creation may be realized is a consideration of infinitely greater importance to the people than a repayment of a given number of dollars and cents into the Treasury. The Government can well afford to lose a portion of this indebtedness if this object can be accomplished. Every consideration of public policy, the enforcement of law, the supremacy and dignity of the Government, demand a treatment of this subject far above and beyond any mere attempt to collect a public debt.

The Government occupies a dual relation to the bond-aided railroads—as sovereign and as creditor. In this aspect the question of settlement unfolds complications that would not present themselves in the ordinary relation of creditor and debtor. A mere creditor might assent to compromise which, in a sovereign, dealing with a dishonest creditor who had violated all laws and covenants, would be repugnant to public policy. It can not afford to condone fraud, to validate the iniquitous work of the Crédit Mobilier, the Contract and Finance Company, and similar organizations, or to ignore the unlawful and outrageous discriminations and extortions charges and the criminal conspiracies for controlling trade which have characterized the administration of these railroads since the date of their completion.

When the Crédit Mobilier scandal was exposed by the investigations of the Wilson committee, in 1873, the Government was offered the alternative of attempting by a suit in equity to recover from the Union Pacific Company the money that had been improperly appropriated, or of proceeding to forfeit the charter of that corporation. A suit in equity was begun in the circuit court of Connecticut, but the Supreme Court, upon the demurser of the defendants, held that the Government, as a creditor, could not sue until the debt had matured in 1895, and so dismissed the case. Since that time the Government has been barred from all efforts at recovery, and is to-day experiencing the embarrassments of that decision.

The question recurs, What shall the Government do? Shall it allow matters to drift along, without action, and continue the unseemly and interminable contests that are as belittling to the sovereign as they are vexatious to the companies, or shall a remedy be applied immediately? Undoubtedly it would be preferable to settle the matter at once. If this much be conceded, what course shall be adopted? Shall the time for the payment of the debts be extended, or shall the Government insist upon an immediate adjustment and settlement with the companies? So far as its action would affect the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Congress has the power to pursue either policy without encountering legal obstacles. Which course shall it follow?

The assets of the companies to-day are insufficient to pay the present worth of the debt, and they will not be able to pay it in 1895, except by assessing stockholders, or by the recovery of large sums of which the companies were defrauded. The officers of the Union Pacific ask for an extension, though the stockholders of that corporation at the last annual meeting directed the managers to make a direct proposition to the representatives of the Government for an immediate settlement, and to meet the issue at once. Mr. Sidney Dillon, a former president and one of the present board of directors, wanted the debt extended one hundred and twenty-five years. Mr. Jay Gould, who closed out his holdings four years ago with an enormous aggregate profit of probably \$40,000,000, thinks the Government ought to be satisfied with the principal of the debt, that is, \$35,539,512, and to throw in back interest. One of the directors (see page 772 of testimony) said that the Government does not want the money, and should throw off the back interest and take bonds, "which would be just as well" as the dead capital which is now in the Treasury.

Another director (page 820 of testimony) said: "The Government ought to put this company in a position so that its stockholders can receive something. I do not think it is the interest of the Government to get all, even if it can, because it would discourage the management, if it has an honest one. A nondividend-paying stock is the stock that wreckers and speculators are looking for."

The argument for the payment of dividends by the Union Pacific Company to its stockholders was presented to the Commission in various forms; but, stripped of its sophistries, it simply amounts to the assertion that the resources of the company would be improved by taking \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 a year out of the company's treasury and by distributing it amongst the stockholders. The directors presented to the Government the alternative of permitting the company to pay dividends to its stockholders or seeing the property wrecked by speculators.

The directors (see page 987 of testimony) said that the Government had never expected to get back a dollar of this money, and had, in fact (see page 981), received a return of \$5, \$10, or \$20 for every dollar it advanced; that it had saved money in the reduction of the cost of transporting mails and military supplies, in the termination of Indian wars, and in the enhanced value of Government lands. Another director went a little further than his colleagues and intimated that if the Government forgave the company the entire debt the stockholders would be very much obliged.

The majority of the Commission recommend an extension of the time for payments of the debts of all the companies for fifty years on certain terms. The testimony shows that, except the Union Pacific, none of these companies have agreed to or will or can accept the terms recommended by the majority. The traffic manager of the Central Pacific testified that his company could not pay the debt, and that an extension for an indefinite time would not be sufficient to enable it to do so. The fact is that as to all the companies except the Union Pacific their bankruptcy is so complete and irretrievable that no part of their indebtedness can ever be recovered by the Government except by immediate compulsory legal process. Extension of time for payment therefore means in reality but an increase of the amount of the debt and the making of its recovery the more hopeless.

The bonds of the Union Pacific provided for in the majority report would sell for about 50 cents on the dollar, and the bonds of the other companies would not be negotiable. The actual effect, therefore, of the report of the majority of the commission is that its recommendation of extension of the time for payment is impractical and impotent as to all these companies except the Union Pacific, and, if adopted, could only result in the failure of the Government to realize any portion of the indebtedness and would be substantially a gift of that sum to those companies. For this reason, therefore, the recommendation of the majority will be considered only so far as it applies to the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

OBJECTIONS TO EXTENSION OF THE TIME FOR PAYMENT.

The objections to an extension of the time of payment of the debt of the Union Pacific are many and insuperable, and were strongly urged upon the

commissioners when testimony was taken in Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado. The Union Pacific Company has received \$176,294,793.53 in surplus earnings and land sales during eighteen years; and if its stock had been fully paid, as Congress required that it should be, and as its officers certified under oath that it was, nearly all of that money would be applicable to-day to the payment of the Government debt. The Government has paid out over \$28,650,770 in dividends and \$82,742,856.28 in interest on bonds, nearly all of which were distributed to shareholders without consideration. It has sunk over \$10,000,000 in the Denver, South Park, and Pacific; it paid out \$10,000,000 to Jay Gould and his associates for branch lines and other investments, which were worthless, and which were unloaded upon the Union Pacific, because of the faithlessness of the management of the company. What assurance, then, can there be that the company in the future will pay any greater heed to the obligations imposed upon it by Congress than it has in the past?

To fund the indebtedness of the company to the Government is to give it an additional subsidy. An extension would recognize as valid the Crédit Mobilier wrongs and the extravagant mismanagement of the various boards of directors. It would validate the results of fraud and be a condonation of monstrous iniquities which the Government can not afford. The gross mismanagement of the Union Pacific and the other Pacific railroads has not only injured the credit of American railroads among investors in this country, but it has shaken the faith of foreign investors to such an extent that hundreds of millions of dollars, which otherwise would have been sent here for investment and aided in the development of the country, have been locked up abroad. The foreign investor looked upon these Pacific railroads as being under Government auspices. They received a Government loan; they made annual reports to the Government, and, in addition to these requirements, the Government had a representation of five directors in the Union Pacific management. The good faith of the country was, therefore, presumed to be back of these Pacific railroad securities.

The present capitalization and indebtedness of the Union Pacific Railway represent triple the cost of its reproduction. To extend the debt is to place a mortgage upon the earnings and upon the products of the people of Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado, not only of this but of succeeding generations. Why should the iniquitous results of the Crédit Mobilier be made a burdensome exaction upon the generations that come after it? To extend the debt is to perpetuate the extortionate rates of transportation which are now charged by the Union Pacific for the maintenance of its present inflated capitalization. Why should the communities of the great West be forced to pay rates that will perpetuate this enormous burden of fictitious and fraudulent indebtedness?

To continue the Union Pacific in its present condition is to force the territory which is tributary to that line to pay fixed charges of \$8,000,000 per annum, exclusive of dividends to stockholders. If that line were capitalized on a proper basis, the sum of \$4,000,000 would pay interest. To extend the debt, therefore, is to tax the Western people, through high rates, not only to pay interest for fifty years on the Government debt at the rate of at least \$2,000,000 a year, but to pay interest also on the other fictitious capital that is represented in the stocks and bonds of the Union Pacific, at the rate of \$2,000,000 a year additional, or a total of \$4,000,000 a year for fifty years. Would it not be an abuse of its power for Congress to give more consideration to stockholders who are legatees of a gigantic fraud rather than to the people who are forced to ship over the road, and who have been taxed for eighteen years to sustain that corporation? The whole question resolves itself into a choice of protecting the so-called innocent stockholders as against the consumers who pay \$28,000,000 a year to the Union Pacific for transportation service.

The people of the West should be freed from the incubus of this enormous load. Eventually the consuming classes and not the stockholders must pay this bill if extension of time be granted, and it will be ruinous to the communities which are dependent upon the Union Pacific if they are forced to bear their share of this great burden, while communities on other roads bear only the burdens of moderate capitalization. So long as the Union Pacific Railway Company is forced to carry this debt, enterprise and development along its line will be measurably repressed.

The extension being unwise and impractical, there is only one course open to Congress, and that is an immediate winding up of the affairs of all the companies, enabling the Government to withdraw at once from all connection with the running of railroads, or sharing in the profits of their management. There ought to be an end to the partnership between the Government and the Pacific Railroads—a speedy and absolute divorce.

The only method by which this result can be reached is that which was suggested by Justice Hunt in the Crédit Mobilier cases. It is the alternative pointed out by the Wilson committee of Congress in the event of the failure of the equity proceedings in the United States courts. It is the course that Congress directed the Attorney-General, by resolution of April 10, 1869 (section 4), to take against the Union Pacific—that is, the forfeiture of the charter.

The beginning of the proceedings at this time to cause the forfeiture of the charters, because of their violations of law and failure to keep their contract with the Government, is only to anticipate by a few years the result which will be inevitable when the bonds mature in 1895 and 1897. To wait until then before instituting legal proceedings would not avert the result, but would further jeopardize the interests of the Government and increase the amount of the indebtedness. It should be borne in mind that it is a fact admitted by every officer of these roads who testified before the commission, and overwhelmingly proved by the evidence submitted, that the payment of the debts at maturity in 1895 and 1897 can, under no circumstances, be expected. The railroad officials, the commissioners, and every intelligent citizen concur in the correctness of this statement.

Upon forfeiture the appointment of a receiver should be applied for to provide for the immediate settlement of the Government's debt. This course involves no actuarial computations or involved legal problems. It is the direct path to the complete solution of a tangle into which the Government should never have been drawn. This course is not recommended for the purpose of punishing this company, or its stockholders, for the willful and continuous violation of obligations imposed by law, but to withdraw the Government from further connection with private enterprises. The stockholders would have the same right to buy that others would have.

In this way the Government would cut loose from all participation in railroad management. It would recover its debt and put its seal of condemnation upon the multiplied wrongs that have marked the administration of that trust.

The capital and indebtedness of the purchasing companies should be limited to the estimates of the cost of reproduction as made by the inspecting engineer of the commission—6% per cent in bonds and 3% per cent in stocks. The purchasing company should be confined solely to the business of a common carrier, operating railroad and telegraph lines, and should be forbidden, directly or indirectly, to invest in the bonds or securities of companies other than railroads, or in railroads that are parallel or competing, or to acquire by purchase, or otherwise, any interest or control in any competing or parallel line. The officers of the company should be prohibited from being interested in any competing or parallel lines, and such company should not be permitted to hold any real estate, except such as may be necessary for its legitimate business, and it should be allowed to issue stocks or bonds only

for money, labor done, or money or property actually received. The sale should also be made upon the condition that the franchises should be exercised thereafter, subject to the regulation and control of the Government, in the public interest.

Such a course would force transcontinental lines to a similar basis, and would benefit consumers in all parts of the country. Transportation would be cheapened; the companies would be liberated from the crushing weight of their debts and made useful arteries of commerce, and a reasonable profit would be yielded to honest investments. In addition to the recommendation of the forfeiture of the charters, I would suggest that, through the receiver to be appointed for the Union Pacific, a suit to be instituted with like purpose to that begun in 1873 against the Credit Mobilier, and that the Attorney-General be instructed to institute proceedings, either civil or criminal, against all persons who have rendered themselves liable for their participation in the use of stock or the making of mortgages or pledges upon the property or future earnings of the Union Pacific Company without leave of Congress; against those who violated their trusts in connection with the consolidation of the Kansas Pacific, Denver Pacific, and Union Pacific in January, 1880; against all persons who have rendered themselves liable through the maladministration of the Central Pacific, Sioux City and Pacific, and Central Branch Union Pacific; against telegraph and express companies, to secure an accounting to the Government for earnings on business done on bond-aided lines, and to require an accounting for lands improperly acquired from the Government, and to force the patenting of lands already granted to the companies.

In applying the remedies necessary for securing the Government indebtedness, the Attorney-General should proceed against all persons and corporations who in any way were parties to or participants in the results of any of the illegal and fraudulent acts which have characterized the management of these corporations and resulted in the waste and misappropriation of the funds of the companies and consequent depreciation of the Government security.

If this recommendation should be adopted, the population of the great West through which the lines of road extend would have these public highways existing and managed as it was intended by law they should be, in the interest and for the benefit of the people, and not as subjects of stock gambling and speculative practices through which enormous fortunes are amassed by railroad officials and favorites, while communities are burdened and private industry repressed. In other words, these roads, as a result of legal purgation, would be free, clear, and clean public highways, honestly and lawfully managed.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. If it is just to cut down the compensation of the land-grant roads of the West, why not apply the same measure to the great trunk lines of the East? Why not make it equal all the way through?

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the gentleman heartily.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Why not elaborate that point? Why make a speech entirely against the interests of the West?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am not doing anything of that kind. What I regret is that the Democratic party, represented by its committee, has not seen fit to make a reduction on all the railroads of the country for carrying the mails. There has been a large reduction in the cost of carrying freight of all descriptions, and there should be a reduction made in the compensation for carrying the mails.

And I hope they will so amend the bill, when it comes to the stage of amendment, as to apply it to all of the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, it is a well-established principle that these corporations, these great public highways, are common carriers, and it is so acknowledged in the law, and they should be made to carry the public freight or mails at the lowest price at which it is possible to carry it and on the basis of a fair profit on the actual cost of the roads, and not upon the basis of the watered stock, which is sometimes three or four times the actual value of the property. And I am glad that some step, even though it be a very short one, has been taken in this regard to make some of the roads comply with the original contracts.

It is a well-known fact that the public domain has been absolutely squandered without adequate protection to the people. Nothing was given in return for it as a matter of fact; and yet gentlemen to-day are coming in here and objecting to this small measure of compensation which will probably give a little to the people in return for all that they have lost, by reducing the rate paid for carrying the mails. And I am surprised, Mr. Chairman, that there are not more men found ready to stand up here on the side of the public and in support of the people.

I am not so much surprised to see so many standing up and ready to advocate the railroad corporations; but I want to warn gentlemen on this floor that the people of this country are beginning to look into this matter for themselves; the people are beginning to get information upon this question; the rural districts of the country will be heard from in time, and they will be heard from in relation to this question of the free delivery of mails to the farmers, who are investigating the subject now. They are investigating this railroad subject, they are learning something of the legislation of the country, and if I am not mistaken the signs of the times indicate pretty clearly that when the next Congress assembles there will be more men here on the floor found talking in favor of the people and fewer in the interests of the great railroad corporations.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. Before the gentleman from Kansas leaves this part of the subject—the land-grant subject—and goes into the question of free delivery, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. SIMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. HAYES of Iowa. I do not wish to antagonize the idea the gentleman has put forth. Assuming that your idea is correct, I

wish to ask the gentleman what reason exists, as a matter of law or equity, that these land-grant roads should be paid but 50 per cent of what is paid to other classes of roads?

Mr. SIMPSON. That is one question that I shall be very glad to have the chairman of this committee explain before we get through with this bill: Why they exempt the roads which received bonds from the people of the United States from the operation of this provision. I agree with the gentleman that I would like to have that explained. Why are these bond-aided roads paid 80 per cent and the land-grant roads are paid but 50 per cent? I believe that all should be on the same basis.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. The reason is that the original acts do not permit it.

Mr. SIMPSON. The original acts do not permit it. Well, there is another evidence that in the original acts passed by Congress these corporations had their defenders on the floor. They seem to be pretty intelligent men, these railroad men. They are very apt to get their friends here in Congress, and when a law is passed in which they are interested, they are very likely to be very well protected. But I say to you that the people are beginning to learn about this matter. Their eyes are being opened. They are gathering wisdom, and they will see to it that there are men here to look after the interests of the people rather than the interests of the corporations. I am satisfied if that had been done before, that a very large proportion of the public domain would not have passed into the hands of these corporations without proper safeguards to protect the popular interests.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have had a law on this subject. The Postmaster-General himself says in reference to this transportation of the mail on railroads:

The act of July 12, 1876, directed a reduction of 10 per cent from the rates of 1873, and the act of June 17, 1878, a further reduction of 5 per cent.

The maximum rates allowable at this time are therefore as follows:

On routes carrying their whole length an average weight per day of—	
200 pounds.....	\$42.75
500 pounds.....	64.12
1,000 pounds.....	85.50
1,500 pounds.....	106.87
2,000 pounds.....	128.25
3,500 pounds.....	149.62
5,000 pounds.....	171.00

One hundred and seventy-one dollars per day to carry a quarter of a car-load of freight or mail matter in weight! No man who knows anything of railroad freights or railroad charges will deny that this is an enormous charge. It is away beyond what any merchant pays for transporting goods, and I say that the reduction of 50 per cent is altogether too small. There should have been a reduction to 40 per cent, and I think the railroads would have fared well at that.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. SIMPSON. Certainly. That is what we all want.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I am much interested in the remarks of the gentleman, but if this law goes into effect it will reduce the amount received by the railroads in my State for carrying the mails \$42,000 a year in round numbers.

Mr. SIMPSON. What road?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The Northern Pacific. Now, it is well known that these roads must earn their fixed charges to meet their indebtedness. Where will they get the money to meet these charges from, if this Government pay for service is withdrawn, if they do not increase the rates on the people for carrying the freights or carrying passengers, and thus take it from the people in the end?

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman says that the railroads are under obligations to earn a large sum of money to pay their fixed charges.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. That is true, is it not? I am not a railroad man, and I do not know.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is true, but—

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will they not get that out of the people? Will they not increase their charges in order to take that out of the people, and will they not get it back in increased charges for carrying freight?

Mr. SIMPSON. The cost of carrying on a railroad is one thing. The paying of dividends on watered stock put into a railroad is another thing. Everybody knows that all the Pacific railroads have increased their indebtedness enormously by issuing bonds upon branch lines that they have built in connection with their roads, and there has been a system of extravagance, purposely, to increase the cost of these roads; they have run them up, I think, until they are attempting to pay dividends on nearly \$90,000 a mile.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Thirty-two thousand dollars a mile on the Northern Pacific.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman says if we do not take the money out of the pockets of the people in the shape of taxes to raise public revenues, and pay them into the pockets of the rail-

roads for carrying the mails, and so forth, that then under the present legislation they will take advantage of the people and rob them in some other direction.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. You misapprehend my position. I say in our State the roads get a reduced rate. In New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the populous States of the East, they get full rates for carrying the mails. In our State they get only 50 per cent. So it is an oppression upon the people of Washington, the Dakotas, Idaho, and Montana, which does not apply to New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Indiana.

Mr. SIMPSON. I agree with the gentleman that there probably has been injustice done, as they have discriminated against roads which run through the West and the South.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. That is what we complain of—that there is a discrimination against the West and the South.

Mr. SIMPSON. That may be. I do not deny that. But I am saying that this is a right and reasonable reduction and that it ought to be made. Now, to say that if we reduce this rate the railroads will turn around and rob the people in some other direction is only to prove to me that it is high time there should be some legislation to restrict these cormorants that are robbing the people of their wealth.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. But we are confronted by a condition. They are in debt, and they have to meet their interest charges.

Mr. SIMPSON. I do not believe the people ought to be taxed to pay the interest upon fictitious values or upon watered stock.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Then you propose to buy the railroads?

Mr. SIMPSON. I do not propose to stand up here and vote for anything that will enable these railroads to rob the people of this country if I can help it, and I will go with the gentleman from Washington or any gentleman in this House in the direction of passing some laws that will place proper restrictions upon these companies, upon the people who control these public highways that are carriers for the public benefit, and that have received such large benefits from the donations of the public domain to them.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I will go with the gentleman from Kansas if he will make it apply equally all over the country.

Mr. SIMPSON. I will do it. I will make it apply to every railroad in the United States, because I believe they are public institutions, and I believe that we have a right to fix freight rates as well as to fix the rates received by these roads carrying the mails.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. If the gentleman will allow me—I have interrupted him a good deal—what I want him to do is to attack some of the strong fellows and not pick out us poor weak fellows who are struggling to get along and get a little start out West.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am not a member of the Democratic party. I am not up in its councils nor controlling its actions. If I was probably it would act differently. The Democratic party is timid and conservative, afraid to act, apparently, and I am surprised that it has done as much as it has. A party is like an individual. It grows old, it grows conservative, and fears to take any onward step. It is always looking backward. Our Republican friends go to the other extreme. They are aggressive. When they go after anything they go after it in earnest and get what they want. They come out boldly and avowedly that they are on the side of all these corporations. They are in for getting all the things they can in this way. They go after what they want, and they get it.

There is a great temptation to join a party like that sometimes, and if the Republican party would turn its energies in the direction of passing some wholesome laws for the people, something that would be for their benefit, I do not know but what I would be tempted to join them; but inasmuch as the Democratic party on the one hand is conservative and refuses to take a step forward to do anything for the people, and inasmuch as the Republican party, on the other hand, is allying itself with these corporations and enacting laws that rob the people, I refuse to join either of these parties, and I go out and we organize the People's party, and we invite our friend from Washington [Mr. WILSON] to go with us; and if he and his friends will do that, then we will be able to do something with these corporations and to do something for the people, and not until then. That is my humble opinion about the matter.

I will here print in the RECORD an extract taken from the fourth annual report of Railroad Commissioners, of April, 1892:

THE DUTY OF PUBLIC REGULATION OF RATES.

The duty of public control of rates is no more to be disputed than the power. Railways are among the agencies of the state. At first their control was committed almost entirely to the representatives of those who advanced the capital to build them. They were then in their infancy, and the doctrine of *laissez faire*, so important in private affairs, was in the beginning perhaps wisely left to apply to them.

But time has wrought and is working rapid and great changes. Railway mileage has doubled with almost each decade, growing from 23 miles in 1850 to 163,597 miles June 30, 1890.

That mileage is capitalized at \$9,437,353,372. Of this 156,404 miles were in operation June 30, 1890, the gross income from which for the previous year was from operation \$1,051,877,632, and from other sources \$126,757,064, a total of \$1,178,644,696. The revenues collected by these companies are more than five times those collected by the Government from tariff duties. Railway employees number about two millions, or nearly ten times as many as those of the Federal Government, while perhaps two million more employees are engaged in affiliated industries dependent upon railroad companies. Thus it appears that the railroad system is hardly second to the Government itself.

Competition between the separate systems has become, as stated by Mr. Jos. Nimmo, jr., in his late argument before the Senate committee, almost absolutely a matter of conventional arrangement. The weaker lines are absorbed by the stronger. Combination is taking the place of competition, the tendency being towards centralization and consolidation of interests and of property. Where unity of ownership is not had the end is reached by federation into associations, and thus the vast railroad systems of the country are being organized into one gigantic power.

This great agency, thus united in interest and management, holds as in the hollow of its hand the commerce of the country. Already it has accumulated wealth in the hands of the few as no other agency in any age in any country has ever done. If uncontrolled by law it can levy what tribute it pleases, direct the channels of trade and the tide of business, make and unmake cities, build up and put down industries, enrich and impoverish individuals and communities. Moved by a common purpose, prompted by a desire of gain, managed by the brainiest men, its forces disciplined and organized and alert, it could control nominations and elections and influence if not dictate legislation. Such power is a source of danger, a menace to the perpetuity of the Republic. It must be put under effective restraint. "The state must control the railways, or the railways will control the state."

Public regulation of railways, then, is not only a public right, but a public duty of paramount importance. It is rooted in the necessity of self-preservation, in the protection of the general welfare. *Salus populi suprema lex.*

II.

WHAT LEGISLATION TOUCHING RATES IS NEEDED.

The right and duty of public control being no longer an open question, it only remains to consider and determine in what manner and to what extent this power ought to be exercised and what legislation is desirable on the subject.

The private capital invested in railways is entitled to favorable and generous consideration. Much of it has been invested at great risk. It has largely contributed to the development of the country. Liberal returns should be allowed. But this capital has been voluntarily dedicated to a business affected with the public interest, and "it must, to the extent of that interest, submit to public control for the common good." This much the general welfare requires.

As railways are public highways and have control of travel and commerce, the necessity of their being limited to the exaction of reasonable charges is manifest; for if they can dictate at will the amount of such charges, the masses of the people and the business of the country are completely at their mercy. Left free in the exercise of such unlimited power they can put what tribute they please upon the people. An increase of 5 mills per ton per mile on freight would raise annually, in addition to the present charges, a sum larger than the total receipts of the Federal Government from internal revenues and custom duties. Railway managers are appointed not by the public, but hold their places at the will of the stockholders. To expect them to look to the public interest rather than to the interests of the owners of the private capital, would be idle. To clothe them with arbitrary power over rates and not to look for them to use that power to enrich, at the expense of the public those whom they serve and to whom they owe their places, is to hope for too much of human nature. As the forces of competition between railroads relax their hold, but tighten upon the crowding population of our cities and country in all branches of private business, the necessity of public regulation increases. Society is organized to protect the weak against the strong—to protect those who can not protect themselves. Regulation of rates is necessary to protect those who can not protect themselves. The president of the American Railway Association, in his address delivered at New York October 14, 1891, admitted that "the local shipper ought to be protected against contributing to pay losses on competitive business, because he is in no position to make rates for himself." This affirmation may, to a certain degree, be predicated of every shipper, and its truth is emphasized by the statistics which accompanied the committee's report last year. Those tables show that railways in the fourteen years prior to 1890 had earned in excess of 6 per cent on the capital actually invested the enormous sum of \$1,582,280,277 from traffic earnings alone; that their earnings for the year 1888 were more than \$171,000,000 in excess of 5 per cent on such capital; that in the eleven central farming States railway earnings had increased 175 per cent, while the increase of value in the wheat and corn crops in those States increased only 57 per cent, indicating that the railways are taking a constantly increasing proportion of the proceeds arising from the sale of farm products, as is further shown by the fact that in those States railway revenue in 1870, when times were prosperous with the farmers, was \$12 for each unit of the population as against \$18 in 1888, an increase in the per capita tax of 50 per cent.

Is it to be wondered, then, that the minds of the people are turned toward the subject of transportation as one of the important economic questions of the times; that its importance is being asserted in interviews with the leaders of thought in public meetings, on political platforms, and in legislative halls?

Senator GORMAN, in a late interview, is reported to have said that the leading public question now is that of transportation.

Judge Cooley, in his last admirable address to this conference on the subject of the railroad problem, took the ground that the railroad problem is the problem of rates.

Representative SIMPSON, claiming to speak for the Farmers' Alliance, takes the position that it matters not what legislation in the interest of the masses is had upon tax and financial questions unless relief is afforded on the subject of transportation; since, if the railways can make their own rates *ad libitum*, they must eventually own and control the country, even if the manufacturing and banking classes be shorn of all power.

This conference is assembled to lend a helping hand in the solution of this problem, and if, as Judge Cooley said, the question of rates is the railroad problem, then no more important subject than that submitted to your committee on rates will command the attention of this body.

That the problem is one difficult of solution no one who has studied it will dispute. The control of highways and the regulation of commerce both belong primarily to the Government, but the owners of railways have been made the agents of the Government in these matters. They have been clothed with the governmental power of eminent domain and the right to levy tribute upon the travel and commerce of the king's—the people's—highways. They have been taken into a sort of partnership with the Government, but with the right of Government to say how their business shall be managed and what tolls or tribute they shall exact, subject only to the limitation that

the property they have put into the partnership shall not be subject to confiscation, nor shall they be compelled to carry without reward. But where shall the line be drawn? How much reward shall they be allowed? How far shall the burden be lightened on the prime necessities of life or in the interest of those remote from water communication? Who for the Government shall fix the limitations upon these tolls and see that the limitations imposed are observed and the laws enforced?

This problem has vexed every government where railways have been built, and its solution has been attempted on various lines.

On the continent of Europe the effort to control rates has resulted in government ownership.

In England regulation by the courts of common law was tried in vain. Statutes in 1845 and 1854 were passed in aid of the common law providing for equal rights and facilities and for summary remedies in the courts on complaint of the Board of Trade. These proved insufficient. In 1888 a board of commissioners were created with judicial powers, whose findings of fact are made conclusive, and schedules of maxima rates recommended by the Board of Trade, which is endowed with administrative powers, have since been imposed by act of Parliament.

There are advocates for governmental ownership in this country. But how is the money to be obtained with which to purchase the railways; and if the money could be provided, are there not insuperable difficulties in the way?

The civil service is already overburdened; to add to it the officers and employees of the railway systems, would it not destroy the Republic? And if the Republic could stand the strain, would the problem be solved? The task of making reasonable rates would still remain. The Government, through its officers or by statute, would have to make the schedules. Can this not as well be secured through the agency of commissioners?

It seems to your committee that it is better to follow in the path England has blazed. We have learned, as did that country, that the common law is wholly unequal to the task of securing reasonable rates; that its machinery is not adapted to this work. Control of rates, to be effectual, must be prompt. If left to the constitutional courts the delays of the law would be as fatal to the control of rates on railways as they would be to the ad valorem assessment of property and the collection of taxes. As in the matter of taxes, so in the matter of rates summary remedies outside of the ordinary judicial forms of law are required. Moreover, the question of the reasonableness of a rate should be treated as an administrative question, the details of which are almost infinite in variety and number involving multifarious economic and commercial considerations. The intricacies and difficulties, the ever-changing conditions and circumstances, the endless complexities which surround and embarrass the task of schedule-making, preclude the idea of trial by jury or court, and indicate the necessity of a tribunal composed of men trained especially for the business, who will be at liberty to visit and inspect the theater of railroad operations, and who will not be distracted from their work by other duties.

To leave the question of rates to the present court system is practically to abandon control. The citizen can not afford to litigate with the railroad, and the delays of the law, could success be attained, at the end would be fatal.

The apprehension of the truth has resulted in the creation of boards of railroad commissioners by Congress and by a majority of the States. These boards have various and different powers over rates. In some cases their powers are only advisory; in others their duty is to see that the statutes touching rates are enforced in the courts; in some power to make a maxima schedule of rates is given.

It must be confessed that, for the most part, the railroad commissions have not given satisfaction. The main reason for this is the lack of power. In most cases the commissioners have power enough to annoy the railroads, but not enough to help the public efficiently. When that distinguished jurist, Judge William Lindsey, lately declined appointment on the Interstate Commerce Commission, he gave as his reason that the Commission had no power to enforce its findings.

Vice in rates partakes either of extortion or discrimination. Of these the latter is by far the worst. The one great evil of rates is the evil of discrimination. The main trouble is, not that rates considered as a unit are too high, but that the disproportion between competitive and noncompetitive rates is too great; that favoritism to certain individuals, lines of business, and localities is shown; that through partiality certain industries and places are built up, and others hampered or destroyed. The fundamental principle of good government is equality before the law. Discrimination invades the sanctity of this principle. Whether this favoritism proceeds from motives of partiality, or a desire to increase business, or from a purpose to meet competition, the evil is the same. Against this evil the effective aid of the law must be invoked. From it the companies, the wronged individuals, and the suffering localities alike should be saved.

If these ends can best be accomplished through administrative tribunals all parties should welcome such settlement of the question.

To cure these evils; to protect railroads against rival railroads; to secure living rates, even at the points of strongest competition; to prevent traffic managers from getting business they are not justly entitled to; to stop indiscriminate rate wars; to promote fair dealing and honest practices; to compel respect for the rights of producers and carriers alike; to take away the power to decree which cities shall be favored at the expense of others, which merchants or manufacturers shall do business at a profit and which at a loss; to make it impracticable for men to combine and corner the markets of wheat, or cattle, or tobacco, or other product at the great centers of trade; to check the growth of monopoly; to secure justice and equality among all persons and classes and between all places and kinds of business—would seem to be a purpose worthy of the state, and not fit to be characterized as an agrarian movement, sneered at as an attack upon vested rights, or denounced as an attempt to confiscate private property. The purpose is a worthy one. It is to provide for the general welfare, in which the railroads are included.

The rule which obtains in most railroad managements is to make the rate as high as the traffic will bear. This rule is based on the interests of the railway companies without regard to those of the shipper, the producer, or the public, and its application gives rise to discrimination and other evils. To avoid wrongs like these various expedients have been resorted to. In some countries, where the Government owns the railroad, the rule is to charge a fixed rate per mile. In others a graduated scale of sliding tariffs has been adopted. In this country it has not been deemed necessary to go to such lengths, but in some nineteen States what is known as the long and short haul rule has been enacted. Of the States providing for this rule, in all but two the rule is absolute. The Connecticut statute provided that a greater charge should not be made for a short than a longer haul "under substantially similar circumstances and conditions." The qualification of the Connecticut statute was followed in the interstate commerce act and in the new constitution of Kentucky. In some of the States, as also in England, maxima schedules of rates have been imposed. In one form or another statutes have been passed in most of the States aimed at the injustice of extortion and unjust discrimination. This evil is denounced by the common law.

But the trouble with the common-law rule is in its application. The difficulty is to give practical effect to it. To meet "the new development of commercial progress" something additional is required.

In the interstate commerce act it was thought provision was made for the better application of this common-law principle by enacting that the findings of fact of the Commission shall be *prima facie* evidence in judicial pro-

ceedings; but the courts hold that the findings of the Commission are, as the law now stands, *prima facie* evidence only upon the case presented to the Commission, and the railroads, by holding back their evidence, can also present a different state of facts before the court from that before the Commission and thus render nugatory this provision of the statute. In England the railroads are compelled to try their case upon the evidence brought before the Commission, and the findings of fact by the Commission are made conclusive.

The people of the United States are conservative. They wish to allow the largest latitude to the railroad autonomy consistent with the public welfare. It is in the power of the people, through the Legislatures to clothe the commissioners with authority to fix maxima schedules of rates. Such exercise of administrative power, unless grossly abused, is binding on the judiciary. This reserved power will doubtless be drawn upon as the necessities of the case require. Special tribunals to try the questions of law with dispatch and commissioners armed with legislative authority as to rates can secure justice; or the law might provide that before the railroads can charge any tolls they must first submit their tariff schedules to and obtain the approval of the commissioners. Again, a new department might be created by the Government—railroad department—and the companies required to adopt and conform to the classifications and rates which the secretary from time to time prescribes. Such methods of control are naturally offensive to the railroads, and if railway managers will yield obedience to milder forms of regulation, may be avoided altogether.

The Interstate Commerce Commission have suggested that the law be amended by providing—

That notice of the time and place of hearing and the opportunity to appear and be heard shall be given by the Commission to all parties interested.

That the production of testimony before the Commission shall be governed by the rules of evidence prevailing on the chancery side of the Federal courts, any party being given the right to except to the admission or rejection of testimony.

That the report of the Commission, after hearing, shall state specifically what changes if any, should be made, and what action, if any, should be taken by any common carrier in respect to the matters under investigation in order to conform its conduct and the management of its business to the requirements of this act.

That a copy of the report, with an order to cease from violating the law, be served on the carriers as now provided.

That in case of disobedience to the order of the Commission, the record of proceedings before the Commission, together with a copy of its recommendations, etc., shall be certified into court, with a petition asking the court to enforce obedience to the order of the Commission, notice of such application being duly given.

That the court shall be empowered thereupon to determine, upon requests of parties, whether any matter embraced in the recommendations and order of the Commission entitles the carrier to a jury trial; and to frame an issue covering such matter, if any, for a trial by jury on the law side of the court. On the trial of such issue any relevant legal testimony to be admissible, and the proceedings at and after the trial to be in all respects as if the trial were had in an action at common law.

That as to all matters embraced in the recommendations and order of the commission not requiring jury trial, or as to which jury trial is not demanded, the court sitting as a court of equity shall proceed to hear and decide them, notwithstanding the pendency of any issue for jury trial.

That the hearing by the court, as to all matters not requiring jury trial, shall be confined to the record of proceedings had before the commission and to such errors in the records as shall be specifically pointed out by parties alleging error therein.

That if the record discloses no error in the recommendation and order of the commission plainly prejudicial to the parties alleging error therein the court shall enforce the same by proper process.

That if the record does disclose error in the recommendations and decisions of the Commission plainly prejudicial to the parties alleging error therein the court shall either make such final order as may be proper or recommit the case to the Commission; and that the findings of the Commission shall have the force of the report of a master commissioner in chancery.

It is objected by the attorneys for the railroads that this would be to blend judicial and administrative functions in the same tribunal. It does not seem to your committee that this objection is well taken.

It has been seen that the Legislature may prescribe rates by direct legislative enactment or by commissioners. This method of fixing rates is legislative or ministerial, and not judicial. How, then, can it be said that the delegation of a less power to the commissioners—the power to find that a given rate is unreasonable—is a delegation of judicial power? The exercise of the administrative power is binding upon the courts. The law, as announced by the Supreme Court, when speaking of administrative matters, is that when there has been "confided to a special tribunal the authority to hear and determine certain matters arising in the course of its duties the discussion of that tribunal within the scope of its authority is conclusive upon all others." (Johnson *vs.* Towsley, 13 Wall., 83.) All that is required is that a fair opportunity for a hearing shall be afforded the interested parties. Upon this principle the Commissioner of Navigation is charged with quasi-judicial duties. Upon this principle patents issued from the Land Office are made conclusive of the legal title, and various semijudicial acts are allowed to be done by administrative or executive officers.

Upon this principle, too, statutes providing for public improvements, with power on the part of the commissioners to apportion the cost among those benefited thereby, are upheld. By virtue of this principle property is assessed by ministerial officers and ad valorem taxes imposed.

The acts of such officers are quasi judicial, but essentially administrative. These officers make their findings and perform their functions, but can not enforce obedience to their orders. The essential feature of a strictly judicial act is effectiveness—the power of enforcing its own orders by its own process.

The amendment referred to not only does not contemplate such judicial power, but does not give as much effect to the acts of the commissioners as could be clearly conferred by conferring upon them the power to fix maxima rates. If, therefore, the latter is not amenable to the objection made, *a fortiori* the former is not.

In the case of *Davidson vs. New Orleans*, 96 U. S., 97, the court said:

"That whenever by the law of a State, or by State authority, a tax, assessment, servitude, or other burden is imposed upon property for the public use, whether it be for the whole State or of some more limited portion of the community, and those laws provide for a mode of confirming or contesting the charge thus imposed in the ordinary courts of justice, with such notice to the person or such proceedings in regard to the property as is appropriate to the nature of the case, the judgment in such proceeding can not be said to deprive the owner of his property without due process of law. * * *

In the Kentucky railroad tax cases (115 United States, 321) Justice Matthews, speaking for the court, answered the objection contended for to the acts of administrative tribunals in these words:

"It is still urged, however, that there is, notwithstanding what has been said, no security that the final action of the board of railroad commissioners in valuing and assessing railroad property under this statute may not be unequal, unjust, and oppressive, and that either by error of judgment through caprice, prejudice, or even from an intention to oppress, valuations

may be made which are excessive, bearing no reasonable relation to what is fair and just, and fixed arbitrarily, based neither upon actual evidence nor an honest estimate.

"But the same suppositions may be indulged in, in opposition to all contrary presumptions, with reference to the final action of any tribunal appointed to determine the matter, however carefully constituted and however carefully guarded in its procedure, and whether judicial or administrative. Such possibilities are but the necessary imperfections of all human institutions and do not admit of remedy; at least no revisory power to prevent or redress them enters into the judicial system, for by the supposition its administration is itself subject to the same imperfections.

"But whatever relief courts of justice may afford against the injuries apprehended, when in fact they have resulted, is secured to the plaintiffs in error by the very statute of which they complain; for the valuation of railroad property under that act, and the assessment of taxes thereon, are not final in the sense that they constitute a charge upon the properties subject to the tax, or a liability fixed upon the corporation owning it. That result can be attained and the tax actually collected only by suit as provided in the fifth section of the statute."

See also the recent case of *Lent vs. Tillotson* (140 United States, 316), where the powers which may be conferred upon commissioners for the assessing on property of the costs of improvement and the effect of their report are discussed.

Due process of law does not necessarily require a rehearing in courts of justice on questions of fact determined by the executive or administrative tribunal acting under authority of law.

It has been defined to be "one which, following the forms of law, is appropriate to the case and just to the parties affected" (111 United States, 701); but even in cases of private property does not always demand judicial determination or necessarily imply a regular proceeding in a court of justice or after the manner of such courts.

96 United States, 97; 115 United States, 331; 113 United States, 27.

In 111 United States, 710, the Supreme Court said of assessors:

"The officers in estimating the value act judicially. * * * The law, in prescribing the time when such complaint will be heard, gives all the notice required, and the proceedings by which the valuation is determined, though it be followed, if the tax be not paid, by a sale of the delinquent's property, is due process of law."

Assessors are administrative officers. In making the assessment they act judicially, but it has never been supposed that their functions are open to the objection that in their office administrative and judicial functions are blended, nor has it ever been decided when their action is questioned in court that the questions of valuations made by them are to be tried *de novo*.

When the rights of the public are involved, these may be determined by summary remedies outside of the ordinary judicial forms of law.

The constitutionality of such an act as the one referred to may further be defended upon the ground that it merely prescribes the effect of evidence. As said by Judge Woods, in *Tilley vs. Savannah*, etc., with reference to the findings of railroad commissioners, as expressed in rates made by them:

"In this provision the Legislature has exercised the power exercised by all Legislatures, both Federal and State, of prescribing the effect of evidence, and it has done nothing more."

"Even in criminal cases Congress has declared that certain facts proved shall be evidence of guilt. For instance, in section 3082 of the United States Revised Statutes it is provided that whenever on an indictment the defendant is shown to be in possession of smuggled goods, 'such possession shall be deemed evidence sufficient to authorize a conviction, unless the defendant shall explain the possession to the satisfaction of the jury.' The statute books are full of such acts, but it has never been considered that this impairs the right of trial by jury."

It was held by Judge Jackson, in the case of the Kentucky and Indiana Bridge Company vs. Louisville and Nashville Railroad (37 Fed. Rep., 567), that no constitutional objection can be urged against making the findings of the Commission *prima facie* evidence in subsequent judicial proceedings, and that such provision merely prescribes a rule of evidence clearly within well-recognized powers of the Legislature, and in no way encroaches upon the court's proper functions.

There is another ground upon which this legislation may rest. The Constitution provides that—

"Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

In *Gibbons vs. Ogden* (9 Wheat., 196) the Supreme Court construed this power in the following language:

"This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself; may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledged no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution. * * * If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of Congress, though limited to specific objects, is plenary as to those objects, the power over commerce with foreign nations and among the several States is vested in Congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government having in its constitution the same restrictions on the exercise of that power as are found in the Constitution of the United States."

This power would appear to be broad enough to authorize much more than is asked in the proposed change in the law.

The effect of the master's report in chancery, if excepted to, is but little, if anything, more than to make his findings *prima facie* evidence.

The master has no judicial power. The purpose of the reference to the master is the same as that contemplated by the amendment referred to, viz., to lighten the labors of the court and to expedite the case.

The said amendment has undergone the ordeal of criticism of the attorneys for the railroads in the discussion before the Senate committee. The argument of these attorneys was mainly directed to show that the question of the reasonableness of a rate is necessarily a judicial question.

They knew that this was the key of the situation, and that if this question can be made legislative or administrative their case must fail.

Therefore it was that they pressed the point so vigorously.

It is singularly unfortunate for their position that the Supreme Court in the Budd case, decided just afterward, reaffirmed the doctrine of the Munn case.

In the light of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Budd case, the arguments of Messrs. Cowan and Nimmo, Jr., before the Senate committee really seemed ridiculous.

Objection may still be urged as a matter of policy to making the Commissioners judges of reasonableness of rates. But why should this not be?

It was shown by the former report of this committee that questions of the reasonableness of rates, under the interstate-commerce act, were questions of fact.

See *Collery & Co. vs. Manchester*, 3 Nev. and McNam., 441; *Denaby vs. Same*, 11 App. Cas., 97; *Samuels vs. L. and N. R. R.*, 31 Fed. Rep., 58; *U. S. vs. Frazer*, 2 L. C. R., 510; *Harper's Law on Com.*, 66-68, and cases cited.

By the common law juries and not the courts are made judges of the facts. Why should not the commissioners, then, be made judges of the facts arising in proceedings under statutes touching rates? Surely men selected to fill the office of railroad commissioners can be found fit to judge of such questions. If a jury of twelve men may be trusted to judge of the facts upon which depend rights of property, of liberty, and life itself, railroad commis-

sioners, chosen with special reference to their fitness for this work and trained in the school of experience, may be depended upon to judge of the reasonableness of rates. There is an irrepressible conflict between railways on the one side and shippers and producers upon the other touching such questions.

It is the interest of the company to get as much as possible for carrying passengers and freight. It is the interest of the shippers to pay as little as possible. Shall the railroads decide between them? It is not right that one should be judge in his own case. Railway directors and officers are trustees both for the stockholders and the public. They have a dual and sometimes divided duty to perform. It would seem that in case of conflict of interest between the parties they represent that it would be a relief to them to have the questions in dispute settled by an impartial tribunal. It is to the interest of the public that neither the railroads nor the shippers be oppressed. The only reasonable and effective way of settlement is by arbitration.

The present provision of the interstate-commerce act touching the findings of the Commission has not only fallen short of its purpose, but tends to bring the Commission into discredit.

It seems to you committee that the findings of fact of the Commission should be made effective.

An amendment to this effect would tend to dignify the Commission, to command more respect for its work, and to enlarge its sphere of usefulness, and, as a necessary result, to enhance its labors.

Should cases so multiply as to overburden the Commission the difficulty could be met by providing for sub or additional commissions as the necessity of the case might require.

Inasmuch as all the States are interested in interstate commerce, and as there is a growing disposition on the part of many of the States to follow Congressional action in their own legislation, and inasmuch as uniformity in State and Congressional legislation is desirable, the most important step in the accomplishment of public regulation of rates is the proper amendment of the interstate-commerce law.

Your committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That we recommend to Congress so to amend the interstate-commerce act as to provide:

1. That the railroads shall try their case in the courts upon the evidence introduced before the Commission.

2. That as between the parties the findings of the Commission shall, in equity proceedings, have the force and effect of a master's report in chancery.

3. That the said Commission be authorized to employ competent counsel to represent them in any litigation they may cause to be instituted under said act.

For the committee:

W. B. FLEMING, *Chairman.*
W. B. FLEMING,
WALKER MCLAURIN,
DAVID N. MORTLAND,
JOHN B. BREATHITT,
JOHN H. KING,
CHARLES R. WHITMAN,
J. W. LUKE,
Committee on Reasonable Rates.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this free-delivery system.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I wish to say to the gentleman that I most respectfully decline his invitation. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I presumed you would. The gentleman appears to be very well fixed where he is; and he is one of those gentlemen who hold on to a good thing when they have it.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I may be in the condition that Paul was when on the way to Damascus—I may be struck by lightning.

Mr. SIMPSON. You are liable to be; and I think there will be a good many members of this House struck by lightning this fall, and it will be of a kind that they do not appreciate. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I hope you have not got your lightning rod up.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, in regard to this free-delivery system. I see grave obstructions in the way of adopting this free-delivery system; but I am equally free to say that I am not like the gentleman from Tennessee, who objects to a great number of postmasters. I believe that having the public well and capably served by a good many public employees is of benefit. Certainly the public school system has been benefited largely by the Government employees teaching schools. Certainly the public service has been benefited by having the large number of postmasters we have; and if the gentleman will adopt the principles of the People's party and elect the postmasters, you will get rid of this troublesome question of patronage.

I wish the free-delivery system could be extended to the rural districts. I believe great benefit would accrue from it. But unfortunately it will be impracticable in large parts of the country, owing to the sparsely settled condition of the country. That is the result of a bad land system—a system of land tenure that enables men to hold large tracts of land out of use. I believe that is the cause of the sparsely settled condition of our country. In many of the States of the Union, Mr. Chairman, half of the land is only occupied through this system of land tenure, allowing men to hold large tracts of land out of use and hold them out of market waiting until the land shall go up in price because of the increased demand caused by increase of population.

That is the reason why public lands are so thinly settled in the western country. There are a very great many places where families live 6, 7, and 10 miles apart. I believe that the first step to be taken is to adopt a system of land tenure and enact some law that will prevent men from playing the surly dog in

the manger by holding large tracts of land out of use until the people can get thickly settled and thus be enabled to avail themselves of these improvements in society in regard to mail facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House any longer, as it is getting late, and many gentlemen wish to adjourn. I will ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD; and they will relate to the subject of this bill.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The gentleman in his remarks assumed that all on this side of the House were railroad men. I want to say, if it is any satisfaction to him, that I have always been opposed by the corporations and railroads.

Mr. SIMPSON. I did not say anything about that; but if that be true, altogether likely in the next election your name will be Dennis.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I want to get myself fairly on the record in that respect.

Mr. CALDWELL. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Six minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then I yield that to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask once more the privilege of getting the benefit of the thirty-five minutes I lost for the purpose of publishing my remarks in the RECORD. I wish to extend in the RECORD a continuation of my remarks made April 23 and this afternoon, and to furnish the citations that should accompany them. I do not wish to take up the time of the House if I can get consent to publish my remarks.

Mr. BAILEY. I will not offer any objection if the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree that this is the last speech he will make on the subject.

Mr. WALKER. Well, it will be, if I can have leave to print. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to occupy the time.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not care at this time to discuss the general question, but I wish to have printed in the RECORD some documentary evidence in relation to the land-grant railroads; also a letter from the Postmaster-General in regard the number of towns now entitled to the free-delivery system under existing law and unsupplied, and also showing a list of the towns that will be entitled to free delivery under the bill which has recently passed the Senate. The items of the bill will be discussed hereafter under the five-minute rule.

I take occasion here to say that I am prepared to defend the bill and every item in it; and I am prepared to show that there will be no crippling of the service and no unnecessary reduction.

The documents are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 26, 1892.

The roads affected by the 60 per cent restriction are the Northern Pacific, from Ashland, Wis., to Tacoma, Wash.; the Southern Pacific, from Huron, Cal., via Goshen to Colorado River opposite Yuma; the Atlantic and Pacific, from Isleta Junction, N. Mex., to Mojave, Cal.

The office has no detailed statement on account of land-grant deductions over the various land-grant railroads, but it is 50 per cent except in the cases of free roads and the three named, of whatever business is done by them. Page 160 of my last annual report shows the earnings of the bond-aided railroads.

A list of all bond aided and land grant railroads mailed to you.

BATCHELDER,

Quartermaster-General, United States Army.

Hon. JOHN S. HENDERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1892.

SIR: In the absence of the Commissioner of Railroads, I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt by your reference of the 28th instant, of a telegram from Hon. JOHN S. HENDERSON, chairman of the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, in which he requests information "relating to railroads aided by the United States, and extent of the aid in bonds or lands, and how much they now earn annually, and what sums or deductions are received by the Government from said roads."

In reply thereto I have the honor to submit the following report in relation to the railroads coming under the jurisdiction of this office, under the act of June 19, 1878. (20 U. S. Stat., 103.)

UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

This company was formed January 26, 1880, by the consolidation of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the Denver Pacific Railway and Telegraph Company, and the Kansas Pacific Railway Company. The portions of the road which were constructed by the aid of a subsidy of bonds and are subject to the requirements of law with respect to the annual payment to the Government of a percentage of earnings, are as follows: Bridge Junction, Omaha, Neb., to a point 5 miles west of Ogden, Utah, 1,304 miles, and from Kansas City, Mo., to a point near Boaz, Kans., 393.94 miles. The subsidy bonds issued to this company amounted to \$33,539,512, the Union division having received \$27,236,512, and the Kansas division \$6,303,000. This company also received a grant of lands under the act of July 2, 1864, to the amount of ten alternate sections per mile on each side of said road on the line thereof, and within the limits of 20 miles on each side of the road.

Under the act of May 7, 1878 (Thurman act), the Government is entitled to a sum equal to 25 per cent of the annual net earnings of the Union Division,

and under the act of July 1, 1882, the Kansas Division pays a sum equal to 5 per cent of the net earnings of the aided portion of the road and one-half of the transportation rendered for the Government. For the year ending December 31, 1890, the net earnings of the Union Division amounted to \$3,985,973.44 and the Government requirement to \$1,078,548.57, the transportation services and the 5 per cent payable under the act of 1882 being in excess of 25 per cent of the net earnings. The net earnings of the aided portion of the Kansas Division amounted to \$774,473.20 and the Government requirement to \$90,628.26. Section 6 of the act of July 1, 1882, provides:

"That the grants aforesaid are made upon condition that said company shall pay said bonds at maturity and shall keep said railroad and telegraph line in repair and use, and shall at all times transmit dispatches over said telegraph line, and transport mails, troops, and munitions of war, supplies, and public stores upon said railroad for the Government whenever required to do so by any Department thereof, and that the Government shall at all times have the preference in the use of the same for all the purposes aforesaid at fair and reasonable rates of compensation, not to exceed the amounts paid by private parties for the same kind of service."

CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

This company and the Western Pacific Railroad Company were consolidated June 23, 1870, and are now operated by the Southern Pacific Company under the lease of February 17, 1885, and the modifications thereof dated January 1, 1888. That portion of the line extending from a point 5 miles west of Ogden, Utah, to Sacramento, thence via Niles to San José, Cal., a distance of 860.66 miles, was aided by the United States with bonds and lands, and is subject to the requirements of the act of May 7, 1878, with respect to the payment of a percentage of its net earnings to the Government. The subsidy bonds issued to aid in the construction of this road amounted to \$27,855,000, and the grants of lands similar to that made to the Union Pacific under the act of July 2, 1864. For the year ending December 31, 1890, the net earnings amounted to \$1,012,861.08 and the Government requirement to \$537,520.44. Section 6 of the act of July 1, 1882, also applies to this road with respect to the transportation of mails, troops, munitions of war, supplies, etc., for the Government.

SIOUX CITY AND PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

This road extends from Sioux City, Iowa, to Fremont, Nebr., a distance of 101.77 miles and received a subsidy in bonds and lands under the acts of July 1, 1862, and July 4, 1864. The bonds issued to aid in its construction amounted to \$1,628,320. The net earnings for the year ending December 31, 1890, amounted to \$185,616.13, and the Government requirement to \$20,818.84. Section 6 of the act of July 1, 1882, also applies to this road with respect to the transportation of mails, troops, munitions of war, supplies, etc., for the Government.

CENTRAL BRANCH UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

This road extends from Atchison to Waterville, Kans., a distance of 100 miles, and received a subsidy in bonds and lands under the acts of 1862 and 1864. The bonds issued to aid in its construction amounted to \$1,600,000. The net earnings for the year ending December 31, 1890, amounted to \$99,771.40, and the Government requirement to \$12,569.68. Section 6 of the act of July 1, 1882, also applies to this road with respect to the transportation of Government supplies, troops, mails, etc.

With respect to the inquiry "Why some roads carry certain matter free and others are allowed 50, 60, and 80 per cent respectively," I have the honor to state that it is owing to the peculiar phraseology of the various acts making grants of lands to aid in the construction of railroads. In Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Company vs. United States (93 U. S. R., 442) the United States Supreme Court says that in construing an act which reads "said railroad shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, free from all toll or other charge for the transportation of any property or troops of the United States," that—

"In view of the legislative history and practice referred to it seems impossible to resist the conclusion, when we meet with a legislative declaration to the effect that a particular railroad shall be a public highway, that the meaning is that it shall be open to the use of the public with their own vehicles; and that when Congress, in granting lands in aid of such a road, declared that the same shall be and remain a public highway for the use of the Government of the United States, it only means that the Government shall have the right to use the road, but not that it shall have the right to require its transportation to be performed by the railroad company. And when this right of the use of the road is granted 'free from all toll or other charge for transportation of any property or troops of the United States' it only means that the Government shall not be subject to any toll for such use of the road. This, we think, is the natural and most obvious meaning of the language used, when viewed in the light afforded by the history of railroad legislation in this country. This was also the interpretation put by the Executive Department of the Government upon the reservation in question prior to the passage of the acts of 1864. * * *

"All that the act reserves is the free use of the railroad. Of course this implies also the free use of all fixtures and appurtenances forming part of the road, and which are essential to its practical use, such as turn-tables, switches, depots, and other necessary appendages. * * * We are of opinion that the reservation in question secures to the Government only a free use of the railroads concerned, and that it does not entitle the Government to have troops or property transported by the companies over their respective roads free of charge for transporting the same."

In various acts making appropriations for the support of the Army, provision is made for the payment of army transportation lawfully due such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds, to be adjusted by the proper accounting officers in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts, but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of the full amount of the services be paid, provided such compensation shall be computed on the basis of the tariff rates for like transportation performed for the public at large, and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service.

The Court of Claims, in Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Company vs. The United States (15 Ct. Clms. 148) says:

"The exact proportion between the cost of a road and the cost of its equipment varies in different roads and in the same road at various times. But in view of the obvious necessity of establishing a fixed relation to govern current payment for work as done, unless the practice of refusing payment and sending claimants here is to be perpetuated, and in view of the manifest advantage of having that rate the same with all the roads, Congress has practically agreed that, irrespective of the particular relations between the cost of a road and the cost of its equipment, 50 per cent of its gross earnings is a fair compensation to the company for the actual cost of transportation and such part of the profits upon transportation as are earned by the company out of the Government. We have, therefore, felt ourselves justified in finding as a fact that 50 per cent of the gross earnings is such a proper compensation."

Many of the grants were made on condition that the roads should be post-roads and military railroads, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and all other Government service, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charges for such Government transportation, whilst others required the railroad to transport property or troops of the United States at the cost, charge, and expense of

the corporations or companies owning or operating the same whenever so required by the Government of the United States.

I transmit herewith a copy of the report of the Commissioner of Railroads for the year ending June 30, 1884, upon pages 218 to 225 of which will be found a full statement, showing the land-grant railroads which are burdened with any obligations or conditions with respect to the transportation of the

United States troops, property, or mails, together with the conditions in detail as to rates, etc., and a reference to the statutes relating to the same.

Mr. HENDERSON's telegram is herewith returned.

Very respectfully,

W. M. THOMPSON,
In Charge of Office.

Hon. SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Land-grant railroads.

No. of route.	Termini.	Corporation.	Present pay.	Proposed pay.	Reduction.
FLORIDA.					
123001	Fernandina, Cedar Keys.	Florida Central and Peninsular.	\$10,018.95	\$6,261.84	\$3,757.11
123002	Lake City, River Junction	do	10,121.28	6,325.80	3,795.48
123003	Pensacola, Flomaton	Louisville and Nashville.	3,178.20	1,986.37	1,191.83
123006	Jacksonville, Lake City	Florida Central and Peninsular.	4,990.55	3,119.09	1,871.46
*123011	Waldo, Wildwood	do	5,801.45	3,625.90	2,175.55
123015	Pensacola, River Junction	Pensacola and Atlantic.	11,687.00	7,304.37	4,382.63
123019	Wildwood, Tampa	Florida Central and Peninsular.	4,509.00	2,818.50	1,691.16
			50,307.03	31,441.87	18,865.16
ALABAMA.					
124004	Montgomery, Decatur	South and North Alabama.	24,396.38	15,227.73	9,168.65
124008	Columbus, Troy	Mobile and Girard.	4,978.83	3,111.77	1,867.06
*124010	Selma, Patona	East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia.	10,670.40	6,669.00	4,001.40
*124012	Flomaton, Montgomery	Louisville and Nashville.	21,815.78	13,634.86	8,180.92
*124015	Wauhatchie, Meridian	Alabama Great Southern.	38,253.60	23,908.50	14,345.10
			100,114.99	62,551.86	37,563.13
MISSISSIPPI.					
*126003	Jackson, Meridian	Alabama and Vicksburg.	9,962.77	6,226.73	3,736.04
126004	Mobile, Cairo	Mobile and Ohio.	40,676.38	29,422.74	11,253.64
			50,639.15	25,649.47	14,980.68
ILLINOIS.					
*135003	Cedar Rapids, Union Pacific Transfer	Chicago and Northwestern.	67,403.20	42,130.15	25,278.05
135020	Chicago, Cairo	Illinois Central.	96,560.03	60,350.00	36,210.03
135021	Dubuque, Centralia	do	50,989.50	31,868.45	19,121.05
			214,957.73	134,348.60	80,600.13
MICHIGAN.					
137005	Jonesville, Lansing	Lake Shore and Michigan Southern.	3,293.12	2,048.20	1,234.92
*137009	Lansing, Bay City	Michigan Central.	8,108.88	5,068.05	3,040.83
*137013	Bay City, Mackinaw City	do	20,783.52	12,983.47	7,800.11
*137015	Flint, Ludington	Flint and Pere Marquette.	19,298.86	12,061.68	7,237.18
*137018	Fort Wayne, Petoskey	Grand Rapids and Indiana.	36,213.75	22,633.60	13,580.15
137031	Fort Howard, Ishpeming	Chicago and Northwestern.	22,540.61	14,087.88	8,452.73
137040	Marquette, Houghton	Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic.	6,543.95	4,089.95	2,454.00
			116,782.75	72,982.88	43,799.92
WISCONSIN.					
*139009	Fond du Lac, Fort Howard	Chicago and Northwestern.	10,789.69	6,743.55	4,046.14
139015	Stevens Point, Portage	Northern Pacific.	4,474.68	2,796.65	1,678.03
*139017	Stevens Point, Ashland	do	21,246.78	13,279.24	7,967.54
139023	Hudson, Bayfield	Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha.	17,819.65	11,137.28	6,682.37
*139030	Stowall, St. Paul	do	26,272.11	16,420.05	9,852.06
*139051	Mills, Superior	do	7,110.18	4,443.85	2,666.33
			87,713.03	54,820.62	32,892.47
MINNESOTA.					
*141001	St. Paul, Missoula	Northern Pacific.	236,488.00	147,805.00	88,683.00
141004	St. Cloud, St. Vincent	Great Northern.	46,914.27	29,321.40	17,592.87
141005	Barnesville, Fargo	do	2,416.98	1,510.61	906.37
141006	St. Paul, Breckenridge	do	33,398.25	20,973.90	12,524.35
*141014	St. Peter, Watertown	Chicago and Northwestern.	19,759.76	12,349.90	7,409.86
141015	Winona, St. Peter	do	19,514.66	12,196.65	7,318.01
*141023	La Crosse, Airlie	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	32,521.78	20,326.11	12,195.67
141025	St. Paul, Sioux City	Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha.	49,939.18	31,211.98	18,727.20
141027	Stillwater, Stillwater Junction	do	183.62	141.00	44.62
141007	St. Paul, Duluth	St. Paul and Duluth.	17,178.42	10,736.50	6,441.92
*141008	White Bear Lake, Stillwater	do	487.50	304.68	182.82
*141009	St. Paul, Austin	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	12,791.00	7,994.37	4,796.63
*141010	Hastings, Ortonville	do	25,698.44	16,061.50	9,636.94
141011	Duluth, Staples	Northern Pacific.	8,889.09	5,555.68	3,333.41
*141012	Austin, Lyle	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	1,142.83	714.17	428.66
141044	Mendota, Minneapolis	do	771.97	482.48	289.49
141060	Hutchinson Junction, Hutchinson	Great Northern.	2,279.43	1,424.64	854.79
141065	Little Falls, Brainerd	Northern Pacific.	1,789.37	1,118.35	671.02
			512,166.55	320,128.92	192,037.63
IOWA.					
*143005	Burlington, Pacific Junction	Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.	202,564.68	129,352.92	73,211.76
*143012	Dubuque, Tete des Morts Creek	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	1,223.96	764.95	459.01
143014	Davenport, Union Pacific Transfer	Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific.	55,664.29	34,790.15	20,874.14
143021	Dubuque, Sioux City	Illinois Central.	60,309.68	37,693.55	22,616.13
*143024	Clinton, Lyons	Chicago and Northwestern.	146.03	91.25	54.78
*143025	Calmar, Sheldon	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	26,673.36	16,670.85	10,002.51
*143073	Pacific Junction, River	Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.	559.77	349.85	209.92
			347,141.77	219,713.52	127,428.25
MISSOURI.					
*145001	St. Louis, Pacific	Missouri Pacific.	24,098.68	15,061.65	9,037.03
145003	St. Louis, Vinita	St. Louis and San Francisco.	66,707.35	41,692.09	25,015.26
145005	Quincy, St. Joseph	Hannibal and St. Joseph.	48,173.07	30,108.16	18,064.91
*145011	Parsons, Chetopa	Missouri, Kansas and Texas.	5,332.76	3,332.97	1,999.79
*145026	Poplar Bluff, Texarkana	Missouri Pacific.	96,179.40	60,112.10	36,067.30
145027	Cairo, Poplar Bluff	St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern.	3,365.18	2,103.23	1,261.95
145050	Palmyra, Hannibal	Hannibal and St. Joseph.	1,805.07	1,128.50	676.57
			245,661.51	153,538.70	92,122.81

Land-grant railroads—Continued.

No. of route.	Termini.	Corporation.	Present pay.	Proposed pay.	Reduction.
ARKANSAS.					
*147001 147003	Hopefield, Little Rock	Little Rock and Memphis	\$16,498.08	\$10,311.30	\$6,186.78
	Little Rock, Fort Smith	Little Rock and Fort Smith	15,295.23	9,559.50	5,735.73
LOUISIANA.					
*149003 149008	New Orleans, Morgan City	Morgan's Louisiana and Texas R. R. and S. S. Co.	14,041.66	8,776.00	5,265.66
	Vicksburg, Shreveport	Vicksburg, Shreveport and Pacific	19,030.19	11,912.00	7,147.59
TEXAS.					
*150003	Shreveport, State Line	Texas and Pacific	2,283.96	1,427.47	856.49
INDIAN TERRITORY.					
153002	Vinita, Sapulpa	St. Louis and San Francisco	3,750.44	2,344.00	1,406.44
KANSAS.					
155004 *155007 155009 *155010	Lawrence, Coffeyville	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe	16,009.19	10,005.73	6,003.46
	St. Joseph, Hastings	St. Joseph and Grand Island	23,446.83	14,654.26	8,792.57
	Junction City, Parsons	Missouri, Kansas and Texas	10,332.25	6,457.70	3,874.55
	Atchison, State Line	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe	130,089.81	81,306.13	48,783.68
NEW MEXICO.					
167003	Albuquerque, Needles	Atlantic and Pacific	85,454.29	53,408.93	32,045.36
WASHINGTON.					
171001 *171005 171009 171011	Portland, Tacoma	Northern Pacific	23,971.07	14,981.91	8,989.16
	Tacoma, Carbonado	do	3,656.61	2,285.38	1,371.23
	Wallula, Missoula	do	59,689.37	37,307.05	22,382.32
	Pasco, South Prairie	do	29,639.97	18,524.98	11,114.99
			116,957.02	73,099.32	43,857.70
CALIFORNIA.					
*178092 178094 178096 178098 178099	San José, Carnadero	Southern Pacific	3,734.57	2,334.10	1,400.47
	Goshen, Yuma	do	65,590.94	40,994.34	24,596.60
	Gilroy, Tres Pinos	do	741.07	463.15	277.92
	Goshen, Alcalde	do	2,512.87	1,570.50	942.37
	Mojave, Needles	Atlantic and Pacific	31,441.12	19,650.70	11,790.42
			104,020.57	65,012.79	39,007.78
	Totals		2,282,724.09	1,433,452.12	849,271.97

* Part.

Statement of service on aided and nonaided Pacific roads, pay for which is withheld by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

[This statement is based on information received from the Sixth Auditor's Office.]

No. of route.	State and termini.	Corporate title of company carrying the mail.	Aided.			Nonaided.		
			Dis-tance.	Annual rate of pay for trans- portation.	Annual rate of pay for railway post-office cars.	Dis-tance.	Annual rate of pay for transpor- tation.	Annual rate of pay for railway post-office cars.
IOWA.								
143029	Missouri Valley, Sioux City	Sioux City and Pacific	Miles. 69.75	\$16,042.50	*\$2,790.00	Miles. 6.58	\$1,513.40	+\$385.50
143077	California, Fremont, Nebr	do	31.63	6,057.77	4782.50			
KANSAS.								
155001	Kansas City, Mo., Denver, Colo.	Union Pacific	394.00	96,009.92	9,850.09	245.73	59,879.48	6,128.75
155002	Lawrence, Leavenworth	do				35.27	1,719.05	
155013	Leavenworth, Miltonvale	Kansas Central				166.33	11,520.01	
155015	Junction City, Concordia	Junction City and Fort Kearney				71.34	5,611.60	
155025	Solomon City, Beloit	Solomon				57.75	4,592.28	
155028	Salina, McPherson	Salina and Southwestern				36.60	1,689.82	
155044	Lawrenceburg, Belleville	Junction City and Fort Kearney				17.27	1,077.99	
155054	Manhattan, Marysville	Omaha and Republican Valley				65.56	4,370.34	
155057	Salina, Zurich	Union Pacific, Lincoln and Colorado				111.63	8,113.26	
155085	Oakley, Colby	do				22.05	1,244.23	
155098	Zurich, Colby	do				93.51	6,150.60	
NEBRASKA.								
157001	Union Pacific Transfer (n. o.), Iowa, Ogden, Utah.	Union Pacific	1,033.34	712,111.11	135,375.75	.36	242.57	
157008	Valley, Stromsburg	Omaha and Republican Valley				90.78	10,555.89	
157012	Columbus, Norfolk	do				50.79	5,428.43	
157013	Lincoln, Nebr., Marysville, Kans.	do				79.08	7,370.25	
157014	Valparaiso, Lincoln	do				20.39	2,151.50	
157015	Grand Island, Ord	do				63.70	5,283.27	
157017	Oconee, Albion	do				34.06	2,650.20	
157025	Genoa, Cedar Rapids	do				30.83	1,449.93	
157033	St. Paul, Loup City	do				30.61	2,031.99	
157038	Boelus, Pleasanton	Omaha and Republican Valley				22.76	972.98	

*69.80 miles.

†5.9 miles.

‡31.30 miles.

Statement of service on aided and nonaided Pacific roads, pay for which is withheld by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury—Continued.

No. of route.	State and termini.	Corporate title of company carrying the mail.	Aided.			Nonaided.		
			Dis-tance.	Annual rate of pay for transpor-tation.	Annual rate of pay for railway post-office cars.	Dis-tance.	Annual rate of pay for transpor-tation.	Annual rate of pay for railway post-office cars.
COLORADO.								
165002	Erie, Boulder.	Denver and Boulder Valley.						
165005	Denver, Leadville.	Denver, Leadville and Gunnison.						
165007	Denver, Colo., Cheyenne, Wyo.	Union Pacific.						
165014	Schwander Station (n. o.), Romley.	Denver, Leadville and Gunnison.						
165023	Sheridan Junction (n. o.), Morrison.	do.						
165024	Garo, London.	do.						
165026	Dickey Station (n. o.), Dillon.	do.						
165031	Como, Buena Vista.	do.						
165032	Como, King.	do.						
165038	Gunnison, Castleton.	do.						
NEW MEXICO.								
167005	Deming, N. Mex., El Paso, Tex.	Southern Pacific.						
ARIZONA.								
168001	Yuma, Ariz., Deming, N. Mex.	Southern Pacific.						
UTAH.								
169008	Echo City, Park City.	Echo and Park City.						
CALIFORNIA.								
176001	San Francisco, Cal., Ogden, Utah.	Southern Pacific.	712.61	347,311.28	874,693.24	91.27	42,686.04	12,146.76
176003	Roseville, Cal., Ashland, Oregon.	do.				323.22	58,312.12	3,790.00
176006	Suisun City, Napa Junction.	do.				12.98	843.44	
176007	Woodland, Grafton.	do.				9.92	424.08	
176008	Vallejo Junction (n. o.), Calistoga.	do.				43.88	4,051.57	
176010	Lathrop, Goshen.	do.				146.76	31,620.90	3,657.50
176012	Stockton, Milton.	do.				30.09	2,006.70	
176013	San Pedro, Los Angeles.	do.				22.49	1,211.53	
176014	Goshen, Cal., Yuma, Arizona.	do.				491.76	65,590.94	6,070.75
176017	Los Angeles, Santa Ana.	do.				33.23	1,733.27	
176020	Los Angeles, Santa Monica.	do.				17.72	787.83	
176022	Davisville, Tehama.	do.				111.77	13,761.12	
176023	Galt, Ione.	do.				27.90	1,550.67	
176024	West Oakland Station (n. o.), Berkeley.	do.						
176025	San Francisco, Alameda.	do.				5.06	285.53	
176026	San Francisco, Sacramento.	do.				11.26	722.10	
176028	Niles, San Jose.	do.	103.83	13,493.74		36.72	4,772.13	
176029	Port Costa, Lathrop.	do.	17.54	944.88		1.07	57.64	
176032	Peters, Oakdale.	do.	11.09	2,427.38	277.25	51.49	11,270.13	12,77
176035	Goshen, Alcalde.	do.				19.15	818.66	
176038	Total.		2,403.79	1,194,398.58	223,768.74	4,376.54	510,139.07	33,456.26

Statement of land-grant railroad service in operation April 28, 1892.

No. of route.	State and termini.	Corporate title of company carrying the mail.	Distance.	Annual rate of pay for transportation.	Annual pay for railroad post-office cars.	Remarks.
	FLORIDA.					
123001	Fernandina, Cedar Keys.....	Florida Central and Peninsular	155.84	\$10,018.95		All land grant.
123002	Lake City, River Junction.....	do.....	149.48	10,121.28		Do.
123003	Pensacola, Flomaton.....	Louisville and Nashville	43.43	3,178.20		Do.
123008	Jacksonville, Lake City.....	Florida Central and Peninsular	59.81	4,990.55		Do.
123011	Waldo, Tavares.....	do.....	96.85	8,237.18		72.50 miles, Waldo and Wildwood, land grant at \$80.02 per mile.
123015	Pensacola, River Junction.....	Pensacola and Atlantic	161.20	11,687.00		All land grant.
123019	Wildwood, Tampa.....	Florida Central and Peninsular	85.62	4,509.60		Do.
	ALABAMA.					
124001	Montgomery, Decatur.....	South and North Alabama	183.86	24,396.38	\$4,578.00	Do.
124008	Columbus, Ga., Troy, Ala.....	Mobile and Girard	85.65	4,978.83		Do.
124010	Selma, Ala., Cleveland, Tenn.....	East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia	263.92	19,897.56		156 miles, Selma and Patona (n. o.), land grant at \$68.40 per mile.
124012	Mobile, Montgomery.....	Louisville and Nashville	179.34	35,485.18	14,270.40	196 miles, Flomaton and Montgomery, land grant at \$182.62 per mile.
124015	Chattanooga, Tenn., Meridian, Miss.....	Alabama Great Southern	295.60	39,210.65	10,937.50	264 miles, State Line (n. o.) and Meridian, Miss., land grant at \$132 per mile.
	MISSISSIPPI.					
126003	Vicksburg, Meridian.....	Alabama and Vicksburg	140.66	15,908.00		95.21 miles, Jackson to Meridian, land grant at \$104.64 per mile.
126004	Mobile, Ala., Cairo, Ill.....	Mobile and Ohio	495.57	40,676.38		All land grant.
	ILLINOIS.					
135003	Chicago, Ill., Union Pacific Transfer (n. o.)	Chicago and Northwestern	489.90	136,003.88	34,148.00	R. P. O., \$90 for 240.80 miles, \$50 for 247.70 miles, \$65 for 1.40 miles; 270.50 miles land grant, Cedar Rapids to U. P. transfer (n. o.).
135020	Chicago, Cairo.....	Illinois Central	365.73	96,560.03	33,612.25	All land grant; R. P. O., \$190 for 55.87 miles, \$75 for 196.23 miles, \$25 for 113.43 miles.
135021	Dubuque, Iowa, Centralia, Ill.....	do.....	344.33	50,871.31	9,769.70	All land grant; R. P. O., \$65 per mile for 69.56 miles, and \$25 per mile for 210.22 miles.
135005	Chicago, Ill., Dubuque, Iowa.....	Chicago, St. Paul and Kansas City	172.20	20,683.78		Land grant 14 miles, \$22.23 per mile for 14.42 miles, lap service.

Statement of land-grant railroad service in operation April 28, 1892—Continued.

No. of route.	State and termini.	Corporate title of company carrying the mail.	Distance.	Annual rate of pay for transportation.	Annual pay for railroad post-office cars.	Remarks.
MICHIGAN.						
137005	Jonesville, Lansing.	Lake Shore and Michigan Southern.	60.95	\$3,293.12	-----	All land grant.
137009	Jackson, Bay City.	Michigan Central.	115.36	12,956.37	-----	78.30 miles land grant, Lansing to Bay City.
137013	Detroit, Mackinaw City.	do	291.29	38,126.87	-----	182.29 miles land grant, Bay City to Mackinaw City.
137015	Monroe, Ludington.	Flint and Pere Marquette.	254.41	31,064.01	-----	171.06 miles land grant, Flint to Ludington.
137018	Fort Wayne, Ind., Mackinaw City, Mich.	Grand Rapids and Indiana.	369.26	41,129.06	-----	383.51 miles land grant, Fort Wayne to Petoskey.
137031	Fort Howard, Wis., Ishpeming, Mich.	Chicago and Northwestern.	180.08	22,510.61	\$4,492.50	All land grant.
137040	Marquette, Houghton.	Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic.	94.73	6,543.95	-----	Do.
WISCONSIN.						
139009	Chicago, Ill., Fort Howard, Wis.	Chicago and Northwestern.	242.46	46,859.08	10,409.50	65.78 miles land grant, Fond du Lac to Fort Howard; R. P. O. \$80 per mile for 62.70 miles, Chicago to Howard; \$40 per mile for 28.40 miles, Howard to Janesville, and \$65 for 65.77 miles, Fond du Lac to Fort Howard.
139015	Stephens Point, Portage.	Northern Pacific.	72.63	4,421.72	-----	All land grant.
139017	Milwaukee, Ashland.	do	345.53	41,252.68	-----	186.43 miles land grant, Stevens Point to Ashland; Milwaukee to Rugby Junction (n. o.), 32.40 miles, at \$35.91 per mile.
139028	Hudson, Bayfield.	Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha.	180.87	18,928.05	-----	All land grant.
139030	Elroy, Wis., St. Paul, Minn.	do	195.66	29,919.83	-----	172 miles land grant, Stowell (n. o.) to St. Paul.
139051	Mills, Wis., Duluth, Minn.	do	70.90	8,222.73	-----	Land grant Mills to Superior, 63.07 miles.
MINNESOTA.						
141001	St. Paul, Minn., Missoula, Mont.	Northern Pacific.	1,255.20	263,918.63	19,737.50	1,148.10 miles land grant, St. Paul to Minneapolis, Watab to Little Falls, and Staples to Missoula; R. P. O. St. Paul, Minn., to Forsyth, Mont., 789.50 miles.
141004	St. Cloud, St. Vincent.	St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba.	318.07	46,914.27	5,609.50	All land grant; R. P. O. 235.13 miles, St. Cloud to Crookston.
141006	St. Paul, Breckenridge.	Great Northern.	214.16	33,398.25	261.00	All land grant; R. P. O. St. Paul to Minneapolis, 10.44 miles.
141007	St. Paul, Duluth.	St. Paul and Duluth.	152.21	17,178.42	-----	Do.
141008	Minneapolis, Stillwater.	do	27.82	1,233.87	-----	12.52 miles land grant, White Bear Lake to Stillwater.
141009	St. Paul, Minn., McGregor, Iowa.	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	212.20	30,727.46	1,077.50	100.10 miles land grant, St. Paul to Austin; R. P. O. 43.11 miles, McGregor to Calmar, Iowa.
141010	Hastings, Minn., Bowdle, S. Dak.	do	369.73	51,525.60	-----	202.11 miles land grant, Hastings to Ortonville.
141011	Duluth, Staples.	Northern Pacific.	147.85	8,839.09	-----	All land grant.
141012	Austin, Minn., Mason City, Iowa.	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	41.33	4,589.07	-----	12.13 miles land grant, Austin to Lyle.
141014	St. Peter, Minn., Redfield, S. Dak.	Winona and St. Peter.	255.16	29,320.06	-----	183.71 miles land grant, St. Peter to Watertown.
141015	Winona, St. Peter.	do	139.86	19,514.66	-----	All land grant.
141023	La Crosse, Wis., Flandreau, S. Dak.	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	311.17	33,659.80	-----	302.11 miles land grant, La Crosse to Airlie.
141025	Minneapolis, Minn., Sioux City, Iowa.	Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha.	279.74	49,939.18	10,760.00	All land grant.
141027	Stillwater, Stillwater Junction (n. o.).	do	3.31	185.62	-----	Do.
141044	Mendota, Minneapolis.	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	9.20	729.92	-----	Do.
141065	Little Falls, Brainerd.	Northern Pacific.	30.99	1,780.37	-----	Do.
IOWA.						
143005	Burlington, Union Pacific Transfer (n. o.).	Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.	233.86	218,957.13	73,465.00	275.96 miles land grant, Burlington to Pacific Junction.
143012	Clinton, Iowa, La Crosse, Wis.	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	181.66	26,245.18	2,422.50	R. P. O., 96.90 miles, Sabula to McGregor; 10.78 miles land grant from near Dubuque, south to Tete des Morts Creek.
143014	Davenport, Union Pacific Transfer (n. o.).	Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific.	317.90	55,664.29	16,607.00	All land grant. R. P. O. \$65 per mile for 53.97 miles, Davenport to Iowa City, and \$50 per mile residue.
143021	Dubuque, Sioux City.	Illinois Central.	326.97	60,162.48	8,165.50	All land grant.
143024	Clinton, Anamosa.	Chicago and Northwestern.	72.06	4,948.73	-----	3.04 miles land grant, Clinton to Lyons.
143025	Calmar, Iowa, Running Water, S. Dak.	Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul.	350.02	48,696.76	5,010.00	R. P. O. Calmar to Sanborn, Iowa, 200.49 miles; 210.79 miles land grant, Calmar to Sheldon.
143073	Pacific Junction, Iowa, Plattsburgh, Nebr.	Chicago, Burlington and Quincy.	5.37	998.60	200.00	3.30 miles land grant, Pacific Junction to East Plattsburgh (n. o.).
MISSOURI.						
145001	St. Louis, Mo., Atchison, Kans.	Missouri Pacific.	330.23	265,028.11	49,560.00	33.70 miles land grant, St. Louis to Pacific.
145003	St. Louis, Mo., Vinita, Ind. T.	St. Louis and San Francisco.	359.88	66,707.35	14,222.50	All land grant; R. P. O. \$50 per miles, St. Louis to Monett, 282.10 miles; \$25 for 460 miles, Monett to Pierce City.
145005	Quincy, Ill., St. Joseph, Mo.	Hannibal and St. Joseph.	207.75	48,173.07	13,680.00	All land grant; R. P. O. Quincy to Cameron, 171.24 miles.
145011	Sedalia, Mo., Dennison, Tex.	Missouri, Kansas and Texas.	435.70	121,599.31	28,282.80	23.63 miles land grant, Parsons to Chetopa.
145026	Bismarck, Mo., Texarkana, Ark.	Missouri Pacific.	414.25	129,668.46	26,923.00	324 miles land grant, Poplar Bluff to Texarkana.
145027	Cairo, Ill., Poplar Bluff, Mo.	St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern.	74.25	3,351.64	-----	All land grant.
145050	Palmyra, Hannibal.	Hannibal and St. Joseph.	15.08	1,805.07	-----	Do.
ARKANSAS.						
147001	Memphis, Little Rock.	Little Rock and Memphis.	135.00	16,682.76	-----	134 miles, Hopefield to Little Rock, land grant at \$123.12 per mile.
147003	Little Rock, Fort Smith.	Little Rock and Fort Smith.	168.49	15,211.87	-----	All land grant.
LOUISIANA.						
149003	New Orleans, Lafayette.	Morgan's Louisiana and Texas R. R. and S. S. Co.	145.54	28,092.98	3,622.75	80.82 miles, New Orleans to Morgan City, land grant at \$173.74 per mile.
149008	Vicksburg, Shreveport.	Vicksburg, Shreveport and Pacific.	172.99	19,051.38	-----	All land grant.

Statement of land-grant railroad service in operation April 28, 1892—Continued.

No. of route.	State and termini.	Corporate title of company carrying the mail.	Distance.	Annual rate of pay for transportation.	Annual pay for railroad post-office cars.	Remarks.
	TEXAS.		Miles.			
150009	Shreveport, El Paso	Texas and Pacific	833.43	\$115,824.85	\$5,080.00	19.30 miles land grant, Shreveport to State Line (n. o.), at \$118.34 per mile.
	INDIAN TERRITORY.					
153002	Vinita, Sapulpa	St. Louis and San Francisco	78.33	3,750.44		All land grant.
	KANSAS.					
155004	Lawrence, Coffeyville	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe.	141.85	16,009.19		Do.
155007	St. Joseph, Grand Island	St. Joseph and Grand Island	252.09	26,686.20		Land grant St. Joseph to Hastings, 227 miles.
155009	Junction City, Parsons	Missouri, Kansas and Texas	157.33	10,332.25		All land grant.
155010	Atchison, Pueblo	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe.	619.31	181,401.95	47,933.90	Land grant Atchison to State Line (n. o.), 470.76 miles.
	NEW MEXICO.					
167003	Albuquerque, Needles	Atlantic and Pacific	575.76	85,451.29		All land grant.
	WASHINGTON.					
171001	Portland, Tacoma	Northern Pacific	145.73	23,823.94		All land grant.
171005	Tacoma, Carbonado	do	35.90	5,162.27		Land grant Tacoma to Melrose (n. o.), 27.03 miles.
171009	Walla Walla, Missoula	do	419.71	59,712.13		All land grant.
171011	Pasco, South Prairie	do	228.07	29,639.97		Do.
	CALIFORNIA.					
176002	San Francisco, Soledad	Southern Pacific	142.98	19,603.91		Land grant San Jose to Carnadero Station (n. o.), 32.50 miles.
176014	Goshen, Yuma	do	491.76	65,590.94	6,070.75	For 242.89 miles, all land grant.
176034	Gilroy, Tres Pinos	do	20.84	741.07		All land grant.
176038	Goshen, Alcalde	do	61.23	2,512.87		Do.
176042	Mojave, Needles	Atlantic and Pacific	240.67	31,441.12		Do.
	Totals.		18,461.14	3,244,919.33	459,017.15	

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1892.

SIR: Your telegram of this date received at 12:21 p. m., wherein you say: "Please inform me what towns are entitled to free delivery under the present law but are now unsupplied. I wish the population and postal receipts in each case. I also wish to know how many new places will be supplied under the bill which has just passed the Senate, authorizing extension of free-delivery system to towns of 5,000 population, and postal receipts amounting to \$5,000 and upward. Please give me the names of the towns in each State that would be supplied if Senate bill becomes a law, and the probable increase of expenditure on account thereof."

In reply, I have the honor to submit the following list of offices in the United States which exceed the present statutory prerequisites of 10,000 population, or \$10,000 gross receipts, at which the free-delivery service has not been authorized, showing the population, according to the census of 1890, and the gross receipts for the preceding fiscal year:

Offices.	Population.	Gross receipts.
Key West, Fla.	18,980	\$12,499
Waterville, Me.	7,107	10,860
St. Charles, Mo.	6,161	10,154
Bristol, Conn.	7,382	10,627
Louisiana, Mo.	5,090	12,612
St. Augustine, Fla.	4,742	11,475
Penn Yan, N. Y.	4,254	12,029
Media, Pa.	2,736	15,679
Peru, Ind.	6,721	10,157
Bucyrus, Ohio	6,951	10,383
Chillicothe, Mo.	5,699	11,393
Greenfield, Mass.	5,252	14,658
Greenville, Miss.	6,655	10,901
Tampa, Fla.	5,532	12,289
Chicago, Mass.	14,050	6,932
Laredo, Tex.	11,319	9,201
Baton Rouge, La.	11,273	10,676
Weymouth, Mass.	10,866	3,177
Michigan City, Ind.	10,704	9,545
Tonawanda, N. Y.	7,145	13,642
Port Chester, N. Y.	5,274	11,002
Bristol, Tenn.	6,226	10,299
Englewood, N. J.	4,785	11,612
Troy, Ohio	4,494	11,129
Decorah, Iowa	2,801	11,168
Washington, N. J.	2,834	18,645
Rutherford, N. J.	2,293	25,079
Newtonville, Mass.		11,741
Northport, N. Y.		11,468
Port Richmond, N. Y.	6,290	10,793
Pullman, Ill.		10,767
South Chicago, Ill.		11,059
Gardner, Mass.	8,424	10,202
Amherst, Mass.	4,512	10,743
Attleboro, Mass.	7,577	10,685
Leominster, Mass.	7,269	10,418
Greenwich, Conn.	10,131	6,820
Anaconda, Mont.	3,975	10,480
Great Falls, Mont.	3,979	11,131
Missoula, Mont.	3,426	11,107
Newton, N. J.	3,003	10,940
Perth Amboy, N. J.	9,512	10,499
Westfield, N. J.		11,517

Post-offices, population, and gross receipts—Continued.

Offices.	Population.	Gross receipts.
Catskill, N. Y.	4,920	\$10,048
Floral Park, N. Y.	11,456	
Kingston, N. Y.	21,261	12,563
Morristown, N. Y.	22,260	
New Rochelle, N. Y.	8,217	12,184
Rondout, N. Y.		12,342
Stapleton, N. Y.		12,426
Bellefontaine, Ohio	4,245	10,001

Where the population is not given it is because the census bulletin fails to give it separately.

While all the foregoing offices and cities have either the gross receipts or population required by the statutes, some of them have not the requirements prescribed by the postal laws and regulations, such as lighted and numbered streets, numbered houses, etc., and some have not at present suitable buildings to accommodate the carriers' service; at others, having two independent post-offices within the corporate limits, the local differences of the citizens as to which office shall be discontinued has prevented the introduction of free delivery.

To establish and maintain the free delivery service at all of the above offices during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, would require an appropriation of \$153,000.

Below you will also find a list of the offices in the United States, which would be entitled to the free-delivery service if the pending Senate bill becomes a law, authorizing the establishment of the free-delivery service at cities with 5,000 population, or at post-offices which produced a gross revenue of \$5,000 during the preceding fiscal year, viz:

ALABAMA.
Bessemer, Talladega, Gadsden, Opelika, Tuscaloosa.
Fort Payne, Eufaula, Florence,
ARIZONA.
Phoenix, Pima, Tuscon, Prescott.
ARKANSAS.
Eureka Springs, Fayetteville, Texarkana, Helena.
CALIFORNIA.
Bakersfield, Modesto, Redding, Tulare, Vallejo.
Berkeley, Napa, Redlands, Salinas, Venura, Visalia, Watsonville, Woodland.
Chico, Oroville, Petaluma, San Luis Obispo, San Rafael, Santa Ana,
Grass Valley, Marysville, Pomona, Red Bluff,
Durango, Grand Junction, Manitou Springs, Naugatuck, Stonington, Winchester.
CONNECTICUT.
Boulder, Fort Collins, Highlands, Glenwood Springs, Longmont, Manitou Springs, Naugatuck, Stonington, Winchester.
COLORADO.
Clintonville, Groton, Killingly, Putnam, Rockville, Southington, Torrington, Thompson, Wallingford, West Winsted,
Colchester, Manchester, Moodus, Naugatuck, Stonington,
Danielsville, Enfield,

FOLRIDA.			NEW JERSEY.		
Gainesville, Ocala,	Orlando, Palatka,	Sanford, Tallahassee.	Bordentown, Burlington, Cape May, Dover, Freehold, Gloucester,	Harrison, Lakewood, Lambertville, Long Branch, Madison, Mount Holly,	Ocean Grove, Phillipsburg, Rahway, Red Bank, Salem, Somerville,
GEORGIA.			NEW MEXICO.		
Albany, Gainesville,	Griffin, Marietta,	Sandersville, Thomasville.	East Las Vegas,	Santa Fe.	Summit, Weehawken, West Hoboken, Woodbury.
IDAHO.			NEW YORK.		
	Moscow,	Pocatello.	Albion, Baldwinsville, Baliston Spa, Bath, Brewster, Brookport, Canajoharie, Canton, Carthage, Cazenovia, Gouverneur, Greenbush, Hamilton, Haverstraw, Hempstead, Herkimer, Huntington,	Ellenville, Fairport, Fishkill, Flatbush, Fort Plain, Fredonia, Fulton, Geneseo, Goshen, Nyack,	Silver Creek, Suspension Bridge, Tarrytown, Tompkinsville, Warsaw.
ILLINOIS.			Sandwich, Shelbyville, South Evanston, Sycamore, Taylorville, Tuscola, Paris.	Ilion, Jamaica, Le Roy, Lowville, Lyons, Malone, Mamaroneck, Medina, New Rochelle,	Waterford, Watertown, Watkins, Wellsville, Westchester, Westfield, Whitehall, White Plains.
Austin, Batavia, Belvidere, Bushnell, Carlinville, Centralia, Charleston, Dekalb, Dwight,	Galena, Genesee, Grand Crossing, Jerseyville, Kewanee, Litchfield, Macomb, Mendota, Morris,	Mount Vernon, National Stock Yards, Normal, Oiney, Pana, Peru, Princeton, Ravenswood,	Washington, Winchester, Kendallville, Rushville.	Clifton Springs, Clyde, College Point, Cooperstown, Dansville,	Waterford, Watertown, Watkins, Wellsville, Westchester, Westfield, Whitehall, White Plains.
INDIANA.					
Bloomington, Bluffton, Brazil, Danville, Franklin, Greencastle, Greensburg,	Hammond, Mishawaka, Mount Vernon, New Castle, Noblesville, Notre Dame, Plymouth,	Portland, Seymour, Lebanon, Shelbyville, Union City, Wabash, Warsaw,			
IOWA.					
Algona, Boone, Carroll, Centerville, Chariton, Charles City, Cherokee, Clarinda,	Corning, Emmettsburg, Fairfield, Grinnell, Independence, Le Mars, Lyons, McGregor,	Manchester, Maquoketa, Marion, Mason City, Newton, Perry, Red Oak, Shenandoah,	Spencer, Toledo, Vinton, Washington, Waverly, Webster City.	Fayetteville, Goldsboro,	Newbern, Statesville,
KANSAS.					
Beloit, Chanute, Clay Center, Coffeyville, Columbus, Concordia,	El Dorado, Holton, Independence, Eureka, Garnett, Great Bend,	Hiawatha, Junction City, Larned, McPherson, Manhattan, Minneapolis,	Olathe, Oswego, Paola, Pittsburg.	Bismarck,	Jamestown, Minot.
KENTUCKY.					
Ashland, Catlettsburg, Danville,	Georgetown, Hopkinsville, Lebanon,	Mount Sterling, Paris, Richmond,	Shelbyville, Winchester.		
LOUISIANA.					
Lake Charles.	Monroe.				
MAINE.					
Bar Harbor, Belfast, Brunswick,	Calais, Cape Elizabeth, Deering,	Ellsworth, Gardiner, Oldtown,	Saco, Skowhegan, Westbrook.		
MARYLAND.					
Easton,	Salisbury,	Westminster.			
MASSACHUSETTS.					
Adams, Andover, Arlington, Athol, Auburndale, Blackstone, Campello, Chicopee Falls, Concord, Danvers, Dedham,	Easthampton, East Weymouth, Franklin, Grafton, Great Barrington, Hudson, Lee, Marblehead, Middleboro, Milton, Montague,	Nantucket, Newton Center, North Attleboro, Norwood, Orange, Palmer, Reading, Rockland, Spencer, Southbridge, Stoneham,	Ware, Watertown, Webster, Wellesley, Westboro, West Newton, West Springfield, Winchendon.	Albany, Baker City,	Guthrie, Oklahoma.
MICHIGAN.					
Allegan, Benton Harbor, Big Rapids, Cadillac, Charlotte, Cheyoggan, Dowagiac, Escanaba,	Greenville, Hancock, Hastings, Holland, Houghton, Hudson, Ironwood, Lapeer,	Ludington, Marshall, Mount Clemens, Niles, Red Jacket, St. Johns, St. Joseph, Sault St. Marie,	Sturgis, Tecumseh, Three Rivers, Traverse City, Negaunee.		
MINNESOTA.					
Albert Lea, Austin, Brainerd,	Crookston, Fergus Falls,	Lake City, Owatonna,	Northfield, St. Peter.		
MISSISSIPPI.					
	Columbus,	Yazoo City.			
MISSOURI.					
Boonville, Brookfield, Butler, Cameron, Carrollton,	Clinton, Columbia, Fulton, Independence, Kirksville,	Lamar, Lexington, Macon City, Mexico, Rich Hill,	Trenton, Warrensburg, Webb City, Marshall, Maryville.		
MONTANA.					
Billings,	Boseman,	Livingston.			
NEBRASKA.					
Blair, Columbus, North Platte,	Holdrege, Norfolk,	Fairbury, York,	Crete, Plattsmouth.		
NEVADA.					
Carson City,	Reno,	Virginia City.			
NEW HAMPSHIRE.					
Claremont, Exeter,	Laconia, Lebanon,	Littleton, Rochester,	Somersworth, Milford.		
NEW JERSEY.					
NEW MEXICO.					
NEW YORK.					
NORTH CAROLINA.					
NORTH DAKOTA.					
OHIO.					
OKLAHOMA.					
OREGON.					
PENNSYLVANIA.					
RHODE ISLAND.					
SOUTH CAROLINA.					
SOUTH DAKOTA.					
TENNESSEE.					
WASHINGTON.					
TEXAS.					
UTAH.					
VERMONT.					
VIRGINIA.					
WEST VIRGINIA.					
WISCONSIN.					

WYOMING.
Laramie.

An appropriation of \$1,000,000 would be necessary to establish and maintain the six hundred and twenty-three offices named in the foregoing list during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

Yours, respectfully,

JNO. WANAMAKER,
Postmaster-General.

HON. JOHN S. HENDERSON,
House of Representatives.

I move that the committee rise.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the Chair if the permission granted to the gentleman from Massachusetts was on the basis that the remarks to be printed in the RECORD are in relation to the question under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. No, sir.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Then I shall object.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection comes too late.

Mr. CAMINETTI. I do not know that it is too late.

The question was taken on the motion that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCHANAN of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8224) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 7092) to authorize building a bridge over Tennessee River.

A bill (S. 661) for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto.

A bill (S. 1646) making Laredo, Tex., a subport of entry.

A bill (S. 2460) to repeal the license tax of \$25 per year now imposed upon produce-dealers in the markets of the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2613) to amend sections 2807 and 2881 of the Revised Statutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its secretaries, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 2868) to regulate the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia; in which concurrence of the House was requested.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. EPES, for ten days, commencing on May 28, on account of important business.

To Mr. LEWIS, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, for Tuesday, May 31, on account of important business.

To Mr. BOWERS, for two weeks, on account of important business.

AGREEMENT WITH INDIANS RESIDING ON COLVILLE RESERVATION, WASHINGTON.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 7557) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians residing on the Colville Reservation, in the State of Washington, with certain modifications, and to make appropriation to carry into effect the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to nonconcur in the Senate amendments on the bill (H. R. 7557) and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BAILEY. Before making objection, I desire to ask the gentleman from Washington what is the character of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7557) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians residing on the Colville Reservation, in the State of Washington, with certain modifications, and to make appropriations to carry into effect the same.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. It is a bill to ratify and confirm the agreement made with the Indians on the Colville Reservation in the State of Washington. The bill as it left the House contained a provision providing for the reimbursement of the money on receiving the allotment of land, but the Senate inadvertently left that out, and has asked a conference so that the reimbursement can be made by the first payment on the lands. It is unanimously reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BAILEY. I stated to the gentleman from Washington that I would offer no objection to this request, but the bill appears to carry an appropriation of money. That being the case—

Mr. WILSON of Washington. It has been passed by the House and the Senate, and that body left this provision out for reimbursing the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh! Reimbursing the Government! Then I make no objection.

The question was taken, and the House nonconcurred in the Senate amendments, and agreed to the conference asked.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the appointment of conferees later.

Mr. HENDERSON of North Carolina. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 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. MCALLEER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, a bill (H. R. 1072) for the relief of John L. Broome. (Report No. 1529.)

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 9041) to incorporate the Washington, Fairfax and Alexandria Railroad Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 9042) for the relief of Caroline Seiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Virginia (by request): A bill (H. R. 9043) for the relief of John M. Dickenson, administrator of the estate of William B. Dickenson, deceased, late of Washington County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHAPIN: A bill (H. R. 9044) for the relief of Stewart J. Donnelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOODNIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9045) for the relief of Thomas M. Bybee, of Riseville, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9046) for the relief of John S. Thomas, of Polkville, Warren County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, bill (H. R. 9047) for the relief of Cynthia B. Gary, of Greenville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9048) for the relief of Alfred V. Riley, of Higira, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9049) for the relief of John A. London, of Morgantown, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9050) for the relief of James P. Hill, Peytonburg, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 9051) granting a pension to Hester A. Robinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULL: A bill (H. R. 9052) rectifying and completing the military record of John Houpt, and granting him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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. BANKHEAD: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the Sixth district of Alabama, bearing 306 signatures, against opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BARWIG: Petition of citizens of Fond du Lac County, Wis., against repeal of import duty on barley or any modification thereof—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of the American Sabbath Tract Society in behalf of the Seventh-Day Baptists of the United States and all lovers of religious liberty, against national Sunday legislation—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Resolution of M. W. Howe, civil engineer of Terre Haute, Ind., for adoption of the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CAINE: Resolutions of the Cattlemen's Congress recently held at Ogden, Utah, against the passage of House bill 4843 proposing additional restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COBURN: Petition of the American Tract Sabbath Society, against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Henry I. Bliss, favoring the metric system of

weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CRAIG of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of congregation of Windy Gap, Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Washington County, Pa., in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday and prohibiting the sale of liquors on the grounds and conducting the art department according to the American standard of purity in art—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers in the case of Walter D. Kelly, alias John Purcell, for removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petition against the sale of liquor at military posts or soldiers' homes—to the Select Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, two protests of Farmers and Laborers' Union 667 and 2127, and citizens of Vernon County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of Seventh-Day Adventists, against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. GOODNIGHT: Proof to accompany bill to pension John A. London, of Morgantown, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany bill for relief of Thomas M. Bylett, of Riseville Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, additional proof to accompany bill for relief of T. M. Bylen, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Lancaster, Mo., in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Nodaway, against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union No. 957, and citizens of Macon County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, four protests as follows: One from Farmers and Laborers' Union No. 1732, and citizens of Jackson County, Mo., one from Farmers and Laborers' Union and citizens of Scotland County, Mo., and two from Farmers and Laborers' Union and citizens of Adair County, Mo., all against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of citizens of Lewis County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HFARD: Protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union, No. 1489, and citizens of Howard County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-lard bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL: Four petitions, as follows: One from York County, S. C.; one from Chesterfield County, S. C.; one from Lancaster County, S. C., and one from Kershaw County, S. C., all against the Brosius lard bill and for the Paddock pure-food bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HOUK of Ohio: Petition of the Typothetae of Dayton, Ohio, against the Government printing envelopes without charge to consumers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JOLLEY: Protest of citizens of Parker, S. Dak., against the Congress of the United States committing the Government to a union of religion and state by act or bill to close the Columbian Exposition on Sunday or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. LODGE: Petition of 39 citizens of St. Louis; 25 of Osceola Mills, Pa.; 21 of New York and Brooklyn; 17 of Brooklyn, and 282 of New York City, for certain restrictions to immigration laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Richard Guenther, for use of the metric system in the customs service—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers in the claim of L. S. Strauss—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in the claim of Armistead T. Mills, a Mexican soldier—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OATES: Petition of citizens of Dale County, Ala., against the Brosius lard bill and for the Paddock pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS: Protest of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Primghar, Iowa, against opening the World's Fair on Sunday

or sale of liquor on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. REYBURN: Resolution of the Presbyterian Sunday School Superintendents' Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., for closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of 35 citizens of Milton, N. Y., against opening the World's Fair on Sunday or sale of liquor on the grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, three petitions, as follows: One from S. McK. Smith, principal of schools at Canajoharie, N. Y.; one from Alexander Falconer, principal of schools at Stillwater, N. Y., and one from Dr. C. C. Wetzel, principal of academy, Amsterdam, N. Y., all for the passage of House bill 4602, for the exclusive use in the customs service of the United States, on and after July 1, 1893, of the metric system of weights and measures authorized by act of Congress, approved July 28, 1866—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SCOTT: Memorial of the American Tract Society against national Sunday legislation—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SCULL: Memorial of Johnson Company, of Cambria County, Pa., favoring the use of the metric system of weights and measures authorized by act of Congress July 28, 1866, exclusively in the customs service of the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Protest of the American Sabbath Tract Society, against legislation requiring the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. VINCENT A. TAYLOR: Petition against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of the American Tract Society, praying that Congress shall not legislate upon the question of closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 31, 1892.

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

The Vice-President being absent, the President *pro tempore* took the Chair.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting certain information relative to the appropriation made by act of Congress of March 3, 1891, for removing the light-house buoy and supply station at Tongue Point to Astoria, Oregon, etc.; which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of E. P. Robbins, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the adoption of a plan to prevent overflows in the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Hugh Warnock, of the United Presbyterian Church of Rock Island, Ill., praying for the passage of legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of sundry citizens of Illinois, remonstrating against the commitment of the United States Government to a union of religion and the state by the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Will County, Ill., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch antiprostitution bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Methodist Episcopal and Congregational Churches of Lacon; of the Wyoming and Duncan Churches of Stark County; of the Presbyterian Church of Princeton, of the United Baptist Church of Van Burenburg; of the Baptist Church of Troy; of the Mattoon District Ministerial Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church; of the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance, all of the State of Illinois, praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on