SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

STEPHEN M. WHITE, a Senator from the State of California; HENRY M. TELLER, a Senator from the State of Colorado, and WILLIAM V. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, appeared in their seats to-day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory thereto, and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "Donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants on said lands;

A bill (H. R. 73) supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled "An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives;"

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States;

A bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes;

A joint resolution (H. Res. 97) donating two obsolete cannon to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa.; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 98) to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1893, on the 21st day of said month.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1021) to grant the right of way to the Kansas, Oklahoma Central and Southwestern Railway Company through the Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

A message in writing was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

Mr. HARRIS. The message from the President of the United States ought to be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, with accompanying documents. The Secretary will read the message.

The Secretary read the message, as follows:

MESSAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In my recent annual message to the Congress I briefly referred to our relations with Hawaii and expressed the intention of transmitting further information on the subject when additional advices permitted.

Though I am not able now to report a definite change in the actual situation, I am convinced that the difficulties lately created both here and in Hawaii and now standing in the way of a solution through Executive action of the problem presented, render it proper and expedient that the matter should be referred to the broader authority and discretion of Congress, with a full explanation of the endeavor thus far made to deal with the emergency and a statement of the considerations which have governed my action.

I suppose that right and justice should determine the path to be followed in treating this subject. If national honesty is to be disregarded and a desire for territorial extension, or dissatisfaction with a form of government not our own, ought to regulate our conduct, I have entirely misapprehended the mission and character of our Government and the behavior which the conscience of our people demands of their public servants.

When the present Administration entered upon its duties the Senate had under consideration a treaty providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the territory of the United States. Surely under our Constitution and laws the enlargement of our limits is a manifestation of the highest attribute of sovereignty, and if entered upon as an executive act all things relating to the transaction should be clear and free from suspicion. Additional importance attached to this particular treaty of annexation, because it contemplated a departure from unbroken American tradition in providing for the addition to our territory of islands of the sea more than 2,000 miles removed from our nearest coast.

These considerations might not of themselves call for interference with the completion of a treaty entered upon by a previous Administration. But it appeared from documents accompanying the treaty when submitted to the Senate, that the ownership of Hawaii was tendered to us by a Provisional Government set up to succeed the constitutional ruler of the islands, who had been dethroned, and it did not appear that such Provisional Government had the sanction of either popular revolution or suffrage. Two other remarkable features of the transaction naturally attracted attention. One was the extraordinary haste—not to say precipitancy—characterizing all the transactions connected with the treaty.

It appeared that a so-called committee of safety, ostensibly the source of the revolt against the constitutional Government of Hawaii, was organized on Saturday the 14th day of January; that on Monday, the 16th, the United States forces were landed at Honolulu from a naval vessel lying in its harbor; that on the 17th the scheme of a Provisional Government was perfected, and a proclamation naming its officers was on the same day prepared and read at the Government building; that immediately thereupon the United States minister recognized the Provisional Government thus created; that two days afterwards, on the 19th day of January, commissioners representing such government sailed for this country in a steamer especially chartered for the occasion, arriving in San Francisco on the 28th day of January, and in Washington on the 3d day of February; that on the next day they had their first interview with the Secretary of State, and another on the 11th, when the treaty of annexation was practically agreed upon, and that on the 14th it was formally concluded and on the 15th transmitted to the Senate. Thus between the initiation of the scheme for a Provisional Government in Hawaii on the 14th day of January and the submission to the Senate of the treaty of annexation concluded with such government, the entire interval was thirty-two days, fifteen of which were spent by the Hawaiian commissioners in their journey to Washington.

In the next place, upon the face of the papers submitted with the treaty, it clearly appeared that there was open and undetermined an issue of fact of the most vital importance. The message of the President accompanying the treaty declared that "the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government," and in a letter to the President from the Secretary of State, also submitted to the Senate with the treaty, the following passage occurs:

> At the time the Provisional Government took possession of the Government buildings no troops or officers of the United States were present or took any part whatever in the proceedings. No public recognition was accorded to the Provisional Government by the United States minister until after the Queen's abdiction and when they were in effective possession of the Government buildings, the archives, the treasury, the barracks, the police station, and all the potential machinery of the Government.

But a protest also accompanied said treaty, signed by the Queen and her ministers at the time she made way for the Provisional Government, which explicitly stated that she yielded to the supreme force of the United States, whose minister had caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support such Provisional Government.

The truth or falsity of this protest was surely of the first importance. If true, nothing but the concealment of its truth could induce our Government to negotiate with the semblance of a government thus created, nor could a treaty resulting from the acts stated in the protest have been knowingly deemed worthy of consideration by the Senate. Yet the truth or falsity of the protest had not been investigated.

I conceived it to be my duty therefore to withdraw the treaty from the Senate for examination, and meanwhile to cause an accurate, full, and impartial investigation to be made of the facts attending the subversion of the constitutional Government of Hawaii, and the installment in its place of the Provisional Government. I selected for the work of investigation the Hon. James H. Blount, of Georgia, whose service of eighteen years as a member of the House of Representatives, and whose experience as chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in that body, and his consequent familiarity with international topics, joined with his high character and honorable reputation, seemed to render him peculiarly fitted for the duties intrusted to him. His report detailing his action under the instructions given him and the conclusions derived from his investigation accompany this message.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

These conclusions do not rest for their acceptance entirely upon Mr. Blount's honesty and ability as a man, nor upon his acumen and impartiality as an investigator. They are accompanied by the evidence upon which they are based, which evidence is also herewith transmitted, and from which it seems to me no other deductions could possibly be reached than those arrived at by the commissioner.

The report, with its accompanying proofs, and such other evidence as is now before the Congress or is herewith submitted, justifies in my opinion the statement that when the President was led to submit the treaty to the Senate with the declaration that "the overthrow of the monarchy was not in any way promoted by this Government," and when the Senate was induced to receive and discuss it on that basis, both President and Senate were misled.

The attempt will not be made in this communication to touch upon all the facts which throw light upon the progress and consummation of this scheme of annexation. A very brief and imperfect reference to the facts and evidence at hand will exhibit its character and the incidents in which it had its birth.

It is unnecessary to set forth the reasons which in January, 1893, led a considerable proportion of American and other foreign merchants and traders residing at Honolulu to favor the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. It is sufficient to note the fact and to observe that the project was one which was zealously promoted by the minister representing the United States in that country. He evidently had an ardent desire that it should become a fact accomplished by his agency and during his ministry, and was not inconveniently scrupulous as to the means employed to that end.

On the 19th day of November, 1892, nearly two months before the first overt act tending towards the subversion of the Hawaiian Government and the attempted transfer of Hawaiian territory to the United States, he addressed a long letter to the Secretary of State in which the case for annexation was elaborately argued, on moral, political, and economical grounds. He refers to the loss to the Hawaiian sugar interests from the operation of the McKinley bill, and the tendency to still further depreciation of sugar property unless some positive measure of relief is granted. He strongly inveighs against the existing Hawaiian Government and emphatically declares for annexation. He says: "In truth the monarchy here is an absurd anachronism. It has nothing on which it logically or legitimately stands. The feudal basis on which it once stood no longer existing, the monarchy now is only an impediment to good government—an obstruction to the prosperity and progress of the islands."

He further says: "As a crown colony of Great Britain or a Territory of the United States the government modifications could be made readily and good administration of the law secured. Destiny and the vast future interests of the United States in the Pacific clearly indicate who, at no distant day, must be responsible for the government of these islands. Under a territorial government they could be as easily governed as any of the existing Territories of the United States." * * * "Hawaii has reached the parting of the ways. She must now take the road which leads to Asia, or the other which outlets her in America, gives her an American civilization, and binds her to the care of American destiny." He also declares: "One of two courses seems to me absolutely necessary to be followed, either bold and vigorous measures for annexation, or a 'customs union,' an ocean cable from the California coast to Honolulu, Pearl Harbor perpetually ceded to the United States, with an implied but not expressly stipulated American protectorate over the islands.

"I believe the former to be the better, that which will prove much the more advantageous to the islands, and the cheapest and least embarrassing in the end to the United States. If it was wise for the United States through Secretary Marcy thirty-eight years ago to offer to expend $100,000 to secure a treaty of annexation, it certainly can not be chimerical or unwise to expend $100,000 to secure annexation in the near future. To-day the United States has five times the wealth she possessed in 1854, and the reasons now existing for annexation are much stronger than they were then. I can not refrain from expressing the opinion with emphasis that the golden hour is near at hand."

These declarations certainly show a disposition and condition of mind which may be usefully recalled when interpreting the significence of the minister's conceded acts or when considering the probabilities of such conduct on his part as may not be admitted.

In this view it seems proper to also quote from a letter written by the minister to the Secretary of State on the 8th day of March, 1892, nearly a year prior to the first step taken toward annexation. After stating the possibility that the existing Government of Hawaii might be overturned by an orderly and peaceful revolution, Minister Stevens writes as follows: "Ordinarily in like circumstances, the rule seems to be to limit the landing and movement of United States forces in foreign waters and dominion exclusively to the protection of the United States legation and of the lives and property of American citizens. But as the relations of the United States to Hawaii are exceptional, and in former years the United States officials here took somewhat exceptional action in circumstances of disorder, I desire to know how far the present minister and naval commander may deviate from established international rules and precedents in the contingencies indicated in the first part of this dispatch."

To a minister of this temper full of zeal for annexation there seemed to arise in January, 1893, the precise opportunity for which he was watchfully waiting—an opportunity which by timely "deviation from established international rules and precedents" might be improved to successfully accomplish the great object in view; and we are quite prepared for the exultant enthusiasm with which in a letter to the State Department dated February 1, 1893, he declares; "The Hawaiian pear is now fully ripe and this is the golden hour for the United States to pluck it."

As a further illustration of the activity of this diplomatic representative, attention is called to the fact that on the day the above letter was written, apparently unable longer to restrain his ardor, he issued a proclamation whereby "in the name of the United States" he assumed the protection of the Hawaiian Islands and declared that said action was "taken pending and subject to negotiations at Washington." Of course this assumption of a protectorate was promptly disavowed by our Government, but the American flag remained over the Government building at Honolulu and the forces remained on guard until April, and after Mr. Blount's arrival on the scene, when both were removed.

A brief statement of the occurrences that led to the subversion of the constitutional Government of Hawaii in the interests of annexation to the United States will exhibit the true complexion of that transaction.

On Saturday, January 14, 1893, the Queen of Hawaii, who had been contemplating the proclamation of a new constitution, had, in deference to the wishes and remonstrances of her cabinet, renounced the project for the present at least. Taking this relinquished purpose as a basis of action, citizens of Honolulu numbering from 50 to 100, mostly resident aliens, met in a private office and selected a so-called committee of safety, composed of thirteen persons, seven of whom were foreign subjects, and consisted of five Americans, one Englishman, and one German. This committee, though its designs were not revealed, had in view nothing less than annexation to the United States, and between Saturday, the 14th, and the following Monday, the 16th of January—though exactly what action was taken may not be clearly disclosed—they were certainly in communication with the United States minister.

On Monday morning the Queen and her cabinet made public proclamation, with a notice which was specially served upon the representatives of all foreign Governments, that any changes in the constitution would be sought only in the methods provided by that instrument. Nevertheless, at the call and under the auspices of the committee of safety, a mass-meeting of citizens was held on that day to protest against the Queen's alleged illegal and unlawful proceedings and purposes. Even at this meeting the committee of safety continued to disguise their real purpose and contented themselves with procuring the passage of a resolution denouncing the Queen and empowering the committee to devise ways and means "to secure the permanent maintenance of law and order and the protection of life, liberty, and property in Hawaii."

This meeting adjourned between 3 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. On the same day, and immediately after such adjournment, the committee, unwilling to take further steps without the coöperation of the United States minister, addressed him a note representing that the public safety was menaced and that lives and property were in danger, and concluded as follows: "We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces." Whatever may be thought of the other contents of this note, the absolute truth of this latter statement is incontestable. When the note was written and delivered, the committee, so far as it appears, had neither a man nor a gun at their command, and after its delivery they became so panic-stricken at their position that they sent some of their number to interview the minister and request him not to land the United States forces till the next morning.

But he replied that the troops had been ordered, and whether the committee were ready or not the landing should take place. And so it happened that on the 16th day of January, 1893, between 4 and 5 o clock in the afternoon, a detachment of marines from the United States steamer Boston, with two pieces of artillery, landed at Honolulu. The men, upwards of 160 in all, were supplied with double cartridge belts filled with ammunition and

with haversacks and canteens, and were accompanied by a hospital corps with stretchers and medical supplies. This military demonstration upon the soil of Honolulu was of itself an act of war, unless made either with the consent of the Government of Hawaii or for the bona fide purpose of protecting the imperilled lives and property of citizens of the United States.

But there is no pretense of any such consent on the part of the Government of the Queen, which at that time was undisputed and was both the *de facto* and the *de jure* Government. In point of fact the existing Government instead of requesting the presence of an armed force protested against it. There is as little basis for the pretense that such forces were landed for the security of American life and property. If so, they would have been stationed in the vicinity of such property, and so as to protect it, instead of at a distance, and so as to command the Hawaiian Government building and palace. . Admiral Skerrett, the officer in command of our naval force on the Pacific station, has frankly stated that in his opinion the location of the troops was inadvisable if they were landed for the protection of American citizens whose residences and places of business, as well as the legation and consulate, were in a distant part of the city, but the location selected was a wise one if the forces were landed for the purpose of supporting the Provisional Government.

If any peril to life and property calling for any such martial array had existed, Great Britain and other foreign powers interested would not have been behind the United States in activity to protect their citizens. But they made no sign in that direction. When these armed men were landed, the city of Honolulu was in its customary orderly and peaceful condition. There was no symptom of riot or disturbance in any quarter. Men, women, and children were about the streets as usual, and nothing varied the ordinary routine or disturbed the ordinary tranquility, except the landing of the Boston's marines and their march through the town to the quarters assigned them. Indeed, the fact that after having called for the landing of the United States forces on the plea of danger to life and property, the committee of safety themselves requested the Minister to postpone action, exposed the untruthfulness of their representations of present peril to life and property.

The peril they saw was an anticipation growing out of guilty intentions on their part and something which, though not then existing, they knew would certainly follow their attempt to overthrow the Government of the Queen without the aid of the United States forces.

Thus it appears that Hawaii was taken possession of by the United States forces without the consent or wish of the Government of the islands, or of anybody else so far as shown, except the United States minister.

Therefore the military occupation of Honolulu by the United States on the day mentioned was wholly without justification, either as an occupation by consent or as an occupation necessitated by dangers threatening American life and property. It must be accounted for in some other way and on some other ground, and its real motive and purpose are neither obscure nor far to seek.

The United States forces being now on the scene and favorably stationed, the committee proceeded to carry out their original scheme. They met the next morning, Tuesday, the 17th, perfected the plan of temporary government, and fixed upon its principal officers, ten of whom were drawn from the thirteen members of the committee of safety. Between 1 and 2 o'clock, by squads and by different routes to avoid notice, and having first taken the precaution of ascertaining whether there was any one there to oppose them, they proceeded to the Government building to proclaim the new government.

No sign of opposition was manifest, and thereupon an American citizen began to read the proclamation from the steps of the Government building almost entirely without auditors. It is said that before the reading was finished quite a concourse of persons, variously estimated at from fifty to one hundred, some armed and some unarmed, gathered about the committee to give them aid and confidence. This statement is not important, since the one controlling factor in the whole affair was unquestionably the United States marines, who, drawn up under arms and with artillery in readiness only 76 yards distant, dominated the situation.

The Provisional Government thus proclaimed was by the terms of the proclamation "to exist until terms of union with the United States had been negotiated and agreed upon." The United States minister, pursuant to prior agreement, recognized this Government within an hour after the reading of the proclamation, and before 5 o'clock, in answer to an inquiry on behalf of the Queen and her cabinet, announced that he had done so.

When our minister recognized the Provisional Government the only basis upon which it rested was the fact that the committee of safety had, in the manner above stated, declared it to exist. It was neither a government *de facto* nor *de jure*. That it was not in such possession of the Government property and agencies as entitled it to recognition is conclusively proved by a note found in the files of the legation at Honolulu, addressed by the declared head of the Provisional Government to Minister Stevens, dated January 17, 1893, in which he acknowledges with expressions of appreciation the minister's recognition of the Provisional Government, and states that it is not yet in the possession of the station house (the place where a large number of the Queen's troops were quartered), though the same had been demanded of the Queen's officers in charge. Nevertheless, this wrongful recognition by our minister placed the Government of the Queen in a position of most perilous perplexity.

On the one hand she had possession of the palace, of the barracks, and of the police station, and had at her command at least 500 fully armed men and several pieces of artillery. Indeed, the whole military force of her kingdom was on her side and at her disposal, while the committee of safety, by actual search, had discovered that there were but very few arms in Honolulu that were not in the service of the Government. In this state of things, if the Queen could have dealt with the insurgents alone, her course would have been plain and the result unmistakable. But the United States had allied itself with her enemies, had recognized them as the true government of Hawaii, and had put her and her adherents in the position of opposition against lawful authority. She knew that she could not withstand the power of the United States, but she believed that she might safely trust to its justice.

Accordingly, some hours after the recognition of the Provisional Government by the United States minister, the palace, the barracks, and the police station, with all the military resources of the country, were delivered up by the Queen upon the representation made to her that her cause would thereafter be reviewed at Washington, and while protesting that she surrendered to the superior force of the United States, whose minister had caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the Provisional Government, and that she yielded her authority to prevent collision of armed forces and loss of life and only until such time as the United States, upon the facts being presented to it, should undo the action of its representative and reinstate her in the authority she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

This protest was delivered to the chief of the Provisional Government, who endorsed thereon his ackowledgment of its receipt. The terms of the protest were read without dissent by those assuming to constitute the Provisional Government, who were certainly charged with the knowledge that the Queen instead of finally abandoning her power had appealed to the justice of the United States for reinstatement in her authority; and yet the Provisional Government, with this unanswered protest in its hand, hastened to negotiate with the United States for the permanent banishment of the Queen from power and for a sale of her kingdom.

Our country was in danger of occupying the position of having actually set up a temporary government on foreign soil for the purpose of acquiring through that agency territory which we had wrongfully put in its possession. The control of both sides of a bargain acquired in such a manner is called by a familiar and unpleasant name when found in private transactions. We are not without a precedent showing how scrupulously we avoided such accusations in former days. After the people of Texas had declared their independence of Mexico they resolved that on the acknowledgment of their independence by the United States they would seek admission into the Union. Several months after the battle of San Jacinto, by which Texan independence was practically assured and established, President Jackson declined to recognize it, alleging as one of his reasons that in the circumstances it became us "to beware of a too early movement, as it might subject us, however unjustly, to the imputation of seeking to establish the claim of our neighbors to a territory with a view to its subsequent acquisition by ourselves." This is in marked contrast with the hasty recognition of a government openly and concededly set up for the purpose of tendering to us territorial annexation.

I believe that a candid and thorough examination of the facts will force the conviction that the Provisional Government owes its existence to an armed invasion by the United States. Fair-minded people, with the evidence before them, will hardly claim that the Hawaiian Government was overthrown by the people of the islands, or that the Provisional Government has ever existed with their consent. I do not understand that any member of this Government claims that the people would uphold it by their suffrages if they were allowed to vote on the question.

While naturally sympathizing with every effort to establish a republican form of government, it has been the settled policy of

the United States to concede to people of foreign countries the same freedom and independence in the management of their domestic affairs that we have always claimed for ourselves; and it has been our practice to recognize revolutionary governments as soon as it became apparent that they were supported by the people. For illustration of this rule I need only to refer to the revolution in Brazil in 1889, when our minister was instructed to recognize the Republic "so soon as a majority of the people of Brazil should have signified their assent to its establishment and maintenance;" to the revolution in Chile in 1891, when our minister was directed to recognize the new Government "if it was accepted by the people;" and to the revolution in Venezuela in 1892, when our recognition was accorded on condition that the new Government was "fully established, in possession of the power of the nation, and accepted by the people."

As I apprehend the situation, we are brought face to face with the following conditions:

The lawful Government of Hawaii was overthrown without the drawing of a sword or the firing of a shot by a process every step of which, it may safely be asserted, is directly traceable to and dependent for its success upon the agency of the United States acting through its diplomatic and naval representatives.

But for the notorious predilections of the United States minister for annexation, the committee of safety, which should be called the committee of annexation, would never have existed.

But for the landing of the United States forces upon false pretexts respecting the danger to life and property the committee would never have exposed themselves to the pains and penalties of treason by undertaking the subversion of the Queen's Government.

But for the presence of the United States forces in the immediate vicinity and in position to afford all needed protection and support the committee would not have proclaimed the Provisional Government from the steps of the Government building.

And finally, but for the lawless occupation of Honolulu under false pretexts by the United States forces, and but for Minister Stevens' recognition of the Provisional Government when the United States forces were its sole support and constituted its only military strength, the Queen and her Government would never have yielded to the Provisional Government, even for a time and for the sole purpose of submitting her case to the enlightened justice of the United States.

Believing, therefore, that the United States could not, under the circumstances disclosed, annex the islands without justly incurring the imputation of acquiring them by unjustifiable methods, I shall not again submit the treaty of annexation to the Senate for its consideration, and in the instructions to Minister Willis, a copy of which accompanies this message, I have directed him to so inform the Provisional Government.

But in the present instance our duty does not, in my opinion, end with refusing to consummate this questionable transaction. It has been the boast of our Government that it seeks to do justice in all things without regard to the strength or weakness of those with whom it deals. I mistake the American people if they favor the odious doctrine that there is no such thing as international morality, that there is one law for a strong nation and another for a weak one, and that even by indirection a strong power may with impunity despoil a weak one of its territory.

By an act of war, committed with the participation of a diplomatic representative of the United States and without authority of Congress, the Government of a feeble but friendly and confiding people has been overthrown. A substantial wrong has thus been done which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires we should endeavor to repair. The Provisional Government has not assumed a republican or other constitutional form, but has remained a mere executive council or oligarchy, set up without the assent of the people. It has not sought to find a permanent basis of popular support and has given no evidence of an intention to do so. Indeed, the representatives of that Government assert that the people of Hawaii are unfit for popular government and frankly avow that they can be best ruled by arbitrary or despotic power.

The law of nations is founded upon reason and justice, and the rules of conduct governing individual relations between citizens or subjects of a civilized State are equally applicable as between enlightened nations. The considerations that international law is without a court for its enforcement, and that obedience to its commands practically depends upon good faith, instead of upon the mandate of a superior tribunal, only give additional sanction to the law itself, and brand any deliberate infraction of it not merely as a wrong but as a disgrace. A man of true honor protects the unwritten word which binds his conscience more scrupulously, if possible, than he does the bond a breach of which subjects him to legal liabilities; and the United States, in aiming to maintain itself as one of the most enlightened of nations, would do its citizens gross injustice if it applied to its international relations any other than a high standard of honor and morality.

On that ground the United States can not properly be put in the position of countenancing a wrong after its commission any more than in that of consenting to it in advance. On that ground it can not allow itself to refuse to redress an injury inflicted through an abuse of power by officers clothed with its authority and wearing its uniform; and, on the same ground, if a feeble but friendly state is in danger of being robbed of its independence and its sovereignty by a misuse of the name and power of the United States, the United States can not fail to vindicate its honor and its sense of justice by an earnest effort to make all possible reparation.

These principles apply to the present case with irresistible force when the special conditions of the Queen's surrender of her sovereignty are recalled. She surrendered not to the Provisional Government, but to the United States. She surrendered not absolutely and permanently, but temporarily and conditionally until such time as the facts could be considered by the United States. Furthermore, the Provisional Government acquiesced in her surrender in that manner and on those terms, not only by tacit consent, but through the positive acts of some members of that Government who urged her peaceable submission, not merely to avoid bloodshed, but because she could place implicit reliance upon the justice of the United States, and that the whole subject would be finally considered at Washington.

I have not, however, overlooked an incident of this unfortunate affair which remains to be mentioned. The members of the Provisional Government and their supporters, though not entitled to extreme sympathy, have been led to their present predicament of revolt against the Government of the Queen by the indefensible encouragement and assistance of our diplomatic representative. This fact may entitle them to claim that in our effort to rectify the wrong committed some regard should be had for their safety. This sentiment is strongly seconded by my anxiety to do nothing which would invite either harsh retaliation on the part of the Queen or violence and bloodshed in any quarter.

In the belief that the Queen, as well as her enemies, would be willing to adopt such a course as would meet these conditions, and in view of the fact that both the Queen and the Provisional Government had at one time apparently acquiesced in a reference of the entire case to the United States Government, and considering the further fact that in any event the Provisional Government by its own declared limitation was only "to exist until terms of union with the United States of America have been negotiated and agreed upon," I hoped that after the assurance to the members of that Government that such union could not be consummated I might compass a peaceful adjustment of the difficulty.

Actuated by these desires and purposes, and not unmindful of the inherent perplexities of the situation nor of the limitations upon my power, I instructed Minister Willis to advise the Queen and her supporters of my desire to aid in the restoration of the status existing before the lawless landing of the United States forces at Honolulu on the 16th of January last, if such restoration could be effected upon terms providing for clemency as well as justice to all parties concerned. The conditions suggested, as the instructions show, contemplate a general amnesty to those concerned in setting up the Provisional Government and a recognition of all its bona fide acts and obligations.

In short, they require that the past should be buried, and that the restored govenment should reassume its authority as if its continuity had not been interrupted. These conditions have not proved acceptable to the Queen, and though she has been informed that they will be insisted upon, and that, unless acceded to, the efforts of the President to aid in the restoration of her government will cease, I have not thus far learned that she is willing to yield them her acquiescence. The check which my plans have thus encountered has prevented their presentation to the members of the Provisional Government, while unfortunate public misrepresentations of the situation and exaggerated statements of the sentiments of our people have obviously injured the prospects of successful Executive mediation.

I therefore submit this communication with its accompanying exhibits, embracing Mr. Blount's report, the evidence and statements taken by him at Honolulu, the instructions given to both Mr. Blount and Minister Willis, and correspondence connected with the affair in hand.

In commending this subject to the extended powers and wide discretion of the Congress, I desire to add the assurance that I shall be much gratified to cooperate in any legislative plan which may be devised for the solution of the problem before us which is consistent with American honor, integrity, and morality.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 18, 1893.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask for the reading of three papers accompanying the message, the instructions of the Secretary of State to Minister Willis, dated October 18, November 24, and December 3.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to permit the Secretary, before complying with that request, to read a list of the documents which come with the message, so that we may understand what is here?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield for that purpose, if there is such a list.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose the Secretary can give a summary of the documents which come with the message.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States in response to a resolution of the Senate, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution passed by the Senate on the 6th instant, I hereby transmit reports of the Secretaries of State and of the Navy, with copies of all instructions given to the respective diplomatic and naval representatives of the United States in the Hawaiian Islands since the 4th day of March, 1881, touching the matters specified in the resolution.

It has seemed convenient to include in the present communication to the Senate copies of the diplomatic correspondence concerning the political condition of Hawaii, prepared for transmission to the House of Representatives in response to a later resolution passed by that body on the 13th instant.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 18, 1893.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, unless someone wishes to have all the accompanying documents read, I ask for the reading of those which I have indicated.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have the list of documents accompanying the message read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. List of papers. First——

Mr. HOAR. I will waive my request until after that of the Senator from New Hampshire has been complied with, and the clerks can then get the list ready.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire whether it would not be better to read the instructions to Mr. Blount first, and take them in order.

Mr. HALE and others. Oh, no.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The papers indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[No. 4.—Confidential.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 18, 1893.

SIR: Supplementing the general instructions which you have received with regard to your official duties, it is necessary to communicate to you, in confidence, special instructions for your guidance in so far as concerns the relation of the Government of the United States towards the *de facto* government of the Hawaiian Islands——

Mr. BUTLER. May I inquire what the motion is in regard to the reading of those papers?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from South Carolina that there is no motion pending. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] called for the reading of certain papers transmitted by the President with the message which has been read.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it not be just as well to have those communications printed? Why delay and waste the time of the Senate in reading them?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire called for the reading of the papers, and no objection has been interposed.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand, and I appeal to the Senator just to allow them to be printed. I have no objection to their being read, but——

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that it would take a long time to print all the documents which have been transmitted with the message. My eye has rested upon three very short communications which I think it would be useful to the Senate to hear read at this time; but if Senators prefer to have all the accompanying papers read, of course I will withdraw the request that those three shall be read. However, I know these communications the Senate will wish to hear, and as they contain substantially the instructions given by the Secretary of State I think they ought to be read in open Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not the slightest objection to the letters being read, so far as I am personally concerned. The only point I make is that it is an unnecessary consumption of time; that is all. I do not desire to have them all read.

Mr. CHANDLER. It would not take five minutes to read those I have indicated.

Mr. VOORHEES. I desire to say a single word. All these papers ought to be read together, or else none of them except the message itself should be read. The rest should be ordered to be printed. I do not think it fair at all that a Senator should pick out certain portions of the communications, aside from the message, in order to have them read at this time. They should stand together. The communication the President made to us has been read, and if it is the sense of the Senate to hear more, we should hear all; if not, we should publish the message and accompanying documents.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Indiana to call for the reading of the accompanying documents?

Mr. VOORHEES. No, sir; I do not. I object to the reading unless it is the sense of the Senate, but I am not going to call for it; it must be expressed in some other way than upon a request of mine. However, I shall object to the reading of garbled extracts and excerpts that suit the occasion. I do not ask for the entire reading, but these papers should be published as accompanying documents, as is usually the rule. What I object to is the reading of excerpts here and there, spots and places.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Indiana that the request of the Senator from New Hampshire was that certain papers which he indicated should be read. No objection having been interposed, the Chair ordered them to be read, and the Secretary had commenced to read the papers called for.

Mr. VOORHEES. I must beg pardon of the Chair; I was not aware that the Secretary had proceeded to that stage. I did not know that consent had been implied and that the reading had commenced, or I would have objected sooner.

Mr. SHERMAN. It will take but a few moments to read the papers which have been specified.

Mr. BUTLER. I happened to be absent from the Chamber in the cloak room at the moment when the reading of the papers was commenced, and when I came in I simply made the inquiry which I did of the Chair and an appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire. Now, if it is in order, and I have a right to make an objection, I shall object to the further reading of the letters; and I would accompany that with a motion to refer the message with the accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that they be printed.

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator will not do that. These instructions to Mr. Willis we have been waiting for with great anxiety, and there is an intense desire on the part of Senators to know what those instructions were. The President has sent in the instructions, and now the simple request is that those instructions may be read. It will not take five minutes.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Maine whether all the papers will not be published by to-morrow morning, and then the basis for the instructions will also be published, so that we can see the basis and the reason for the instructions themselves.

Mr. FRYE. But the President has given us, and it has been read to-day, the full basis of all those instructions.

Mr. FAULKNER. In substance.

Mr. FRYE. Very carefully drawn, too; as ably as any advocate could have done it. It seems to me there ought not to be an objection to the reading.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not object to the country knowing everything that has been communicated, but I submit that the reading is a waste of time, that is all.

Mr. FRYE. It will not take five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not the slightest objection to everything being given to the public; but, as the Senator from Indiana has suggested why the accompanying documents should be garbled and a part read and not all, I can not understand. I shall insist upon my objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me? In view of the statement which the two Senators have made that apparently there is an attempt to have read in the Senate garbled extracts, I think it wise that I should state what led me to select these three documents.

I went to the desk and asked that I might see the package which accompanied the President's message. I found that it contained a large amount of matter, much of which I thought had been already printed and given to the public. I noticed, however three short communications which constituted, the instructions given by Secretary Gresham on the dates named, October 18, November 24, and December 3, the day before Congress met, which I saw could be read in five minutes; and therefore I indicated those as documents which I thought might very well be read to the Senate. I made no invidious selection. I selected those which I thought the Senate would want to hear. It seems to me that either all should be read or that at least these three should be read, and that no good is to be accomplished by the Senator from South Carolina in opposing the read-

ing of these three short documents, which contain the sum and substance of all the people of the country at this time want to know and which they now wish to know very much.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the other documents, the reading of which he did not call for, have not been all or nearly all printed before, and discussed by the Senate?

Mr. CHANDLER. It occurred to me that they had.

Mr. HOAR. So only the reading of the new ones is asked for.

Mr. CHANDLER. I may be mistaken about that, but I knew these had not been made public, and therefore I selected them.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose simply for the purpose of suggesting that the President's message is always read, and every precedent is against reading the accompanying documents. Now, let the message go to the appropriate committee with the accompanying documents. There need be no delay. That committee can determine which of the accompanying documents shall be printed and go to the public. One day is not going to be very prejudicial to the great interests of this country or to any individual.

Mr. BUTLER. I merely desire to say in reply to what has fallen from the Senator from New Hampshire that I think he and the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senate and the whole country will survive until to-morrow, when perhaps these documents can be printed. I have not the slightest objection that everything in connection with the President's message and the Hawaiian matter from beginning to end shall be given to the public. I have no such motive as that. I have no desire to suppress anything, but I merely made the motion in the interest of what I thought was good, practical common sense, economy of time, etc.

Now, I renew my motion to refer the message with the accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE. I suggest to the Senator to change, if he makes it, to one to print and refer.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not the slightest objection.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire will state his question of order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understood that the reading of the papers had commenced at my request and by unanimous consent. The Senator from South Carolina interrupted the reading with a suggestion, which I was glad to hear; but it seems to me that now the reading should proceed under the order which had been made before the Senator rose.

Mr. VOORHEES. Before this matter passes away, I desire to say in justice to myself that I had not the slightest conception or knowledge—I could not have had—of what the Senator from New Hampshire desired to have read. It was not because it was one thing or another that I objected, but on the ground stated so well by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]. I knew that every precedent of the business of the Senate was against such a proceeding, and I did not hear, I could not hear, what the Senator from New Hampshire indicated as desiring to have read. It is not because I want to suppress the reading of anything. Of course it is not. We shall be ready not merely to have read and heard and read ourselves, but we shall be ready to consider all these questions before the American people.

Mr. FAULKNER. I rise to a point of order. It strikes me that under the usages of the Senate these papers can not be read except on motion and the action of the Senate by a majority vote. In reference to the question whether the reading by the Secretary had been begun, I desire to say that the Senator from South Carolina, at the very moment the Secretary commenced reading the document called for by the Senator from New Hampshire, rose and addressed the Chair, and the Secretary had not proceeded over two or three lines before the President of the Senate recognized the Senator from South Carolina, and he made the objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from West Virginia allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FAULKNER. Of course.

Mr. CHANDLER. In view of that statement I withdraw the claim that the reading shall proceed under the announcement of the Chair, and call the attention of the Chair to Rule XI, which is pertinent to the suggestion which the Senator from West Virginia has just made. I am willing to have the case disposed of under that rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read Rule XI.

The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XI.

OBJECTION TO READING A PAPER.

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Chair——

Mr. HOAR. I call for the yeas and nays on the question.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope the Chair will recall the fact that during the extra session, lately closed, the question of the construction of this rule arose in the Senate, and there seemed to be an almost unanimous consent that the decision of the Chair at that time was correct, and that the rule applies to papers which are in the nature of public documents. A public document can be read at the desk on the vote of the Senate; a paper not a public document can not be read at the desk, under Rule XI, if it be objected to. That seems to me to be the distinction. If unanimous consent is asked and objection is made to the reading of any part of these communications, I submit that it is the right of any Senator to move that the paper be read notwithstanding the objection, and it is within the power of the majority to order its reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Nebraska that the rule announced is the rule the Chair adheres to, and the Chair, under Rule XI, submits to the Senate the question.

Mr. FAULKNER. I desire to say, in justice to the views I myself take of the rule, that I suggested in the remarks I made that the paper could only be read on the motion of a Senator and by a vote of the Senate. The construction of the Senator from Nebraska is, I think, clearly correct. The only objection I have to the reading of the papers is that I think we ought to send all the papers to the public at the same time. The Senator from Massachusetts is entirely mistaken when he is under the impression that the papers accompanying the message have already been published. Many of them refer back to a period anterior to those which have been heretofore published.

Mr. BUTLER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTLER. I inquire if the motion to commit does not supersede the motion which is now about to be submitted by the Chair? I have a motion pending to refer the message and the accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that they be printed. I inquire if that does not take precedence, under Rule XI, of the motion just submitted?

Mr. MILLS. I desire on that subject to call the attention of the Chair to Rule XXII, which reads:

When a question is pending no motion shall be received but—
To adjourn,
To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain,
To take a recess,
To proceed to the consideration of executive business,
To lay on the table,
To postpone indefinitely,
To postpone to a day certain,
To commit.

There is now a subject being considered by the Senate. I do not care what the subject may be or what stage it may have attained in the consideration of the Senate, it is pending, and that pending question is the question made by the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the reading of a paper. The Senate has a right to adjourn pending that motion, or to fix a date to which it will adjourn, or to take a recess, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or to commit the whole subject to a committee, all these motions having precedence of the other motion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from Texas is mistaken. A motion has not been made by me that a paper be read; but I called for the reading of a particular paper in connection with the President's message. The Chair has stated that under Rule XI the question whether it shall be read or not, it being objected to, is to be submitted to a vote of the Senate. I respectfully suggest to the Chair that the motion to refer without reading ought not to intervene upon that transaction. How can the Senate know whether it wants to refer the paper or not until it determines whether or not it will have it read? The question is not upon a motion, but upon a rule.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, suppose, pending the request or motion, whichever it may be, of the Senator from New Hampshire, I move that the Senate take a recess, can anybody doubt that that is in order? If I move that the Senate adjourn, can anybody doubt that that is in order? If I move, as the Senator from South Carolina has moved, that this matter should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, Rule XXII says that motion takes precedence of the motion to read. There can be no doubt about it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, the statement made by my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, does not change the condition. He says he did not make the motion, but the rules do make the motion, whether he made it or not. When a bill is pending before the Senate, it may be to engross, nobody moves to engross, but the Chair puts the motion because the rule puts it; it may be

to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair puts that motion, and it goes to the Committee of the Whole; it may be to go out of Committee of the Whole into the Senate: no one makes that motion; the rules already provide for the motion and makes the motion. The Chair simply puts the motion because parliamentary law requires the motion to be put and prescribes the motions and the order in which they shall be made.

The Senate was proceeding under the motion made by the rules, whether it was made by a Senator or not, to the consideration of this question, and pending the consideration of the question, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] made a privileged motion having precedence of that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], which is to commit; and it has precedence of every other motion except those motions enumerated, as my friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] says, in the same rule and giving precedence to them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that under Rule XI no motion is necessary in order that the sense of the Senate may be taken in regard to the objection of the Senator from South Carolina to the reading of the paper; it is a matter for the Senate to determine; and pending the vote, the Senator from South Carolina moves to commit to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That the Chair holds to be a privileged question, and the Chair will submit that question to the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. And that is a debatable question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I inquire of the Chair if the question is debatable?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is debatable, as the Chair understands.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be best for the Senate and for the country that these instructions should be read at this time. I can not conceive of any reason why Senators should object. The Senator from South Carolina puts his objection distinctly upon the ground of the want of time. I beg to say to the Senator that he has himself occupied more time upon the floor than would have been required for the reading of all the papers for which I called.

The message of the President, which has been read at the desk, contains a statement that he has not yet been able to restore the Queen of Hawaii because the conditions that there should be a general amnesty and a recognition of all the bona fide acts and obligations of the Provisional Government were not acceptable to the Queen. The President distinctly states that this is the reason why he has accomplished nothing.

I believe that the three papers, for the reading of which I have asked, the instructions of Secretary Gresham to Minister Willis of October 18, the instructions of November 24, and the telegram of December 3 will show to the Senate and to the country that the reason that the President's plan of restoration miscarried was not because the Queen was not willing to accept the conditions of amnesty and a recognition of the acts of the Provisional Government, but because she could get no assurance that the Army of the United States should be used to restore her to the throne and to maintain her upon the throne.

I think, Mr. President, that the instructions, when they are read to the Senate, will prove that the President has been inaccurate when he attributes the failure of his policy of restoration solely to the refusal of the Queen to grant amnesty to the members of the Provisional Government. I think that the Senate will have no doubt about the inaccuracy when we see those instructions. I think the Senate will also discover that there has been a disingenuousness, to say the least, upon the part of the President in dealing with the Provisional Government of Hawaii.

It appears that the President expected when he signified his decree that the Queen should be restored and the Provisional Government destroyed, that thereupon there would be a universal acquiescence in his decision, and that when the communication was made known to the Queen of the intention of the President, the Queen was not merely unwilling—if she was so unwilling—to grant amnesty to the members of the Provisional Government, but was convinced that she could not be restored and could not be maintained upon the throne without the Army of the United States. Therefore it becomes material to know what the instructions were which were given by the President to Mr. Willis as to the use, if any, which should be made of the soldiers of the United States.

If it should turn out that Mr. Willis was instructed that if the Queen asked whether or not the soldiers of the United States could be used to place her upon the throne and to keep her there, she should be told that the President had no authority to use the Army for that purpose without the consent of Congress, but if the Provisional Government asked the very same question, whether or not the troops would be used to effect the restoration, that Government should be told, not as the Queen would be, that the Army would not be used without the consent of Congress, but that the President felt bound to exert all his constitutional powers to effect the restoration—if, I say, these should turn out to be the exact instructions, then I submit that the President has disingenuously, at least, treated this subject in his message to Congress, and that he has not stated the case fully and exactly and literally as it exists: that is to say, that the failure to carry out the plan of restoration was not because the Queen would not grant amnesty to the members of the Provisional Government, and all persons who aided in establishing it, but because she could not get the assurances from Mr. Willis that the soldiers of the United States would be used to place her upon the throne and to maintain her there after she had been thus restored to her royalty.

Mr. President, these are points upon which the country needs to be informed at the earliest possible moment; upon which the Senate needs to be informed at the earliest possible moment; and why any Senator should object to having the exact and literal instructions of the Secretary of State, representing the President, to Mr. Willis read at the Secretary's desk, when they are so brief that they could have been read and could have been known to the Senate and could have gone to the country half an hour ago, it is impossible for me to conceive, unless the Senators who make the objection fear the effect upon the country of the disclosures in some of these papers which are now unread and unpublished upon the table of the Senate.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire knows that that paper of instructions is now in the press, in type; that it has been flashed all over the country, and the insinuation that anybody is trying to suppress it is not worthy of the Senator or anbody else.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know that the facts are as the Senator states. I think this is a most anomalous proceeding in the Senate of the United States. I never yet heard an objection made to the reading of a public paper upon the table of the Senate which could be read in five minutes; and I am at a loss to understand why the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Indiana, and the Senator from West Virginia are so determined that these three brief papers, which tell this whole story, shall not be read from the Secretary's desk of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President —

Mr. FAULKNER. As the Senator from New Hampshire referred to me, I would ask him, before he takes his seat, if he has ever known any Senator to get up on the floor of the Senate to request the reading of only portions of a paper accompanying a President's message, to the exclusion of all others?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, over and over again. Senators have gone to the desk when there were bulky communications and have asked that particular papers which contained the point of the whole case should be read. That has been done repeatedly.

Mr. FAULKNER. I would ask the Senator further, whether we may not disagree as to whether those three papers contain the entire point and the basis of the message of the President? It was for that reason that I objected. I am willing that the Senate shall sit here and have every paper accompanying the message read, but I am unwilling that the Senator from New Hampshire, or any other Senator, shall select from the documents which accompany the message of the President a few, and then have the others postponed until to-morrow.

I desire to say further that the Senator knows that there is no suppressing of any information. The Senator knows that he can now ask for the reading of all the papers.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts rises to a question of order, which he will state.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] has not been recognized by the Chair as entitled to the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from West Virginia that the Chair had recognized the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. HOAR. Now, I yield to my friend from West Virginia with entire pleasure, having asserted my right. [Laughter.]

Mr. FAULKNER. I am under great obligations to the Senator from Massachusetts for his extreme courtesy. It is not very often that the Senator from Massachusetts yields to anyone. [Laughter.] I feel that he has, therefore, bestowed upon me a distinguished personal courtesy, for which I extend him my sincere thanks.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator is talking very well indeed so far, and I am glad to hear him.

Mr. FAULKNER. I was interrupted in the remarks I was making. I only rose for the purpose of addressing an inquiry or two to the Senator from New Hampshire, and was by his answer led off into other remarks.

I would simply say in conclusion that if the Senate desires to sit here and hear all the documents read which accompany the

President's message, so far as I am concerned I am willing to have those documents read; but I shall not consent, as a member of the Senate, to a partial reading of the accompanying documents, and I think it not according to the universal custom of the Senate, and therefore hope the Senate will sustain the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to commit.

Mr. HOAR. I rose not to take part in this discussion, but only to call the attention of the Senate and of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who have raised this proposition, to a fact which I think probably they have not ascertained, and I should like the attention of the Senator from South Carolina and of the Senator from Indiana.

All the matter which accompanies the President's message, as I understand, consists in old or new public documents which have been printed and I think are entirely known to the Senate and to the public, except the three short matters, the reading of which the Senator from New Hampshire has asked for, which come in in manuscript. They are new. The Secretary thought they would take five or six pages of our ordinary print, but I should not think they would take more than four, certainly not more than five or six.

I quite agree that Senators would be entirely right in rising and saying that they would not tolerate the picking out from a document certain matters which, taken alone, might make a one sided case, but should insist on reading the whole. That, however, is not this case.

It is the case of a message, to which there are attached printed documents in regard to the Hawaiian question, coming down from President Harrison's time, some twenty or thirty in number, including Mr. Blount's report, which has been in our hands in print for three or four weeks. What the Senator from New Hampshire asks, however, is simply some new additions to our present information, contained in manuscript, the chief one being the instructions to Mr. Willis, which, as I said, would not make more than three or four pages, and could have been read in five minutes and perhaps in three. That is all there is of it. Does the Senator think it is worth while to have a discussion about such a question?

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not think it is.

Mr. HOAR. If I may be pardoned an additional suggestion, those experienced parliamentarians on the other side will understand, if the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to refer the message and accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations comes up, I can debate that motion, or the Senator from New Hampshire, or any other Senator, and the Senator debating it can read as a part of his remarks the instructions to Mr. Willis; so that we are not discussing a question of any practical importance anyway.

Mr. VOORHEES. I think myself that we are magnifying a matter which might have passed along without such attention being drawn to it. The Senator from New Hampshire, however, rose, and without explaining what he had in mind or to what part of the accompanying documents his suggestion related, called for the reading of two or three papers. We could not very well hear on this side, and he did not point out the character of what he desired to have read. I confess, had I known that it embraced simply the instructions to Mr. Willis, so far as I am concerned, although the rule is the other way, I should not have made an objection.

But there has been so much temper and feeling and partisan bias exhibited on this subject, and so much, if Senators will pardon me, of unfairness, as I conceive, that the bare attempt of a Senator on either side of the Chamber proposing to pick out certain parts to have read, contrary to all the precedents of the Senate, contrary to its usages, at once excited my opposition, and I fell back immediately upon the rule, as Senators on the other side would have done if the situation had been reversed. This much it is proper to say.

So far as suppressing information is concerned, that is utter nonsense. The instructions to Mr. Willis are now being published in all the afternoon newspapers. It is only because I thought a step of unfairness was sought to be taken to the prejudice of the message, that I took the ground that the accompanying documents should all be published or all be referred with the message; and that is a fair construction, in my judgment.

So far as the accompanying papers are concerned, the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts is that many of them have been published heretofore. That is a matter of course, because the scope of the Senator's resolution went back to 1881, I think. If the papers have already been published and are subject to criticism, why did the Senator ask for their republication in this form? I do not want to be critical or hypercritical.

Mr. HOAR. I desired to get them all together.

Mr. VOORHEES. As the Senator suggests, the only good reason was that they should all be put together in this form.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, it is partly that and partly because there might have been instructions in former Administrations since 1881, which were then deemed confidential and not made public. My resolution was that, if the President deemed it not incompatible with the public interests, he should send in all the instructions since 1881. I understand he now sends them in, and in the very printed documents in which they existed.

Mr. VOORHEES. I know nothing about that. I inquire, Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], to commit the President's message and accompanying documents to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from Indiana is not occupying the floor——

Mr. VOORHEES. I yield to the Senator from Iowa with pleasure.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. I only wish to say a word upon this subject. I take it for granted, of course, that the message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed. I confess some desire to have read at the Secretary's desk the brief documents to which our attention has been called, and I think it has been the uniform custom—I will not say the courtesy of the Senate, because that seems to be rather an old phrase and somewhat in disrepute—but it has been the uniform usage of the Senate when a Senator asks for the reading of a document or a paper, if it is not a long paper and will not occupy much time, to have that paper read. That has been the usual custom.

I remember very well at the last session when the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] was making a most elaborate argument upon the public question we were then discussing and had spoken for some hours, he sent to the Secretary's desk a long document, being a letter addressed by a gentleman in Missouri to another gentleman in Missouri, and asked that it be read. Objection was made that it was not within the rules of the Senate; and thereupon under Rule XI the question was submitted to the Senate and by a large majority—I remember that I voted with the majority because I believed where a Senator desired to have a paper read which was in his opinion of public importance, that the Senate should allow it to be read at the time—and I think every Senator upon the other side of the Chamber voted to have that paper read, which occupied a half hour.

I have not seen these papers, except to glance at them casually at the desk, and I am sure that they can be read in ten minutes. It is now said by the Senator from Indiana that these papers are to be printed in the evening newspapers, and that if we will all wait until we receive the 5 o'clock edition of the Washington Star we shall have here an opportunity of reading what the public will have read two or three hours in advance.

I submit to the Senate that these are documents of great moment, especially the instructions of the Secretary of State, under the direction of the President, to a minister who went to Hawaii upon a delicate and important public mission, in which the people of the United States are greatly interested. If I were Secretary of State and a request were made in this Chamber for the reading of an important document, written by me, of instructions to my minister, I should think, as a matter of courtesy to me as Secretary of State, the document should be read here.

I hope now, after all that has been said about it, that whatever there is on this subject shall be disposed of by unanimous consent, that the three papers referred to may be read, and if afterwards any injustice appears to have been done for the reason that some other paper is not read, I am willing, for one, to sit here and listen to the reading of that paper also. I think justice to all concerned requires that. Therefore I hope before the reference is made that the papers referred to may be read.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have said over and over again, and I now repeat, that there is not a syllable or a word or a line in those papers which I desire to suppress and keep from the public. That is all, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] says, idle nonsense. The mere intimation or suggestion by anybody that I desire to suppress anything is simply nonsense. I do not think that I can use any milder term.

I have said that my objection to reading the papers was that we all know the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] very well; we understand perfectly well his tactics in political matters. If he can get the advantage of a political adversary by garbling a report or a communication, we know perfectly well that he will do it. If the Senator from New Hampshire had stated what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has just stated, I do not know that I should have interposed any objection, but the Senator from New Hampshire gets up and selects certain papers from the accompanying documents submitted by

the President, and asks that they be read, and the universal suspicion is that that Senator had some object, some nigh-cut that he wants to take on the President or the Democratic party. That is a fact, and we all know it.

The Senator says that he is surprised that anybody should object. I do think that Senator ought not to be surprised at it. He knows perfectly well that we have to be on the lookout for him all the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I beg right at this point to thank him for the compliment he has just paid me.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is entirely welcome to the compliment, I assure him; but it is a fact all the same. I have not a single particle of objection to reading the papers. The only question I had was as to the economy of time.

Mr. CULLOM. Then let the papers be read.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not yielded the floor yet. I want to submit a few more brief remarks.

I think, in common fairness to the President and common fairness to the Secretary of State, that if any papers in connection with these three documents, the reading of which has been requested, affect them in any way, they ought to be read, and I scarcely think that anybody will charge the Senator from New Hampshire with any desire to be guilty of a special courtesy to the Secretary of State or the President of the United States.

If the Senator from Iowa had made that request, I might have suspected that his desire was to indulge in the utmost courtesy to the Secretary of State and to the President, and that no other motive actuated him.

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. BUTLER. That, I have no doubt, would be universally conceded on our side. If the Senator from Iowa desires to have the papers read, if the Senate can afford to stand it, I have not the slightest objection to having them read, but it is a little surprising to me that the impetuosity of the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Iowa can not be restrained until to-morrow morning. I think the country will survive whether these papers are read or not. The anxiety, the earnestness, and the assiduity with which those Senators are following up this question is praiseworthy, and I commend them for it. It is an indication that the times are improving, that they want to sustain the present Administration, and give it all the courtesy and consideration which any Administration has received. So, with that view, and with the assumption that that is the object, that they are trying to protect the Secretary of State and the President, I shall withdraw my objection.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Pending the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] to commit, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] asks unanimous consent for the reading of the papers indicated.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi objects.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Mississippi will kindly yield to me a moment, I wish to say in reply to the Senator from South Carolina that we are happy to be informed on this side of the Chamber that whenever we wish to accomplish a partisan object slyly and without suspicion, it behooves us to put forward for that purpose the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. [Laughter.] For my own part, I shall gladly agree to his leadership whenever a partisan purpose is to be slyly accomplished.

But, Mr. President, I beg to ask the Senator from South Carolina why it should be assumed in this case, of all others, that I was actuated by a partisan motive? The Senator must know that for three months during the extra session I was humbly following the lead of President Cleveland and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES]. [Laughter.] Did I act in good faith on that occasion? I thought I did; I tried to do so; and I trained with the President of the United States and the Senator from Indiana to the best of my ability. I only regretted that upon the question then pending we did not find with us, sustaining the President and the Senator from Indiana, the Senator from South Carolina. [Laughter.] I am afraid the Senator from South Carolina was influenced by other than a motive of high public duty when he dissented from the recommendations of his President and the recommendations of the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Finance.

I trust when we again make a fight for sound money in the Senate, actuated thereto by a message of President Cleveland and under the distinguished lead of the sound-money Senator from Indiana, the Republicans on this side of the Chamber will be able then to ally with themselves the Senator from South Carolina.

Why this talk about partisanship upon this question of Hawaii? Did not the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] the other day, with high-sounding sentences, declare that he was incapable of being influenced by partisanship in discussing a question of foreign affairs, and did he not then undertake to speak for the Democratic side of this Chamber, and did we not all on this side of the Chamber realize that the Democratic party were utterly incapable of taking a partisan view of a question of foreign affairs? [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the announcement of the Senator from Delaware that such was the noble and magnificent position of the Democratic party on the Hawaiian question, struck deep into the hearts of the Republicans upon this side of the Chamber, and since then we have been equally imbued with the desire that the Hawaiian question should be disposed of without the slightest partisanship. Therefore, I think the Senator from South Carolina was unwarranted in singling me out for denunciation on the ground that I am seeking, when asking to have these instructions read at this time, some partisan advantage of the President, whom I supported so constantly and so loyally upon the silver question. The President of the United States is necessarily dealing with this question in a nonpartisan way.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator imagines for one instant that what I said was in the form of denunciation, I desire now to apologize to him in the most unqualified manner, and I now extend to him my unqualified apology for the slightest suspicion that I intended to denounce him in any way. I will say now to that Senator, since the announcement of his nonpartisan patriotism has been made, it has sunk very deeply into my heart. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad that I have been able to teach a lesson to the Senator from South Carolina. That lesson is this, that upon matters of this kind connected with foreign relations he should follow the distinguished Senator from Delaware, who has announced, presumably by authority and after consultation with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who is the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that this question of our relations with Hawaii shall be treated from a nonpartisan standpoint. I regret that the Senator from South Carolina for a little while found himself imbued with a partisan spirit and desired to attribute partisan motives to others. I hope now that he will reverse——

Mr. BUTLER. I apologize, Mr. President.

Mr. CHANDLER. That he will reverse himself and resume his judgment, and hereafter we shall be sure that he deals with questions of foreign affairs without partisan spirit, as we all know, in the height of his statesmanship, he deals with every public question—without the slightest regard for political parties. [Laughter.]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know what the precedents of the Senate are in reference to the matter now before us, but I do know what is just and right. Here is a case attempted to be made against the President. He sends in, in accordance with a resolution of the Senate, his message with the documents called for by the resolution of the Senate, and we have here, I think, a very unjust, not to say unprecedented state of affairs. When the message is read, of a large number of documents accompanying it two or three are selected for the purpose of being read and the great mass are not to be read. I say it is just, right, and fair, when we go into the reading of the documents, that the whole case shall be put before the Senate and before the country, and not a part of it. I object, therefore, to the reading of these selected papers unless all are read, because, as I have stated, when a case is put before the country and before the Senate the whole of it ought to be put before the country and the Senate, and not a part of it.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, just one word in response to the suggestions made by the Senator from Mississippi. I asked unanimous consent that these three papers might be read at the desk. As I understand the situation in which we are placed at this moment by the rules of the Senate or by the suggestions made on the floor, the Senate passes a resolution requesting the President of the United States to furnish to us certain documents and papers. The documents and papers in response to that resolution are sent to the Senate. They are here on our table in the possession of the Senate. I think by all parliamentary rules, certainly by all proper parliamentary rules, unless some Senate rule intervenes, I have the right as a Senator on this floor to have every paper read respecting the subject sent here by the President in pursuance of the resolution of the Senate. But I do not ask that all the papers shall be read.

Now, is it possible that under our rules, when papers are at the desk called for by us, we are to be forced to vote for their reference to a standing committee of this body without knowing what they contain and without having the privilege of an investiga-

tion and examination of them? Is that a part of the system of rules we have adopted in this body?

The Senator from Mississippi says he objects to a partial case. I seek to make no case. Here is a long message from the President dealing with this question and stating that he submits with his message certain papers, specifically alluding to the instructions sent to Mr. Willis, our minister at Hawaii. Is it possible that that is not an important question and a distinct question? Are we to read all the testimony, all the statements by Mr. Blount through the months of April, May, June, and July, his communications, his letters, his cross-examinations, his statements to the Secretary of State? Are we to be required to listen to all those at the desk in order that we may have the brief, confidential instruction, now for the first time sent to the Senate, given by our Secretary of State to his minister?

I submit, Mr. President, that if the rules of the Senate require us to submit to that they surely should be dispensed with so far as making such a discrimination is concerned.

I move that the three documents indicated be read at the desk pending the question of reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in order that, for one at least, I may know what the instructions contain.

Mr. FAULKNER. It strikes me that a motion to refer has precedence of the motion of the Senator from Iowa. I understood that the Senator from South Carolina had withdrawn his motion, and although I do not agree with his attitude in withdrawing it, yet I propose to follow the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this side of the Chamber, even when I do not agree with them, as they have special charge of this particular matter.

Mr. MILLS. The Chair has ruled that a motion to commit has precedence of a motion to read, and for the Senator from Iowa to make his motion again is to go behind the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. ALLISON. Then the rules of the Senate require that a document which is in our possession must be referred to a committee and ordered to be printed without a Senator knowing what it contains.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I will ask for correct information from the Chair whether the motion of the Senator from South Carolina has been withdrawn. Though I do not agree with the attitude of the Senator from South Carolina, yet he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I propose to follow the members of that committee on this side.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is not advised that the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to refer the President's message, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on Foreign Relations has been withdrawn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does that motion include the printing of the message and accompanying documents?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It includes the printing. Pending the motion of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the three papers indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire be read. To that request the Senator from Mississippi objects?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. HOAR. The motion of the Senator from South Carolina being pending, to commit the papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I call for the reading of the three papers which the Senator from New Hampshire asked to have read, and which are included in the motion to refer. I desire that my call, if it be objected to, be submitted to the Senate under Rule XI for its vote.

Mr. STEWART. Without debate.

Mr. CALL. I should like to submit a single suggestion to the Senate. The fifth clause of the seventh rule of the Senate provides as follows:

> The Presiding Officer may at any time lay * * * before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose.

I submit what does the term to "lay before the Senate" mean? Does it mean the announcement that a message or a document has been received from the President of the United States, or does laying before the Senate mean such a presentation of the subject as will inform the Senate what is in the message? In my judgment it can not be laid before the Senate unless there be a presentation in some form of the substance of the communication.

Mr. HOAR. On the vote of the Senate, if the question shall be put to a vote, I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MILLS. I make the point of order that the call by the Senator from Massachusetts for the reading of the papers is consideration. It is the consideration of the subject, and the rule says that pending the consideration the motions specified shall have precedence in the order in which they stand arranged. A motion to commit has precedence of a motion to consider the subject in any of its aspects, whether to read a paper, to make a speech on it, to amend it, or to do anything else with it.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to suggest to the Chair that I do not deem myself to be making a motion under Rule IX. My right stands just as if a motion were pending under that rule to commit a bill, and I should ask that the bill be read for information before the vote is taken to commit it. These papers are the subject of the pending motion. There is a motion to commit and a motion to print certain papers, and on that motion, to use the language of the rule, I call for the reading that we may know what we are voting upon, and what we are to commit, and what we are to print. I conceive that the special rule (which was not intended to compel the Senate to submit to the reading of voluminous documents) is that, as incident to the various motions set out, the Senate shall know by having read what it is acting upon. On that point I ask the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MILLS. I will test the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts. Suppose a bill were pending and the question were the engrossment of the bill, and the Senator from Massachusetts should call for the reading of the bill, and then a Senator should move to adjourn. Which would have precedence, the reading of the bill or the motion to adjourn?

Mr. CHANDLER. Undoubtedly a motion to adjourn or to take a recess.

Mr. HOAR. All admit that.

Mr. CHANDLER. But when the subject is under consideration whether a paper shall be referred, and a call is made that the paper, the reference of which is to be submitted to a vote of the Senate, shall be read, is not that the highest question of privilege?

Mr. MILLS. Then the Senator begs the whole question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Texas if it is not the highest kind of a privileged question, whether the paper shall be read.

Mr. MILLS. All these questions are privileged. The motion to adjourn is a motion of the highest privilege of the body. The reading of a paper is the consideration of the subject. If the Senator admits that a motion to adjourn may be put to the Senate in preference to the reading, then he admits all the other motions provided for in Rule XXII. It would certainly be in order——

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me at that point? The reason why I do not admit it is because the reading of a paper is expressly provided for by the rule. The question shall be decided without debate whether the paper shall be read.

Mr. MILLS. But Rule XXII says that when any question is pending, whether it is that a paper or any other part of a message shall be read, then certain motions shall have precedence. One is that the Senate shall adjourn; another that it shall fix the day to which it shall adjourn; and another is to commit the whole subject, without reading any papers, to the committee, in order that the committee organized by the parliamentary body may investigate the subject and bring it back to the Senate on a report, and enable the body to consider it more intelligently. I hold that the motion of the Senator to demand the reading is not in order.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator give us any rule?

Mr. MILLS. Rule XXII.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought before I left the Chamber a moment ago that the Chair understood me to have withdrawn my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not so understand the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER. So I have been informed. I withdrew the motion to commit, in view of what had been said by the Senator from Iowa, and I so stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa renew his request?

Mr. ALLISON. I renew my request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa renews his request for the reading of the papers indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire. Is there objection?

Mr. FAULKNER. I do not object, because it is the view of the Senators representing the Committee on Foreign Relations that that request should be granted. In my judgment I do not agree with the committee, but I shall not object to unanimous consent.

Mr. CALL. I want to say before this action is taken that under the provision of the rule it is very clear to me that the Chair can not lay before the Senate a communication from the President without presenting to the Senate information as to what the matter is. What does laying before the Senate mean, in the sense of the rule? Does it mean presenting a subject in such form that the Senate can not know what it is? Surely not. It is not laid before the Senate in the sense of the rule unless it is presented in such form that the Senate may know what it is.

Then the rule goes on to say that any motion shall be suspended

to allow the President of the Senate to lay before the Senate a communication from the President. If these words do not mean the reading of the matter or the presentation of the substance of it, then they are idle, they mean nothing. There is no sense in laying papers before the Senate in such form that the Senate can not understand the matter; and the rule makes that a question of privilege. The message has been laid before the Senate by the President of the Senate under that clause.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none. The papers indicated will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, October 18, 1893.*

[No. 4.—Confidential.]

SIR: Supplementing the general instructions which you have received with regard to your official duties, it is necessary to communicate to you, in confidence, special instructions for your guidance in so far as concerns the relation of the Government of the United States towards the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

The President deems it his duty to withdraw from the Senate the treaty of annexation which has been signed by the Secretary of State and the agents of the Provisional Government, and to dispatch a trusted representative to Hawaii to impartially investigate the causes of the so-called revolution and ascertain and report the true situation in those islands. This information was needed the better to enable the President to discharge a delicate and important public duty.

The instructions given to Mr. Blount, of which you are furnished with a copy, point out a line of conduct to be observed by him in his official and personal relations on the islands by which you will be guided so far as they are applicable and not inconsistent with what is herein contained.

It remains to acquaint you with the President's conclusions upon the facts embodied in Mr. Blount's reports and to direct your course in accordance therewith.

The Provisional Government was not established by the Hawaiian people, or with their consent or acquiescence, nor has it since existed with their consent. The Queen refused to surrender her powers to the Provisional Government until convinced that the minister of the United States has recognized it as the *de facto* authority, and would support and defend it with the military force of the United States, and that resistance would precipitate a bloody conflict with that force. She was advised and assured by her ministers and by the leaders of the movement for the overthrow of her Government that if she surrendered under protest her case would afterwards be fairly considered by the President of the United States. The Queen finally wisely yielded to the armed forces of the United States, then quartered in Honolulu, relying upon the good faith and honor of the President, when informed of what had occurred, to undo the action of the minister and reinstate her and the authority which she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

After a patient examination of Mr. Blount's report, the President is satisfied that the movement against the Queen if not instigated was encouraged and supported by the representative of this Government at Honolulu; that he promised in advance to aid her enemies in an effort to overthrow the Hawaiian Government and set up by force a new government in its place, and that he kept this promise by causing a detachment of troops to be landed from the Boston on the 16th of January and by recognizing the Provisional Government the next day, when it was too feeble to defend itself, and the constitutional government was able to successfully maintain its authority against any threatening force other than that of the United States already landed.

The President has therefore determined that he will not send back to the Senate for its action thereon, the treaty which he withdrew from that body for further consideration on the 9th day of March last.

On your arrival at Honolulu you will take advantage of an early opportunity to inform the Queen of this determination, making known to her the President's sincere regret that the reprehensible conduct of the American minister and the unauthorized presence on land of a military force of the United States obliged her to surrender her sovereignty for the time being and rely on the justice of this Government to undo the flagrant wrong.

You will, however, at the same time inform the Queen that when reinstated the President expects that she will pursue a magnanimous course by granting full amnesty to all who participated in the movement against her, including persons who are or have been officially or otherwise connected with the Provisional Government, depriving them of no right or privilege which they enjoyed before the so-called revolution. All obligations created by the Provisional Government in due course of administration should be assumed.

Having secured the Queen's agreement to pursue this wise and humane policy, which it is believed you will speedily obtain, you will then advise the Executive of the Provisional Government and his ministers of the President's determination of the question which their action and that of the Queen devolved upon him, and that they are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority.

Should the Queen decline to pursue the liberal course suggested, or should the Provisional Government refuse to abide by the President's decision, you will report the facts and await further directions.

In carrying out these general instructions, you will be guided largely by your own good judgment in dealing with the delicate situation.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. Q. GRESHAM.

Inclosure: Mr. Gresham to Mr. Blount, confidential instructions, March 11, 1893.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram sent through dispatch agent at San Francisco.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, November 24, 1893.*

The brevity and uncertainty of your telegrams are embarrasing. You will insist upon amnesty and recognition of obligations of the Provisional Government as essential conditions of restoration. All interests will be promoted by prompt action.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, December 3, 1893.*

Your dispatch which was answered by steamer on the 25th of November seems to call for additional instructions.

Should the Queen refuse assent to the written conditions, you will at once inform her that the President will cease interposition in her behalf and that while he deems it his duty to endeavor to restore to the sovereign the constitutional government of the islands, his further efforts in that direction will depend upon the Queen's unqualified agreement that all obligations created by the Provisional Government in a proper course of administration shall be assumed, and upon such pledges by her as will prevent the adoption of any measures of proscription or punishment for what has been done in the past by those setting up or supporting the Provisional Government. The President feels that by our original interference and what followed we have incurred responsibilities to the whole Hawaiian community, and it would not be just to put one party at the mercy of the other.

Should the Queen ask whether if she accedes to conditions active steps will be taken by the United States to effect her restoration or to maintain her authority thereafter, you will say that the President can not use force without the authority of Congress.

Should the Queen accept conditions and the Provisional Government refuse to surrender, you will be governed by previous instructions. If the Provisional Government asks whether the United States will hold the Queen to fulfillment of stipulated conditions you will say the President, acting under dictates of honor and duty as he has done in endeavoring to effect restoration, will do all in his constitutional power to cause observance of the conditions he has imposed.

GRESHAM.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection the message of the President, with the accompanying documents, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HAWLEY. And printed.

Mr. HOAR. Has a motion been made to that effect?

Mr. VILAS and others. No.

Mr. HOAR. I make that motion. I move that the message and accompanying documents be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOLPH. Printed and referred.

Mr. HOAR. I move that they be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I desire the motion under the rule to go over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 69) prescribing limitations of time for completion of title to certain lands disposed of under act of Congress approved September 27, 1850, and the acts amendatory thereto and supplemental thereto, and commonly known as the "donation act," and for the protection of purchasers and occupants on said lands; and

A bill (H. R. 73) supplementary to the act of Congress approved January 28, 1879, entitled "An act defining the manner in which certain land scrip may be assigned and located or applied by actual settlers, and providing for the issue of patents in the name of the locator or his legal representatives."

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Territories:

A bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and

A bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the admission of the State of Arizona into the Union, and for other purposes.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 97) donating two obsolete cannon to the cities of Allegheny and Pittsburg, Pa., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 4610) to improve the methods of accounting in the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that an appropriation of $[illegible]00 be included in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for traveling expenses for inspector of furniture for public buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PASCO presented petitions of Frank E. Saxon and 15 other business men of Hernando County, of J. M. Barco and 16 other business men of Levy County, and of J. M. Fleming and 25 other business men of Citrus County, all in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a term of the United States circuit and district courts at Ocala, Marion County, Fla.; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., praying for the establishment of a navy-yard at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN presented petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Fairfield, Washingtonville, Madison County, Washington Court-House, Chicago, Centerton, Bryan, New Richmond, Rutland, and Scioto and Pike counties, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS. I present a memorial of several thousand iron miners in the mines of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and the memorial of John Cailson and several hundred iron miners at Ely, Minn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on iron ore, representing that they are out of employment, and that the mines in which they formerly worked are closed. I move that the memorials be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the St. Paul (Minn.) Press Feeders' Union, praying for Government ownership of telegraph and telephone lines; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of the Nashville (Tenn.) branch of the Journeymen Stone-Cutters' Association of North America, praying that the Government of the United States become the owner or take control of the telegraphic system of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. TURPIE presented the memorial of A. Steffen, a tobacco manufacturer of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on Sumatra and other leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, presented a petition of lithographers of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for an increase in the duty on lithographic plates from 25 per cent ad valorem to 50 per cent ad valorem; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 163, of Superior, Wis., praying for the establishment of a governmental telegraph system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Port Townsend, Wash., stating "that a commercial necessity exists to have a suitable life-saving station established on the Pacific coast between Cape Flattery and Destruction Island," and praying that an appropriation be made for that purpose; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORDON presented a petition of the Savannah (Ga.) Cotton Exchange, praying that an appropriation be made for an examination of the old inland route between Savannah and Wrights Rivers, in the State of Georgia; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Sumter County (Ga.) Farmers' Alliance, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the circulating medium; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Columbus, Ga., praying relief for corporations and others using evidences of indebtedness as a circulating medium during the recent unprecedented stringency and financial depression; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Macon, Ga., of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., and of the Georgia Bankers' Association of Macon, Ga., praying relief for banks issuing clearing-house certificates during the late financial stringency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3246) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 968) for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 146) to extend North Capitol street to the Soldiers' Home, reported it without amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1113) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4013) to release and turn over to Mrs. Mary O. Augusta certain property in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 971) to open, widen, and extend alleys in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 832) to simplify the form of deeds of conveyance, trust, and releases of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1267) authorizing the attorney for the District of Columbia and his assistants to administer oaths and affirmations, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3629) to close alleys in square numbered 751, in the city of Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1086) to close alleys in square No. 751, in the city of Washington, D. C., reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 356) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from sale certain land in the abandoned Fort Cummings military reservation, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

FORT BRIDGER MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. CAREY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 165) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Bridger abandoned military reservation, in the State of Wyoming, to report it with an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all public lands now remaining undisposed of within the abandoned military reservation in the State of Wyoming known as the Fort Bridger military reservation, are hereby made subject to disposal under the homestead law only: *Provided*, That actual occupants thereon upon the 1st day of July, 1892, shall have the preference right to make one entry not exceeding one quarter section under existing laws if qualified, which shall include their respective improvements: *Provided further*, That any of such lands as are occupied for town-site purposes and any of the lands that may be shown to be valuable for coal or minerals shall be disposed of as now provided for lands subject to entry and sale under the town-site, coal, or mineral land laws, respectively.

The amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was to add at the end of the bill the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reserve from disposal, under the provisions of this act, any lands included in said reservation which may have heretofore been used for cemetery purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill known as the bill to repeal the Federal election laws, for the purpose of submitting some remarks upon it.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1293) to relieve Benjamin F. Church from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1294) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin Hartley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHITE of California introduced a bill (S. 1295) to reimburse the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada for moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1296) for the relief of Andrew Gray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SHOUP introduced a bill (S. 1297) fixing the limit of indebtedness which may be incurred by Salt Lake City; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1298) to remove from the rolls of the Army the charge of desertion against Neil Patton, late of Battery F, Second United States Artillery, and to grant grant him an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its

title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PEFFER introduced a bill (S. 1299) for the relief of John B. Roach and William F. McPherson, executors of John Roach, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEFFER. I desire to introduce another bill, and in view of the importance of the subject-matter of the bill I ask unanimous consent that it may be read at length.

The bill (S. 1300) to provide funds for immediate use in relieving want and destitution throughout the country was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas want and destitution among the poor and unemployed people is advertised in the newspaper press of the country; and

Whereas it appears that there is urgent need of money to relieve the distress occasioned by such want and destitution; and

Whereas it appears further that the distress has reached a degree beyond present ability of local arrangements to properly relieve; and

Whereas Congress has heretofore granted relief in cases of pressing emergencies in the several States: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That in the name and on behalf of the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required to deliver to the presidents of the boards of national relief commissioners of the several States herein authorized to be appointed, the several amounts of money and in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

SEC. 2. That whenever, within ten days after the approval of this act, the governor of any State or Territory shall certify to the President of the United States that there is, within the limits of such State or Territory, distress among the poor and unemployed people; that such distress exists among and affects large numbers of people who are, by reason of their poverty, unable to help themselves; that such distress has reached a point beyond the capacity of present local arrangements to adequately relieve, or that if funds have been provided for relief purposes they have been exhausted or are not available for immediate use in the impending emergency; and when the governor shall further certify that he has designated three competent persons—naming them—of different political and religious affiliations to take charge of and apply any funds delivered to them by authority of Congress for the purpose of relieving want among the poor and unemployed people of their State, the President shall immediately appoint and commission such persons to act as a board of national relief commissioners to receive and apply money provided by this act, the first named of such commissioners to act as president, the second as treasurer, and the third as secretary of the board of national relief commissioners for the particular State or Territory, and he shall thereupon notify the Secretary of the Treasury of said appointments. The members of said board shall take the usual oath of office and the treasurer shall execute a bond in the sum of $100,000, to be approved by the United States district attorney for the district in which the capital of the State or Territory is located, conditioned for the faithful discharge of his duties and that he will properly account for all moneys intrusted to him under the provisions of this act. The oaths of the commissioners and the bond of the treasurer shall be filed in the office of the clerk of said district court. The commissioners shall immediately meet at the capital of the State or Territory and organize. On notice from the said United States district attorney and the governor of the State or Territory, in a joint communication, that the board of national relief commissioners is duly organized as required by this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be delivered to the treasurer of said board one-fourth part of the aggregate amount of money herein allowed to such State or Territory, and he shall not at any time pay or deliver to such officer more than such one-fourth part unless the governor, at the end of thirty days after such payment, shall certify that the distress continues and that more money is required to relieve it, in which case another one-fourth part of said aggregate amount may be forwarded, and so, on like certificate by the governor thirty days after each payment, another one-fourth part may be sent until the aggregate sum is all paid: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount allowed to each State or Territory shall not exceed $1 for every ten inhabitants of such State or Territory as shown by the census of 1890.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of $6,300,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, and the said amount shall be provided as follows: First. All the silver dollars now in the Treasury, and not covered by certificates outstanding, shall be used; and if these be not enough to supply the whole amount required, second, the Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately cause to be coined from any silver bullion now in the Treasury standard silver dollars enough to make up the whole amount.

SEC. 4. That the several boards of national relief commissioners are hereby authorized to turn over to duly authorized officers of municipalities and of private relief organizations, in the several counties, cities, and towns of their respective States and Territories, such portions of the moneys intrusted to them by this act as they may deem best to make the provisions of this law most effective.

SEC. 5. That the members of said boards of national relief commissioners and all other persons participating in the distribution and application of the funds herein provided shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed and held to be officers of the United States, subject to be dealt with as such in case of fraud, embezzlement, or theft.

Mr. PEFFER. I ask that the bill may be laid on the table temporarily, and to-morrow as soon as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has concluded his remarks, or as soon thereafter as I can get the floor, I shall submit some remarks on the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1301) for the relief of the legal representatives of Hiram Somerville; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAREY introduced a bill (S. 1302) to establish the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 1303) for the relief of the Overton Hotel Company, of Memphis, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1304) to make Commodore William P. McCann, of the Navy, a rear-admiral on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HUNTON introduced a bill (S. 1305) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of certain corporations within the District of Columbia, approved October 1, 1890; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 1306) to establish a port of delivery at Bonners Ferry, Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin introduced a bill (S. 1307) to prohibit horse-racing in the District of Columbia between the 1st day of December and the 1st day of April, each succeeding year, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1308) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1309) to provide for the provisional government of foreign countries and places acquired by treaty or otherwise; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. FRYE. I should like to have the bill read at length.

The bill was read the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the United States shall acquire dominion over any foreign country or place, by treaty of annexation or otherwise, the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate, may appoint a governor for the same and a legislative council, to consist of any number of persons not less than five nor more than twenty-five, whose acts shall be subject to revision or repeal by Congress; and, unless the treaty of annexation or cession shall otherwise provide, said governor and council shall constitute and conduct a provisional government for such country or place until Congress shall otherwise provide by law.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1310) for the relief of Alfred M. Burnham; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1311) for the relief of George F. Rider; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 1312) for the relief of the heirs of Charles B. Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 46) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan the Columbian caravels to the American National Red Cross, Incorporated; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 47) concerning the appropriation for the introduction of a water supply to the station of the United States Fish Commission in Lake County, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE.

Mr. HARRIS. Some days ago a joint resolution proposing to extend Massachusetts avenue through the Naval Observatory grounds was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I referred the joint resolution to the Secretary of the Navy, and he sends me a communication and the draft of a bill in respect to the Naval Observatory grounds that I think important. I therefore move that the communication be printed and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN, it was

Ordered, That Mr. J. A. McCreary, of Emporia, Lyon County, Kans., have leave to withdraw from the files all documents and papers filed by him to accompany Senate bills Nos. 1816 and 1817, introduced during the Fifty-second Congress, subject to the rules.

On motion of Mr. HUNTON, it was

Ordered, That the papers relating to the claims of the stockholders of the Seaboard and Roanoke Railroad Company be taken from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Claims.

ADDITIONAL SENATE MESSENGER.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms is hereby authorized and directed to employ an additional messenger at a salary of $1,440 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided for.

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate a list of the judgments of the Court of Claims rendered since March 4, 1893, on which there has been no appeal, and the time for appeal has expired.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed at the Government Printing Office, in addition to the number already ordered by law, 15,500 copies of the fourteenth annual report of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, uniform with the preceding volumes of the series, of which 3,500 shall be for use of the Senate, 7,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for distribution by the Geological Survey.

MARITIME CANAL OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. MORGAN. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask its consideration, if that is according to the rule. I am not quite certain whether I have a right to do so or not.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a committee to consist of three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, be raised, whose duty it shall be to examine into and report upon the present condition of the Maritime Canal of Nicaragua, now being constructed under a charter granted by the Congress of the United States and under concessions granted by the States of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and the prospect of the completion of said work under the control and with means to be raised by the said Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, and such other matters connected with the construction and control of said canal as may better enable Congress to determine what legislation, if any, is proper and necessary for the promotion of the general welfare of the people and Government of the United States.

2. Said committee may hold its sessions during the sessions of Congress, at any place in the United States, and may proceed to Nicaragua and Costa Rica and there conduct the examinations required by these resolutions, and the expenses of said committee incurred on the part of the Senate shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and the expenses incurred on the part of the House of Representatives shall be paid out of the contingent fund of said House.

3. Said joint committee shall choose its chairman and appoint a clerk and stenographer, and a sergeant-at-arms, who shall have, respectively, an allowance of $6 per diem while in the service of the committee, and said committee shall report upon the matters committed to them by these resolutions.

Mr. HARRIS. The resolution will have to go the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. That was the question in my mind.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will so hold. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to make an inquiry on that point. The suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee is true in respect of a resolution passed merely by authority of the Senate. All resolutions passed by authority of the Senate which incur expenses imposed upon the contingent fund of this body must of course go to that committee. This is a concurrent resolution, and I wish to inquire whether that does not make a difference.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg leave to suggest to my friend from Alabama that any resolution, whether a Senate resolution or a concurrent one, that makes a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate is required by law to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Then perhaps I am in error. I was quite uncertain and mentioned the fact that I was uncertain about it at the time the resolution was introduced. However, I should like to say a few words upon the resolution.

The Congress of the United States finds itself now in an attitude in reference to the Nicaraguan Canal which requires in good faith to its own people and in good faith to all the governments of the world that we should determine whether we intend to take any legislative steps for assisting the canal project or not. It may not be the judgment of Congress that the United States ought to be in anywise connected in the way of financial support with the construction of the canal, or it may be that the judgment of Congress is that we ought to take the subject up and become its patrons and benefactors to the extent that we should have the control of it. I mean, of course, the actual and financial control; I do not mean the political sovereignty over the country where the canal is to be constructed.

But it is due to the Maritime Canal Company, which has spent about six or seven million dollars in the construction of the work; it is due to the people of the United States, and particularly to the people of the Western coast of the United States, that this line of communication shall either be adopted and executed by Congress, with all convenient and economic speed, or else that we shall at once announce our intention not to do this thing, and not to interfere with it, so that the company, chartered under our laws, can go abroad or come to the people of the United States or the States of the American Union and obtain funds for the building of the canal as a private enterprise and conduct it hereafter without any interruption from the Congress of the United States.

What I desire to do, as a friend of the canal, is to have the subject disembarrassed of the difficulties with which it is continually contending. I believe that, notwithstanding the stringency of the times, the great difficulty in raising money upon securities of any kind, if Congress had never interposed an objection and had never undertaken to legislate upon this subject at all, the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, under the great powers and beneficial advantages we have given it in the charter, and under the encouragement of the Governments of Nicaragua and Costa Rica, with the assistance of other governments of the world (which in the absence of assistance from us they have a perfect right to render), would to-day have been in a career of decided prosperity. It would have been working along, and would have commended itself to the world as an institution which was really established in the public faith and confidence and would work out in spite of all opposition and all embarrassment.

I say this, Mr. President, because of the enormous advantages which must inure to the holders of the stock of the Maritime Canal Company whenever the canal is completed. We have but one example to which we can refer of an international character to sustain and support the proposition which I am now advancing, and that is the example of the Suez Canal. That was not built by a government, it was built by private enterprise, assisted by the Khedive of Egypt, but most largely out of the funds of the people of France, who subscribed to the securities of that company, taking its bonds, etc. But it has eventuated in Great Britain buying up the interest of Egypt in the canal and making a vast amount of money, four or five fold the money they put into the canal. It has been completed and is now being duplicated—that is to say, enlarged to double its former size—and the income from it is something that is wonderful, connected with such a vast investment. There is perhaps no investment approaching it in magnitude in the world that yields an income so great and so steady and so perfectly secured.

Therefore I feel authorized to say, upon the example of the completion and prosperity of the Suez Canal, that if the canal across the Isthmus of Darien were built through Nicaragua (which is now the only place where a canal is possible, according to the consensus of the opinion of the whole civilized world), it would be one of the most profitable investments to be found in the reach of the enterprise of financial men in the world. So I argue, indeed I conclude, that if the United States Government had not interfered in anyway with this matter that canal would have gone on prosperously.

But at the same time the burden of it upon the people of the United States would have been something enormous. Congress made an effort to relieve the people of the United States from this very heavy burden by taking up the subject and proposing to advance the money for the purpose of building the canal, so as to bring the cost of construction down to the lowest dollar possible, and so that in realizing profits upon the stock of the canal we could save to the people of the United States and of course to the people of the rest of the world a dollar and a half or two dollars a ton upon all the merchandise that might pass through the canal back and forth.

The proposition here was to get control of the enterprise (which, so far as we are concerned, was in its financial features at least a private enterprise) and work it for the benefit of the people of the United States so as to make it cost them as little as possible, and thereby get as low a rate of toll as possible. That was the effort in Congress, but we have had much opposition, and doubt, and distrust, and difficulty about the matter.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the Congress of the United States interfering with this matter any farther except upon a conclusive determination of the two bodies that they intend to take it up and dispose of it. If we do not intend to assist in building the canal, in the name of conscience let us take our hands off it, so that the men who have invested their money in it and who have the credit, as they believe and as I believe, to build the canal, may go along and do it. The people of the United States want this connection between the two oceans. The people of the world want it. The progress of this age demands it. It is the grandest work that has ever entered into the conception of the human mind. But it is not a recent conception. It is 150 years, or perhaps 200 years old. It has been going through the thought of statesmen in various countries for more than a century, yes, for more than two centuries, and has always received the approval of the most sedate minds that have ever attempted to investigate it.

The object of my resolution is to enable a committee of Congress, to be composed of three gentlemen from each House, to go down there. I will not be one of them, because owing to present circumstances it is impossible for me to go upon such a mission, but there are other gentlemen who are willing to go. They can there determine what is the present condition of the work on the canal and the prospect of the work and examine into every fact connected with it of every kind and character, political, financial, and commercial, and come back and make

their report to the two Houses of Congress. Then we shall be prepared to enter determinately upon the question whether we will or will not take part in the building of the canal. That is the first question to be settled. After we have determined, for instance, that we will build the canal, the question as to the mode of construction, the measures by which we can secure the Treasury of the United States, and by which we can realize to the people of the United States the reduction of the tolls upon the canal, are all matters of detail about which the two Houses can very readily agree. There is no danger of our going wild about it at all. We can take this measure up after the Senate and House have concluded that it is their duty to build the canal and dispose of the details, I think, without any serious difficulty whatever.

My friend, the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], and myself were invited before a committee of the House of Representatives the other day to express some opinions and give some information that we were supposed to have upon this question. The proposition of which I am now speaking originated in the other House with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I understand that they have made a unanimous report to that body of some kind, I do not know precisely what, but favorable to the sending of a joint committee of the two Houses to Nicaragua; and I thought that it was my duty perhaps, as a friend of the measure, to introduce this scheme in order that it might undergo amendment if necessary, and, at all events, consideration.

I ask that the Committee on Contingent Expenses of the Senate, if they appreciate the value of this matter as I think it deserves to be appreciated, will take up the resolution as soon as possible and report it back, because if the committees can be raised they really ought to go immediately and avail themselves of the holiday recess, so that their absence from Congress will not be a very long one.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

THE RUSSIAN THISTLE.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday last I introduced a bill proposing to give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for the destruction and extermination of the new agricultural pest which has in recent years taken possession of many acres of Western land, known as the Russian thistle or Russian cactus. I requested that the bill then lie on the table and gave notice that to-day I would call it up and submit some remarks thereon. I ask that the Secretary may read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 1237) providing for the destruction and extermination of the noxious plant or weed known as saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to employ competent agents, not exceeding ten in number at any one time, whose duty it shall be, under instructions from the Secretary of Agriculture, to make examinations and investigations, at such points as may by him be deemed necessary, and to report to him with respect to the existence of the noxious plant or weed known as saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus in any of the States or Territories of the Union, and upon receipt of conclusive information that such noxious plant or weed exists and is growing and thriving upon any of the lands in any State or Territory it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to instruct the said agents to employ and direct all necessary help and to proceed, in the proper season, to destroy and exterminate all such saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus wherever found upon the highways, in cultivated fields, upon abandoned lands, or upon the public lands, or upon railroad or other land grants, and to prevent its spreading to adjacent States or Territories or communities. The compensation of said agents shall be at the rate of $6 per diem, with all necessary expenses, while engaged in the actual performance of their duties, and the compensation of persons employed in the work of destroying and exterminating the thistles as aforesaid shall not exceed $2 per diem for adult males and $1 per diem for females and for males under 15 years of age.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the speedy and effectual destruction and extirpation of all saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus, as aforesaid, and to certify such rules and regulations to the executive authority of each State and Territory and invite said authorities to cooperate in the execution and enforcement of this act.

SEC. 3. That the sum of $1,000,000, to be immediately available, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall report annually to Congress, at the commencement of each session, a list of the names of all persons employed, their sex and age, and submit with such report an itemized statement of all expenditures under this act, and give full particulars of the means adopted and carried into effect for the destruction and extermination of all saltwort or Russian thistle or cactus in the various States and Territories wherever found; also to report concerning the extent and manner of State coöperation.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, this is a new subject, especially new to Congress, but it is by no means a new question. There is ample precedent for such legislation in the act of 1884, known as the pleuro-pneumonia act. I have had considerable hesitation in offering this measure, because I know there is a general aversion to what is known as paternalism, and that it will bring up the old question between national authority and State authority. However, after a personal investigation of the magnitude of the thistle pest and the trouble that it is giving the farmers of the West, and after examining all the reports which have been made upon it by officials sent out from the Agricultural Department, I concluded that there is but one way by which it may be eradicated and driven out of the agricultural sections of the West, and that way I have provided, I believe, in the bill which has just been read.

As I have said, there is but little known concerning this new agricultural pest. I find in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1891 but a very brief reference to it, which I will read. The Secretary says:

The variety Tragus is not known to be native in this country, but its home is in Russia, and it has more than likely been introduced from that country either with forage seed or brought over in some way by emigrants.

However it may have become introduced in the West, one thing is certain, and that is that it is rapidly spreading and threatens to be one of the very worst weeds with which the farmer will have to contend. It has already gained a strong foothold in North and South Dakota, extending eastward into Minnesota and Wisconsin, and is common in northern Nebraska, and has been recently detected along railroad tracks near Denver, Colo.

I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to the fact that it has invaded his State and is doing a great deal of damage, as I shall show by reports from the Secretary as I proceed.

I have read about all the reference to this pest in the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1891. I find in that report also a letter from the president of the Dakota Irrigation Company, dated October 28, 1891, addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture. I shall read a brief extract from that letter. The writer says:

This obnoxious weed has become so formidable in some portions of the State, notably in Scotland, S. Dak., where the Russians formerly settled, that many farmers are driven from their homes on account of it. A man who was there some time ago states that farmers were leaving their land by the dozens, simply because of this evil. As to the soil it affects, the plants are found in different soil, but thrive best in high, dry places, railroads being the favorite position, and the poorer the soil the more vigorously it grows. It is also found growing abundantly in cultivated fields, springing up among crops that are being cultivated, especially in wheat fields, but not as much in cornfields, as there they have a chance to kill the weeds as fast as they start. It is never found in low, wet places, and very seldom on the unbroken prairie. The weed is similar to the old-fashioned tumble-weed, and as it has millions of seeds, any field where one of these plants has grown will be literally covered with the seeds.

From the best authority I can obtain, there is no question but that the Russians brought the seed to this country. It is claimed that the tender plants make good feed for stock; I have noticed that cattle and sheep eat them when the weeds are very young, but the plant grows quickly and in a short time the stalk becomes hard, and then nothing will touch it. It is becoming a very serious question with our farmers how to free their land at this time, and unless some method is devised to stop its growth or exterminate it a great many acres will become valueless in a very short time.

In the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1892 I find this reference to the Russian thistle, which may be considered additional to what I have read from the report of 1891. The Secretary says:

The Russian thistle grows best on high, dry land. The plants are less numerous and robust in wet than in dry seasons, not because they can not stand wet weather, but because they are more crowded by other plants. The thistle appears to grow equally well in alkaline and nonalkaline soils. The absence of trees and fences, the strong winds, and the methods of farming followed in the Northwest are particularly favorable to its distribution and growth. The policy of growing only a few very profitable crops has induced the farmers to break up a larger area than they can work well.

Wheat is sowed over acre after acre, sometimes merely drilled in on the furrow, or even on unplowed stubble land. Where whole sections and even townships form one continuous wheat field, an acre here and there so grown up to weeds as not to be worth harvesting, does not seem to be of much importance; but it is in such places that the principal development of thistle seeds for the succeeding year takes place. Plowing in the spring or early summer is especially favorable to the growth of the Russian thistle, since it then obtains a thorough foothold in July, and, being able to stand dry weather better than other plants, takes complete possession of the soil.

In addition to this I find in a publication from the Department of Agriculture known as Farmers' Bulletin No. 10, dated 1893, a report on this subject. This, I will say, was written by a gentleman who went to the West to investigate the Russian thistle and came back and made a report to the Secretary of Agriculture, which is very lengthy. I shall only read passages from it which indicate the growth and the extent of the pest. The writer says:

It will take possession of a field to the exclusion of everything else, and it draws from the land a large amount of nourishment that might otherwise go to make useful plants. In these respects it merely partakes of the properties of all weeds, except that it spreads and multiplies more rapidly, and hence takes more space and more nourishment.

Some of its special characteristics render this thistle much more troublesome than other weeds. It is armed with spines quite as sharp and much stronger than those of common thistles. Because of these it is difficult to drive horses through a field where the plants are abundant. In some sections the farmers find it necessary to bind leathers about the horses' legs while at work.

* * * * * * *

Thrashers find it almost impossible to get gloves thick enough to keep the spines out of their fingers, yet thin enough to work with.

The Russian thistle is the worst rolling tumbleweed on the prairie, and in time of prairie fires is easily blown across a fire-break of any width, carrying

fire to stacks and buildings. The weeds bank up against wire fences, causing them to be blown over by the force of the wind, and are sometimes carried into the groves on tree claims, making it impossible to cultivate. * * * When large and well developed they are bulky and stiff, making it very difficult to run harvesting machinery or even a plow. On railroad grades they prevent the growth of grass and other plants that would keep the banks from washing.

The Russian thistle originated in Eastern Europe or Western Asia. It has been known in Russia many years and has quite as bad a reputation in the wheat regions there as it has in the Dakotas. It was introduced in Bonhomme County, S. Dak., about fifteen years ago. Reports differ as to the method of its introduction. There is little doubt, however, that it was first brought there in very small quantities in flaxseed which was imported from Europe. * * * The few plants grown from the foreign seed grew, produced seed, and increased slowly and almost unnoticed until about six years ago (1886).

* * * * * * *

The Russian thistles are most wonderfully adapted for spreading and covering new territory. As tumbleweeds they are carried for miles by the wind, scattering seeds as they go. By this means alone they often advance 5 or 10 miles in a single season. Single stray weeds may doubtless be blown much farther. The general advance is in the direction of the prevailing winds or the most frequent high winds, but the shifting breezes beat the plants about and seed all the area occupied. In many localities where a few plants were first seen four or five years ago every spot of land where the sod has been broken is now occupied. On every badger burrow and overfed spot in the prairie; on every roadside, railroad embankment, fire-break, and neglected garden; on every field of early-plowed land or stubble may be seen a patch of thistles. The seeds are not here and there, as with Eastern weeds, but they are everywhere. The few plants introduced four or five years ago have seeded the land for miles in every direction.

Plants are carried long distances on the railroads by stealing rides on the brake-rods and on the engines. They are also carried in the bedding or earth on stock cars. The seed is carried in flaxseed to considerable extent, but in none of the other grains raised in the West.

Whenever the plants or seeds thus carried by man are dropped they make new centers of growth, from which they may be scattered to the surrounding country by the wind. They grow larger and more abundant some years than others; but even during their off years they keep on spreading over new territory.

Here is an estimate made by the writer of this report of the damage done by the pest in 1892. He says:

In the badly infested area more than 640,000 acres are devoted to wheat-raising. The average loss on this land that may be attributed to the Russian thistle alone can not be less than 5 bushels per acre, and 3,200,000 bushels of wheat at the minimum price of 50 cents per bushel—

That was the farm price last year. Since then the Sherman act has been repealed and now the farm price is about 40 cents—

indicates a loss to the farmers of the two Dakotas of $1,600,000, The loss in other crops, the injuries caused by the spines and the fires caused by the plants jumping firebreaks will bring the total loss to something more than $2,000,000 for the year 1892.

Here is a loss to agriculture in the Western States of upwards of $2,000,000 in one year.

I called upon the Secretary of Agriculture recently and had compiled at the Department an estimate of the loss for the year 1893, by way of contrast, showing the extent and growth of this weed. The estimate is as follows:

ESTIMATE OF DAMAGE CAUSED BY THE RUSSIAN THISTLE IN 1893.

About one-tenth of the corn crop of the two Dakotas has been damaged at least 1 per cent, causing a loss of	$5,000
Fully one-third of the oats crop has been damaged 10 per cent, a loss of	500,000
The flax crop in many places has been a total failure, and the damage to the entire crop is not less than 33⅓ per cent, a loss of	600,000
About 10 per cent of the wheat in North Dakota and about 75 per cent of that in South Dakota is grown in the infested area. The damage to wheat in this area is fully 20 per cent, a loss of	3,000,000
The damage to potatoes and other crops, and to farm machinery and stock, and due to fires carried by the thistles is at least	200,000
The damage in Iowa and Nebraska	90,000

Making a total loss of $4,395,000 for the present year. If the pest continues to spread, as it certainly will unless effective measures are taken to destroy it, it will soon cover the wheat fields of all the Western States. In five or six years, if it is not checked, the States of Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota will be completely overrun with it.

I have one other item of evidence to offer in connection with what I have already read. It is from Prof. H. L. Bolley, botanist of the Government experiment station of North Dakota. He thus speaks of the thistle in a recent special bulletin:

Of its damaging capabilities I need only note that entire fields of large area may be seen into which it would be extreme cruelty to force a team, because of the large size, density, and thorny nature of the brush. Within the area of its distribution in South Dakota (most of that portion known as the James River Valley) many farms are being abandoned, the cactus having taken full possession.

From Lisbon to Edgeley, and southward from these two points, there may be seen many fields which in the spring gave promise of a good yield of wheat. At this date the ground is occupied by a solid mass of cactus brush; and there was no harvest. Three years ago farmers in that region were hardly aware of the existence of such a weed, but were at times interested in a few stray ones tumbling across the prairie. Sixteen years ago the weed did not exist in the Dakotas; yet in 1892 Government officials estimated the damage upon wheat land alone as being $1,600,000.

This report was made by a gentleman who is on the ground and who has observed the growth and spread of the thistle.

Having thus reviewed the reports of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the thistle for the years 1891–'92, I now submit a brief review of the most recent information on the subject. The following memorandum is furnished by Mr. Coville, in charge of the division of botany of the Agricultural Department. It is from information recently gathered by Assistant Botanist Dewey, who has done all the field work in connection with the Russian thistle. Mr. Dewey returned from the affected districts only a few days ago. The history of this terrible plague is thus brought down to date. It was prepared especially at my request, to be used in connection with the data already submitted:

In September and October, 1892, a field agent was sent by the United States Department of Agriculture to investigate the damage done by the Russian thistle in North and South Dakota. A report of this investigation was subsequently published as "Farmers' Bulletin, No. 10," of the Department of Agriculture, giving a map of the area infested at that time by the weed, an estimate of the damage caused by it, and an account of some of the methods which might be used to stop its progress. The information brought out in this bulletin would have done a great deal toward enabling the people of those States to repress the Russian thistle, if it had been widely disseminated among them, and if they had been impressed by State or national legislation with the danger of the weed with which they had to deal.

In November of the present year the same region was examined by the same field agent, and the facts brought out are such as to cause the greatest apprehension regarding the future of wheat-growing in these and adjacent States. The rapid spread of the weed is indicated by a map showing its distribution at the present time compared with its known distribution in 1892, both these maps being based on data brought together by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The map referred to is on exhibition in the Chamber. The green background represents the area covered by the thistle in 1892, the red indicates the spreading of the thistle in the year 1893. It will be seen by reference to this map that the thistle is found as far South as the north line of Kansas, and as far North as the Dominion line. It also appears as far West as Wyoming, and as far East as Milwaukee, Wis. It is only a question of time when it will extend from ocean to ocean, and from Texas to the North Pole, unless checked, and checked without delay.

Mr. Dewey then goes on to give the history of the weed in the United States. He says:

In 1873 it was first introduced in Bon Homme County, S. Dak., in flaxseed brought from Russia. Four years later Yankton County was invaded. Ten years after its first introduction it was spread to Hutchinson, Douglas, and Charles Mix, the tier of counties to the north and west.

In 1888 it was first noticed in many new localities and probably fresh seed was introduced in some of the Russian flax fields in the northwestern part of South Dakota during that year. Since 1888 the pest has been rapidly covering all the region infested, and at the same time has been spreading to new localities, so that now it is really troublesome over an area of 25,000 square miles, equal to half New England, and it has become scattered but has not yet become really troublesome over an additional area of at least 25,000 square miles, equal to half of New England.

The information received by the Department of Agriculture up to the present time shows that the weed is scattered over seventy-five counties in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Wyoming; that the average damage done by it in the region is approximately 20 per cent of the entire crop; that in the seventy-five counties in which the weed positively occurs about two-thirds of the land is infested by it.

The agencies by which the seed is transported to new areas are principally in flax and wheat seed, by transportation on trains and by the wind. It is also carried about by families moving from one point to another, and by threshing machines traveling from farm to farm. The damage thus far done is probably slight in comparison with the amount which may be expected in the future, if we estimate the damage on the basis of the rapidity with which the plant spreads, and the fact that in the areas already infested by it, it is annually causing greater damage per acre. From some localities reports have been received that the entire crops were rendered worthless by this weed.

The problem of eradication in the counties now infested is a problem of the greatest difficulty, requiring the expenditure of a large sum of money, and the active coöperation of all the inhabitants, together with a carefully arranged and executed plan of work.

Many different means to check the progress of the weed have already been suggested by the Department of Agriculture. Among these are late summer fallowing, early fall plowing, burning, and pasturing it with sheep. None of these methods have, however, any efficacy if they are not universally applied.

In this connection Senators will understand that it is useless for a single farmer or any community of farmers to undertake to rid their land of the thistle while any other number of farmers neglect to do so, because the winds will simply carry the seeds over the lands which had been protected against it. The result is the next year the industrious farmers will have as great a crop of thistle as their neighbors who failed to take proper precautions. So it must be apparent that any move against this enemy must be made all along the line simultaneously and by some preconcerted measure adopted, I believe, as it should be, by Congress, and under rules coming from the Secretary of Agriculture, because the States are simply powerless to deal with it. On account of the present low prices of grain all over this country the farmers can not afford to add another single dollar to any acre which they cultivate. They are now putting every dollar of money and every hour of time they have into the preparation of their lands for their crops year after year, and the necessity of expending any amount on their farms in addition to the usual expenses incident to the raising of crops would simply drive them out of business.

The report of Mr. Dewey concludes as follows:

With regard to the further spread of the weed, the greatest emphasis should be placed upon the question of pure seed of grain, flax, and other crops. So important a matter is this that it is almost necessary that State and national legislation should be enacted making obligatory the inspection

of all seed exported from the infested area. If such steps had been in vogue when the Russian thistle was first introduced into the United States, it would have been easily exterminated, and no more single important item in dealing with the weed can be suggested than this.

Mr. President, the closing paragraph of this report gives a very fair illustration of the damage which is being done, and I again call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to this paragraph, because it pertains to the ravages of the Russian thistle in his State.

In the single county of Woodbury, in the State of Iowa, it is estimated that the damage done by this weed during the season of 1890 was practically none; in 1891, $2,000; in 1892, $10,000, and in the present season, $50,000.

This is in one county in Northwestern Iowa.

The amount of damage indicated in this estimate is not so alarming as the rate of increase which it shows. The damage to the crops was much greater during the present year (1893) than in the previous year (1892), but owing to the difference in the price of grain the increase does not appear so large as it really is. The damage in 1892 was estimated at $2,000,000. This year it is estimated at $4,39 .000, showing an increase of $2,395,000 in spite of the decreased prices and decreased crops due to other causes.

Mr. President, I have been at considerable pains to collect everything I could concerning this plant, and consider that I was very fortunate a few days ago in making the acquaintance of a distinguished Russian scientist, who is now traveling over the United States, and is at present in this city, and who gave me much valuable information. I refer to Prince Galitzen, who is a member of the Russian Geographical Association, and also a member, I believe, of the agricultural society of the province of Pultava, in Russia, and himself a large landowner and agriculturist.

Prince Galitzen tells me that four years ago, when he left Russia, he passed through the southwestern portion of Siberia, and there found stretches of this thistle for five or six hundred miles in the most fertile parts of that country. It had driven every farmer out of that section. He also tells me that the Russian Government, which has been engaged in the great work of irrigation and putting in large irrigating ditches in southwestern Siberia for some years, has abandoned the project chiefly on account of the thistle. He states that the pest has overrun the country largely in the provinces of Ural and Kieff, which comprise the most fertile agricultural region in Russia, and that the peasant farmers are simply fleeing in terror before it.

He has had no report from there since he left concerning the pest, but has no doubt that by this time the Russian Government has concluded to take hold of it, and assist the local governments in driving it out, or, at least, attempting to do so. He says the local governments are utterly powerless to cope with it, and we can well understand that with the condition of the farmers to-day all over this country and the low stage of the exchequers of the various States of the Western country, the seat of agriculture in this country and the great breadbasket of the world, they are unable to cope with it alone, because it must be attacked all along the line simultaneously on every spot of land where it is found.

Of all the pests of agriculture of which I have ever heard, in my judgment, this is the worst, and in fact I believe it exceeds in its power for destruction all others put together.

The chief reason why the Government of the United States should take hold of the matter is that in sections where it is most prolific, where it is doing the greatest amount of damage, there is yet a very large area of unclaimed land; in other words, public domain, and I know from personal observation that on the public lands in many parts of my State the thistle has taken complete possession, and they have become the breeding ground for it.

We can well understand how futile it is for any farmer to attempt individually to keep it out of his fields, when those fields are surrounded by the thistle on the public lands and on the abandoned farms. In such places it thrives most prolifically. Another reason why Congress should act, it seems to me, is that the seed of the thistle was brought to this country by immigrants, and the immigrants came here under the provisions of treaties and laws that came from Congress. In this respect it is in the same category with cholera, pleuro-pneumonia, or any other dread disease, against which Congress legislates without question.

Mr. President, in view of the importance of agriculture in this country, when we consider the fact that agriculture is the basis of our industries, indeed the corner stone, and we may say the structure itself, of the Republic, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress to take action respecting this terrible scourge to the greatest of all our great industries. I simply occupy the time of the Senate this morning for the purpose of laying before it the information which I have gathered in order that Senators may have a compact document hereafter to which they may refer in considering this question.

I now move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be so referred, in the absence of objection.

PROPOSED FINANCIAL LEGISLATION.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, were it not that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has given notice that he desires to address the Senate to-morrow, and also the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], considering that so much time has been occupied in the morning business, I should be disposed to defer the speech of which I gave notice some days since until some other day, but, although it may be tiresome to the Senate, I think I shall proceed.

I ask that the resolution of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution referred to by the Senator from Oregon will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MORRILL on the 7th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That all parts of the President's message relating to the tariff, internal revenue, and income tax, together with that relating to those who, it is said, after a hard struggle for tariff reform, are solemnly pledged to it, be, and hereby are, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOLPH Mr. President, upon the second day of the late special session of Congress, immediately after the receipt of the President's message, in which he attributed the then depressed condition of our industries and our finances to the operation of the Sherman law, I embraced the opportunity to dissent from his views, and to very briefly state that, in my judgment, the controlling cause which had brought disaster to our industries, which had closed our factories and mills, which had thrown our laborers out of employment, which had forced collections, made money scarce, and caused the suspension and failure of our banks, and the falling off of the revenues, was the same cause which had always, during the whole period of our national existence, produced similar disastrous effects in this country, viz., the threatened abandonment of the protective system, the fear of hostile tariff legislation; and I then asserted, what I now repeat, that the only real prosperity this country has ever enjoyed has been under the protective system, and that all business and financial reverses that have overtaken our people can be directly traced to the abandonment, or the proposed abandonment, of the protective policy.

There have been periods of comparative prosperity, owing to conditions in Europe or in our own country growing out of wars or failure of crops, which created a more favorable and more profitable market than usual for our surplus agricultural products, and helped to prevent ruinous competition of foreign products with our domestic manufacturers—periods during which a moderate protection to American industries was sufficient to make them moderately prosperous. But the fact remains, as is fully demonstrated by our experience for more than a century, that labor, being the source of all wealth, national and individual prosperity can only be secured by such protection to domestic industries as will give employment to American labor, so that all our people shall be engaged in the creation of wealth.

Being in favor of the measure so long before the Senate for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, and being desirous of securing an early vote upon it, not because I regarded it as the source of our troubles, or supposed its passage would greatly relieve our prostrate industries, but because I believed the continued purchase of silver bullion was contrary to sound financial principles, and therefore if persisted in must eventually impair the credit of the Government and at the same time greatly diminish the purchasing power of our silver currency—during the discussion, as I was about to say, I contented myself with briefly dissenting from the claim made by the President and the political majority in Congress that our business troubles resulted from the operation of the Sherman law, promising that when that measure should be disposed of, and there was a suitable opportunity to do so, I would undertake, by reference to our history, to show that our business and financial depression should have been expected from, and was the natural and logical result of the success of the Democratic party; a success that carried with it the control of the executive branch of the Government and of both branches of Congress, thus placing that party in a position to carry into effect its pledge to overthrow the protective system and to enact a tariff for revenue only, like those of 1833, 1846, and 1857.

What has happened has been predicted by Republican speakers for years, if the Democratic party should secure control of the executive and legislative departments of the Government. The men who managed the great industries of the country saw the South again in the absolute control of the Democratic party. They were admonished also by Mr. Cleveland's free-trade message of 1887; by the passage through a Democratic House of the Mills bill; by the attitude of Democrats in both branches of Congress in recent years; by the action of the Demo-

cratic national convention of 1892 in substituting the radical Neal resolution for the moderate resolutions on the tariff reported by the committee on platform, that the South has not changed its attitude on the tariff since South Carolina declared protective laws to be unconstitutional and null and void, and that if the United States should attempt to force the tariff laws within her borders she would destroy the Union.

Actuated by the instinct of self-preservation, these managers and promoters of American industry and enterprise paused to see where the threatened blow would fall, and diminishing their products, getting rid of their surplus and forcing collections, made ready for the threatened storm. Every industry, every calling, felt the shock, and the wheels of our great industrial system were stopped. To properly trace the history of protective legislation in this country, it is necessary briefly to allude to the causes which led to the separation of the colonies from the mother country and to the adoption of the present Constitution.

THE CAUSES WHICH LED THE COLONIES TO DECLARE THEIR INDEPENDENCE OF THE MOTHER COUNTRY.

Among all the causes which alienated the colonies from Great Britain, the most potent was her persistent policy of refusing, hindering the colonists from making for themselves the things they needed; of suppressing by hostile legislation every attempt in the colonies at manufacturing, even the most ordinary and necessary articles; a policy intended for the purpose of making the inhabitants of the colonies producers of raw materials for English markets only, and wholly dependent on Great Britain for the manufactured articles they consumed. Time will not permit me to enumerate the various hostile acts of the British Parliament to suppress and destroy manufactures in the colonies. They are familiar to every student of American history. The system of repression was complete. It extended to almost everything the colonists undertook to make for themselves. In pursuance of this policy the ship building and the shipping interests of the colonies were destroyed by the British navigation act.

These many acts of oppression, calculated to make the colonists entirely dependent upon the mother country, and which were only aggravated by every attempt to obtain redress, produced great discontent among the colonists; and when Great Britain, not content with making them producers of raw materials for the British markets, and consumers of British manufactures only, sought to replenish her treasury by internal taxation in the colonies, and by customs duties on importations of foreign goods forced upon them by British policy, the discontent ripened into resentment and open rebellion. The story of the stamp act and of the tea party in Boston Harbor are familiar. It was commercial tyranny against which the colonists rebelled. It was commercial freedom which they sought, and it was to obtain this that finally, driven to desperation and willing to hazard life and honor in the struggle, they declared their political independence of the mother country.

The commercial policy of Great Britain, and causes which led to the formation of a new constitution, were discussed by United States Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, on January 23, 1832, in a powerful speech in the Senate upon the tariff question, from which I quote the following. He said:

> The want of a power to protect the great interests of commerce, navigation, agriculture, and manufactures, all of which rest upon the same basis, led to the call of the convention which formed our Constitution. Without the power to protect these great interests, no Constitution would have been formed, and if that power were taken away, dissolution would inevitably ensue.
>
> While we were colonies to Great Britain she endenvored, by rigid restrictions, to confine our industry to such agricultural pursuits as would not interfere with her own; and, by restrictions still more rigid, did she endeavor to prevent the establishment of manufactures in this country; and even the great Chatham, the distingui hed friend of this country, to whom we have long sung praises and erected statues, declared that he would not willingly permit the manufacture of even a hobnail in these colonies. By an act of Parliament, in the year 1750, it was made a criminal offense to erect any mill or other engine for slitting or rolling iron or any plating force to work with a trip hammer or any furnace for making steel. The punishment for this offense was a fine of £200 and the abatement of any such work as a nuisance.
>
> The governors of the respective provinces were bound to see this law carried into effect, under a penalty of a fine of £500, the loss of their office, and a disqualification to hold office. By another statute, hatters were restrained from taking more than two apprentices each, and not for any period less than seven years, and from employing negroes in their business, and the colonists were prohibited from transporting hats or home manufactured woolens from one province to another.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Immediately after the establishment of our independence Great Britain endeavored to obtain from us all the advantages which she had derived from us while colonies without extending to us the advantages we had enjoyed from the indulgence of the mother country; and in this they succeeded while we were held together, not united, by the old confederation till our country was on the brink of ruin. It will not be time misspent to examine the plans and schemes adopted in Great Britain, and which she is still pursuing in part to get possession of our commerce and navigation, and to prevent the growth of our manufactures. Lord Sheffield, in his observations on the commerce of the American States, puts the policy of Great Britain on these subjects in a clear point of view
>
> In page 255, he says: "Nothing should be done to court the attention of foreigners to participate in a trade of which our superior skill in manufacture, our capital as merchants, our spirit of enterprise, and many other circumstances applicable to our situation, has, in a manner, secured to us a monopoly. For if we are consistent and understand our own situation as great a share of the American trade is still in the power of Great Britain as is consistent with her interest, and this, too, upon principles which will render it more secure than volumes of treaties, namely, those incitements which arise from mutual convenience and mutual interest; but above all, upon the score of interest alone, the merchandise of Great Britain must ever be preferred in America. But the encouraging of the American States to build ships for us is holding out a premium for the emigration of our shipwrights, together with the various industrious classes connected with shipbuilding, to the country where timber and iron abound, and where, consequently, shipbuilding may be carried on to the greatest advantage."
>
> The unsettled condition of the American States since the preliminaries of peace were ratified, and the turn of affairs there, which might have been well foreseen, by no means justify any gratuities on the part of this country (Great Britain), which in the present state of things can not afford any sacrifices. We have only to let the confusion of the new States settle as they may without troubling ourselves about them. If a commercial treaty were as much to be wished, as it certainly is not during the present ferment, there is no power with whom it could be made with any certainty of being carried into effect. But it is plainly impossible to make a commercial treaty with the American States without giving them some valuable privilege for which they have precluded themselves from making any adequate return.
>
> The treaty of peace and subsequent acts, opened the ports of Great Britain and Ireland to them, in the same manner as their ports were opened to us, when they repealed their restraining laws. A brisk trade has already begun, and it is unnecessary to prove on which side the advantage is—between the traders who ask for credit or the traders who give it. "Every account from America says that British manufactures are selling at a considerable profit, while other European goods can not obtain the first cost. Every day's experience shows that this country, from the nature and quality of its manufactures, and from the ascendency it has acquired in commerce, will command three-fourths of the American trade.
>
> It is said that the mode of doing business likely to prevail, particularly in the Southern provinces, will be what is denominated a wholesale trade, to be carried on by European, or rather British, merchants, who will form connections at home and carry out cargoes of assorted goods to be sold by the package unopened to those who retail, and who will receive in return within the year from the American merchants the produce they may collect, which will be shipped off by the British wholesale merchants. This is the species of trade that British subjects should wish to pursue. Without being concerned in retailing goods, they should endeavor to monopolize the supplies in wholesale to country merchants. This will enable them to deal to a great extent with half the hazard formerly experienced, and it will, besides, give them the sole command of the shipping business.
>
> It is not probable that the British merchants will choose, in the new state of affairs to fix their stores, as formerly, in Virginia and Maryland. They may rather adopt the expedient already mentioned, of sending out agents or partners with wholesale cargoes, to be sold to merchants who may not have credit here; and they may be very safe while their creditors are on the spot ready to compel punctuality, and to receive and ship their produce. This line of commerce, although the profits at first may be smaller, will ultimately be more advantageous to the British merchant. Large sums of money will not, as formerly, be sunk in debts. The returns will be more certain and less liable to those disappointments which prevailed when every American planter was a British creditor.
>
> A great improvement upon this ingenious plan of Lord Sheffield to engross the commercial business of this country, is the auction system as now carried on in the city of New York, where seven-eighths of the business is in the hands of the agents of British merchants and manufacturers.
>
> In page 276, Lord Sheffield says: "It is certain that the confusion of the American States can now only hurt themselves. They must pay Europe in the best manner they can for clothing and many articles, for which they are not likely to have the credit they had while in more settled circumstances. If one or more States should prohibit the manufactures of any particular country they will find their way to them through other States and by various means. The difficulty will only raise the price on consumers in the States where the articles are prohibited.
>
> "The British manufactures found their way to every part of the country during a most rancorous war, and the most strenuous American manufacturers acknowledge that no imposts or excise laws will for a long time be regarded in America. In the meantime, and at all times, Britain will have nothing to apprehend. The United States will hardly enter into real hostilities with Britain. Britain need not quarrel with them at all; but, should either happen, some stout frigates cruising between Halifax and Bermuda, and between the latter and the Bahamas, would completely command the commerce of this mighty continent."
>
> The views of Lord Sheffield were realized. Great Britain could not cause our manufacturing establishments to be abated as nuisances, but she completely controlled our manufactures by regulating our commerce, and by the same process destroyed our navigation and shipping interests. Each State adopted its own system for raising revenue and protecting its industry, and this brought them into immediate collision and conflict with each other. New York and Pennsylvania laid duties upon foreign imports; the duties were paid in the cities of New York and Philadelphia, and went into the treasuries of those two States. New Jersey derived her supply of those imports through those two cities, and of course paid taxes to the amount of the duties upon such imports, not into a common treasury for the benefit of the United States, but into the treasuries of New York and Pennsylvania for their exclusive benefit. This was a burden which nothing but force could oblige any State to bear. New Jersey, sooner than submit to this tyranny and oppression of her sister States, abandoned every idea of protecting her industry, and made Perth Amboy a free port.
>
> This measure was calculated completely to defeat the objects of New York and Pennsylvania, and as completely to answer those of Great Britain. Similar conflicts took place between other States, which were attended with similar results. And it became evident that the power to regulate commerce must be vested in one General Government, or that a total dissolution of the Union must take place. Agriculture was neglected for want of a market, commerce languished; even our coasting trade was in the hands of foreigners, and the manufacturing establishments, which had grown up during the war, were everywhere abandoned in despair. All this Lord Sheffield had clearly foreseen. The remedy for these evils was the convention that formed the Constitution of the United States; this Lord Sheffield had not foreseen.
>
> By the Constitution of the United States, Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the States, and with the Indian tribes. Under this general power, Congress may permit foreign nations to participate in our carrying trade, or they may prohibit them.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is now well understood that the great secret of national wealth in any country consists in finding profitable employment for all the citizens or subjects of such country who are willing to labor, and this can not be done without directing that labor to the great objects of agriculture, commerce,

navigation, and manufactures. No nation can become great or rich by agriculture alone; none by commerce, navigation, and manufactures alone. A small part of the population of a thickly settled country can till all the lands of that country; the residue must be idle if no other employment is afforded them. If they engage in commerce and navigation, these can employ but a very few in comparison with the whole; and unless they engage in manufactures, at least for themselves, a considerable portion of the people must remain idle for want of employment.

Where the population is not dense, a small part engaged in agriculture can produce all that the residue want; and if they have no foreign market for their produce, as is the case with the grain-growing States in this Union, a large portion of the people would be idle. In fact, the wealth and prosperity of this country depends upon the vigorous pursuit of all those brancaes of industry.

* * * * * * *

We can now interpret the golden dreams of those who think to seize the occasion of the extinguishment of the public debt to prostrate the protective system, when, as they fondly believe, Great Britain will manufacture for us to the amount of many millions beyond what she does now, when there will be no refusal on the part of this country to take foreign manufactures, and when there will be no limit to the consumption of American cotton in Europe.

These dreams will never be realized. The protective system may be destroyed; property to the amount of millions may be sacrified and abandoned; the whole industry of the grain-growing States may be paralyzed; a scene of distress may prevail over the land, such as we have never yet witnessed; but the British, the French, and the Dutch will buy no more cotton than they want, and so much they will have, for to that extent it is more valuable to them than gold.

Great Britain makes war upon our manufactures with a perseverance that is without a parallel, and refuses to take the produce of the Eastern, Western, and Middle States. These States have no defense against this system but to exclude as far as they can the manufactures of Great Britain by substituting their own.

* * * * * * *

There is an article now going the rounds of the Southern papers, which, I fear, expresses the exasperated feelings of a portion of the South, I hope a small one, against the other sections of the Union. The article is headed "A call to arms." The author continues: "The crisis is now coming on when our politicians—I mean our popularity hunters—will discover that none but Whig principles will prevail" (so far it is to be hoped he is right); but he proceeds, "With the public debt must inevitably go its offspring, the American system. There will be a hard struggle for it. The United States Bank, the sugar-planter, the iron-master, and the Lowells and Appletons will die hard."

This is quoted from the United States Telegraph, of the 10th of this month, taken from the Richmond Inquirer. How the United States bank became a part of the American system, said Mr. D., I know not. All the stockholders in Europe, and in the Southern States, are enemies of the protective system of this country. But leaving the bank out of the question—"the sugar planter, the iron master, and the Lowells and the Appletons, will die hard." Yes, they will die hard—in the language of the Senator from Georgia, they will die in the last ditch. But their struggle for life will be here—in the two Houses of Congress. To the majority they submit—they will neither threaten nor resist the laws.

But what says the Senator from South Carolina upon this subject? He does not sound a beat to arms, but he anticipates with raptures the moment of the extinction of the public debt, as it will, in his opinion, remove the foundation of the protective system. This, he exclaims, is the great national jubilee! "Now, now is the time for action! We have reached Mount Nebo! We stand upon the top of Pisgah, and shall we perish in the sight of the Promised Land?" Moses perished there, and was buried in the land of Moab, and no man knows his sepulchre unto this day. If by this promised land is meant the abolition of the protective system, the destruction of the manufacturing establishments of the Western and Eastern, and the Middle States, the wasting of property to the amount of millions, and the dooming to poverty, wretchedness, and misery, thousands upon thousands of our worthy, industrious, economical, and laborious citizens, then I do most fervently pray that the honorable Senator may never pass Mount Pisgah, nor riot in this land of promise, but that he may long remain in the land of Moab, till he shall reach a good old age, even the age of Moses, if it shall please Heaven, and that it may be said of him at his last day, that "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

From an address issued by the Harrisburg convention of farmers and manufacturers, in 1827, I quote the following:

Chatham, the illustrious Chatham, the great friend of political rights, had no idea of permitting a feeling of independence to grow up in this country—no willingness that our fathers should ascertain their own strength: and for these reasons it was that he said, "America should not be allowed to manufacture a hob-nail" with his approbation. By these severe and selfish policies he intended to keep us hitched up to the car of England's king. This was the grand principle on which the "Mother country" acted. The governors, and judges, and soldiers, and clergy, and all others, sent hither in the pay of the king, were instructed to encourage us in hewing wood and cultivating the earth, and in sending all our raw materials "home," and to discourage the establishment of work shops or the manufacture of anything which could be supplied by importations.

The declaration of political independence was made good by sacrifices and sufferings, by deeds of patriotism and heroism, which fill a brilliant page in the world's history, and are a source of pride to all Americans. During the eight years of the Revolutionary war our trade with Great Britain was cut off, and trade with other countries made so difficult and hazardous, that the people were largely thrown upon their own resources for what they consumed. As a result, many manufactories of the articles in common use were started and successfully conducted. The spinning wheel, the loom, the forge, the tannery, the shoe shop, the cabinet shop, and kindred industries, furnished employment for the people, and became sources of wealth: and, in spite of the great expense of the war and the loss of the labor of those engaged in it to protective industries, the country experienced a degree of prosperity previously unknown in its history; a prosperity trace ble to the inability of foreign countries to supply the necessities of the colonists and the necessity which forced their production at home. Peace came at last. The independence of the colonies was assured. They supposed that with peace and independence nothing but prosperity awaited them; but they soon found that their complete emancipation required the adoption of a policy which would protect them against the undue competition of the products of other countries and thus foster and protect domestic industries.

A PERIOD OF FREE TRADE.

The Continental Congress having no power to impose duties on imports and to regulate commerce with foreign countries, the country, from the time peace with Great Britain was declared until the passage of a tariff act by the First Congress after the adoption of the present Constitution, practically enjoyed free trade. It is true that one or more of the States in which the power to impose duties upon imports was vested imposed a low duty on imported goods, inadequate for the protection of domestic industries; but other States did not impose duties upon imports, and there was nothing to prevent goods entering the ports of one State free of duty from being carried into other States. This period is the only one of absolute free trade that this country ever had, and it is both interesting and instructive to note the results. If we can draw useful lessons from experience it would seem as though our experience under free trade during this period should help to guide us in the matter of tariff legislation to-day.

The country was speedily flooded with British goods; large shipments of foreign manufactures were also made to the United States from almost every country of Europe. Many of the goods were not adapted to our necessities. Merchandise was imported in such quantities that there was not store room for it; and we are told by writers of that day that quantities of merchandise lay upon the wharves unhoused for many days. Our industries, which had thriven during a long, desolating war, were destroyed. The people bought largely of foreign goods. All the specie in the country was sent abroad to pay for importations. The power of the people to pay for goods was exhausted. The surplus of foreign goods was so great that the prices fell in many instances far below the cost of production in the country of their manufacture. Domestic industries were ruined; property would not sell for enough to pay taxes; labor was unemployed; bankruptcy was universal, and discontent prevailed everywhere. There was loss of confidence between man and man; despondency, suspicion, and desperation seized men's minds, and the general discontent soon ripened into riots and insurrections.

An armed force surrounded the houses of assembly at Exeter, N. H., and held the assembly prisoners until the mob was dispersed by the militia. Mobs made a tumult in Connecticut, but were overawed by the vigilance and promptness of the governor. In Massachusetts the discontent ripened into Shay's rebellion. Three western counties of North Carolina declared their independence and set up an independent State called Franklin. A conspiracy was formed in the county of Washington, Va., for the purpose of becoming a part of a new State. The Connecticut settlers at Wyoming rose in insurrection against the State of Pennsylvania and proposed to form a State of their own. Forced into idleness and starvation the universal suffering of the people threatened not only the peace and safety of the land, but seemed to indicate that our forefathers were incompetent for self-government and to foreshadow the failure of our experiment of republican government. The fathers of the Republic were alarmed

Washington wrote to David Stewart November 19, 1786, as follows:

However delicate the revising of the Federal system may appear, it is a work of indispensable necessity. The present Constitution is inadequate; the superstructure is tottering to its foundation, and without help will bury us in its ruins.

He wrote to Edmund Randolph, November 19, 1786, as follows:

Our affairs seem to be drawing to an awful crisis: it is necessary, therefore, that the abilities of every man should be drawn into action in a public line, to rescue them, if possible, from impending ruin.

And to John Jay, a letter from which I quote the following:

What astonishing changes a few years are capable of producing! I am told that even respectable characters speak of a monarchical form of government without horror. From thinking proceeds speaking, and thence to acting is often but a single step.

Speaking of this period of free trade, Hildreth, the historian, in his history of the United States, says:

The large importation of foreign goods, subject to little or no duty and sold at peace prices, was proving ruinous to all those domestic manufactures and mechanical employments which the nonconsumption agreements and the war had created and fostered. Immediately after the peace the country had been flooded with imported goods and debts had been unwarily contracted, for which there was no means to pay. The imports from Great Britain in the years 1784 and 1785 had amounted in value to $30,000,000, while the exports thither had not exceeded $9,000,000. The lawyers, whose fees were thought enormous and who were fast growing rich from the multiplicity of suits with which all the courts abounded, were regarded with no very favorable eyes by the mass of the citizens, impoverished by the same causes to which they owed their wealth. There was an abundance of discontented persons more or less connected with the late army, deprived by the peace of their accustomed means of support, and without opportunity to engage in productive industry.

The community, from these various causes, was fast becoming divided into two embittered factions of creditors and debtors. The certificates of the public debt, parted with at a great discount by the officers and others to whom they had been given, were fast accumulating in the hands of a few speculators able to wait for better times. With the example of the old tenor paper before their eyes, an opinion gained ground among the people, oppressed by taxes to meet the interest on these debts, that the holders of certificates by purchase were only entitled to receive what they had paid—an opinion which tended to still further depreciation. Others of the debtor party had more extensive views. Stop and tender laws were called for, and in some States were passed. New issues of paper money were demanded, which, by their depreciation, might sweep off the whole mass of debt, public and private. Such issues were made in New York and Rhode Island, in which latter State John Collins had just been elected governor. The Rhode Island paper soon depreciated to 8 for 1. Laws were enacted to enforce its circulation; but, though similar to those formerly recommended by Congress to support the credit of the Continental money, they were now generally denounced as oppressive and unjust, and obtained for Rhode Island an unenviable notoriety.

Even those States which issued no paper money were far from enjoying a sound currency. The excessive importation of foreign goods had drained the country of specie. The circulating medium consisted principally of Treasury orders on the State tax collectors and depreciated certificates of State and Federal debt. Even among those in favor of meeting the public liabilities by taxation there was a lack of agreement as to the way in which taxes should be raised. The excessive importation of foreign goods and the consequent pressure upon domestic manufactures had diminished a good deal of the old prejudice against customs duties. A party had sprung up in favor of raising a large part of the public revenue in that way, thus reviving the old colonial schemes for the protection of domestic industry by duties upon foreign goods. This, however, was opposed by the merchants as injurious to their interests. They came forward as the champions of free trade, and insisted upon the old system of direct taxation. A large part of the people seemed quite disinclined to submit to either method.

The weakness for some years so evident in Congress had begun to extend to the States. Not only was the idea in circulation of separating into two or three confederacies, but some of the principal States seemed themselves in danger of splitting into fragments.—Pages 465, 466, 467, and 468, *vol. 3.*

I could continue this description of the condition of the country under free trade with similar quotations from all the contemporaneous writers of that period, but this quotation will suffice. A recent writer, after citing numerous authorities concerning the condition of the country during this period, sums up the case as follows:

The testimony so far presented establishes conclusively the following points:

1. That only very low duties on imports (scarcely to be dignified by the name of restriction) were levied by any State, and that these duties were rendered nugatory by the counteracting laws and practices of other States.
2. That in consequence the system of free trade with foreign nations existed with hardly any impediment whatever.
3. That the country was inundated with the influx of European and Asiatic merchandise.
4. That manufacturing establishments in the Confederation were crippled, prostrated, or utterly ruined by the overmastering competition from abroad.
5. That an exhaustive drain of specie for export speedily followed, until the American people, from New Hampshire to Georgia, were left almost completely without a circulating medium.
6. That property, real and personal, depreciated to a frightful degree.
7. That, in the absence of ability to engage in legitimate enterprises, a craze for speculation seized upon the community, mainly taking the form of traffic in public and private securities.
8. That bankruptcy became general, the courts were crowded with suits, the prisons overflowed with debtors, the lawyers fast acquired wealth by the multiplicity of fees, and the farms, houses, and personal property of the unfortunates were sacrificed to clear off trifling obligations.
9. That even necessary taxes often could not be collected without a levy and sale.
10. That relief was sought in stay laws, installment of debts, property-tender acts, suspension of the operation of the courts, emission of paper money, and various like expedients.
11. That all the supposed palliatives served only to intensify the universal distress.
12. That the movement of events was steadily from bad to worse until perplexity and foreboding became the predominant feelings of the time.
13. That the parent cause of this brood of evils was the free-trade system, which led, by a succession of cumulative consequences, to greater and still greater calamities.

Need I add anything more to depict the deplorable condition of the country during the only period in its history when foreign importations came into the country free of duty?

As is always the case in times of business depression and distress, many people clamored for relief by legislation; they demanded the issue of paper money, stay laws, the scaling down or repudiation of public obligations. The poorer classes arrayed themselves against their more fortunate neighbors. The very foundations of human society were weakened, and security for life, liberty, and property was largely destroyed. At last, however, the people began to learn the true cause of all their calamities, and came to understand that in order to restore and maintain prosperity, domestic industries must be protected from undue foreign competition; and from then on the sentiment in favor of a stronger government, with power to regulate commerce with foreign countries, and to protect American industries, grew day by day.

THE MOVEMENT FOR A STRONGER GOVERNMENT WITH POWER TO PROTECT AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

At Mount Vernon in March, 1785, a movement for a stronger government and more perfect union was born. The movement at first was for a convention, to be composed of delegates from the States, to be appointed by their Legislatures. Its object was to devise some measure, under the Articles of Confederation, for the regulation of commerce, with a view to the protection of domestic industries and the augmentation of the power of Congress to deal with the question. The movement originating with Washington received the indorsement of Virginia by the adoption by the Legislature of that State in January, 1786, of a resolution calling for a convention of the States and by the appointment of delegates.

A majority of the States appointed delegates to the convention, which met at Annapolis, Md., in September of that year; but as it was attended only by representatives from five of the States, being a minority of the States, the convention adjourned without other action than a report that adequate provision for the regulation of commerce could not be made under the Articles of Confederation, and a recommendation to Congress for the calling of a convention to frame measures by which the powers of Congress might be enlarged. Congress acted upon the recommendation, and called a convention, which met at Philadelphia in May, 1787.

The present Constitution was the result of their deliberations. The convention was composed of delegates appointed by the Legislatures of the States. The new Constitution was not to be a league or compact between the States, but was intended to be the work of the people of the United States, not the mere expression of the voice of the States, and its submission to the people for approval or disapproval was provided for. Congress sanctioned the proposed constitution, and it was submitted to the people for ratification; and when it had been ratified by the requisite number of States the power to regulate commerce and protect domestic industries was taken from the States, and, with the imposition of a duty corresponding to the power, conferred upon the Federal Government.

POWER TO PROTECT AMERICAN INDUSTRIES THE MOST IMPORTANT FEATURE OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

The most important provision of the new Constitution was the provision conferring on Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, between the States, and with Indian tribes. The power of Congress to protect American industries and American labor by imposing duties upon importations of foreign merchandise was made a corner stone of the new political fabric.

THE PEOPLE REJOICED AT THE PROSPECT OF RELIEF TO OUR SUFFERING INDUSTRIES.

The adoption of the Constitution and its ratification by the States were celebrated by public rejoicings and street parades in the principal towns. The people understood that the important provision of the new Constitution was that conferring upon Congress the power to regulate commerce, and they rejoiced because they confidently expected the new Government would provide protection to home industries, and by thus giving employment to domestic capital and domestic labor would be restored prosperity to the country. The adoption of the Constitution changed the situation and improved the condition of the country. Confidence was inspired. Hope took the place of despair. Courage succeeded despondency. Discontent subsided. Public order prevailed, and business, without waiting for legislation under the new Constitution, began to revive. All classes looked forward to the Government under the more perfect union for security for their investments and for protection to their labor. Improvement in every department of industry was manifest. I could quote from many of the public writers of that day in confirmation of this statement, but I will content myself with quoting from the History of the United States, by Tucker, the following:

The country, now buoyant with hopes, in proportion to the dangers it had recently escaped, and the evils it even then encountered, looked forward with impatience to the meeting of the first Congress under the new Constitution. The officers of the Army who had not made sale of their unsatisfied claims saw in the new Government, provided as it was with unlimited powers of taxation, the prospect of justice from their country. The other public creditors, who were generally people of property and influence, looked forward to have their claims doubled or even quadrupled in value. The merchant and shipowner confidently expected protection from the discriminating duties and navigation laws of other countries: and even the small manufacturing class hoped for the encouragement of a protective impost. The agricultural class, without looking for any immediate benefit from legislation, expected to share in the general prosperity and to profit by an improvement of the markets, both foreign and domestic. In the cities, especially, where these benefits were more fully appreciated, there were pompous and costly demonstrations of the general joy.

CONGRESS RESPONDED TO THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE.

When Congress met petitions from tradesmen and mechanics, praying the early attention of Congress to the encouragement and protection of American manufactures, were presented. Within a week from the time a quorum was obtained in the House of Representatives, James Madison brought forward the subject of the tariff. The first act of the session was an act providing for official oaths of officers under the new Government; and the very next act passed by a Congress composed largely of the men who had been delegates to the Constitutional Convention, was a tariff act, the preamble of which was as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported.

This act, with this preamble, was approved by President Washington. I cite these things to show not only that all classes believed authority had been conferred upon Congress to protect American industries, but that they regarded this provision of the Constitution as the keystone of the political fabric.

THE DECLARATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1892 THAT PROTECTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

I might leave this proposition here were it not for the declaration of the Democratic party, in its last national platform, that protection is unconstitutional. This remarkable declaration was adopted by a two-thirds vote of over nine hundred delegates, and appears to have been indorsed by a majority of the voters of this country in the election of President Cleveland. It was reserved to the Democratic party in 1892 to declare that the men who advocated, previous to the adoption of the Constitution, a stronger Government, with power to protect American industries; that the men who succeeded in having a convention called for the professed object of conferring upon Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign countries, that thereby American labor might be protected, and that the men who framed the Constitution had failed in the great object they had in view; that all the distinguished men who controlled public affairs at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and for thirty years afterwards, were mistaken in their interpretation of that instrument; that the men who composed the first Congress were either mistaken as to its true interpretation and meaning or made haste to violate its provisions by passing an act—the second act of the Congress—for the protection of American industries and reciting in its preamble that it was intended in part for that purpose. It was reserved, I say, to the Chicago Democratic national convention of 1892, more than a hundred years after the adoption of the Constitution, to declare that Washington, who presided over the Constitutional Convention, and who signed the first act of Congress passed pursuant to the power to regulate commerce, and his contemporaries and great associates in the Convention were ignorant of its true meaning. No further evidence is needed of the construction placed upon the Federal Constitution by its framers and the fathers of the country than their official acts. But extracts from the speeches of some of the great statesmen of the country will be interesting. I present some quotations from the speeches of Daniel Webster on this question. Everyone knows that upon all public questions Mr. Webster, the expounder of the Constitution, never spoke until by examination and consideration he could speak advisedly. In a speech to the citizens of Buffalo in June, 1833, he said:

The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution.

In an address delivered in Pittsburg, July 8, 1833, he said:

Gentlemen, it is an historical truth, manifested in a thousand ways by the public proceedings and public meetings of the times, that the necessity of a general and uniform impost system, which, while it should provide revenue to pay the public debt and foster the commerce of the country, should also encourage and sustain domestic manufactures, was the leading cause in producing the present National Constitution. No class of persons was more zealous for the new Constitution than the handicraftsmen, artisans, and manufacturers.

In a speech before the Whig convention at Andover, November 9, 1843, in discussing this question, he said:

There are two propositions to which I invite your attention;

1. Congress has power to lay duties of impost. No State has this power. This is a most important consideration.

2. Before the adoption of the Constitution, and while the States could lay impost duties, several of them had laid such duties with discriminations avowedly intended to foster their own products. They now can do no such thing. It must accordingly be done by Congress or not at all.

Now the power of Congress is to regulate commerce. And in all English history, and all our own history, down to the Revolution, and to the time of the adoption of the Constitution, importation of some articles was encouraged, and of others discouraged or prohibited, by regulations of trade. The regulation of trade, therefore, was a term of well-known meaning, and did comprehend the duty or object of discriminating, with a view to favor home productions. We find this to have been so, from the time of the Tudors and Stuarts down; and in America, the opinion I have stated was held by Otis, Adams, and the other great and eminent men of the Revolution. * * *

The whole history of the country from 1783 to 1788 proves this. That history is as important as that of any period of our national existence. We see in it the then infant States struggling under a load of debt incurred in the sacred cause of the Revolution, struggling under the extinction of commerce and prostration of manufactures, and struggling all in vain. These things produced that strong disposition which prevailed from 1784 to 1788 to establish a uniform system of commercial regulations, and extends also all proper encouragement to manufactures.

At Albany, August 27, 1844, he discussed this question in the following terms:

Now, I ask you again, how were these petitions for protection treated? Did Congress deny its power? Did it say that it could not possibly give them this protection, unless it should happen to be incidental? Did it say we have only a revenue power in regard to this matter? that is, we have the clear and undoubted power to take so much money out of your pockets and apply it to our own purposes; but God forbid that, in doing so, we should do you any good at the same time? Were these petitioners told that they must take care of themselves? that these were days of free trade, and everybody must have a right to trade on equal terms with everybody else?

Far, far from it. In regard to the subject of these petitions, we all know that the very first Congress secured to the navigation of the United States that which has been from that time to this the great foundation, not only of preference, but of monopoly—the whole coasting trade of the Union; and the shipwrights of America enjoy that monopoly to the present day, and I hope they will enjoy it forever. Look at the coasting trade of the United States, so vast in its extent. It is entirely confined to American shipping. * * *

But how did Congress treat these petitions from the cities of New York and Baltimore to extend protection to the mechanic arts? It granted them. It yielded it. And, except a formal act for taking the oaths, the very first act passed by Congress was to secure the coasting trade and protect the mechanic arts by discriminating duties, and thus carry out the clear and, according to historical testimony, the most manifest object of the Constitution.

Senator Rufus Choate, than whom there never was a more painstaking member of the Senate, March 14, 1842, said:

And who in that assembly of men—many of whom sat in the Convention which framed the Constitution, all of whom had partaken in the discussions which preceded its adoption—breathed a doubt on the competence of Congress to receive such petitions as these and to grant their prayer? "I conceive" (said the most eloquent of the eloquent, Mr. Ames), "I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment, and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare." But I have more to say before I have done on the proceedings of that Congress, and leave them for the present. In the meanwhile I submit to you that the proof is complete that the people who adopted the Constitution, universally and without a doubt, believed that it embodied this power. It was for that they received it with one wide acclaim, with tears of exultation, with ceremonies of auspicious significance, befitting the dawn of our age of pacific and industrial glory. Even those who feared its imperial character and its other powers, who thought they saw the States attracted to its center and absorbed by its rays, did not fear this power.

And now, sir, I wonder if, after all, the people were deluded into this belief! I wonder if that heroic and energetic generation of our fathers, which had studied the controversies and had gone through the tasks of the Revolution; which had framed the Confederation, proved its weakness, proved its defects; which had been trained by a long and dreary experience of the insufficiency of a nominal independence to build up a diffused, and massive, and national prosperity, if the trade laws of foreign governments, the combinations of foreign capitalists, the necessities of foreign existence, are allowed to take from the native laborer his meal of meat, and from his children their school, and depress his standard of comfortable life; which had been trained by experience, by the discussions of its ablest minds, in an age of extraordinary mental activity, and yet of great morality, sobriety, and subordination, peculiarly favorable to the task—trained thus to the work of constructing a new government, I wonder if such a generation were deceived, after all! I wonder if it was not living water, that which they supposed they saw gushing from the rock, and sparkling and swelling at their feet, but only a delusive imitation, struck out by the wand of an accursed enchantment! No, sir; no man who believes that the people of this country were fit to govern themselves—fit to frame a Constitution, fit to judge on it, fit to administer it—no such man can say that the belief, the popular belief in 1789, of the existence of this power, under the circumstances, is not absolutely conclusive proof of its existence.

And then, in addition to this, how do you deal with the fact that all the framers of the Constitution themselves, as well as every public man alive in 1789, and the entire intelligence of the country, supposed they had inserted this power in it?

Did not those who made it know what they had done? Considering their eminent general character, their civil discretion, their preparation of much study and yet more experience of arduous public affairs for the task; their thorough acquaintance with the existing systems, State and national, and with the public mind and opinions of the day; the long, patient, and solitary labor which they bestowed on it; the immediate necessity imposed on them of explaining and defending it to the country—in view of this, if you find them unanimously concurring in ascribing this power to the instrument, is it not the transcendentalism of unbelief to doubt? Do we really think we are likely to understand their own work now better than they did the day they finished it?

Well, sir, we have satisfactory evidence that the members of the Convention went, all of them, to their graves in the belief that the Constitution contained this power. Mr. Madison's opinion I have read. We have it on unquestionable authority that Mr. Gallatin has repeatedly said that, upon his entrance into political life in 1789, he found it to be the universal opinion of those who framed the Constitution, and those who resisted its adoption—the opinion of all the statesmen of the day—that Congress possessed the power to protect domestic industry by means of commercial regulations.

What a spectacle was presented to the country and to the world by the Democratic convention of 1892, when Watterson and Neal and their associates assumed to know more about what the Constitution meant than Washington, Madison, and their compatriots, who framed it in the midst of great national peril, business depression, and financial disturbances, for the express purpose of securing relief to the country, and who in Congress gave it a practical construction; more than the great expounder of the Constitution, Webster; more than the able, scholarly, painstaking, and brilliant Choate; and after more than one hundred years of legal and legislative construction declared that protection is unconstitutional. Well may an American citizen, preferring his own country to foreign countries, his own countrymen to foreigners, contemplating this unpatriotic and I might almost say treasonable declaration of the Democratic party and the subsequent success of the party, tremble for his country and almost despair of its future prosperity.

Mr. President, if I deemed it important to do so, I might continue the discussion of the constitutionality of protection by quoting from historians, statesmen, and the press of the times, and the debates in the Constitutional Convention, to show that it was the inability of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and to protect domestic industries that brought the country to ruin, bankruptcy, discontent, and insurrection, and that it was this same inability that came near making our experiment of self-government a failure, and that this defect was the cause of

a universal demand for a stronger government, with power to regulate the importation of foreign goods—a demand that resulted in the calling of a Constitutional Convention. I might also produce authorities to demonstrate that the framers of the Constitution, in language which from long use had a well-understood meaning, undertook to confer upon Congress the power to regulate commerce and protect domestic industries, and believed they had done so; that the people everywhere understood that this had been done, and looked to Congress for the speedy exercise of the power; and that during all our history legislation has proceeded upon the assumption that this power existed; but I will not prolong this discussion, as it will answer no practicable purpose.

The statesman who will, in the face of the facts of history, assert that protection to American industries and American labor is unconstitutional would not be convinced though Washington should rise from his grave and declare that the intention of the framers of the Constitution in adopting the clause authorizing Congress to regulate commerce with foreign countries was to enable Congress to protect American industries. "Ephraim is joined to his idols; let him alone."

I might follow the course of tariff legislation from the passage of the first act and show how our prosperity was affected thereby, until the passage of the more pronounced protective legislation of 1816, 1824, and 1828; but time will permit me to discuss only the more important tariff acts and their influence upon the national prosperity.

I will say, in a word, that the adoption of the new Constitution, conferring upon Congress the power to regulate commerce, and the legislation of Congress which followed for the protection of domestic industries, rescued the country from a condition of universal bankruptcy and suffering, from discontent, insubordination and violence, and restored comparative prosperity, revived industries, gave employment to labor, made republican government possible, and placed the young Republic on a firm foundation. The contrast afforded by these two chapters in our history, between commercial slavery and commercial freedom, between free trade and protected industries, between ruin, bankruptcy, and discontent and prosperity, comfort, independence, and contentment, is as strong as that between midnight darkness and noonday brightness.

THE IMPROVED CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY UNDER THE NEW CONSTITUTION AND PROTECTIVE TARIFF LAWS.

The improved condition of the country under the new Constitution and protective tariff laws and the position of Washington upon the tariff question is shown by the following extracts from his message to Congress. In his first annual message of January 9, 1790, he said:

The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures by all proper means will not, I trust, need recommendation.

In his second annual message, President Washington congratulated Congress on the favorable prospects of public affairs an abundant harvest and flourishing commerce, the improved public credit, and increased revenues. In his third annual message, he said:

Your observations, in your respective situations, will have satisfied you of the progressive state of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation. In tracing its causes, you will have remarked, with particular pleasure, the happy effects of that revival of confidence, public as well as private, to which the Constitution and laws of the United States have so eminently contributed.

In his fourth annual message he felicitated Congress on a "continuance of the national prosperity generally," and said:

The prosperous state of our revenue has been intimated.

In his sixth annual message he said:

When we call to mind the generous indulgence of Heaven by which the American people became a nation; when we survey the general prosperity of our country and look forward to the riches, power, and happiness to which it seems destined, with the deepest regret do I announce to you that during your recess some citizens of the United States have been found capable of an insurrection.

He commenced his seventh annual message in the following terms:

I trust I do not deceive myself while I indulge the persuasion that I have never met you at any period when, more than at present, the situation of our public affairs has afforded just cause for mutual congratulation.

And later on, after referring to the condition of Europe, said:

Our favored country, happy in striking contrast, has enjoyed general tranquillity—a tranquillity the more satisfactory because maintained at the expense of no duty. Our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures prosper beyond example, the molestation of our trade (to prevent a continuance of which, however, pointed remonstrances have been made) being overbalanced by the aggregate benefits which derives from a neutral position. Our population advances with a celerity which, exceeding our most sanguine calculations, proportionately augments our strength and resources, and guarantees our future security. Every part of the Union displays indications of rapid and various improvement, and with burdens so light as scarcely to be perceived, with resources fully adequate to our present exigencies, with government founded on the general principle of national liberty, and with mild and wholesome laws, is it too much to say that our country exhibits a spectacle of national happiness never surpassed, if ever before equaled?

President Washington commenced his eighth annual message as follows:

In recurring to the internal situation of our country since I had last the pleasure of addressing you, I find ample reason for a renewed expression of that gratitude to the Ruler of the universe which a continued series of prosperity has so often and justly called forth.

In the same message he said:

Congress have repeatedly, and not without success, directed their action to the recognition of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to secure a continuance of their effort in every way which shall appear eligible.

THE TARIFF OF 1816.

From the time the first tariff act for the protection of American industries was passed by the First Congress to the passage of the tariff of 1816, a number of acts were passed imposing duties upon imports, and designed for the protection of domestic industries, all of them affording encouragement to such industries, but none of them adequate to afford full protection. The time required to transport merchandise from Europe to this country and the cost and risk of transportation afforded considerable protection to our industries, and on that account lower duties were sufficient for their protection than are to-day required with improved means of transportation, while the profitable markets for our surplus agricultural products afforded by European wars and the stimulus to our manufactures imparted by our war with Great Britain all aided in giving this country a considerable prosperity under comparatively low duties.

President Madison, in his message to Congress December 1, 1815, recommended encouragement to the manufacturing interests. He said:

Under circumstances giving a powerful impulse to manufacturing industry, it has made among us a progress and exhibited an efficiency which justify the belief that with protection not more than is due to the enterprising citizens whose interests are now at stake, it will become at an early day not only safe against occasional competition from abroad, but a source of domestic wealth and of even external commerce.

At the Fourteenth Congress, which assembled December 4, 1815, and was in session until the 30th of April, 1816, a new tariff law, imposing increased duties upon importations, was enacted. The intention of those who favored the new law was to establish a system of protection to American manufactures.

Mr. Calhoun opened a speech in the House of Representatives on April 4, 1816, by saying:

The debate heretofore on this subject has been on the degree of protection which ought to be afforded to our cotton and woolen manufactures, all professing to be friendly to those infant establishments and to be willing to extend to them adequate encouragement.

Again, in the same speech, he said:

Coming, as he did, from the South, having in common with his constituents no interest but in the cultivation of the soil, in selling its products high and buying cheap the wants and conveniences of life, no motive could be attributed to him but such as were disinterested.

Again, discussing the necessity for protection to our manufacturing industries, he said:

It [protection] is to put them beyond the reach of contingency. Besides, capital is not yet and can not be for some time adjusted to the new state of things. There is, in fact, from the operation of temporary causes a great pressure upon these establishments. They had extended so rapidly during the late war that many, he feared, were without requisite surplus capital or skill to meet the present crisis. Should such prove the fact it would give a setback and might, to a great extent, endanger their ultimate success. Should the present owners be ruined and workmen dispersed and turn to other pursuits the country would sustain a great loss. Such would, no doubt, be the fact to a considerable extent if not protected.

Mr. Clay, in the same debate in the House on the 25th of March, said:

We all know that now is the time for encouragement, and that the domestic manufacturer has to struggle more at the end of a war, and at that moment the greater aid is necessary to support home against foreign competition.

And—

That the object of protecting manufactures was that we might eventually get articles of necessity made as cheap at home as they could be imported, and thereby to produce an independence of foreign countries.

Mr. Lowndes said in the same debate—

That he believed the manufacture of woolens, and particularly of blankets, required a decided present encouragement.

But the duties imposed by the act of 1816 were insufficient to afford adequate protection to many manufactures which had been built up during the war, and the excessive importations of foreign goods caused by our low tariff and the depression of prices in Great Britain soon prostrated and destroyed them.

THE BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL DEPRESSION OF 1819.

The termination of the commercial advantages enjoyed by England during the European war, and the cessation of the vast war expenditures by Great Britain, revolutionized the industrial system of England in 1819, greatly reduced the prices of commodities, and reacted on the industrial condition of the United States. The New England States suffered from excessive bank expansions, from the loss of their foreign market and of their domestic market for provisions, which the war and the prosper-

ity of our industries had created. Farmers suffered from a ruinous fall in the prices of their commodities, and manufactures were undersold by foreign goods sent out by English manufactories for the purpose of crushing the rising manufacturing establishments in the States.

The attention of all classes was directed to Congress for relief, and meetings were held in the Northern States in favor of an increase of the tariff. The farmers of the country, anxious to secure a market for their products, were zealous advocates of protection to American industries. On September 27, 1819, a convention of delegates from nine States of the Union assembled at New York to urge upon Congress better protection to American industries. The favorable effect of the legislation of 1816 is shown by President Monroe's first annual message, transmitted to Congress December 2, 1817, the opening paragraph of which is as follows:

At no period of our political existence had we so much cause to felicitate ourselves at the prosperous and happy condition of our country.

And later said:

Our manufactories will require the continued attention of Congress. The capital employed in them is considerable, and the knowledge required in the machinery and fabric of all the most useful manufactures is most valuable. Their preservation, which depends on due consideration, is connected with the high interests of the nation.

When his third annual message was sent to Congress, December 7, 1819, the changes in Europe resulting from a cessation of wars, great industrial depression in England, and the depreciation of the value of manufactured articles, enabling them to be profitably transported into the United States, had so affected our industries and disturbed our finances that the condition of the banks and of the industries of the country were discussed in the message.

This portion of the message is exceedingly interesting and instructive. It reads almost like a description of our recent business and financial disturbances. It shows that cheap material and cheap labor will not secure industrial prosperity, that financial disturbances follow business disturbances, and that undue competition from foreign manufactures was the cause of business and financial disasters of that period. He said:

The great reduction in the price of the principal articles of domestic growth, which has occurred during the present year, and the consequent fall in the price of labor, apparently so favorable to the success of domestic manufacture, have not shielded them against other causes adverse to their prosperity. The primary embarrassments which have so deeply affected the commercial interests of the nation, have been no less adverse to our manufacturing establishments in several sections of the Union.

The great reduction of the currency, which the banks have been compelled to make in order to continue specie payments, and the vitiated character of it where such reductions have not been attempted, instead of placing within reach of these establishments the pecuniary aid necessary to avail themselves of the advantages resulting from the reduction of the prices of raw materials and labor, have compelled the banks to withdraw from them a portion of the capital heretofore advanced to them. The aid which has been refused by the banks has not been obtained from other sources, owing to the loss of individual confidence from the failures which have recently occurred in some of our principal commercial cities. An additional cause of the depression of these establishments may probably be found in pecuniary embarrassments which have recently affected those countries with which our commerce has been principally prosecuted.

Their manufactures, for the want of a ready and profitable market at home, have been shipped by the manufacturers to the United States, and in many instances sold at a price below their current value at the place of manufacture. Although this practice may, from its nature, be considered temporary or contingent, it is not, on that account, less injurious in its effects. Uniformity in the demand and price of an article is highly desirable to the domestic manufacturer.

It is deemed of great importance to give encouragement to our domestic manufactures. In what manner the evils adverted to may be remedied, and how far it may be practicable in other respects to afford to them further encouragement, paying due regard to all the other great interests of the nation, is submitted to the wisdom of Congress.

No adequate relief to our embarrassed industries was provided by the next Congress. The time was mainly occupied in the discussion of the slavery question; and to meet a deficiency of revenue a loan of three millions was authorized, which was made. But, notwithstanding this loan of three millions, when the next Congress assembled the Treasury was empty and a floating debt of four millions was to be provided for. Again the adoption of measures which would have at once revived our industries, produced prosperity, and filled the Treasury was postponed. A loan of five millions was authorized. Appropriations for fortifications and for the Navy and the Army, and for other purposes, were greatly reduced. Again the slavery question was the all-absorbing topic. To show the condition of the country during this period I will quote from speeches in Congress during the tariff discussions of 1824:

Mr. Martindale, of New York, in the House, February 24, 1824, said:

I rise under a deep conviction of the vast importance of the principles of the bill upon your table, and my utter incompetency to a satisfactory discussion of them. But, sir, my great anxiety that those principles should finally prevail, and that they should now prevail, believing, as I do that the condition of the country imperiously demands their adoption, and my consciousness, too, sir, that that country on this occasion expects that every man should do his duty, have determined me to make an attempt to overcome my extreme diffidence and approach the discussion of this most momentous subject. It is a subject deeply interesting, sir, inasmuch as it is the commencement of a new system of policy, fraught with principles which must produce interminable and most salutary consequences, and inasmuch as it is the very first measure of the Government which looks seriously and extensively to the protection of the native productions of the country.

This system, sir, is to bring into existence from our own soil and from the labor of our own countrymen that which would not exist without it, and in addition to that which we now produce as a substitute for what we buy. It looks through the medium of the mechanic and artisan to the farmer; it can reach him in no other way; it can protect him no other way. Unless I greatly mistake the character of the bill, and labor under so strong a delusion that I am led to believe a lie, it is fraught with manifold and lasting blessings to our common country.

* * * * * * *

I propose to inquire, sir, if there be any evils under the pressure of which this nation suffers. Is full employment provided by the nature and distribution of our occupations for every class or community? Do none stand idle because no man hireth them? Does not the agriculture of the country languish and the laborer stand still because, beyond the supply of food for his own family, his produce perishes on his hands or his fields lie waste and fallow, and this because his accustomed market is closed against him? It does, sir. From every section of this extended country we hear complaints of poverty and individual distress. From the North, from the East, and from the West—in all directions, sir, but from the cotton-growing sections—hundreds of petitions and memorials have reached us, pouring forth the loud voice of supplication and prayer for some measures of protection and relief.

These have proceeded from the yeomanry of our country, from the industrious mechanic, from the farmer as well as from the manufacturer. And will gentlemen suppose that these complaints are feigned and causeless? Our own personal knowledge excludes the supposition. Let each member of this committee take the circuit of his district (excepting always the highly favored commercial and cotton-growing districts) and inquire individually of his agricultural and manufacturing constituents: Sir, are you clear of debt, and if not, have you the ready means of payment? Have you a ready market for all the surplus produce of your farm to the utmost ability of your farm to produce by the labor you can command? Do you keep as many sheep as your farm can sustain, and can you sell the wool they produce? Is your farm adapted to the culture of flax and hemp, and if so, where can you find a market? The answers these several questions will receive would show the accumulated and various distresses of his constituents.

There is, sir, multiplied and deep distress in this country. We are not in that prosperous and happy condition that some gentlemen would feign persuade us to believe. This distress presses harder upon the farmer and manufacturer, I know, sir, than upon any other class of our fellow-citizens. The reason is obvious. While the merchant was growing rich in exchange of his importations for the farmers' produce during what may be termed emphatically "the golden days of commercial prosperity," the farmer was consuming these importations to the extent of his ability to purchase. He did not even then become rich. When all his produce commanded an unexampled price and a quick sale, the merchant turned the exchange more to his own advantage than to the farmers', by paying the price of the purchase of the produce by the imported articles of consumption. While this extraordinary demand for the productions of our soil continued, a corresponding activity in our agricultural pursuits was excited, and a kindly soil rewarding the labors of the farmer with abundant crops, enabled him to sustain for the time habits of expense and indulgence to which he had not been accustomed.

But this day of unclouded prosperity was soon to be overcast. The years of plenty were soon to be succeeded by years of dearth and famine. The European markets were closed against the articles of food with which our farmers had been accustomed to supply them; and thus they were suddenly deprived of the means of satisfying an unabated demand for foreign manufactures. We suddenly discovered the defective organization of our community. We now found ourselves a nation of mere farmers and merchants, producing our own food, to be sure, but dependent on the merchant for our clothing to a vast amount, together with almost every article of domestic convenience without the adequate means of purchasing them. Foreign nations no longer stood in need of our food; they produced a sufficiency for their own use. But we needed their manufactures and could not supply them ourselves. This showed at once a defective distribution of the labor of the community. We were incapable of satisfying our own wants from our own resources. Clothing and domestic utensils are as necessary as food, and we can supply but one; and that one we can supply to ten times the amount of the demand.

Mr. Clay, in the House, Wednesday, March 31, 1824, said:

In casting our eyes around us, the most prominent circumstance which fixes our attention and challenges our deepest regret, is the general distress which pervades the whole country. It is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by successive unthreshed crops of grain perishing in our barns and barn-yards for the want of a market; by the alarming diminution of the circulating medium; by the numerous bankruptcies, not limited to the trading classes, but extending to all orders of society; by an universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labor; by the ravenous pursuit after public situations, not for the sake of their honors and the performance of their public duties, but as a means of private subsistence; by the reluctant resort to the perilous use of paper money; by the intervention of legislation in the delicate relation between debtor and creditor; and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of the whole mass of the property of the nation, which has, on an average, sunk not less than about 50 per cent within a few years.

This distress pervades every part of the Union, every class of society; all feel it, though it may be felt, at different places, in different degrees. It is like the atmosphere which surrounds us—all must inhale it, and none can escape it. In some places it has burst upon our people without a single mitigating circumstance to temper its severity. In others, more fortunate, slight alleviations have been experienced in the expenditure of the public revenue and in other favoring causes.

* * * * * * *

What, again I would ask, is the cause of the unhappy condition of our country, which I have faintly depicted? It is to be found in the fact that, during almost the whole existence of this Government, we have shaped our industry, our navigation, and our commerce in reference to an extraordinary war in Europe, and to foreign markets, which no longer exist; in fact that we have depended too much upon foreign sources of supply, and excited too little the native; in the fact that, whilst we have cultivated, with assiduous care, our foreign resources, we have suffered those at home to wither, in a state of neglect and abandonment.

* * * * * * *

The greatest want of civilized society is a market for the sale and exchange of the surplus of the produce of the labor of its members. This market may

exist at home or abroad, or both, but it must exist somewhere, if society prospers; and wherever it does exist, it should be competent to the absorption of the entire surplus of production. It is most desirable that there should be both a home and a foreign market. But, with respect to their relative superiority, I can not entertain a doubt. The home market is first in order, and paramount in importance. The object of the bill under consideration is to create this home market and to lay the foundations of a genuine American policy. It is opposed, and it is incumbent upon the partisans of the foreign policy (terms which I shall use without any invidious intent) to demonstrate that the foreign market is an adequate vent for the surplus produce of our labor. But is it so? Foreign nations can not, if they would, take our surplus produce. If the source of supply, no matter of what, increases in a greater ratio than the demand for that supply, a glut of the market is inevitable, even if we suppose both to remain perfectly unobstructed.

* * * * * * *

I would trouble the committee with only one other quotation which I shall make from Lowe, and from hearing which the committee must share with me in the mortification which I felt on perusing it. The author says: "It is now above forty years since the United States of America were definitely separated from us, and since their situation has afforded a proof that the benefit of mercantile intercourse may be retained, in all its extent, without the care of governing, or the expense of defending, these once regretted provinces." Is there not too much truth in this observation? By adhering to the foreign policy, which I have been discussing, do we not remain essentially British, in everything but the form of our Government? Are not our interests, our industry, our commerce, so modified as to swell British pride, and to increase British power?

* * * * * * *

Sir—

Said Mr. Webster, in the House April, 2, 1824—

the object of the bill before the committee is to aid the industry of the country by adjusting the proportions of the several branches to the state of the country; to aid the introduction and progress of manufacturing industry by relieving it from the pressure of European competition: to sustain agriculture by providing a domestic market for provisions and raw materials, and to secure a permanent and increasing commerce by providing the materials which are necessary to sustain it. The produce of industry is the nutriment of commerce; and our shipping can not for any length of time exceed the number which that will sustain.

Peace in Europe has cut off the carrying trade and diminished our commerce in provisions, and the future prosperity of our foreign commerce is involved in the success of our domestic manufactures. However desirable it may be to cherish and enlarge so important a branch of national industry, it would be delusive to expect it to thrive and prosper without employment.

The power of regulating its intercourse with other nations belongs to every independent government. It may admit the productions of other countries or exclude them. It may admit them freely or under what modifications it may deem proper. The only way in which domestic manufactures can be aided is by the imposition of duties; and this power in the distribution of authority between the General Government and those of the States is allotted to Congress, and they have complete sovereignty over the subject.

It will not be denied that it is the duty of government to exercise its powers in such manner as will be most conducive to the interests of the country.

* * * * * * *

It is not the density of population in the country, but the collection of people in towns and villages that facilitates a division of labor and furnishes a sufficiency of hands, and a market that will support a diversified industry. There is no certain rule, but the one before stated: when production exceeds consumption, and a portion of the people are without occupation for want of employment, the period has arrived when a division of labor has become necessary. This rule is certain, simple, without ambiguity, and admits of universal application.

The disposition or employment of the surplus population, is a proper subject of legislative regulation. This involves no interference with private rights, and no violation of the freedom of industry; the object is to provide employment for those who have none, whose industry is repressed by the policy or interfering industry of other nations, and which nothing short of legislative interference can relieve.

The growth of our manufactures is as effectually prevented by the moral restraints imposed by the superior advantages of those countries with whom we have a free and regular commercial intercourse, as if they were under legal restrictions, and no power less than that of the nation can control those obstacles.

This is an important branch of public policy; it is the true foundation of political economy, the basis of national wealth; every system that is not erected on this foundation rests on the sand.

The interference of Government to secure employment to this class of the population is absolutely neceseary to render the nation industrious. Industry will always be in proportion to its reward. If a farmer has no market for his surplus productions the supply of his own wants will be the measure of his exertions; and if there be no foreign demand for the surplus produce of the country the industry of the nation will be limited to the supply of the nation. The want of a market for surplus productions, as effectually limits the exertions of industry, as if the surplus was liable to the grasp of a licensed plunderer, as is now the case in Turkey. Whether the surplus of the farmer perishes on his hands or is taken from him by force the effect on industry is the same.

It is the policy of Government to provide objects for the occupation of all the citizens. The general prevalence of industry among the great mass of the people is indispensable to good order, peace, and domestic security; to prevent idleness, pauperism, and crime, and all those mischiefs which usually result from an unoccupied and necessitous population.

* * * * * * *

The United States since they were independent have, until recently, found it their interest to continue the policy that was imposed on them by Great Britain while colonies; they have devoted themselves almost exclusively to agriculture, and have exported their provisions and raw materials, and exchanged them for the manufactured goods of other countries, and chiefly for those of Great Britain.

While the war in Europe continued the demand for our provisions created an active industry and gave employment to all our citizens. The peace in Europe, by enabling those countries to augment the products of agriculture has destroyed the demand for our provisions, and has left us without a market for our surplus productions, or with a very limited one; many articles of agricultural produce can not be sold for the cost of production. This has paralyzed agricultural industry; the farmers have contracted their operations and diminished the number of their hands.

Improved land has fallen, and become the most unprofitable subject for the investment of capital. The whole estimate of real estate in New York fell 18 per cent under the advantage of a vast expenditure, from 1815 to 1821. Many, who a few years since purchased their farms on credit, have been obliged to sell them at a sacrifice. In many cases of partial payments, farms have been sold for less than the sum for which they were mortgaged, and the owners are ruined. The uncertainty of a market for the productions of agriculture forbids purchases on credit, and a large class of industrious citizens are without any certain or constant means of employment.

Our manufactures are excluded from our own markets as well as from those of other countries by the superior advantages of British manufaturers. Their industry languishes, and many of them are thrown out of employment as well as the farmers; many of our forges are abandoned; factories erected at great expense are shut up; many flouring mills are idle, and many vessels are lying at our wharves for want of freight. The number of paupers, especially that class which require only occasional relief, is rapidly increasing. The expense of paupers in New York increased from 1815 to 1822 from $245,000 to $470,000.

Permanent paupers to the whole population in England are in the ratio of 1 to 22; in Pennsylvania, of 1 to 265; in Delaware, of 1 to 227; in New York, of 1 to 220; in Connecticut, of 1 to 150; in New Hampshire, of 1 to 100; in Massachusetts, of 1 to 68.

Perseverance in our present condition will increase and aggravate these evils. It is the settled policy of the manufacturing nations of Europe to derive the means of subsistence from their own soil, and without a market for our surplus productions, or a division of labor by the introduction of new branches of industry, a portion of our population will be without employment.

Senator Dickerson, of New Jersey, May, 1824, said:

That some radical change in our system of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is required is incontestably proved by the distressed condition of all those branches of industry. To apply the remedy is the business of Congress.

The prosperity of a nation can be only secured by fostering and protecting its industry. The whole secret of national wealth consists of finding profitable employment for all who are willing to devote themselves to labor.

* * * * * * *

The importance of protecting industry applies more forcibly to the United States than to any other country. With a vast extent of fertile country, under various climates, producing nearly everything that our wishes or necessities require, if we are not prosperous and happy, it must be because we do not rely upon our own resources, but depend upon foreign nations for those supplies which nature has placed at our own doors. By the policy heretofore adopted we suffer Europe to prescribe the laws which regulate the prosperity, or rather adversity, of this country. To this may be attributed the distress which has prevailed in almost every section of the United States for the last eight years.

* * * * * * *

In the last eight years we have imported for our own consumption more than one hundred millions worth of manufactures, which we might have made and ought to have made for ourselves, while a large portion of our population have remained idle for want of employment.

* * * * * * *

Manufactures can not succeed unless capitalists can be induced to vest their capital in establishments necessary for those purposes. It is in vain to call upon our population not engaged in agriculture to work at manufactures when no capitalist will employ them. It is in vain to call upon the capitalist to invest his money in manufacturing establishments when such investment would probably result in the loss of his capital. If the capitalist could compel the people to work at as low a rate of wages as is given in Europe we could succeed; but men will not do that unless famine is staring them in the face, which will not be the case in this country for some centuries to come—when our population shall begin to press upon subsistence.

The capitalist must be enabled to derive a reasonable profit upon his investment, giving a reasonable price for labor, or he will reserve his money, the value of which is enhanced by the distress of the country.

TARIFF ACT OF 1824.

Congress was at last brought face to face with the necessity of affording protection to our industries, and providing the necessary revenues to support the Government by increased duties upon imports; and to do this the tariff act of 1824 was passed. As has always been the case when a protective tariff law has been enacted, our languishing industries at once revived, new industrial establishments sprang into existence, providing employment for labor, supplying also a market for agricultural products; money became plenty; the Treasury, no longer depleted and well-nigh bankrupt, contained in its vaults an ample and generous supply of funds; in short, the nation entered upon an era of prosperity such as this country had never before enjoyed.

I could multiply proofs almost without limit to show the great and beneficial effect of the tariff of 1824; to show that new life was infused into every branch of industry, that agriculture, commerce and manufactures alike flourished, that labor was employed, that wages improved, that everyone was prosperous, and the Treasury was full. President Adams, in opening his annual message of December 6, 1825, said:

In taking a general survey of the concerns of our beloved country, with reference to subjects interesting to the common welfare, the first sentiment which impresses itself upon the mind is of gratitude to the omnipotent Dispenser of all good for the continuance of the signal blessings of His Providence, and especially for that health which, to a usual extent, has prevailed within our borders, and for that abundance which, in the vicissitudes of the seasons, has been scattered with profusion over our land.

In his second annual message, of December 9, 1826, he said:

With the exceptions incidental to the most felicitous condition of human existence, we continue to be highly favored in all the elements which contribute to individual comfort and to national prosperity. In the survey of our extensive country we are generally to observe abodes of health and regions of plenty.

In his third annual message he said:

The productions of the soil, the exchanges of commerce, the vivifying labors of human industry, have combined to mingle in our cup a portion of enjoyment as large and liberal as the indulgence of Heaven has, perhaps, ever granted to the imperfect state of man on earth.

In his fourth annual message he said:

If the enjoyment in profusion of the bounties of Providence forms a subject for mutual gratulation and grateful acknowledgment, we are admonished at this return of the season, when the representatives of the nation are assembled to deliberate upon their concerns, to offer up the tribute of fervent and grateful hearts for the never-failing mercies of Him who ruleth over all.

And later, in the same message, he said:

The condition and prospects of the revenue are more favorable than our most sanguine expectations had anticipated.

President Jackson, in his first annual message, said:

In communicating with you for the first time, it is to me a source of unfeigned satisfaction, calling for mutual gratulation and devout thanks to a benign Providence, that we are at peace with all mankind, and that our country exhibits the most cheering evidence of general welfare and progressive improvement.

Later, in the same message, he stated his position upon the subject of protection, as follows:

The agricultural interests of our country is so essentially connected with every other, and so superior in importance to them all, that it is scarcely necessary to invite to it your particular attention. It is principally as manufactures and commerce tend to increase the value of agricultural productions, and to extend their application to the wants and comforts of society, that they deserve the fostering care of government.

Speaking of the revenues, he said:

The state of the finances exhibits the resources of the nation in an aspect highly flattering to its industry and auspicious of the ability of the Government in a very short time to extinguish the public debt.

In his Maysville road veto of May 27, 1830, President Jackson said:

As long as the encouragement of domestic manufactures is directed to national ends, it shall receive from me a temperate but steady support.

THE TARIFF OF 1828.

The increase of duties by the act of 1828 was not made without a general demand for increased protection by the manufacturing States. Conventions of farmers and manufacturers were held, and Congress was besieged with petitions for adequate protection to American industries. A general convention of agriculturists and manufacturers, and others friendly to the encouragement and support of the domestic industry of the United States, assembled at Harrisburg, Pa., July 30, 1827, composed of delegates from Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia; and after a five-days session, adopted an address to Congress praying for increased protection to American producers, more especially to wool and woolen manufactories.

This address, which was prepared by a committee of the ablest members of the convention, is a masterly production, covering the whole question of the tariff, and is worthy of a careful perusal by the statesmen of to-day. I quote from it as follows:

The principle of protecting the domestic industry has been adopted in most nations, and exists wherever a prosperous people are found. Without it misery must prevail; and no more than a grade of happiness beyond that which pertains to savage life, can be expected, men being clothed in skins and having their homes as if in dens and caverns. There are natural causes of soil, climate, and condition why these things should be, as well as many incidental or artificial circumstances that bear upon them, and also something which may be called a value in human life that must be respected. This is the cost of subsistence, and forbids "freedom of trade."

There is no speculation in the proposition. It is a fact that a man in France may be as well subsisted for one-half less than a man in England; that a Spaniard does live on food upon which an Englishman would nearly perish, and that an East Indian would starve out a Spaniard on the same supplies. We speak of persons performing labor, or, in other words, producing value. It is important, then, that these parties can freely exchange commodities. The operation of natural causes or determinable habits would enrich the one and beggar the other.

The address thus refers to the fact that some persons have recently denied the power of the United States—

To perform the natural operation of protecting the national industry, as practiced by nearly every other civilized nation, as indispensable to the preservation of its own existence; and it is asserted that this power had been exerted from the beginning, and that the preamble of the first act passed under the new Constitution for raising revenue recited that the act was necessary for "the encouragement and protection of manufactures."

Attention is called to the fact that the commerce and navigation of the United States had been protected to the utmost extent to which protection might go. That "heavy discriminating duties" on imports and tonnage were levied—the coasting trade prohibited to foreigners; reciprocity was always demanded, and restriction met with restriction at every step. And continuing:

But what American heart is not warmed when the result of this decisive protection of commerce and navigation is presented to view, which has raised up our tonnage to be second only to that of Great Britain; which has caused the starry banners to be displayed with honor from the burning line to the icy barriers of the north and south; which has demonstrated the momentous truth, a truth worth all the sophisms of the old and new school of amalgamated economists, that protection, or even prohibition, has no necessary relation to the cost of articles to the consumer, seeing the proud fact is that we excel all nations in the celerity, certainty, and cheapness of our tranfportation; the foreign, through protection; and the coasting, by prohibition.

The discussion in Congress of the tariff bill of 1828 is both interesting and valuable. I submit a few extracts:

Mr. Mallary of Vermont, in the House, March 4, 1828, said:

Manufacturers, we all know, are constantly accused of being governed by sordid and selfish views. They are charged with hostility to all other classes of the people. They are held up to observation as a body of iron-handed monopolists. From whom do these accusations come? The severest are from a few seaboard merchants and foreign agents. A numerous body of American merchants, distinguished for their wealth and talents, are among the warmest and ablest advocates of the American policy.

Sir, in a country like the United States, where all may engage in what employment they choose, there can never be a monopoly by any body of manufacturers. The extent of the country, the favorable positions everywhere afforded, the industry and enterprise of the people, will always be a safeguard against the least danger. You might as well maintain that the farmers are monopolists, the mechanics are monopolists, as to lay the same charge against the manufacturer.

But, sir, I maintain that the tendency of protecting domestic manufactures is to prevent a most dangerous and powerful monopoly, a moneyed aristocracy that would be resistless, overwhelming.

I mean, distinctly, the mercantile interest on the seaboard. If this nation, great and extensive as it is and will be, was composed of farmers and merchants alone, what would be the consequence? The seaboard would be the place of exchange for domestic and foreign productions. This would be effected at a few points favored by nature. Profits and gain would, from necessity, be confined to a few. The farming interest must sustain all the charges and expenses of transportation of its productions—heavy, bulky—while the merchant would at all times secure to himself his reward, whatever may be the sacrifices and losses of the farmer. On the seaboard, therefore, all the moneyed capital of the nation would concentrate. The interior would be in dependence, debt, and bondage.

I am not insensible to the importance of foreign commerce. But that alone never did, and never can, make a nation of extensive territory prosperous. History proved the fact. To be sure, large cities have sprung into existence by trade. Nations, or states possessing small domain like Venice and Genoa, may have become rich and powerful by foreign commerce.

A country as extensive as France, or Germany, or Russia, or the United States never could have wealth, competence, and the ordinary comforts of life universally distributed without the aid of domestic manufactures. There might be a Hanseatic League of cities, rich and powerful, showing defiance to the proudest monarchs, while the countries which supported them would remain poor, depressed, and miserable.

There might be a rich and flourishing Dantzic, with wretched Poland in the rear to sustain it.

Mr. Wright, of New York, in the House, March 10, 1828, said:

And here, sir, it is my duty to premise that it has been my object, and I believe it to have been the object of the majority of the committee, to frame a bill which should have in view the protection of the leading interests of the country. I have supposed that in all laws having a reference to the protection of the domestic industry of this country, agriculture should be considered the prominent and leading interest. This I have considered the basis upon which the other great interests rest, and to which they are to be considered as subservient. Still this is not to be considered as entitled to protection exclusive of the manufacturing interest. I do not believe that a law which would be injurious to manufacturers would be beneficial to agriculture; but I do believe that protection to manufactures should be given with express reference to the effect upon agriculture, and that no protection can be wise or consistent with the policy of this Government which has not for its object to add strength and vigor to this great and vital interest of the country. The same may be said of the commercial interest, as it also is only subservient to the great interests of agriculture.

Mr. Barnard, of New York, in the House, March 17, 1828, said:

Manufactures have kept very exact pace with civilization. And the history of commerce itself is little else than the history of the progress of manufactures. In that age of the world when manufactures were little known that company of Ishmaelites "coming from Gilead, bearing spices, balm, and myrrh, going to carry it down to Egypt," I dare say, thought themselves driving a very extensive and profitable trade. The commerce of the celebrated commercial cities of Italy were never so flourishing as when they became manufacturers to supply the necessities of the Crusaders in the holy wars. The prosperity of English commerce is dated from the encouragement which was given to the English manufacturers, and at this day is almost wholly dependent upon them, either directly or indirectly, for its successful prosecution.

Under the tariff act of 1828, a new impetus was given to American industry, resulting in increased prosperity, increase of industrial wealth, and a full Treasury.

THE CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE REPEAL OF THE ACTS OF 1821 AND 1823.

President Jackson, in his third annual message, said:

Among the happiest effects of the improved relations of our Republic has been an increase of trade, producing a corresponding increase of revenue beyond the most sanguine expectations of the Treasury Department.

And later:

A modification of the tariff which shall produce a reduction of our revenue to the wants of the Government and an adjustment of the duties on imports, with a view to equal justice in relation to all our national interests, * * * is deemed to be one of the principal objects which demand the consideration of the present Congress.

This portion of the President's message was referred in the House to the Committee on Manufactures, which, as well as the Committee on Ways and Means, had been selected with a view to the modification of the tariff. Mr. Adams of Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, on the 23d day of May, 1832, reported a new tariff bill. Mr. McDuffie, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, had previously reported a radical tariff bill to meet the views of the ultra free-trade advocates, and had submitted a report denouncing the tariff laws and the protective system as taxing the South for the benefit of the North.

Mr. McDuffie having forced on the discussion of his bill in the House, on June 1 the first section of the bill was struck out by a vote of 81 yeas to 41 nays.

The Adams bill, after a protracted and heated discussion, passed

the House by 132 yeas to 65 nays; and passed the Senate July 9 by 32 yeas to 16 nays; and was approved by the President.

This act was a very liberal concession to the South. It provided for a great reduction of the revenue, and considerably reduced the duties upon articles which came into competition with articles of domestic manufacture. It was supposed it would be received by the advocates of free trade and by the dominant party in South Carolina as at least a temporary settlement of the disturbing question of the tariff; but those who had yielded their own views on the subject to conciliate the Southern discontents were disappointed. The day after the passage of the act the representatives of South Carolina who favored nullification as a remedy for their supposed grievances met at Washington and adopted and published an address to the people of South Carolina, the concluding sentences of which were as follows:

They will not pretend to suggest the appropriate remedy, but after expressing their solemn and deliberate conviction that the protective system must now be regarded as the settled policy of the country, and that all hope of relief from Congress is irrecoverably gone, they leave it to you, the sovereign power of the State, to determine whether the rights and liberties which you received as a precious inheritance from an illustrious ancestry shall lie tamely surrendered without a struggle, or be transmitted undiminished to your posterity.

Following this address, meetings were held in South Carolina at which the tariff act just passed was denounced. Those who attended them were pledged to support the State government in measures to resist the enforcement of the tariff laws, and the people were urged to opposition to the General Government.

Notwithstanding the exertions of the respectable, law-abiding portion of the community, the discontents secured a majority in both houses of the Legislature. As soon as the complexion of the Legislature was known, Governor Hamilton convoked it. Immediately after assembling on October 22, 1832, a bill was reported and passed authorizing a convention to meet at Columbia on the 19th of the following month of November. Without going into details, it is sufficient for my purpose to state that the convention passed an ordinance declaring all acts of Congress imposing duties on imported goods, and more especially the laws of May 19, 1828, and July 14, 1832, to be absolutely null and void within that State, and declaring it to be the duty of the Legislature of the State to pass such laws as would be necessary to carry the same into effect from and after the following February.

This ordinance concluded with the declaration that any attempt on the part of the United States to reduce the State to obedience, or to enforce the revenue laws otherwise than through the civil tribunals, would be deemed inconsistent with the continuance of South Carolina in the Union, and the people of that State would proceed to organize a separate and independent government. A copy of the ordinance was officially transmitted to President Jackson by the governor of South Carolina. The Legislature met when the convention adjourned, and passed the laws required by the ordinance. Acts were passed authorizing the governor to call the militia into service to resist any attempt by the General Government to enforce the revenue laws, to accept volunteers, to call out the whole military power of the State, and provision was made for the purchase or arms and munitions of war. The Union was imperiled. The existence of the Government was threatened. Federal action became imperative. All the available military force of the Government was ordered to assemble at Charleston, and a sloop of war was sent to that port to protect the officers of the Government in the performance of their duties.

President Jackson, in his annual message of December 4, 1832, said:

It is my painful duty to state that in one quarter of the United States opposition to the revenue laws has arisen to a height which threatens to thwart their execution, if not to endanger the integrity of the Union.

And on the 11th day of December, 1832, he issued a proclamation abounding in patriotic utterances, appealing to the people of South Carolina to retrace their steps, and announcing his determination to execute the laws and to preserve the Union by all constitutional means. I quote from that proclamation the following:

Look on this picture of happiness and honor and say, we, too, are citizens of America. Carolina is one of these proud States; her arms have defended, her best blood has cemented this happy Union. And then add, if you can, without horror and remorse, this happy Union we will dissolve; this picture of peace and prosperity we will deface; this free intercourse we will interrupt; these fertile fields we will deluge with blood; the protection of that glorious flag we renounce; the very name of Americans we discard.

And for what, mistaken men! for what do you throw away these inestimable blessings—for what would you exchange your share in the advantages and honor of the Union? For the dream of a separate independence—a dream interrupted by bloody conflicts with your neighbors, and a vile dependence on foreign power. If your leaders could succeed in establishing a separation, what would be your situation? Are you united at home—are you free from the apprehension of civil discord, with all its fearful consequences? Do our neighboring republics, every day suffering some new revolution or contending with some new insurrection—do they excite your envy? But the dictates of a high duty oblige me solemnly to announce that you can not succeed.

The laws of the United States must be executed. I have no discretionary power on the subject—my duty is emphatically pronounced in the Constitution. Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution deceived you—they could not have been deceived themselves. They know that a forcible opposition could alone prevent the execution of the laws, and they know that such opposition must be repelled. Their object is disunion; but be not deceived by names; disunion by armed force is treason. Are you really ready to incur its guilt? If you are, on the heads of the instigators of the act be the dreadful consequences, on their heads be the dishonor, but on yours may fall the punishment—on your unhappy State will inevitably fall all the evils of the conflict you force upon the Government of your country.

It can not accede to the mad project of disunion, of which you would be the first victims. Its First Magistrate can not, if he would, avoid the performance of his duty. The consequence must be fearful for you, distressing to your fellow-citizens here, and to the friends of good government throughout the world. Its enemies have beheld our prosperity with a vexation they could not conceal; it was a standing refutation of their slavish doctrines, and they will point to our discord with the triumph of malignant joy.

It is yet in your power to disappoint them. There is yet time to show that the descendants of the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Rutledges, and of the thousand other names which adorn the pages of your Revolutionary history, will not abandon that Union, to support which so many of them fought and bled and died. I adjure you, as you honor their memory; as you love the cause of freedom, to which they dedicated their lives; as you prize the peace of your country, the lives of its best citizens, and your own fair fame, to retrace your steps.

Snatch from the archives of your State the disorganizing edict of its convention; bid its members to reassemble and promulgate the decided expressions of your will to remain in the path which alone can conduct you to safety, prosperity, and honor; tell them that, compared to disunion, all other evils are light, because that brings with it an accumulation of all; declare that you will never take the field unless the star-spangled banner of your country shall float over you; that you will not be stigmatized when dead, and dishonored and scorned while you live, as the authors of the first attack on the Constitution of your country! Its destroyers you can not be. You may disturb its peace; you may interrupt the course of its prosperity; you may cloud its reputation for stability, but its tranquillity will be restored, its prosperity will return, and the stain upon its national character will be transferred and remain an external blot on the memory of those who caused the disorder.

Fellow-citizens of the United States! The threat of unhallowed disunion, the names of those (once respected) by whom it was uttered, the array of military force to support it, denote the approach of a crisis in our affairs, on which the continuance of our unexampled prosperity, our political existence, and perhaps that of all free government, may depend. The conjuncture demanded a free, a full, and explicit enunciation, not only of my intentions, but of my principles of action; and as the claim was asserted of a right by a State to annul the laws of the Union, and even to secede from it at pleasure, a frank exposition of my opinions, in relation to the origin and form of our Government, and the construction I give to the instrument by which it was created, seemed to be proper.

Having the fullest confidence in the justness of the legal and constitutional opinion of my duties which has been expressed, I rely with equal confidence on your undivided support in my determination to execute the laws, to preserve the Union by all constitutional means, to arrest, if possible, by moderate, but firm measures, the necessity of a recourse to force; and if it be the will of Heaven that the recurrence of its primeval curse on man for the shedding of a brother's blood should fall upon our land, that it be not called down by any offensive act on the part of the United States.

Fellow-citizens! the momentous case is before you. On your undivided support of your Government depends the decision of the great question it involves, whether your sacred Union will be preserved, and the blessing it secures to us as one people shall be perpetuated. No one can doubt that the unanimity with which that decision will be expressed will be such as to inspire new confidence in republican institutions, and that the prudence, the wisdom, and the courage which it will bring to their defense will transmit them unimpaired and invigorated to our children.

I have thus fully presented the condition of the matter of the attempted nullification of South Carolina at the time Congress met in 1832 to show the attitude of the South upon the tariff question; to show that a dissolution of the Union was first threatened on account of the tariff and by the advocates of free trade, and for the purpose also of showing the causes which influenced some of the friends of protection at that Congress to favor the compromise act of 1833, by which the protective policy was striken down, and the country plunged into bankruptcy and ruin, and great distress brought upon the people.

As I proceed, it will appear that South Carolina did not stand alone in her hostility to the tariff laws, but that such hostility extended generally throughout the Southern States, and that it continued until those States attempted to secede and destroy the Union; that it was one of the causes which, when the South could no longer control the Administration and Congressional legislation, led to the rebellion. This hostility to the protective policy exists in the South to-day; and it is this fact, connected with the success of the Democratic party, dominated as it is by the South, that has produced the prevailing widespread disaster to the industries of the country. I will incorporate in my remarks extracts from some of the more important speeches delivered in the Senate and the House during the discussion of the tariff bill of 1832.

Mr. Clay, January 11, 1832, in the Senate, said:

It forms no part of my present purpose to enter into a consideration of the established policy of protection. Strong in the convictions, and deeply seated in the affections, of a large majority of the people of the United States, it stands self-vindicated, in the general prosperity, in the rich fruits which it has scattered over the land, in the experience of all prosperous and powerful nations, present and past, and now in that of our own. Nor do I think it necessary to discuss that policy on this resolution. Other gentlemen may think differently, and may choose to argue and assail it. If they do, I have no doubt that, in all parts of the Senate, members more competent than I am will be ready to defend and support it.

* * * * * * *

In making this inquiry, the first question which presents itself is, whether it is expedient to preserve the existing duties in order to accumulate a surplus in the Treasury, for the purpose of subsequent distribution among the

several States. I think not. If the collection, for the purpose of such a surplus, is to be made from the pockets of one portion of the people, to be ultimately returned to the same pockets, the process would be attended with the certain loss arising from the charges of collection, and with the loss also of interest while the money is performing the unnecessary circuit; and it would, therefore, be unwise. If it is to be collected from one portion of the people and given to another, it would be unjust. If it is to be given to the States in their corporate capacity, to be used by them in their public expenditure, I know of no principle in the Constitution which authorizes the Federal Government to become such a collector for the States, nor of any principle of safety or propriety which admits of the States becoming such recipients of gratuity from the General Government.

Mr. Hayne, in the Senate January 16, 1832, stated the Southern position on the tariff, and foreshadowed the attempt of South Carolina to nullify the laws. He said:

The gentleman from Kentucky set out with the declaration that he did not deem it necessary to offer any arguments in favor of the American system: "that the protecting policy stands self-vindicated; that it has scattered its rich fruits over the whole land, and is sustained by the experience of all-powerful and prosperous nations."

Sir, we meet these positions at once by asserting, on our part, that the protecting system stands self-condemned in our own country by the desolation which has followed in its train, and the discontents it has produced—condemned by the experience of all the world, and the almost unanimous opinion of enlightened men in modern times. And now, having fairly joined issue with the gentleman, we might put ourselves upon the country, and submit the case without argument; nor should I have any fears for the result if the issue was to be tried and decided by an impartial tribunal, free from the disturbing influence of popular prejudice and delusion, and the strong bias of interests, personal, pecuniary, and political.

* * * * * * *

Let not gentlemen so far deceive themselves as to suppose that the opposition of the South to the protecting system is not based on high and lofty principles. It has nothing to do with party politics, or the mere elevation of men. It rises far above all such considerations. Nor is it influenced chiefly by calculations of interest, but is founded in much nobler impulses. The instinct of self-interest might have taught us an easier way of relieving ourselves from this oppression. It wanted but the will to have supplied ourselves with every article embraced in the protective system, free of duty, without any other participation on our part than a simple consent to receive them.

But, sir, we have scorned in a contest for our rights to resort to any but open and fair means to maintain them. The spirit with which we have entered into this business is akin to that which was kindled in the bosom of our fathers when they were made the victims of oppression; and if it has not displayed itself in the same way it is because we have ever cherished the strongest feelings of confraternity toward our brethren, and the warmest and most devoted attachment to the Union. If we have been in any degree divided among ourselves in this matter, the source of that division, let gentlemen be assured, has not arisen so much from any difference of opinion as to the true character of the oppression, as from the different degrees of hope of redress. All parties have for years past been looking forward to this crisis for the fulfillment of their hopes or the confirmation of their fears. And God grant that the result may be auspicious.

Mr. McDuffie, May 28, 1832, said:

Free trade is the great doctrine of political reformation in modern times; it is to the commerce and the social condition of nations what the reformation of Luther was to the Christian religion. * * * I should regard it as the proudest monument that we could erect to the glory of this Republic, the chosen habitation of freedom, to set an example on this subject to the other nations of the earth. It would stand, sir, as a beacon light on the great ocean of human affairs, to conduct all nations to the haven of prosperity. Yes, sir; let us plant the tree of free trade, and water it, that its branches may be extended to the uttermost extremities of the earth, and the Christian and the philanthropist will joyfully concur in anticipating the blessed period when, beneath its fruitful and refreshing shade "the nations of the earth may pitch their tents in peace." * * *

Mr. Chairman, owing to the peculiar circumstances in which she has been placed, and not because she claims to have more intelligence or patriotism than the other Southern States, it has been the lot of South Carolina to be in the van of this great struggle for constitutional liberty. Virginia and North Carolina, in proportion to their population, furnish a comparatively small amount of the exports upon which the protecting system directly operates. Georgia has been engrossed in maintaining her rights in another contest with this Government; and the people of the new States of the Southwest, cultivating a fresh and fertile soil, recently acquired at the minimum price, can as well afford to make cotton at 6 or 8 cents a pound as those of South Carolina can at 10. They can sustain this oppressive system with comparatively little suffering when the older planting States will be utterly ruined. But they have too much sagacity not to see that when the tide of ruin shall have swept away the States which stand first in the march of the oppressor, they are destined to be the next victims.

South Carolina, then, is fighting the common battle of all the Southern States. She threw herself into the breach as a forlorn hope, when all the auspices were against her; and, whatever may be the result of the contest, I can not but regard her destiny as a happy and glorious one. Nothing elevates the character of a people to so high a point as a disinterested struggle for liberty; and I do not believe there is at this moment a spot upon the face of the globe where the spirit of freedom is higher than in South Carolina. There is no vulgar ambition mingling in this controversy. In adverting to historical analogies, I have been struck with the strong resemblance between the situation of the Southern States in this apparently unequal contest and that of the Grecian states which united to resist the Persian invasion.

Ours, to be sure, is a civil struggle, not to be waged with the vulgar implements of war, but by the sovereign, the legislative, and the judicial powers of the States. South Carolina is fully aware of the responsibility she has assumed and of the peril she must encounter; but no great object can be accomplished without great sacrifices. Had it not been for the heroic spirit of Leonidas and his immortal band, who devoted themselves at Thermopylæ for the common cause of Greece, the light of Grecian liberty might have been extinguished forever, and the destiny of mankind entirely changed. And I do confidently believe that if South Carolina fails in the struggle she is now waging, the brief days of American liberty will be numbered.

Senator Holmes of Maine, January 30, 1832, said:

I should not, probably, Mr. President, have thrown myself on the indulgence of the Senate, had not the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hayne] denied the power of Congress to protect our manufactures, and intimated an opinion that a State might annul the acts of the Federal Government. And although the few sentiments which he uttered on the subject came in at the close of his remarks, and seemed rather as an afterthought, yet, as he has embodied them in the speech, I can never let doctrines so dangerous pass without my decisive disapprobation. Here every friend of the Constitution should be upon the walls—he should "cry aloud, and spare not." Here, we should repeat again and again; here there should be "line upon line, and precept upon precept," And though my little bark has been pelted and shattered by the storms and tempests which invest the capes, shores, and seas of public life, yet, frail as it is, I will venture to launch it into the boisterous ocean of debate, if thereby I can contribute aught to save the Constitution of my country from the shipwreck to which it is exposed.

* * * * * * *

And what is this power to "regulate"? It is to make rules to govern. And what is a rule? It is a law. We all remember when, in our incipient studies, we were taught that a law was "a rule of civil conduct, prescribed by the supreme power of a State, commanding what is right, and forbidding what is wrong." The supreme is the legislative power; and this must be supreme over the subject-matter and person on which it is called to act; and the "right or wrong" is determined by the decree of the judiciary, to whom, in free governments, this duty is confided. The word rule, is, in the Constitution synonymous with law. "Uniform rules of naturalization," and "rules for the government of the Army and Navy," are made by enactments, and are, to all intents and purposes, laws. To regulate commerce, therefore, is to prescribe rules to govern the exchange of the products of agriculture and manufactures, and it is a power over the whole subject-matter, except where restrained by the Constitution itself. It would seem to me that this inference is irresistible, and that, unless the regulation of commerce includes that of the exchange of its objects, it is nothing but an abstraction.

But if I am wrong in this the Constitution has failed of its design. It originated in the want of power to reciprocate the favor, and retaliate the injuries of foreign nations on this very subject of trade. This power of protecting our own manufacturer was urged as the chief reason for its adoption. Some States had, notwithstanding the Articles of Confederation, undertaken to expound treaties. Congress on the 13th of April, 1787, came to the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the several States can not explain, limit, or control a national treaty, but such treaties are the supreme laws of the land by the Articles of the Confederation."

In 1784, April 30, a resolution of Congress recommended to the several States to vest the United States in Congress assembled, for the term of fifteen years, with power to prohibit any goods from being imported into or exported from any of the States, in vessels belonging to or navigated by the subjects of any power with whom the United States have not formed any treaties of commerce; and also, of prohibiting the subjects of any foreign State, etc., unless authorized by treaty, from importing into the United States any goods, etc., which are not the produce or manufacture of the dominions of the sovereign whose subjects they are. (5 Marshall's Washington. 70.)

"The idea of compelling Great Britain to relax somewhat of the rigors of her system by opposing it with regulations equally restrictive seems to have been generally taken up." (*Id.*, 69.)

So, also, note Mr. Adams's letter, recommending that Congress should have the power:

"The Boston petitioners request that the numerous impositions of the British on the trade and exports of these States may be forthwith contravened by similar expedients on our part." (*Id.*, 77.)

"The Pennsylvania memorial, after stating that other nations will not be restrained by any apprehensions, as long as the power remains severally with the States, of being met by any consistent and effectual restrictions on our part, prays Congress to recommend to the States to give it the necessary power over the commerce of the United States." (*Id.*, 78.)

Washington, in a letter to a friend in Great Britain, thus states: "They [the people] now see the indispensable necessity of a general controlling power and are addressing their respective assemblies to grant it to Congress." (*Id.*, 78.)

Again; "I do not see that we can long exist as a nation without lodging somewhere a power which will pervade the whole Union in as energetic a manner as the authority of the State governments extends over the several States." (*Id.*, 95.)

"Suppose, as has been contended, that the Federal power of taxation were to be confined to duties on imports, it is evident that the want of being able to command other resources would frequently be tempted to extend those duties to an injurious excess." (1 Federalist, No. 35, p. 8.)

The more intelligent adversaries of the Constitution admit the necessity of the power of taxation, but they qualify their admission by a distinction between what they call internal taxations; the latter of which they explain into commercial imposts, or rather duties on imported articles; they declare themselves willing to concede to the Federal Government. (1 Federalist, No. 30, page 19.)

Our manufactures are another great object which has received no encouragement by national duties on foreign manufactures, and they never can, by any authority in the old Confederation.

The question is, have these been encouraged? Has Congress been able, by national laws, to prevent the importation of such foreign commodities as are made by raw materials as we ourselves raise. (Mr. Dawes of Mr. Elliot's Debates, volume 1, page 76.)

Mr. Pierce (opposed to the Constitution) was afraid the impost would be abandoned for direct taxation. (*Id.*, 91.)

Mr. Williams of New York, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that when the moneys arising from impost and excise should be insufficient, then a requisition for a direct tax upon the States should be made, and, on refusal, Congress should levy the tax. (1 Elliot's Debates, pages 294, 295.)

Chancellor Livingston, in objecting to this amendment, remarked that if the manufactures of this country were always to be in a state of infancy, if the amendment were only a temporary expedient, the provision might consist with good policy; but, at a future day, an enlarged population will render us a manufacturing people, the imposts will then necessarily lessen, and the public wants will call for new sources of revenue. (*Id.*, page 303.)

Mr. George Mason opposed the power to lay direct taxes. (2 Elliot, page 64.)

Mr. MADISON. Direct taxes will only be recurred to for great purposes. (*Id.*, 96.)

Mr. NICHOLAS. Money can not be raised more judiciously than by imposts. It is not felt by the people. But he insisted that the power of direct taxation was necessary. (*Id.*, 98.)

Mr. MARSHALL answered the objection that direct taxation was unnecessary. (*Id.*, 187.)

Mr. MONROE contended against direct taxation because the impost and back lands were sufficient. (*Id.*, 232.)

Mr. MADISON. I admit that the imposts will increase until the population becomes so great as to compel us to recur to manufactures. (*Id.*, 238.)

Mr. SPENCER of North Carolina. I would give them the power of laying imposts, and I would give them the power to lay and collect excises. I con-

fess that this is a kind of tax that I would with great reluctance agree to exercise. But it is obvious that, unless such excises were admitted, the public burden will all be borne by those parts of the community which do not manufacture for themselves. (3 Elliot, page 77.)

Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania: "The future collection of the duties and imposts will, in the opinion of some, supersede the necessity of having recourse to internal taxation." (3 Elliot, p 289.)

Mr. Wilson again, on the same subject: It is not an important object to extend our manufactures and our commerce." (*Id.* 282.)

Mr. Martin, of Maryland, proposed in the convention for forming the Constitution that requisitions should precede direct taxation. (4 Elliot, Yate's Min., 30.)

Massachusetts convention ratified the Constitution, and proposed among other amendments that Congress do not lay direct taxes but when the moneys arising from the imposts and excise are insufficient for the public exigencies, nor then until Congress shall have first made a requisition upon the States. (4 Elliot, 210.)

South Carolina: "The General Government of the United States ought never to impose direct taxes but where the moneys arising from the duties on imposts and excise are insufficient for the public exigencies, nor then until Congress shall have made requisition upon the States." (4 Elliot, 214.)

New Hampshire in nearly the same words. (*Id.*)

New York nearly the same. (*Id.*, 218.)

Rhode Island: "No direct taxes without previous requisition, nor without the consent of three-fourths of the States." (*Id.*, 235.)

In the preamble of the act of the 22d July, 1789, the reason of that tariff is alleged to be to "pay debts and protect domestic manufactures." (1789, first session.)

To complete a temporary system [of revenue] in time to embrace the spring importations, Mr. Madison presented a scheme of imposts which had been recommended by the former Congress and had already received the approbation of a majority of the States, to which he added a proposition for a tonnage duty. Mr. Fitzsimmons, of Pennsylvania, moved to enlarge the catalogue of specific duties to include those calculated to encourage the productions of our own country and protect our infant manufactures, and others tending to operate as sumptuary restrictions upon articles of luxury. But though the propriety seemed to be admitted, yet the time was thought insufficient for a permanent and extensive plan. (5 Marshall, 190.)

Mr. Madison consented to subjoin the amendment proposed by Mr. F. and it was received. But a difference of opinion arose on filling the blanks as to particular articles; and no inconsiderable degree of watchfulness was discovered lest those States which were more populous, and whose manufactures were in greater progress, should lay protecting duties, whereby the industry of one part of the Union would be encouraged by premiums charged on the labor of another part. *Id.* 191.

On the tonnage question, Mr. Madison supported the affirmative, that we ought to have vessels enough to answer all the purposes of our commerce, to form a school for seamen, and to lay the foundation of a navy; and if this were a burden on some parts of the Union they ought to bear it for the public good. *Id.* 192.

You see, then, sir, after the Constitution was adopted and put in operation, what was the understanding of it by those who contributed to its formation and adoption. The very first public general law, approved on the memorable 4th of July, 1789, bore upon the face of it its design to protect domestic manufactures. If the Constitution has been violated the enormity was committed by its framers and adopters by the very first act which they did after their votes to support it, and thus, too, on the glorious anniversary of our independence. Its death wound was inflicted at its birthday, wantonly inflicted; there was no mistake, no plea of ignorance to shelter them; the protection of manufactures stood in glaring capitals conspicuously on its front. And, strange to tell, that from that time down to 1824, though we had had protection upon protection, and had experienced a partisan warfare in which the combatants were violent and vindictive, and not overfastidious about their weapons, not a lisp was uttered of this usurpation, nor the least pretense of the unconstitutionality of a protective tariff.

Sir, I put these historical facts against all the arguments made, or to be made, I care not how ingenious, subtle, or powerful. Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and a host of others, who made this same Constitution, could not have mistaken its design in this respect; and they either were right in the exercise of this power or willful and wicked usurpers.

Sir, it is most certain that if revenue must be the chief object of an impost, it is excluded from every other pursuit, as well as the protection of manufactures. How, then, could the tonnage act be justified? How could the famous resolutions of Mr. Madison, of 1794, discriminating against nations having no commercial treaties with us be justified? Now let us see what have been the Executive opinion and practice on this subject.

WASHINGTON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

"The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufacture, by all proper means, will not, I trust, need recommendation. But I can not forbear intimating to you the expediency of giving effectual encouragement, as well to the introduction of new and useful inventions from abroad as to the exertions and skill in producing them at home."

Was this for revenue?

Mr. Jefferson's report of 23d of February, 1793, made pursuant to a resolution of the House of the 14th of February, 1791:

"Where a nation imposes high duties on our productions, or prohibits them altogether, it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs, first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition with our own of the same kind, imposing on them duties lower at first, but heavier and heavier afterwards, as other channels of supply open."

Not for revenue, surely.

Message, November, 1804, he submits:

"Whether the great interests of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation can within the pale of your constitutional powers be aided in any of their relations."

Nothing of revenue in all this.

Again, "An immediate prohibition of the exportation of arms and ammunition is submitted to your consideration."

Nor in this.

Message of December, 1806:

"Shall we suppress the impost and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?" This looks like protection.

Mr. Madison's message, December, 1810:

"Although other objects will press more immediately on your deliberations a portion of them can not but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of securing to our manufactures the success they have attained, and are still attaining under the impulse of causes not permanent, and to our navigation the fair extent of which it is at present abridged by the unequal regulation of foreign governments." This, too, is protection.

In the clause of the Constitution which declared that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, the word "commerce" comprehends "navigation;" and a power to regulate navigation is as expressly granted as if that term had been added to the word "commerce." (Gibbons vs. Ogden, 9 Wheat., 189-193.)

Exceptions from a power mark its extent. (*Id.*, 191.)

The power to regulate commerce extends to every species of commercial intercourse between the United States and foreign nations, and among the several States. (*Ib.*, 193).

Like all other powers, it is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and has no other limitations than such as are prescribed it by the Constitution. (*Ib.*, 195.)

It is the power to prescribe rules by which commerce is to be governed. It seems to imply in its nature full power over the thing to be regulated, and necessarily excludes the action of all others that would perform the same operations on the same thing. (*Ib.*, 209.)

Sir, unless the United States have an ultimate, effectual decision and determination of conflicts between State and Federal power, the Constitution is a misnomer. A constitution of government and no power to govern without the consent of the constituent? Legislative authority to make laws, to be executed only at the will of those on whom they are to operate? Judiciary and executive power, to be met and opposed with effect by those from whom these powers emanated? A government containing in its constitution a revolutionary principle which can destroy it? And yet this dominated a government. Palpable absurdity. Your confederation was a "perpetual league," and its energies would be exerted upon the different members only by advice or actual force—war. The name and nature of this was changed, and we have a Constitution conferring legislative, judiciary, and executive powers as absolute upon those matters on which they are designed to act as such powers can be.

I am aware that, at times, States have attempted to put on airs and set up their own against Federal opinions. But they have always been in the wrong and were compelled to retract.

* * * * * * *

But, sir, agriculture has been specially protected. Of this I do not complain; far from it. It is the first, the great interest—the foundation of all the rest. The earth is to us what the mother is to the child—our best nurse, our dearest and kindest friend; and although she sometimes frowns on us in her storms, her blasts, and her pestilence, yet she again smiles in her gentle breezes, her refreshing showers, and genial sunshines; and when we arrive at the evening of life and need repose, she kindly receives us to sleep in her bosom. But, metaphor aside, I would speak practically to practical men. And I aver that no nation ever did more for agriculture than the United States has done. Indeed, none ever had the means. We commenced as the great landholder. The public lands were pledged to pay the public debt; but this was but a secondary consideration. The primary object was settlement, cultivation, wealth, strength—an extension of civilization and an augmentation of the means of happiness.

Every facility given to the purchase of these lands was a premium on agriculture. * * * It was bringing so much agricultural capital into the market at a reduced price. It, to be sure, diminished the value of this kind of capital already invested by overstocking the market, and it diminished the revenues of the capital by increasing the production.

* * * * * * *

It is said that the cotton-growers can never manufacture the raw material which they produce. It would seem strange that it is so; and one of the reasons given by the Senator from South Carolina is stranger still. It is this, that one of our enterprising Yankees erected a factory there, and a negro burnt it down. It is not stated that he was governed by the anti-tariff mania, nor what induced the incendiary to perpetrate the crime. But to make this case a good reason against the success of manufactures there, I suppose if the negro had burnt the owner's dwelling-house he ought to live out of doors, because houses would not succeed at all.

This anecdote might lead to a train of thinking upon the subject of a certain class of population, which I choose to exclude; and, when the Senator is disposed to be merry at the expense of New England, and sneer at our "wooden ware and notions," instead of retorting, I will join in the laugh. It is true, our "wooden ware," our elegant cabinet work, not excelled by any in the world, does not adorn the parlors, drawing-rooms, bedchambers, and even the churches, of the rich and the favored South. We are, in this sense, your "hewers of wood," if not your "drawers of water." But of one thing be assured, we do not intend to hew your wood or draw your water for nothing. We intend to be paid, and well paid, for it. And, as to our "notions," "I guess" that New England notions will bear comparison with any other notions whatever.

But, nevertheless, protection must be abandoned. It is "sectional and unequal"—"accursed, ruinous, fatal policy"—"a case of life and death" "Give us back the merchants bankrupted by our policy—the sailors, ships, farmers, and, above all, harmony," and we consent to—what? Why, that every factory shall be razed to its foundation! This, indeed, is very, very liberal; it looks quite like a compromise. Give me your food and raiment, and your money, too, and make me contented with it in the bargain; and, in consideration thereof, I will consent that you may go and starve. Sir, I have a small objection to the acceptance of this liberal offer—a want of reciprocity. We have now our all, nearly, vested in manufactures, and the industry of the country is engaged in them. We have no knowledge of any rich nabobs, nor of operators under taskmasters. These things may exist in the South, but they belong not to New England.

On the 2d of February, 1832, Mr. Clay contrasted the condition of the country during the period prior to the tariff of 1824 and during the period which followed the act of 1824, in the following graphic language:

Eight years ago it was my painful duty to present to the other House of Congress an unexaggerated picture of the general distress pervading the whole land. We must all yet remember some of its frightful features. We all know that the people were then oppressed and borne down by an enormous load of debt; that the value of property was at the lowest point of depression; that ruinous sales and sacrifices were everywhere made of real estate; that stop laws and relief laws and paper money were adopted to save the people from impending destruction; that a deficit in the public revenue existed, which compelled Government to seize upon and divert from its legitimate object the appropriation to the sinking fund to redeem the national debt; that our commerce and navigation were threatened with a complete paralysis. In short, sir, if I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the tariff of 1824.

I have now to perform the more pleasing task of exhibiting an imperfect sketch of the existing state of the unparalleled prosperity of the country. On a general survey we behold cultivation extended, the arts flourishing, the face of the country improved, our people fully and profitably employed, and the public countenance exhibiting tranquillity, contentment, and happiness. And if we descend into particulars, we have the agreeable contemplation of a people out of debt; land rising slowly in value, but in a secure

and salutary degree; a ready though not extravagant market for all the surplus productions of our industry; innumerable flocks and herds browsing and gamboling on ten thousand hills and plains covered with rich and verdant grasses; our cities expanded and whole villages springing up, as it were, by enchantment; our exports and imports increased and increasing; our tonnage, foreign and coastwise, swelling and fully occupied; the rivers of our interior animated by the perpetual thunder and lightning of countless steamboats; the currency sound and abundant; the public debt of two wars nearly redeemed; and, to crown all, the public treasury overflowing, embarrassing Congress, not to find subjects of taxation, but to select the objects which shall be liberated from the impost. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the establishment of their present Constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

This transformation of the condition of the country from gloom and distress to brightness and prosperity has been mainly the work of American legislation, fostering American industry, instead of allowing it to be controlled by foreign legislation, cherishing foreign industry. The foes of the American system, in 1824, with great boldness and confidence, predicted: First. The ruin of the public revenue, and the creation of a necessity to resort to direct taxation. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hayne], I believe, thought that the tariff of 1824 would operate a reduction of revenue to the large amount of eight millions of dollars. Second. The destruction of our navigation. Third. The desolution of commercial cities. And fourth. The augmentation of the price of objects of consumption, and further decline in that of the articles of our exports. Every prediction which they made has failed—utterly failed. Instead of the ruin of the public revenue with which they then sought to deter us from the adoption of the American system, we are now threatened with its subversion, by the vast amount of the public revenue produced by that system. Every branch of our navigation has increased. As to the desolation of our cities let us take, as an example, the condition of the largest and most commercial of all of them, the great Northern capital.

* * * * * * *

Thus, sir, has this great system of protection been gradually built, stone upon stone, and step by step, from the 4th July, 1789, down to the present period. In every stage of its progress it has received the deliberate sanction of Congress. A vast majority of the people of the United States has approved, and continues to approve it. Every Chief Magistrate of the United States, from Washington to the present, in some form or other, has given to it the authority of his name; and, however, the opinions of the existing President are interpreted south of Mason and Dixon's line, on the north they are, at least, understood to favor the establishment of a judicious tariff.

The question, therefore, which we are now called upon to determine is not whether we shall establish a new and doubtful system of policy, just proposed and for the first time presented to our consideration; but whether we shall break down and destroy a long-established system, patiently and carefully built up and sanctioned, during a series of years, again and again, by the nation and its highest and most revered authorities. And are we not bound deliberately to consider whether we can proceed to this work of destruction without a violation of the public faith? The people of the United States have justly supposed that the policy of protecting their industry against foreign legislation and foreign industry was fully settled, not by a single act, but by repeated and deliberate acts of Government, performed at distant and frequent intervals. In full confidence that the policy was firmly and unchangeably fixed, thousands upon thousands have invested their capital, purchased a vast amount of real and other estate, made permanent establishments, and accommodated their industry. Can we expose to utter and irretrievable ruin this countless multitude without justly incurring the reproach of violating the national faith?

Senator Ewing, of Ohio, in the course of a speech in the Senate, on the 17th day of February, 1832, describing the effect of the tariff of 1824 on the farming interest, said:

The state of things which I have dwelt upon somewhat at large was that of our whole country in 1823-'24. It was in the situation of the farmer, with his ten boys, who could find employment but for eight; and such, more especially, was the situation of the Middle and Western States. The low state to which our farming interest was reduced, the low price to which our fine lands and the products of lands had sunk, produced unexampled pecuniary distress, and called aloud for relief. Our statesmen were not slow in discovering the cause of the evil and in applying the remedy; hence their united support of the tariff of 1824—the merit of which I claim for them—for the Middle and Western States; and will not agree that it shall be transferred, as a subject of either praise or blame, to New England.

The effects anticipated from the tariff were such as have, in fact, followed it; and which, it is fair to say, resulted from it. Men and capital were transferred from agriculture to manufactures. In those sections of the Union, as New England, in which the land is poor and unproductive, and which abounds in capital, and is thickly peopled, their manufactures, which had once been prostrated by a ruinous competition, revived, and new ones were, to a vast extent, established. The competition of their labor and their capital was withdrawn from the farming interest, and that section of the Union, instead of contributing her mite, as before, to crowd and glut the market of the large Atlantic cities, with the products of agriculture, herself thereafter furnished the best and most certain market for the rich products of the West.

Senator Dallas of Pennsylvania concluded a speech in the Senate February 29, 1832, as follows:

If there be any—certainly there are none upon this floor—who seek to distract the peace and dissolve the bonds of our federative Government, who would put at hazard, in pursuit of temporary projects, or to indulge ambitious aspirants, the repose and institutions of the Republic, who contemplate change and revolution, I beseech such men to extend their forecasting vision into the future, and to confront posterity. Let them be warned by anticipating the judgment of that tribunal. The excitements of the day may be gratified; they may delude themselves into the belief that they are laboring to vindicate the Constitution, or to uphold the principles of human liberty, but if they recklessly involve the American people in the horrors, uncertainties, and fatal consequences of civil war, and of violent disruption, they must be content to receive, as a merited reward, an immortality of detestation.

Their party and paltry pretexts will be forgotten; their refined discrimination in theory, and their high-wrought declamation will be forgotten; even their virtuous passions will cease to extenuate their offense; and all posterity, struggling in vain to recombine the elements, and to rebuild the edifice of our great and glorious and happy Confederacy—amid the desolation of perpetual conflicts, and in the darkness of sectional bondage—will doom them to loud, deep, and everlasting execration. Let no man, sir, seek elevation or renown at the price of the National Union and tranquility. He will never find it. Failing, he must rank, during life, among the few outcasts whom we have yet engendered; and if he achieve his country's ruin, when dead, the burning lava of universal hatred will roll hissing over his grave; and, though like "the aspiring youth who fired the Ephesian dome," he should acquire fame, it will be the fame of bitter and boundless abhorrence.

Mr. Crawford of Pennsylvania, in the House May 29, 1832, said:

Our countrymen had, what is always found in company with character and honor, firm hearts, determined to redeem their situation, and conform, as far as might be, their habits and pursuits to their new condition. Bringing to their efforts economy and industry, it is to this much abused system that we are mainly indebted for a prosperity that has realized the dreams of the visionary, and overgone the calculations of the most sanguine. It is impossible to look upon the picture which the country north, east, and west, and a portion of that south of us, presents for the gratification of the mental eye, without shrinking from the idea that so much competency, and comfort, and happiness are to be destroyed, that the fountains of so much of all that is desirable are to be dried up, which only require to be kept open to furnish a stream of abundance and independence of useful occupation, and an adequate reward for it, which are the elements of individual and collective felicity.

Mr. Appleton of Massachusetts, in the House, May 30, 1832, said:

It must be apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the question of the tariff, as connected with the bill on your table, and the accompanying report of the Committee on Ways and Means, so eloquently explained and enforced by the honorable gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of that committee, assumes a character altogether new in this House. It is not a question of the general expediency of a system of protection to domestic manufactures; it is not a question of modification or improvement of the tariff; it presents the naked question, whether a system of protection, founded on impost duties is at war with the eternal principles of justice, and should consequently be abandoned? * * *

Under these circumstances, let me ask is South Carolina prepared to abandon the Union, and meet the horrors of a civil war, on the strength of the theory of the gentleman from South Carolina, for a nonenity—a mere abstraction—a figment of the brain? I am aware the excitement of South Carolina is no mockery. I agree with the gentleman that it is not the spirit of vaporing; but I believe it, to use his own works, "an arrant delusion, as antisocial as it is unjust." A fearful responsibility rests somewhere!

As to the honorable gentleman from South Carolina himself, it were little to say he is sincere: he is even beyond enthusiasm. I can attribute to him on this subject nothing short of downright fanaticism. I apply this word in the conviction of its truth, and in the spirit of charity. Who can have attended to the spirit of his whole address, without perceiving that his own mind is made up? Who can have noticed the kindling of his manner when he spoke of "glorious rebellion:" his picture of the prosperity of South Carolina in a state of separation; of the glorious harvest which free trade would furnish her; and not perceive that nothing short of the influence of fanaticism could have so wrought upon him, unless one could attribute to him the unholier motive of a criminal ambition?

South Carolina prosperous, separated from the Union! Her population doubled in ten years! What but infatuation can think so? What will free trade do for her? All the ports of the United States are as free now as they can be for foreign trade. Every article of foreign merchandise can be bought and sold in them for exportation, free of duty. In the language of the gentleman himself, I say to him, it is time to pause. For Heaven's sake pause!

Mr. Davis of Massachusetts, in the House, on the 6th of June, 1832, made a speech, which is valuable for its recital of the causes which brought about protective legislation, as well as an argument against the doctrine of secession. He said:

I must beg leave, if the committee will bear with me, to draw their attention to things forgotten, to go back into matters of history connected with the policy of this Government. It has been said, history is philosophy teaching by example. Whatever may be thought of this as an aphorism, it is unquestionably true that experiment is better than theory, and that our knowledge is greatly improved by the lessons of wisdom which lie in past times.

Whoever will examine our colonial history will not fail to learn that one of the great causes of discontent among the colonists and of complaint against the mother country was that she fettered the industry of the colonies. A distinguished statesman said, America shall not manufacture a hobnail.

So jealous was England of her own interests, so watchful of the prosperity of her manufactures, that she was unwilling we should shoe a horse without driving the nails forged by her labor. She lived up to this policy; compelled us to trade with her; boasted that we took her surplus goods, the orts and ends of her manufactures, such as no other people would buy; and that the trade greatly enriched her. This was all true; but it made our fathers almost as poor as the aborigines whom they had displaced. This unequal condition could not exist, and it by and by created discontent, which brought on the Revolution; the colonies were severed from the parent country, and the people of these States supposed themselves to be independent. They looked upon themselves as detached from Great Britain, and all other governments acknowledged them to be so, and such was the fact *de jure*, but *de facto* they were still miserably dependent, and continued so until they extricated themselves in the manner I shall point out.

The war terminated in 1783, and the country, by its great efforts, sacrifices, and privations, was naked and destitute. This being well known, peace was scarcely ratified before Great Britain emptied her warehouses of goods and poured them into this country. They were everywhere sold and the people everywhere became indebted, under the expectation that the produce of the land would pay. But in this they were deceived; for Great Britain then pursued the same policy as now; she would buy nothing she could produce. Corn, wheat, beef, pork, butter, and cheese were shut out of her markets by high duties; and the consequence was that a scene of desolation and distress ensued which beggars description. The pressure of private and public debt became so grievous as to be intolerable. The people could not extricate themselves from the meshes in which foreign countries had entangled them by regulating trade, while this country had no power to countervail such regulations. Their cattle, their farms, the whole fruits of a laborious and economical life, were swept away under judicial process to pay trifling debts, because, as labor had no value, property had next to none.

This was borne as long as a brave, resolute, and patient people could endure it; but when there seemed no alternative left but imprisonment for debt and starvation, they were wrought into madness, and began to inquire whether this was the fruit of the liberty they had achieved; and in this scene of discontent and dismay, that last and fearful remedy, rebellion, followed in one of the States at least. The people, in their despondence, offered open resistance to the courts, because executions came from that source; and they sought to overcome the process by which their property

was swept away, because they were unable to reach the real cause, and apply an efficient remedy to the real evil. It was soon seen that this violence and bloodshed endangered the liberties of the people, while it brought no relief from embarrassments. It was plain that debts could not be paid without the fruit of labor could be turned into money. It was equally plain that foreign countries had, by their regulations of trade, taken it out of our hands, and imposed such onerous conditions in favor of their own labor that we could not live under them. We had no regulations; it was, in every sense of the expression, a period of free trade such as is now earnestly sought for; and yet it was a period of dismay and distress such as had never been witnessed in this country.

How does this contrast with the picture of happiness which the glowing imaginations of the advocates of free trade in this House have described? Can we learn no wisdom from the calamities of that period. Or are we anxious for a repetition of those scenes of bankruptcy and ruin?

But let us see what the statesmen of that day thought and did to extricate themselves from the fatal embarrassments which beset them. They comprehended the cause of disaster; they saw that while they had no power to make general salutary regulations of foreign trade, other nations availed themselves of that circumstance to make regulations in favor of themselves, both oppressive and unjust toward the people of this country. They saw that such a state of things was equivalent to yielding to other powers the sole authority to legislate in matters of trade, and binding themselves to abide the provisions of such laws however injurious. They saw it differed but little from a state of colonial bondage, for Great Britain had at once so arranged the matter that she took more than all the profits of American labor.

The remedy for this evil was obvious. These selfish regulations could only be controlled by countervailing regulations, securing to our citizens benefits and advantages which would be an equivalent. This was the only remedy which could extricate the people from the net in which they were entangled; the only mode by which they could be relieved from British monopoly; for the right of foreign countries to make and maintain their laws could not be denied. Great exertions were therefore made to arrange a system of counteracting measures. The old confederation was, however, a mere league entered into by the States for belligerent purposes, and was in no respect adapted to the relations of peace. It conferred no power to regulate trade with foreign countries or among the States. The consequence was that these matters were left to be managed by the several States, and some levied duties and made regulations of one kind, some of another, and some made none.

This state of things was intolerable, and to obtain a system more efficient and beneficial, application was made by Congress to the States for a grant of power for this purpose by the Legislatures, but it was withheld by some and granted by others, with qualifications so variant and conflicting that it could not be exercised. Though the exertions to attain to this object had been great and powerful, yet the failure was so complete that all hope of success in that way was abandoned, and the most wise and sagacious statesmen began to look to a constitution forming a general government with larger powers, as the only remedy which could restore harmony and prosperity to a people poor and weary with contention. A proposition was made for a convention for that purpose. It was held, and the instrument which now forms the basis of this Government was framed, and having been sent to the people was ratified, and went into effect in 1789.

I now ask the attention of the committee to the doings of the first Congress. It met, and many of the members had been members of the convention which framed the Constitution. The first act passed, after providing for oaths of officers, had a twofold object: first, to restore public credit; and, second, to encourage American industry. And, lest there should be misapprehension as to this, the purposes of the act are distinctly set forth in the preamble. Can anyone pass these facts through his mind, and find a lingering doubt as to the objects of forming this Government? Can anyone review this history and then affirm that the principal object in giving a power in the Constitution to regulate trade was not to countervail foreign regulations and to aid American labor? But, sir, it is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the constitutional power. I have spoken of that on a former occasion, and my purpose now has been to glance only at the historical facts, for they need no argument to aid them.

What, permit me to ask, was the result of this wise policy? I can not do more ample justice to it than by quoting the language of a distinguished friend at a public festival—"the dead corpse of public credit sprang upon its feet." The effect on business was everywhere instantaneous and equally surprising. There was no interim between a state of deep, sullen depression and one of vigorous, laughing prosperity. This act, which laid the foundation of the great American policy, infused the vital principle into the drooping, disheartened spirits of all laborers. It restored a discontented community to tranquillity, and caused peace and happiness to pervade this widespread country; and from that day to this no people on earth have been blessed with such continued and eminent prosperity. If there be any parallel it has escaped my reading and my observation. What a contrast between free trade and the American policy! But to understand the wonderful vigor and power of industry when cherished and protected in its pursuits, let us follow this historical inquiry a little further.

The Constitution went into operation under all the load of Revolutionary debt which had been discharged; and the expenses of another war, amounting probably to $150,000,000, have been defrayed. This protecting act, and those which followed by strong duties, threw the whole navigating interest into our hands; we made and sailed our own vessels; it excluded all foreign vessels from the coasting trade; restored the fisheries to a better condition; did much for the mechanic arts and many kinds of manufactures; and restored the whole country to such a vigorous state of healthful action, giving to all employment and good wages, that the people of no nation have been so well fed, clothed, lodged, and felt so little of public burdens as the people of the United States; and now, sir, we have arrived at a period when the last remnant of public burden is about to be removed under the silent and easy operation of this system of public policy, which has been attended with such wonderful success that it seems almost to work by miraculous power.

Sir, is not this a fit season for joy, for mutual congratulations, for the outpouring of thankful hearts, for gratitude to Heaven for blessing with signal success the efforts of the Government to make a free, happy, enlightened people? And yet, what are we talking about? With these auspicious results before them, gentlemen are questioning the perpetuity of this Government; they endeavor to weaken our confidence in it; they talk boldly of disunion. What ingratitude! What disregard of the blessings of Heaven! It is the last topic which should find a place in the patriotic heart. It is a baleful deadly poison dashed into our cup which is overflowing with joy. Sir, I have not the power to express the sentiments which fill my mind. I can not give utterance to my surprise (and gentlemen will pardon me when I say my incredulity) when I hear them, at a crisis like this, talk of the oppression of this Government. I entreat them to escape for a while from their own gloomy reflections, to contemplate the unparalleled success of this Government; to behold the prosperity, the joy, the comfort, the happiness, it has everywhere diffused.

It has not, it is true, created kings or princes; it has failed, indeed, to satisfy the grasping hopes of the ambitious; but it has not failed of the object for which it was created; it has made a more enlightened, happy people than any other system of polity. I lament that the fervor, the glowing ardor, the untiring zeal, the eloquence, which I witness on this floor, is no better employed than in rousing suspicions and weakening public confidence in the free institutions of the country. I lament that it should be thought a grievous cause of complaint that a majority rules, and that a minority should be considered a more safe fiduciary of power than a majority.

These doctrines seem to unsettle the very principles upon which a republican government rests. And while I lament this perversion of reasoning, and that doctrines full of the evil spirit of revolution find even able advocates, I feel grieved that a rancorous and bitter spirit of hostility exists toward the free laborers of this country, for they constitute both the physical and moral strength of the nation; and you can not, sir, depress or injure them without giving the country a shock that will be felt at its remotest borders.

* * * * * * *

I desire the attention of the committee upon this subject, in its connection with the public policy of this Government. It involves momentous considerations, on which hang the destinies of our free institutions. The labor of the United States is divided into two kinds, free and slave. The latter is not labor, in the strict sense in which we employ the term, but the operation of capital, the same as we see it in horses and oxen. Slaves work not for themselves, and have nothing to hope or expect beyond the coarsest of food and clothing, and a hovel for a shelter. How widely different the objects of a freeman! He labors for himself and he aspires to objects beyond physical want. He aims at something higher than food, raiment, and lodging. He lifts his hopes to those moral and intellectual attainments which qualify him to become a free, enlightened, independent citizen, capable of appreciating the value of a republican government, and maintaining it by a discreet exercise of the elective franchise. Every voter is identified with and constitutes a portion of this Government; and nothing is more certain than that it will fall when the voters become too poor to educate their families—too poor to be enlightened themselves—too poor and debased to care whether they are freemen or slaves.

Sir, the laborer in this country—he who has no capital save the hands which God has given him—easily secures to himself all these inestimable blessings. Industry, economy, intelligence, and a fair fame, make him a pillar in society and a tower of strength to his Government. It is the earnings of labor which enable him to accomplish this. But if you curtail wages you lessen his means to become a useful citizen, and this course may be pursued until wages are as low as they are in Ireland; and then we shall have a people like the wretched potato population of that country. If the laborer is obliged to retrench expense because you reduce his pay, he will first spare his moral comforts, because physical wants are more urgent than moral. His family will cease to be educated, schools and churches will be diminished, and we may then look for that vice and profligacy which the enemies of manufactures and the mechanic arts have hitherto searched for in vain. Sir, I hope never to see the day when this Government shall be so unwise as to tear away the foundations on which it rests; when this nation shall disregard its peace and happiness by trafficking away its great moral power in an experiment upon England, to see if she can not be made to purchase a few bags more of cotton, and to sell us calicoes a cent or two in the yard cheaper.

Sir, let us not, in such a rash and foolish experiment, to gratify the insatiable avarice of the greedy planters, barter away the most precious of God's gifts—that lofty, manly spirit of independence which swells the bosom of the free, enlightened laborer. Let his heart continue to be filled with gratitude that he can safely depend on his own hands to supply the means of obtaining the moral and physical comforts of life. Such a laborer leans not on the rich for bread, nor does he look to the poorhouse as his ultimate home, but carries forth to his daily toil a proud consciousness that he can depend safely on his own hands; that the dependence between him and the rich is mutual, and as necessary to the one as to the other.

Mr. Evans, of Maine, in the House, June 11, 1832, said:

Mr Chairman, that the protective policy has contributed very much to the present prosperous and happy condition of this country, seems to me to scarcely admit of doubt. The honorable member from South Carolina [Mr. Mitchell] has inquired, "When was it not prosperous?" Sir, I think it was not prosperous during the period which intervened between the termination of the late war and the protective act of 1824. In that interval, as the gentleman himself declared, all the manufacturing interest which, under the influence of stern necessity, had grown up during the war was prostrated. Our navigation went abroad as before, but only to meet rivals where it had been accustomed to find employers.

The plains of Europe, which for a quarter of a century had been furrowed only by the massy wheels of artillery, now opened their bosoms to the implements of husbandry, and the sickle reaped its treasures where, for that long period, the falchion and the bayonet only had garnered in their dreadful harvests. Our agriculturists sent their productions abroad, but only to find producers where they had formerly found consumers. The consequence of this state of affairs everybody remembers. Commerce and avigation languished; manufactures were destroyed; agriculture was at its lowest depression; wages low; labor unemployed; real estate, farms, sacrificed; bankruptcy, dismay, and desolation spreading over the land.

This, sir, was not certainly a prosperous period. Now, all is reversed; labor is sure of employment and of remunerating wages. Agriculture finds a market and good prices; commerce and navigation are steadily advancing, and in a great degree prosperous. Population is rapidly multiplying. Towns and villages are springing up on the margins of all our rivers and streams, and in the interior of the country, and great public improvements, connecting the whole country together, are rapidly constructing. The condition of the people is wonderfully improved. The means of education are enjoyed and improved by the children of those who in their day had none. The physical and moral energies of the whole country are exerted to make it a great, and wealthy, and happy nation. Surely no man can look abroad over this land without beholding everywhere the signs of visible improvement, of great success, of extended prosperity.

The honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bell] has said that these were "vulgar evidences" of national prosperity. He did not inform us what are to be considered as refined proofs. Be they "vulgar" or not, no man can mistake them. They are palpable to the senses. We see them; we feel them; we hear them, and we can not mistake them. The gentleman very correctly remarks that we should not look at individuals, or particular towns, or districts, or States as evidence of the general prosperity, but should cast our eyes over the whole Union to observe the welfare of the whole. This is unquestionably the duty of every statesman. But, sir, national wealth and prosperity are only the aggregate of individual wealth and prosperity. Where these are generally diffused and extensively enjoyed, it is not a very "vulgar" evidence of public prosperity—of national strength. * * *

Mr. Doubleday, of New York, in the House, June 11, 1832, said:

I come, then, Mr. Speaker, to the conclusion that the Federal Constitution is a compact between the different States of this Union, as sovereign States;

that as no common arbiter has been appointed, each State, in the exercise of its inherent sovereignty, has a right to judge for itself of the infractions of the Constitution and of the mode and measure of redress, and consequently the right to resist or defend itself against unconstitutional and arbitrary power by the Federal Government or any of its departments; that this right is to be exercised under the deep and solemn responsibility of producing disunion or civil war; that when a State has determined to resist the measures of the Federal Government, whether it be a law of Congress or a decision of the Supreme Court, the Federal Government, if it resolves to enforce its measures, acts under the same deep responsibility, in which the people of the other States will participate unless they instruct their agents (their Representatives here) to repeal or desist from the prosecution of the obnoxious measures; and finally, that if the State assuming this attitude will not yield, and the Federal Government persists, there must either be a dissolution of the Union or an appeal to the sword. Our reliance that we shall never be reduced to this extremity is on a rigid adherence to the Constitution and that spirit of conciliation and concession in which the Constitution was formed.

Mr. Denny, of Pennsylvania, in the House, June 12, 1832, said:

The true question, notwithstanding all that has been said and although it has been called "a delusion," is, shall we prefer the productions of foreign labor and foreign countries to the productions of our own citizens and of our own country? Shall we protect and foster the industry of our own citizens, or shall we permit it to be destroyed by an unequal and unfair competition with foreigners? In the proportion that foreigners throw into our market their productions, in the same proportion is the industry of our country impaired and the laboring class deprived of the means of subsistence: and foreign labor takes the place of our own. If the foreign manufactures glut our market with their manufactures we become the principal sufferers. How to protect ourselves, how to protect the industry of our own citizens, and encourage labor, how to rescue us from a dependence upon foreigners, is the great object of the American system and the true foundation of the wealth of the nation.

We all agree that labor, workmanship, is wealth. Nations are made of individuals; national wealth is made up of individual labor and workmanship; diminish labor, throw it out of employment, and you diminish national wealth. If you substitute foreign labor for our own, you increase foreign wealth at the expense of our own nation. Throw ten or twenty thousand laborers out of employment by introducing the produce of foreign laborers and you inflict a serious injury upon the country, and confer a corresponding benefit upon the foreign country. That community is always the most prosperous in which there is full employment of labor. Those are wise measures of a government which add to the means of employing industry, and equally wise are those which tend to preserve or protect the productive industry of the country from the injurious operation of foreign regulations, from ruinous and unequal contest with foreign industry, and from a desperate competition with foreign bankrupts or foreign pauper labor in our own market. Such a policy is wise, it is dictated by sound sense, by the universal principle of self-preservation, and is pursued by every intelligent nation.

Labor must find something to operate upon; it is in the power, and it is the duty of a wise government to aid in giving such a direction to labor as shall best promote the interests of the country; and those interests are best promoted when the labor of the citizens is judiciously employed upon the resources of the country. Strictly speaking, it may be said that the basis of the wealth and power of a nation consists in its internal resources, physical, moral, and intellectual; these mutually aid each other. Physical resources call for, invite the exercise of, and furnish employment to, the intellectual and moral energies of a people intrusted with them. These intellectual and moral energies are stimulated to devise new modes and facilities for judiciously and most advantageously developing the physical resources, so that the nation shall derive from them in the fullest manner all the benefits which they are calculated to confer. Unless the nation avails itself of these resources the possession of them is of no account. * * * *

Mr. Choate of Massachusetts, in the House, June 13, 1832, said:

Upon the whole, sir, I submit that it has not been ascertained since 1824 or 1828, that no further protection is necessary, nor that the proposed degree of reduced protection is all which is necessary.

Well, sir, has it been ascertained that protection is unavailing and inexpedient, it being now discovered to be impossible to introduce domestic manufactures by such means at all, or at least without great and disproportionate expense? Let it be premised that it is only four years since the system was consummated. Even if you date back from 1824, it is quite too short a time to develop the fair action of a complex policy like this. He is a bold statesman, and that is a bold party and a bold Administration, which will say that the result of such an experiment has demonstrated that this kind of industry can not be engrafted upon the stock of the masculine morality, energetic habits, the skill, perseverance, and frugality of this people. However the system had operated, nobody could say it had failed on a fair trial and therefore should be abandoned.

But I go further. I ask every member of this committee, if even the brief and in some respects unfavorable experiment which has been made does not prove conclusively that this seed is sown on good ground, and that, although it is yet but in the blade and the green ear, it will shoot higher and bring forth of full corn in the ear a hundred fold. You have not overrated the capacities of your country nor erred in your vision of her greatness. We see far enough to know that whatever of wealth, power, enjoyment, and aggrandizement a diversified, preserving, rewarded, intellectual industry will bestow upon a nation is already within our grasp. We see far enough to know that the same great power of the social world which reared and which upholds the strong columns of England's ocean throne will carry us up also to the same dazzling elevation, and cover us over, in the fulness of time, with the same brightness of glory. *Sic tibi etiam itur ad astra.*

Gentlemen say, however, that they admit you can introduce and establish manufactures by a protective policy, but it will cost too much. The price paid by the consumers of the country is too high, and the remuneration which we anticipate is too remote and too inadequate. Sir, this does not come to the point. You expected it would cost something thus to introduce manufactures when you adopted this policy. You expected a temporary enhancement of prices to the consumers, and you look forward to a great ultimate national compensation, overbalancing this sacrifice, "casting your bread upon the waters to receive it again after many days."

The true question is this: Has it been proved, by the experiment of these eight years, that it will cost more than you expected to establish manufactures by a protective policy? Do prices stand higher, or is domestic competition less enterprising and successful, or have manufactures thriven more feebly than you anticipated, rendering it probable that you will be forced to give, not too much for the whistle, but more than you meant to give. Sir, the reverse of all this has happened. The friends and foes of the system have alike been disappointed by its splendid and quick success. Prices have fallen from some cause, competition is crowded and bold, and manufactures have multiplied themselves, if it so pleases the gentleman from Tennessee, "beyond the dreams of avarice" or of enthusiasm.

Has the experiment proved that the successful introduction of manufactures, by aid of this kind of legislation, works out in any way an overbalance of national injury? Does it operate to diminish revenue or to depress trade, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, and the wages of labor? Do the great cities wither under this curse? Does the country wither under it? Does it begin to develop antirepublican and aristocratical influences in our society? No, sir. The gentleman from Tennessee himself admits that the eye of man never reposed upon a more soothing spectacle of general enjoyment and prosperity than that which this whole land—excepting only, what I do not except, the Southern region of misery—this moment presents. "Thrice happy, if we but knew our happiness."

Will it be said, however, that public sentiment has at length declared against the system, and that this is a new fact, relieving you of your pledge and requiring you to retrace your steps? Sir, it should be borne in mind that the Government settled this policy against a very divided public opinion, and therefore the continuance of such a divided opinion ought to be cautiously received, as a reason for receding from it. I do not know that in 1824 the weight of opinion was not against the protecting tariff. The literary press of this country and of England, the professed and perhaps sincere sentiments of British statesmen given out in Parliament about that time, the whole navigating and commercial interests, the united East and South, some of the first abilities of the day in Congress, encountered by great abilities, it is true, on the other side; these were against it, and yet it was adopted.

Was anybody so weak as to suppose that a trial of eight years would convert all this body of opposition over to the tariff? Can you, then, honorably urge this anticipated continuance of hostility, supposing it were undiminished, as a reason for giving up a system with which so many interests have since been intertwined, and which you adopted in defiance of that hostility? But, sir, that is not all. Every candid man who hears me will admit that public sentiment is more favorable to the preservation of the tariff than it was to its passage. The press, the elections, the voice of the Northern States, Maryland, of East Tennessee—everything proves it. * * *

Mr. Burges of Rhode Island (in the House, June 16, 1832) took the floor.

He commenced by saying that government and laws were established in aid of human labor, and that these aids were given to labor that, by its operations, human wants might be supplied and the condition of the human race improved? Not only laws and government, he said, but institutions for defense, for health, and for instruction, as well as machinery and land, were all instruments in the hand of labor; and all men, whether employed in furnishing or in using all these, were alike workingmen, fellow-laborers together in the great field of national toil, where every man is interested, and each one expects to be a sharer in the harvest, whether abundant or scanty, of national production. They all labor, not merely that they may accumulate, but that they may consume; not by avarice to store up, but, by the blessing of God, to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

* * * * * * *

We are told by the sages of South Carolina, or at least by one of them, that he who, by a sale of his own commodities, purchases those of others is truly the producer of those commodities. It has been gravely stated in this House that the Southern planter is a manufacturer of hardware, cotton and woolen cloths, whenever he exports his cotton, rice, and tobacco to Liverpool and exchanges them for those fabrics. These planters are thus manufacturers to the amount of $20,000,000, because they are growers of cotton, rice, and tobacco, exported to the amount of $20,000,000. They complain of the American system because it does not permit them as Southern manufacturers to bring their hardware, cotton, and woolen cloths into the American market free of duty, but does permit the Northern manufacturers to bring their fabrics into that market free of duty.

What a scheme of piracy and plunder is disclosed by this doctrine! The clods of this earth to whom accident may have furnished wealth can easily purchase the works of genius and labor, either mental or bodily, and they, by this purchase, become the producers of whatever may have adorned human ingenuity or effort in all the walks of science, letters, and art, whether useful or ornamental. Can we by the vile incantation of money call down from their splendid mansions and enwrap ourselves in the beams of glory of those men who, beginning with Moses and Homer, have risen age after age on the admiring eyes of mortals and now adorn and irradiate the whole firmament of the intellectual world? For if we can, by purchase, appropriate to ourselves the skill of the humblest artisan, so may we in like manner purchase the ingenuity of the most distinguished artist. The mere man of acres and slaves, because he grows cotton, can, therefore, by his own skill, build palaces or temples, adorn them with paintings or statuary, and fill his libraries with the science and literature of all ages, from the fertile and abundant resources of his own plantation.

Surprising discovery! Wonderful man who has "sought out so many inventions!" Has he purchased the orations of Cicero, of Demosthenes, or the divine rhapsodies of Homer, Virgil, Milton? Then is he truly, according to his own showing, the producer of these incomparable works. One-sixth part of the annual labor of some faithful slave, a single bag of cotton, has made this man of miracles the great author of all those works which have given immortality to men both in the ancient and modern world! Did any one of us, while at the schools, admire any of these once the divine productions of antiquity; and are we now at times lighted up by scintillations from their holy fires? Why, sir, all this is mere darkness before the brilliancy of this wonder of our age; who, by the simple agency of a solitary slave, has really become the very incarnation of all the poetry and eloquence of all time.

This new potency of bargain and sale is truly a sublime discovery. All relations heretofore on earth seem to dissolve under it. The very mules of the West, sent down in droves and sold in South Carolina, acquire a new paternity by that sale, and thenceforth are the production of those planters who purchase them. Still more wonderful, had this very man who achieved this discovery made cotton and exchanged it not for books, but for slaves, he would not be a maker of poetry and orations, but, in the place of literature he would do no more than make slaves.

THE COMPROMISE ACT OF 1833.

When Congress assembled, President Jackson, in his fourth annual message, discussed the tariff and recommended that it should be dealt with so that none could complain of injustice. Referring to the arguments of the opponents of a protective tariff, he said:

A large portion of the people in one section of the Republic declares it not only inexpedient on these grounds, but as disturbing the equal relations of property by legislation, and, therefore, unconstitutional and unjust.

Doubtless these effects are, in a great degree, exaggerated, and may be ascribed to a mistaken view of the considerations which led to the adoption

of the tariff system; but they are, nevertheless, important in enabling us to review the subject with a more thorough knowledge of all its bearings upon the great interests of the Republic, and with a determination to dispose of it so that none can, with justice, complain.

It was evident, as soon as Congress convened, that the final contest concerning the protective policy was about to be waged, and that the policy of the Government, as evidenced by the acts of 1824 and 1828, was to be reversed; not because the country did not prosper under a protective tariff, but at the demand of the South; that while the Administration, by vigilance and firmness, had quelled for the time being the incipient rebellion in South Carolina, the legislative department was to allow the Government to be coerced into a course admittedly detrimental to the prosperity of the country. The Secretary of the Treasury urged upon Congress a reduction of duties. The portion of the President's message relating to the tariff was referred in the House to the Committee on Ways and Means, of which Mr. Verplank, of New York, was chairman.

Although the tariff bill of the previous session had been passed with the hope of satisfying South Carolina, and, as we have seen, by a large majority, it was now evident that to conciliate the South the protective policy was to be abandoned. On the 27th of December a tariff bill was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means.

It would be profitable to trace, in this connection, the proceedings of Congress concerning the threat of South Carolina to prevent the execution of the laws of the United States within her borders, and the discussion of the proposed tariff legislation, but it is only my present purpose to show that the act known as the compromise act of 1833 was passed to conciliate the South, and on account of the hostility of that section to the tariff system.

The abandonment of the protective policy at the behest of the South was not made without a protest, and the doctrine of nullification was ably discussed and forcibly denounced. Senator Poindexter of Mississippi, on the 19th of February, 1833, commenced a speech as follows:

I can not hope that any effort of mine will operate to arrest the action of this body; but the people whose future peace and happiness and everything dear to them is involved in the issue of this great struggle may find in the investigation of this subject the means of arriving at proper conclusions in relation to it. I feel the responsibility of the position which I occupy.

I know how vain it would be to indulge the belief that, with the simple weapons of reason and of truth, I could overcome the dumb eloquence of numbers so forcibly displayed in this Hall, arrayed in solid phalanx to carry into effect purposes of desolation and blood, which can neither be mistaken nor obviated save only by the deleterious results which may be felt in all their fury by a reaction on the heads of those who have contributed to put this ball of civil discord in motion. Under such discouraging circumstances I must be permitted to say that my views of this momentous question will be addressed to the calm and dispassionate consideration of a free and enlightened people, who alone can control the movements of this Government; and I wish it to be distinctly understood that I expect not, hope not, and mean not, to make an impression within these walls.

The theory of nullification, so freely denounced, and so much deprecated by honorable Senators who have preceded me in this debate, it is not my purpose at present to examine. When consolidation and the total prostration of the last vestige of State sovereignty is made the desideratum on which alone the Union can be perpetuated, I mean not to cavil about the remedy by which so great an evil may be averted. If, sir, I am left to choose between a total overthrow of the happy system erected by the wisdom of the patriots who framed the Constitution, and some efficient remedy to maintain it, I will not hesitate in the course which duty and patriotism so plainly indicate.

Mr. Clay, who was known as the father of the protective system, introduced in the Senate the bill which was to doom the protective system to a lingering death. His excuse for so doing I give in his own words.

On February 12, 1833, speaking on the proposed modification of the tariff, he said:

When I survey, sir, the whole face of our country, I behold all around me evidences of the most gratifying prosperity—a prospect which would seem to be without a cloud upon it were it not that through all parts of the country there exist great dissensions and unhappy distinctions, which, if they can possibly be relieved and reconciled by any broad scheme of legislation adapted to all interests, and regarding the feelings of all sections, ought to be quieted; and, leading to which object, any measure ought to be well received.

In presenting the modification of the tariff laws which I am now about to submit, I have two great objects in view. My first object looks to the tariff. I am compelled to express the opinion, formed after the most deliberate reflection and on a full survey of the whole country, that, whether rightfully or wrongfully, the tariff stands in imminent danger. If it should even be preserved during this session, it must fall at the next session. By what circumstances and through what causes has arisen the necessity for this change in the policy of our country I will not pretend now to elucidate. Others there are who may differ from the impressions which my mind has received upon this point. Owing, however, to a variety of concurrent causes, the tariff as it now exists is in imminent danger, and if the system can be preserved beyond the next session it must be by some means not now within the reach of human sagacity.

The fall of that policy, sir, would be productive of consequences calamitous indeed. When I look to the variety of interests which are involved, to the number of individuals interested, the amount of capital invested, the value of the buildings erected, and the whole arrangement of the business for the prosecution of the various branches of the manufacturing art which having sprung up under the fostering care of this Government, I can not contemplate any evil equal to the sudden overthrow of all those interests. History can produce no parallel to the extent of the mischief which would be produced by such a disaster. The repeal of the edict of Nantes itself was nothing in comparison with it. That condemned to exile and brought to ruin a great number of persons. The most respectable portion of the population of France were condemned to exile and ruin by that measure. But in my opinion, sir, the sudden repeal of the tariff policy would bring ruin and destruction on the whole people of this country. There is no evil, in my opinion, equal to the consequences which would result from such a catastrophe.

* * * * * * *

If there be any who want civil war, who want to see the blood of any portion of our countrymen spilt, I am not one of them; I wish to see war of no kind; but, above all, do I not desire to see a civil war. When war begins, whether civil or foreign, no human foresight is competent to foresee when, or how, or where it is to terminate. But when a civil war shall be lighted up in the bosom of our own happy land, and armies are marching, and commanders are winning their victories, and fleets are in motion on our coast, tell me, if you can—tell me, if any human being can tell its duration? God alone knows where such a war will end. In what state will be left our institutions? In what state our liberties? I want no war; above all, no war at home.

Sir, I repeat, that I think South Carolina has been rash, intemperate, and greatly in the wrong; but I do not want to disgrace her, nor any other member of this Union. No; I do not desire to see the luster of one single star dimmed of that glorious Confederacy which constitutes our political sun; still less do I wish to see it blotted out, and its light obliterated forever. Has not the State of South Carolina been one of the members of this Union in "days that tried men's souls?" Have not her ancestors fought alongside our ancestors? Have we not, conjointly, won together many a glorious battle? If we had to go into a civil war with such a State, how would it terminate? Whenever it should have terminated, what would be her condition? If she should ever return to the Union, what would be the condition of her feelings and affections? What the state of the heart of her people? She has been with us before, when her ancestors mingled in the throng of battle, and as I hope our posterity will mingle with hers for ages and centuries to come in the united defense of liberty, and for the honor and glory of the Union. I do not wish to see her degraded or defaced as a member of this Confederacy.

Mr. Clay, on February 25, 1833, said:

The friends of free trade insist that duties should be laid in reference to revenue alone. The friends of American industry say that another, if not paramount, object in laying them should be to diminish the consumption of foreign and increase that of domestic products.

* * * * * * *

All that was settled in 1816, in 1824, and in 1828 was that protection should be afforded by high duties without regard to the amount of the revenue which they might yield. During that whole period we had a public debt which absorbed all the surpluses beyond the ordinary wants of Government.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, I want to be perfectly understood as to the motives which have prompted me to offer this measure. I repeat what I said on the introduction of it, that they are, first, to preserve the manufacturing interest; and secondly, to quiet the country. I believe the American system to be in the greatest danger; and I believe it can be placed on a better and safer foundation at this session than at the next.

* * * * * * *

No, Mr. President, it is not destruction, but preservation, of the system at which we aim. If dangers now assail it, we have not created them. I have sustained it upon the strongest and clearest convictions of its expediency. They are entirely unaltered. Had others who avow attachment to it supported it with equal zeal and straightforwardness, it would be now free from embarrassment; but with them it has been a secondary interest. I utter no complaints—I make no reproaches. I wish only to defend myself now, as heretofore, against unjust assaults. I have been represented as the father of this system, and I am charged with an unnatural abandonment of my offspring. I have never arrogated to myself any such intimate relation to it. I have, indeed, cherished it with paternal fondness, and my affection is undiminished.

But in what condition do I find this child? It is in the hands of the Philistines, who would strangle it. I fly to its rescue, to snatch it from their custody and to place it on a bed of security and repose for nine years, where it may grow and strengthen, and become acceptable to the whole people. I behold a torch about being applied to a favorite edifice, and I would save it, if possible, before it was wrapt in flames, or at least preserve the precious furniture which it contains. I wish to see the tariff separated from the politics of the country, that business men may go to work in security, with some prospect of stability in our laws, and without everything being staked on the issue of elections, as it were on the hazards of the die.

* * * * * * *

If we adjourn without any permanent settlement of the tariff in what painful suspense and terrible uncertainty shall we not leave the manufacturers and business men of the country? All eyes will be turned with trembling and fear to the next session. Operations will be circumscribed, and new enterprises checked; or, if otherwise, ruin and bankruptcy may be the consequence. I believe, sir, this measure, which offers a reasonable guaranty for permanency and stability, will be hailed by practical men with pleasure. The political manufacturers may be against it, but it will command the approbation of a large majority of the business manufacturers of the country.

Mr. Davis of Massachusetts, in the House, February 25, 1833, said:

I am greatly surprised at the sudden movement made in this House. One short hour ago, we were collecting our papers and putting on our outside garments to go home, when the gentleman from Kentucky rose and proposed to send this bill to a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union with instructions to strike it all out and insert, by way of amendment, an entire new bill, formed upon entirely different principles; yes, to insert, I believe, the bill which the Senate now have under consideration. This motion was carried; the business has passed through the hands of the committee, is now in the House, and there is a cry of "Question!" "Question!" around me upon the engrossment of the bill. Who that was not a party to this arrangement could one hour ago have credited this?

We have, I believe, been laboriously engaged for eight weeks upon this topic, discussing and amending the bill which has been before the House. Such obstacles and difficulties have been met at every move, that I believe very little hope has of late been entertained of the passage of any bill. But a gleam of light has suddenly burst upon us; those that groped in the dark seemed suddenly to see their course; those that halted, doubted, hesitated, are in a moment made firm; and even some of those that have made an immediate abandonment of the protective system a *sine qua non* of their approbation of any legislation, seem almost to favor this measure.

* * * * * * *

Peacemakers, mediators, men who allay excitements and tranquillize public feeling, should above all considerations study to do it by means not of-

fensive to the contending parties, by means which will not inflict a deeper wound than the one which is healed. Sir, what is demanded by those that threaten the integrity of the Union? An abandonment of the American system, a formal renunciation of the right to protect American industry. This is the language of the nullification convention. They declare they regard the abandonment of the principle as vastly more important than any other matter; they look to that, and not to an abatement of duties without it; and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Davis], with his usual frankness, told us this morning it was not a question of dollars and cents; the money they regarded not, but they required a change of policy. They demand the pound of flesh, with the unyielding obstinacy of Shylock; and they require this House to apply the knife nearest to the heart; and shall it be cut away? Is it patriotic? Is it harmonizing public feeling? Is it saving the Union to drain out the life blood? What is this bill? I will not say it goes at once to such extremities, but it seems to me to contain a principle which works an unqualified abandonment of the protective policy, unless changes greater than we have a right to look for shall take place in our condition.

* * * * * * *

What will be the effect of this bill? The protection will be diminished from year to year. This will check the operations of capital; it will, I fear, stop investments, if it does not crush that enterprising, valuable class of young men who have entered upon business, relying upon their industry and capacity to carry them forward. They are in debt, and I fear timid creditors may fall upon them. Business then will be brought to a stand at any rate, and if bankruptcies ensue, will be diminished. This is precisely what some interested in manufacturing are selfish enough to desire, for they have money; wages will be cheaper if a portion of the mills cease to run and no new ones are erected, and the capitalists will by this means, in the end, gain more by a diminution in the competition in business and the reduction in wages than they will lose by the reduction in duties.

But, sir, this is a policy founded in such naked selfishness; it is built up so manifestly at the expense of those who have small capital, and of the laborers; it is so hostile to the first principles of protection which invite the free investment of capital from all quarters, that goods may be made cheap by the competition and the public be thus benefited, that no friend of American labor can give it his approbation on that ground. It may answer for a time the purposes of a few, if it operates as they anticipate; but should this prove so, it will be an unanswerable argument with the public for disapproving of it, for the causes which will make the measure valuable to some will make it injurious to the public.

Again, sir, I can vote for no bill which abandons protection. I think this does. It adopts the Carolina system for equalizing duties, by bringing them all to 20 per cent. It abandons the exercise of all right to discriminate, and in that, give me leave to say, abandons common sense, for the system of equalization has never, to my knowledge, until now found an advocate among financiers or political economists. It is, however, a very cunningly devised plan and worthy of its origin (Gallatin, in the free-trade report), for it contains a sweet poison that will destroy the last remnant of protection.

Mr. E. Everett of Massachusetts, in the House February 25, 1833, said:

He considered the bill, as originally reported in the Senate, as a total, an absolute abandonment of the protective system after 1842—at best, it was but a lease to the manufacturers for seven or eight years, or, perhaps, more properly speaking, a notice to wind up their concerns within that time; their destruction was slow, but sure. The existing protection was to go down, down, from year to year, until the end of the term, when the existing establishments were to be abandoned by the Government. He said the existing establishments, for new ones could not be expected. Prudent capitalists would not venture in a sinking concern.

About the same time was given that was allowed the bank to wind up; and were theirs a mere money business, they would have less reason to complain; but, unfortunately, their capital was fixed, and must be sacrificed. Factories and machinery were of no value unless in operation. The owners of flocks were not in a much less hopeless condition. He repeated that the bill, as originally laid on their tables, abandoned the protective policy. It reduced all duties to the same level, 20 per cent. Even the principle of discriminating duties was abandoned. In its present form, he admitted that principle was faintly perceptible.

Mr. Burges, of Rhode Island, in the House, February 26, 1833, said:

I protest against this measure, continued Mr. Burges, because, like that which has been stricken out of the bill to make room for its insertion, it proposes to provide for the wants of the Government, but does not propose to make any provision for the wants of the nation. It calls on the people for money to feed that Government, and at the same time takes away that protection of their labors by which the people have hitherto been enabled to feed themselves. Not less than 1,715,000 free white workingmen are annually employed in the agricultural, mechanic, and manufacturing labor of the Eastern, Northern, and Western States of this Union.

That part of these men thus employed in mechanic and manufacturing labor depend on that part of them employed in agricultural labor, in the same and other States, for a market for their fabrics; and a supply in return of food—of corn, wheat, flour, beef, pork, and other provisions—amounting annually to more than $27,000,000. They also look to them, and to other producers in many of the States, for a further market for like fabrics; and expect in exchange the products of their lands and mines, equal to $15,000,000 in amount annually. Those employed in the farming and mineral labors of these States look to such as are engaged in these mechanic and manufacturing labors for this market for their products, and therein for their supply, by this exchange, of those various manufactured fabrics annually to this great amount.

By the destruction of this mechanic and manufacturing labor, men employed in agriculture, whether on their own lands, or farming the lands of others, must lose that market; and not only lose their annual supply of those fabrics heretofore purchased in it, but their annual production left on their hands for want of a market, must, to this amount, annually be utterly lost to them. For in no other market of the world could they sell their breadstuffs and provisions, their wool, their lead, their iron, and steel.

* * * * * * *

How do the provisions of this bill insure the destruction of that system? By the utter abandonment of even the very principle of discriminating, countervailing, or protecting duties of impost on imported goods, wares, and merchandise. At the end of ten years these duties, that is, the whole system of imposts, are to be reduced to 20 per cent ad valorem, and to stand at that rate upon all imported commodities, such as are produced in our own country, by our own domestic industry.

* * * * * * *

This evil will fall on the whole country, and will be a just retribution for the cruel and unrelenting ruin which this profligate measure will have brought on the many hundreds of thousands of free, white workingmen, now employed in the mechanic, manufacturing and agricultural labors of the free States. When the domestic manufacturers, the owners of the mills and machines, by the working of which those men now earn their bread, and that of their families; when these owners find they must surrender a tenth part of their protection—a tenth part of the impost, over and above 20 per cent of the whole, they will call on their workingmen to surrender a like tenth part of their wages, or to leave their employment.

When will this first call be made? In the very dead of the next winter, when they and their families must perish or have employment. It will be repeated annually at that season. They will surrender rather than hear their children cry for bread when they have none to give them. This demand on labor for a reduction of wages will be repeated once a year, just as often as this bill makes a like reduction of the rate of that impost by which manufacturing labor and capital are now protected. At the end of ten years, when the whole protection is taken away, the wages of labor will be reduced to 20 per cent of its present amount. What a consummation of what a scheme!

Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, in the House, February 26, 1833, on the tariff, said:

That he was opposed to all further legislation at this time on the subject of the tariff. This Congress had already acted upon the subject. We have passed one law, and are *functus officio*. If the act of the last session, passed with so much unanimity as a final adjustment of this vexed question, is again to be disturbed, let it be by other hands; let us not be driven by a handful of nullifiers into a repeal of our own legislation before it has gone into effect, and before anyone can foresee whether its operation is to be beneficial or injurious. If we degrade ourselves by such an act of inconsistency the world can assign but one reason for our course, and that will be that a majority of 2 to 1 have been compelled to surrender their own deliberate judgment to the threats of a few nullifiers, thereby recognizing and establishing nullification, not only as a peaceable but as an efficient and constitutional remedy, proclaiming to the world that the United States is not a Government but a thing to be governed by the passions, whims, and caprices of each and every State in this Union.

* * * * * * *

Some gentlemen, however, indulge the hope that whatever is now surrendered will be recovered hereafter. This, he feared, was a vain hope. But why pass an act destructive to the best interests of the country, with the hope that those who come after us will repeal it? Will such an excuse as this satisfy our constituents? Will it satisfy our own convictions of public duty? But we are told by others that our successors will do worse; that they will destroy the whole system; that they will entirely repeal the act of 1832. We are therefore called upon to destroy this act, to murder our own offspring, lest it might perish by other hands, to cut our own throats to prevent others from doing it. "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." Let us live while we can. If the country must be destroyed, let the sin rest upon other heads. Let us do right, and leave the responsibility of doing wrong to others.

* * * * * * *

But, sir, if this precedent is to be now established by yielding to the demands of nullification; if the Constitution and laws of this Union are to be canceled by the South Carolina ordinance; if the legislation of Congress is to be repealed at the pleasure of every State in the Union; if our Government, established at the expense of so much blood and treasure, is thus to be overthrown and destroyed, I for one said Mr. S., shall escape the sin and the reproach by voting against this bill.

If, sir, the effect of the adoption of this measure shall be (as he firmly believed it would) to sap the foundations of the national prosperity, destroy millions of capital, and throw thousands of industrious people out of employment; if its effects should be to reduce to the level of the paupers of England the free and now prosperous labor of the country, to grind down alike the wages of the farmer and mechanic, to exhaust our currency, and spread poverty, wretchedness and ruin far and wide over this now prosperous and happy land, his constituents, to whom he was much indebted, should never have it in their power to say to him, "You contributed to bring this ruin upon us."

Senator Sprague, of Maine, on the 26th of February, 1833, made a speech, which for force and argument deserves a place among the great speeches made in Congress. He said:

This new school in politics teaches that the several States have, by the Constitution, only delegated certain powers, which each may resume at pleasure. The United States have the power to declare war, but each State has the reserved right to annul it, and be herself at peace. The United States may make treaties, but each State may, *ad libitum*, revoke this authority and terminate the compact. Express prohibitions are imposed upon the States; they may not declare war, make treaties, coin money, emit bills of credit, pass *ex post facto* laws, or those impairing contracts; and yet every State has reserved the right, at any moment, to cast off all these prohibitions.

She is fettered, indeed, but just so long only as it may be her sovereign will and pleasure! And actually to throw off all these restraints, to resume all these powers, is not revolution—it is legal, peaceable, constitutional remedy! It is pursuant to the Constitution, within its scope; and the State is still a member of the Union! The United States, the Constitution, and the Government, it is said, are but agents, a mere aggregation of delegated powers; yet the agency may be revoked, the delegation terminated, and the Constitution and Government remain! It will be no revolution! Can anything be more preposterous?

Sir, we all admit the original inalienable right of man, individually and collectively, to resent oppression, to overturn and destroy government, when, by perversions and corruptions, it has become subversive of the ends for which it was instituted. But this is the primary right of force, of revolution, of rebellion, by which government is overthrown and subverted. It is not pursuant to the law of the land; it is above and beyond it; it is in defiance of oppressive legislation. Can the destruction of the Government be legal? Can the annihilation of the Constitution be constitutional?

The distinguished member from South Carolina [Mr. Calhoun] has referred to the danger to which their slave property might be exposed if his doctrines be not established. Will he permit me to warn him of the greater danger of superseding the securities of the Constitution? Let him beware how he appeals from the plain stipulations of that instrument to the original and inalienable rights of man. Let him not lead the way in a course of reasoning which points directly to the inquiry, by what means one-half of the human beings upon the soil of South Carolina are held in absolute dominion as property by the other—how their natural and sovereign rights have been cloven down, and transferred to their masters. Be not wise beyond what is written. Abide by the Constitution; that is your best and highest security. From that solemn compact we will not depart. We have no inclination to

disturb it, nor to refine away its guarantees: they are the work of our fathers, and let them be forever sacred.

We have witnessed much controversy as to the origin of the Constitution. In my judgment, it is the work of the people of the several States, acting as separate communities. It was drafted by a convention and proposed to the States; but until their adoption it was a mere proposition, an unexecuted instrument having no efficiency. The ratification by the people of the several States imparts all its validity. They, having all power, could make it anything that they pleased. The people of Virginia and Maryland, for example, might agree to commingle in one mass, to amalgamate, to become, as by fusion, one people, abrogating entirely their State institutions and forming a new single government over a single community; or they might make a league, a mere confederation, or form a union anywhere between these two extremes, participating of both, embracing such extent or degrees of each as to them might seem fit.

And the same remark may be extended to the other States. Having this power, the only question is, how did they exercise it—what union did they form? The answer is to be found in the instrument itself—the Constitution. It has been much contested whether it is federative or popular. It is neither. It is both. In its origin and in the sources of the organization of the Government it is federative; in the action of the Government upon all those subject to its powers it is popular. The laws are made for and reach and operate directly upon individuals, passing by the local governments and penetrating beyond them, and scarcely recognizing the existence of the States as communities. The judiciary is coextensive with the legislative power.

Such being my view of the fundamental law of this nation, I can not recognize any right in a State to arrest and repeal the legislation of Congress. I dare not withhold my support from a measure which seems essential to the maintenance of the Government and the Constitution. If the Legislature of the nation should refuse to uphold and vindicate them at such a crisis, they must fall, and their authority be prostrated, I fear, forever. I could not forget the past, nor shut my eyes to the fact that the present alarming extent and threatening form of resistance and defiance have been consequent upon the tolerated practical nullification of the State of Georgia. The gentleman from South Carolina nearest to me [Mr. Miller] has assured us that such is the fact. Attempts have been vainly made to find a distinction between the two. In principle they are identical.

I regret that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forsyth], in his endeavor to render his defense of the one consistent with his condemnation of the other, has deemed it necessary to assail the Supreme Court of the United States—to pronounce the reasoning and argument of one of its most important decisions to be unworthy the lowest county court in any of the States. I can assure the gentleman that the country regards it far otherwise, and that the most vigorous and gifted minds deem it one of the most powerful productions of the wonderful intellect of the revered chief of that august tribunal. If, in the inscrutable ways of Providence, our institutions are destined to be subverted and left in ruins by the convulsions of revolution, that decision, and other kindred constitutional opinions from the same mind, will remain to after generations splendid and enduring monuments of intellectual and moral greatness, and, like the broken columns and classic remains of Athens and Palmyra, be the wonder and admiration of successive ages.

The time has arrived when the progress of nullification must be arrested, or the hopes of permanent union surrendered. The gentleman [Mr. Calhoun] assures us that his theory would make this Government a beautiful system! Beautiful as would be the proud and polished pillars which surround us, if resolved into their original rude and paltry pebbles; beautiful as the dashed mirror, from whose fragments are reflected twenty-four pigmy portraits, instead of one gigantic and noble original!

The triumph of that doctrine dissolves the Union. It must be so regarded by foreign nations; it is almost so even now. Already have the exultations of the oppressor and the laments of the philanthropist been heard beyond the Atlantic. They have looked with fear and hope, with wonder and delight upon the brilliant and beautiful constellation in our western hemisphere, moving in majestic harmony, irradiating the earth with its mild and benignant beams. Shall these stars now be severed and scattered, and, rushing from their orbits through the troubled air, singly and feebly sink into clouds of murky blackness, leaving the world in rayless night? Shall the flag of our common country, the ensign of our nation, which has waved in honor upon every sea—the guardian of our common rights—the herald of our common glory—be severed and torn into twenty-four fragments; and our ships hereafter display for their protection but a tattered rag of one of its stripes?

The gentleman [Mr. Calhoun] declares emphatically that this is a question of liberty or despotism. I believe it. In my conscience I believe it. If this Union be dissolved, despotism is the ultimate result. It requires no prophetic vision to see how it will be accomplished. Draw the line where you will, wars, frequent, inevitable wars, will ensue. Border nations have been considered natural enemies. History is a little more than a record of their contentions. Human nature is not changed on this side of the ocean. Indeed, there is hardly a nation, in any age or continent, which has given more unequivocal proof of devotion to military achievement and a spirit of martial adventure than the people of these United States.

Their having been once friends, so far from preventing or restraining, would but aggravate their mutual animosity. The sweetest substances become the most acrid by perversion. Fraternal feelings, corrupted or perverted, give new bitterness and intensity to hatred and revenge. We have already had two wars with Great Britain, who once held toward us a parental relation; and who can doubt that they would have been more frequent had we been separated only by an imaginary line? The different sections of the country, arrayed in arms each against the other, would know no bounds to their mutual exasperation. We should be told, in relation to the slave population, what the British Parliament were with respect to the Indian savages—that they were arms which God and nature have put into our hands. It would, indeed, be a sacrilegious abuse of that hallowed name—but the argument would prevail: a servile war would be kindled.

Relentless and fiendlike passions would be let loose to rage with unbridled license; and violence and havoc, conflagration and devastation, would ensue—the horrors of which could be depicted only by the imagination of a Milton or a Dante. It would seem that the severe regions of the North would have less to apprehend from hostile invasions. Southern chivalry, even if not in requisition for the defense of their own sunny lands would find little to invite them to arctic expeditions. Would they come to our rugged soil and more rugged clime, to our rock-bound shores and snow-capped hills? Would they penetrate a dense and teeming population of hardy, laborious and unyielding freemen—every valley a Thermopylæ and every hill a Bunker's—where "friends may find a welcome, and foes a grave?"

The North is by nature the region of strength. It has been so from the days of Atila, King of the Huns, to Platoff, hetman of the Cossacks. The Northern hive would again swarm upon the blooming and honeyed fields of the South. But is there any consolation in this? In such a contest victory is disaster and defeat is death. If this Union shall be severed free governments will for a while, perhaps, exist upon its fragments. But on both sides of the dividing line must speedily arise a chain of fortified places and military posts for protection against sudden incursions of predatory and border warfare, to which they are eminently exposed. Standing armies, to occupy these fortifications, and to repel the formidable danger of organized invasion, are the necessary consequences.

A martial spirit will be everywhere excited and military ambition universally dominant. One party will obtain success and advantages in the war to counteract which the other must give additional strength to the Executive arm. The first will resort to the same expedient to regain their preponderance and the weaker will then concentrate all their power in the hands of one man, that it may be wielded with the most efficiency for their protection. Imminent danger of destruction and the primary law of self-preservation will silence the voice of liberty; civil power will be submerged, and military despotism wave its horrid and resistless sceptre over the ruins of the Republic.

This Union is not only the citadel of our liberty, but the depository of the hopes of the human race. He who shall be its destroyer will go down to future ages, associated, indeed, with its founder, the Father of his country—but with a contrasted immortality. No halo of glory will surround his brow, but on his head will gather the hissing curses of all generations—horrible as the snakes of Medusa. He will stand on the highest and blackest eminence of infamy—the detestation of mankind. If he meet not a traitor's death he will fill a traitor's grave, over which there will be no requiem but the groans of the oppressed and the execrations of the good. His monument will be of human bones, upon foundations slippery with human blood. However high may have been his elevation, his fall will be like that of Lucifer; and like him, sinking into his bottomless and boundless habitation of darkness and woe, he may exclaim—

"Hail! horrors, hail!
And thou, profoundest hell,
Receive thy new possessor!"

Senator Robbins, of Rhode Island, March 1, 1833, in a speech in the Senate, said:

The bill carries with it the idea that the protective policy is an evil in itself, an evil to be deprecated and not to be tolerated for a moment, but to prevent a greater evil, namely, the evil of a sudden overthrow of the great establishments dependent upon it, and to be tolerated only for a few short years, to give an opportunity to those establishments to wind up their affairs and enable them, so far as that time will enable them, to prevent the consummation of their total ruin. The bill thus considers this protective policy as a great State criminal condemned to die, but whose sentence is respited for a few days to give him time to arrange his affairs, repent him of his evil deeds, and prepare for death, but whose doom is fixed and irrevocable; die he must.

Such an idea going out to the country, I think, must be pernicious in its effects, especially as it goes out from the professed friends, or some of them, of the policy, with its great champion at their head. It must repress the spirit of adventure; it must depreciate the value of those establishments; it must arrest the progress of the business at the point where it now is; no more capital will be invested in it, and the capital already invested will be withdrawn as far and as fast as it can be. The tide will have reached its high-water mark; it will now turn back and fall to low ebb, perhaps never to recommence its flood. These great establishments, so widely spread over the country, with all the industry dependent upon them, will be kept in a feverish, lingering state of existence, suspended between hope and fear, with much to alarm their fears, with little to animate their hopes. It can not be but this languishing state must ensue, for we all know how feeble is the hand when not seconded and invigorated by the impulses of the heart.

THE EFFECT OF THE COMPROMISE ACT.

The South prevailed. The protective system was stricken down. The act of 1833, as passed, provided for a gradual reduction of duties; but almost immediately after its passage its disastrous effects began to be felt. The prosperity of the country was checked, and business depression and financial stringency increased until the final culmination in 1837. May 10, 1837, all the banks of the city of New York suspended. The suspension of the banks of Albany, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Providence, Hartford, Boston, and the banks in every portion of the country followed. The Legislature of New York on the 16th of May authorized the suspension of the banks of that State for two years. A reliable author described the industrial embarrassment of the period as follows:

During the preceding two months—preceding the suspension of the banks—unprecedented embarrassments and difficulties were experienced among the mercantile classes, and were felt in all commercial towns of the United States, and especially in New York and New Orleans. The number of large failures which took place in New York in a short time was about three hundred, their liabilities amounting to many millions. In two days, houses in New Orleans stopped payment owing an aggregate of $27,000,000. In Boston one hundred and sixty-eight failures took place in six months.

A great pressure was brought upon President Van Buren to call a special session of Congress. A committee, appointed by a mass meeting in the city of New York, came to Washington to urge upon the President the importance of convoking Congress in extraordinary session. They presented an address to him, in which the condition of the country was graphically described, an epitome of which was published in the press of the day, as follows:

Under a deep impression of the propriety of confining their declaration within moderate limits, they affirmed that the value of their real estate had, within the last six months, depreciated more than forty millions of dollars; that within the preceding two months there had been more than two hundred and fifty failures of houses engaged in extensive business; that within the same period, a decline of twenty millions had occurred in their local stocks, including their railroad and canal incorporations, which, though chartered in other States, depended chiefly upon New York for their sale; that the immense amount of merchandise in their warehouses had, within the same period, fallen in value at least 30 per cent; that within a few weeks not less than twenty thousand individuals, depending upon their daily labor for their daily bread, had been discharged by their employers because the

means of retaining them were exhausted, and that a complete blight had fallen on a community heretofore so active, so enterprising, and prosperous; the rulers, they declared, had produced a wider desolation than the pestilence which depopulated our States, or the conflagration which laid them in ruins.

The President was, at last, compelled to act, more by the condition of the revenues than on account of the distress of the people, and issued a proclamation on the 15th of May convoking Congress on the first Monday of September. The following is the opening clause of the proclamation:

Whereas great and weighty matters, claiming the consideration of the Congress of the United States form an extraordinary occasion for the convening of them.

President Van Buren, however, ignored the true cause of the business depression and financial troubles, and refused to make such recommendations as, if made and acted upon, would have relieved the general distress. He said, among other similar expressions:

To avoid every unnecessary interference with the pursuits of the citizens will result in more benefit than to adopt measures which could only assist limited interests, and are eagerly, but perhaps naturally, sought for under the pressure of temporary circumstances. If, therefore, I refrain from suggesting to Congress any specific plan for regulating the exchanges of the country, relieving mercantile embarrassments, or interfering with the ordinary operations of foreign or domestic commerce it is from convictions that such measures are not within the constitutional providence of the General Government, and that their adoption would not promote the real permanent welfare of those they might be designed to aid.

Again he said:

I deeply regret that events have occurred which require me to ask your consideration of such serious topics. I could have wished that in making my first communication to the assembled representatives of my country I had nothing to dwell upon but the history of our unalloyed prosperity.

The tenor of this message, as can be easily seen, promised no relief to the public; and the special session, which continued forty-three days, enacted no legislation which to any considerable extent relieved the business of the country; and when Congress convened in regular session, the President informed it that:

The industry and prudence of our citizens are gradually relieving them from the pecuniary embarrassments under which portions of them have labored.

However, these embarrassments had not disappeared two years later; for in the opening portion of his third annual message, he said:

The ravages of fire and disease have painfully afflicted otherwise flourishing portions of our country, *and serious embarrassments yet derange the trade of many of our cities.*

The condition of the country during this period is shown by the following quotation:

Mr. Young of Kentucky, in the House, June 19, 1846, said:

Great as the prosperity of the country had proved under the tariff of 1824, it was not suffered to last. The Southern States refused to obey the law. The infamous doctrines of nullification were broached and sedulously propagated, until at length our happy Union was seriously threatened. Then it was that that great and eminent statesman, who deserved so richly the honorable title of the father of the American system, consented to sacrifice his own offspring to avert the horrors of civil war. With a sublime moderation he tempered the angry spirit which had been raised, and soothed it by agreeing to the compromise act. His object was attained. Civil war was avoided, but the consequences of the compromise were written in tears and blood. Hence came the awful distress of 1837.

A fearful revulsion took place in our business affairs. The scenes of 1819 were again revived. General distrust prevailed, and suits were multiplied, until the business of the country was so prostrated that it was no longer worth while to sue. As to its practical use and enjoyment, property became valueless. Notwithstanding the high prosperity which had prevailed in 1824 and 1825, when the revulsion of 1837 came, all were found to be in debt. As a mitigation of the general misery, many of the Western States passed relief laws, forbidding property to be sold under two-thirds of its value. This operated in some degree to prevent the general ruin which would otherwise have ensued. But if American labor had been protected in due time, no such legislative interference would have been required.

Similar quotations from authors and statesmen might be multiplied, but it is unnecessary. It is an historical fact, which no one will dispute, that the general distress brought upon the people by the abandonment of the protective system, and by the operation of the compromise act of 1833, was so great, and their appeals to a Democratic Congress for relief were so fruitless, that a political revolution took place which elected Gen. Harrison and placed the Whigs in power. The condition of the country was such, in the judgment of President Harrison, as to demand the assembling of Congress in extraordinary session.

THE POLITICAL REVOLUTION OF 1840 AND THE WHIG TARIFF OF 1842.

At the Presidential election of 1840 the Democratic party, which had controlled the Government for twelve years, was held responsible by the people for the universal business depression and financial disturbances and the widespread distress. The prevailing condition of the industries, the derangement of the finances, and the suffering of the people were rightfully attributed to the striking down of the protective policy, and the people decreed the retirement of the Democratic party from power and placed the Whigs in control of the Administration and of both branches of Congress. And although Mr. Tyler, who upon the death of President Harrison succeeded to the Presidency, grievously disappointed his party in regard to the tariff question as well as other questions, in 1842 an act was passed increasing duties upon imports and discriminating in favor of domestic industries.

Mr. Tyler was nominated for Vice-President from a supposed necessity of choosing a candidate for Vice-President from the South, after the nomination of Gen. Harrison, and without much attention to his principles or his political character. If it had been supposed that he would have succeeded to the Presidency, it is not likely he would have been nominated.

President Tyler justly subjected himself to serious criticism by accepting the nomination from the Whig party, and afterwards deserting the party when he accidentally succeeded to the Presidency. His Administration was popular with neither Whigs nor Democrats. It was a bitter disappointment to the Whigs. The majority in Congress in political accord with the new Administration was 7 in the Senate and about 50 in the House of Representatives. Congress, convoked in special session by President Harrison before his death, assembled May 31 and adjourned September 13.

The time of Congress was mainly occupied in a struggle with the President over bills to incorporate a bank, which caused the alienation of the Whig party from the Administration and the loss of all confidence between them. But several important acts were passed, among them an act relative to duties and drawbacks By this act a large number of articles placed on the free list by the act of 1833 were subjected to a duty of 20 per cent. At the second session of the Twenty-seventh Congress, which met December 6, 1841, and continued until August 31, 1842, a new tariff law was passed, by which ample provision was made for the public revenue and protection afforded to American manufactures and other branches of national industry. This bill received the approval of President Tyler, although he had previously returned, with his veto, two different tariff bills, the first being a provisional revenue bill, vetoed on June 29, the other, vetoed August 9, being substantially the bill finally approved. excepting that it provided for the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands.

THE BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF THE TARIFF OF 1842.

The proofs of the immediate beneficial results of the protective tariff of 1842 are abundant. President Tyler, in his third annual message, said:

We have new cause for the expression of our gratitude in the preservation of the health of our fellow-citizens, with some partial and local exceptions, during the past season, for the abundance with which the earth has yielded up its fruits to the labors of the husbandmen, for the renewed activity which has been imparted to commerce, for the revival of trade in all its branches, for increased rewards attendant upon the mechanical arts, for continued growth of our population, and the rapidly reviving prosperity of the whole country.

This prosperity continued; and in his fourth annual message he said, in proof of the beneficial effect of the tariff of 1842 upon the credit and finances of the country:

The credit of the Government, which had experienced a temporary embarrassment, has been thoroughly restored. Its coffers which, for a season, were empty, have been replenished. A currency nearly uniform in its value has taken the place of one depreciated and almost worthless. Commerce and manufactures, which had suffered in common with every other interest, have once more revived; and the whole country exhibits an aspect of prosperity and happiness. Trade and barter, no longer governed by a wild and speculative mania, rest upon solid and substantial footing, and the rapid growth of our cities in every direction bespeaks most strongly the favorable circumstances by which we are surrounded.

Senator Evans of Maine, January 23, 1844, speaking concerning the compromise act, said:

Now, one of the good effects of the act of 1842 was to settle the market—to put an end to that uncertainty which created fluctuations of prices. Manufacturers, knowing what they had to depend upon, could renew their efforts, engage more largely and with smaller profits in business, and produce their fabrics at less cost; so that they could afford to reduce prices and fully meet the demand by a regular and full supply. This was what the friends of the tariff law anticipated; and, whether by the operation of that law or not—whether admitted or denied to be from that cause—the fact was undeniable, that the result has justified the anticipation; for business is more prosperous than ever, and prices are growing cheaper without the producer being injured by the reduction.

Another thing that resulted from these causes was, that the home demand for agricultural productions was increased as the operatives in manufactories increased in the ability to become consumers. The agricultural producers were actually beginning already to feel the beneficial effects of the tariff law of 1842.

* * * * * * *

He could tell the Senator from South Carolina that his wish that his State should be left to herself could not be accomplished. She was a partner in this Union and had entered into a compact for a general government, from which she could not now be allowed to retire.

Again, February 5, 1844, Senator Evans said:

He would now ask, What was the state of the country previous to the year 1824? Why, with all our immense imports and seeming national prosperity

Government was forced to borrow money to go on, business declined, the shipping interest was neglected, and the country was going rapidly into ruin; but after 1824 the protective system gave a new impulse to trade, business revived; and after 1828 things wore still a better aspect, and continued to do so until the compromise act reached its lowest point of duty; then came another change; foreign articles increased, while the home fabric decreased, in price; there was no revenue; commerce declined, and the country was compelled to resort to loans to enable Government to carry on its operation. He might go back to the year 1789, and from that to the present he would be enabled to show the same causes producing the same effect—the lowest rates of duties injurious to revenue, commerce, and the general good of the country, and the highest productive of directly opposite results.

The honorable Senator will say all this is in opposition to elementary principles, and is not laid down by Adam Smith; it does not reach the conclusion which he reached three-quarters of a century back, and which, as he declared it true then, must be true forever. In mathematics and geometry a truth once attained is a truth forever; but in moral philosophy it is quite different. A true line of action to-day may be changed by to-morrow by causes springing up in the interim. What in the time of Adam Smith may have been admitted as truth experience since may have proved not well established. Since then, what has been the history of the world? Manufactures have improved, and steam, the great agent, was then unknown; and so little was thought of any benefit to be derived from manufactures, that Adam Smith himself expressly recommended this country (then colonies) to make agriculture their pursuit, and not to think of manufactures. The very article on which the honorable Senator seems to set so much value was not then known as an article of produce; it is since that period cotton has become a staple of the country. The views of Adam Smith were not entitled to the fullest credit.

* * * * * * *

The view which had been offered of the benefits to accrue to the South from a dissolution of the Union, if offered as an illustration, was, he considered, a most unhappy one, and could only be viewed in a favorable light by men (if any could be found) possessed of more zeal, but much less discretion, than the honorable Senator. He (Mr. McDuffie) had painted in most inviting colors the happiness that the proposed Southern confederacy would enjoy when freed from the shackles of the Government of the Union, and careering onward, under the direction of some form of separate legislation. He had permitted his imagination to dwell on the unexampled prosperity that was, under a dissolution of the Union, to bless his section of the country, quite regardless of what (if his views were correct) the result would be to all other portions of the States. He had the sagacity not to hold forth on any wrong that a disruption of the Union would inflict on our common country; but he described in glowing colors the great advantages, the unbounded wealth, and indescribable improvement which such disruption would confer on one part of the broken confederacy.

All these great advantages, he maintained, the South would gain by severance from the Union. The Southern confederacy would, under self-government, outrival the Hesperian gardens, and be blessed with perpetual verdure and eternal spring; become the depository of unbounded wealth, the land of unparalleled happiness—free from political convulsions, proof against national earthquakes, no possibility of being involved in war, but ever blessed with smiling peace.

* * * * * * *

To those who, under the influence of discontents more imaginary than real, would venture to attempt the carrying on of such a visionary scheme as that of forming separate confederations founded on homogeneous interests, he would recommend the study of that portion of mythological history which records the adventure of him who, but for one day, attempted to drive the chariot of the sun. They would find that his life was the forfeit of his temerity. Whoever attempts the dismemberment of this Union will live only in the reproaches of mankind; he may live in history, but it will not be on the page where are inscribed the names and deeds of the good and wise and great, the benefactors of mankind; but on that page where are recorded the names and acts of those who were the authors of civil discord and national calamity. He did not believe any portion of the South desired such results. He believed that they felt, with the people of the North, that all were bound together in one common cause, as one community—one nation. As such, we had achieved independence, renown, and an ascendency unparalleled in so short a time. To preserve these we must preserve the Union which has conferred such blessings.

Referring to the effect of the tariff of 1842, Mr. Evans, July 14, 1846, said:

But the tariff of 1842 is to be overthrown. The fierce and bitter denunciations; the outpouring of all sorts of opprobrious epithets directed against the existing law, proclaim the purposes of its opponents. Well, why is it to be overthrown? This is a question surely worth a moment's consideration. Has the tariff of 1842 accomplished that which its friends and advocates and supporters promised it would accomplish? Has it failed in the fulfillment of any single object which was designed to gain? Has it yielded an adequate revenue? Has it restored public credit and public confidence? All this we promised. All this we pledged ourselves to achieve. And how were our promises and pledges met?

Why, gentlemen, then on the other side—and I see many of them still here—ridiculed our professions and promises. They predicted a great decline in the revenue. They predicted destruction to our commercial interests. They predicted all manner of evil. It was maintained that we would not be able to obtain the loans necessary to carry on the Government—for the Treasury was then so impoverished that the Government was under the necessity of borrowing twelve or fifteen millions—and I recollect that one gentleman contended very zealously that we should be obliged to give $100 of scrip for $90 in cash.

Well, we passed the law authorizing the loan, and not a dollar could we get at any rate until this revenue bill was passed. Then, sir, money enough could be obtained and at a lower rate of interest than that authorized to be paid. The public credit advanced at once and continued to advance until the stocks of the United States reached, I think, a maximum of about 115 or 116 and at that sold rapidly after the enactment of this law, because everybody saw that we had a system which would enable us to carry on the Government, to pay the interest punctually and the principal when it became due. Look, then, at the working of the act of 1842. It did not go fairly into operation for several months after it was enacted. It can hardly be said that it was fairly in operation till the succeeding spring—the spring of 1843. About that time we changed the commencement of the fiscal year, so that our fiscal years now end on the 30th of June.

Take, then, the first whole fiscal year under the act of 1842, and you will find that it yielded us (after paying all the expenses of collection, drawbacks, and everything else, of which I will speak bye and bye) twenty-five and three-quarter millions. That was the result of the first year. In the second year (1845) the amount was twenty-six and three-quarters (almost), showing an increase of about a million. In the third year (just ended June, 1846) the net amount was $26,311,864, according to the best computation I could make, for the statements are quite contradictory. By the papers received this morning from the Secretary of the Treasury the amount is set down at $23,681,915. Thus is shown a constant increase, but an increase marked by an extraordinary uniformity.

The following extract from a speech made by Mr. Johnson of Tennessee in the House January 31, 1844, shows the acrimony with which the discussions in Congress were conducted. Mr. Johnson referred to the death of President Harrison as follows:

I am not superstitious, but I do believe the Almighty does now and then manifest His power in various ways, as in olden time; like the case of Saul of Tarsus, when journeying from Jerusalem to Damascus, he was struck with blindness. We read also of Herod addressing the people upon a certain day set apart for the purpose of receiving honor, such as was due only to the Supreme Being; and all the people shouted, and said his voice was like the voice of a god; and the angel of God smote him, and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost. Sometimes we see the power of God manifested in tempests, in the agitation of the mighty deep; sometimes we see His indignation flashing forth in the forked lightning; sometimes He sends forth a baleful comet, emitting from its fiery tale pestilence and death.

I might refer to instances in modern times; I might refer to the occurrences of 1840, when a most extraordinary excitement pervaded the community; when reason was dethroned and confusion and profanity reigned paramount; when hard cider and coon skins were substituted as the very emblems to be used with all the sacred rights of the Holy Communion; when men were diverted from the worship of the true and living God, to honor with whom they had succeeded in elevating to the highest pinnacle of human ambition, and whom the Almighty, in the display of His power, struck as a star from its sphere, down to the level of the tomb.

I give this as an instance of divine interposition. May we not trace it somewhat further? Who knows what might have been the result of his administration of the Government? Who knows but God expressly interposed to set an obstacle in the way of the accomplishment of those mighty calamities which would, peradventure, have been produced under his administration of the Government—the abolition of slavery and the dissolution of the Union?

At the Presidential election of 1844 the Democratic party was successful. James K. Polk was elected President and George M. Dallas Vice-President. The people were deceived, at least in some sections of the country, into the belief that the Democratic party, if restored to power, would not disturb the Whig tariff of 1842. The rallying cry in Pennsylvania was, "Polk and Dallas, and the tariff of 1842."

THE TARIFF OF 1846.

Reversing entirely the policy of the previous Administration upon the tariff, the principal recommendation of President Polk in his first annual message was for a revision of the tariff of duties on imports, with a view to a reduction of the rates of duty and a consequent withdrawal of the protection to industry afforded by the tariff of 1842.

With the election of a Democratic President, the Democrats secured a majority in both Houses of Congress, and the recommendation of the President was promptly adopted by Congress. A new tariff bill, on a plan drawn up by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Walker, was enacted, after a protracted discussion, by a vote of 114 to 94 in the House, and by 28 to 27 in the Senate. On a motion to discharge a committee to whom the bill was referred for amendment, the Senate was equally divided, when Mr. Dallas, the Vice-President, gave the casting vote in the affirmative, and the bill was passed, to take effect December 1, 1846. The tariff of 1846, while called a revenue tariff, was not such a tariff as is now advocated by the Democratic party. Under it discrimination was made in favor of American industries. Under the tariff act of 1842 the average rate of dutiable articles was $33\frac{47}{100}$ per cent. Under the act of 1846 it was cut down to $26\frac{22}{100}$ per cent.

ANOTHER DEMOCRATIC DEFEAT.

Again, in 1848, as in 1840, while Democratic division made Whig succession possible, the action of the Democratic party in repealing the Whig protective tariff act of 1842 and passing the tariff for revenue act of 1846, contributed to its defeat, and helped to bring about the election of Taylor and Fillmore, the Whig candidates for President and Vice-President. That it was well understood that the protective policy had again triumphed at the polls is sufficiently evidenced by the inaugural address and the first message of President Taylor and the subsequent messages of President Fillmore.

RESTORATION OF PROTECTIVE DUTIES RECOMMENDED BY PRESIDENT TAYLOR.

In his inaugural address President Taylor said:

It shall be my study to recommend such constitutional measures to Congress as may be necessary and proper to secure encouragement and protection to the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, to improve our rivers and harbors, to provide for the speedy extinguishment of the public debt, to enforce a strict accountability of all officers of the Government, and the utmost economy in all public expenditures.

In his first annual message, sent to Congress December 4, 1849, he said:

I recommend a revision of the existing tariff, and its adjustment on a basis which may augment the revenues. I do not doubt the right or duty of Congress to encourage domestic industry, which is the great source of na-

tional, as well as individual wealth and prosperity. I look to the wisdom and patriotism of Congress for the adoption of a system which may place home labor at last on a sure and permanent footing; and by due encouragement of manufactures, give a new and increased stimulus to agriculture, and promote the development of our vast resources, and the extension of our commerce. Believing that to the attainment of these ends (as well as the means of augmentation of the revenues to the prevention of frauds) a system of specific duties is best adapted, I strongly recommend to Congress the adoption of that system, fixing the duties at rates high enough to afford substantial and sufficient encouragement to our industry, and at the same time so adjusted as to insure stability.

Vice-President Millard Fillmore, upon the death of President Taylor, succeeded to the Presidency. Upon the question of the tariff he pursued the policy of the Whig party, as marked out by his predecessor; but the want of a Whig majority in Congress, and an unfortunate division of Whig members over the slavery question, rendering a return to the protective policy impossible. The act of 1846 was therefore continued in force, causing large importations of foreign merchandise, the prostration of our industries, and the constant drain of gold from this country to pay the balance of trade against us.

In his first annual message, President Fillmore, discussing the tariff, said:

I therefore strongly recommend a modification of the present tariff, which has prostrated some of our most important and necessary manufactures, and that specific duties be imposed, sufficient to raise the requisite revenues, and making such discrimination in favor of the industrial pursuits of our own country as to encourage home production without excluding foreign competition.

In his second annual message he effectually disposed of the arguments that low duties upon imports will increase the demand for our agricultural products abroad in the following language:

The policy which dictated a low rate on foreign merchandise was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand, and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show, incontestably, that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy. On the contrary, notwithstanding the repeal of the restrictive corn laws of England, the foreign demand for the products of American farmers has steadily declined since the short crops and consequent famine in a portion of Europe have happily been replaced by full crops and a comparative abundance of food.

How conclusive is this to show that our foreign market depends upon the world's supply and demand, on the character of the crops throughout the world, and is not affected either by protective or revenue duties. In the same message, alluding to the production of gold in California, he said:

The production of gold in California for the last year seems to promise a large supply of that metal through that quarter for some time to come. This large annual increase of the currency of the world must be attended with its usual results. These have been already partially disclosed in the enhancement of prices, and the rising spirit of speculation and adventure, tending to overtrading as well at home as abroad. Unless some salutary check shall be given to these tendencies it is to be feared that importations of foreign goods beyond a healthy demand in this country will lead to a sudden drain of the precious metal from us, and most disastrous consequences to the business and capital of the American people.

In his third annual message he said:

Without repeating the arguments contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it is coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing interests are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost, thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer, to that extent, is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus products.

In the third place, the destruction of our manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our own market, and he consequently raises the price of the articles sent here for sale, as is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England. The prosperity and welfare of every nation must depend upon its productive industry. The farmer is stimulated to industry by finding a ready market for his surplus products, and benefited by being able to exchange them, without loss of time or expense of importation, for manufactures which his comfort and convenience require. This is always done to the best advantage where a portion of the community in which he lives is engaged in other pursuits.

PRESIDENT PIERCE REVERSES THE POLICY OF HIS PREDECESSOR, AND URGES A STILL FURTHER REDUCTION OF DUTIES.

Again, at the Presidential election of 1852, the Democratic party was successful, and the Democratic idea of the tariff question prevailed. President Pierce, in his first annual message, said:

The second of the above-mentioned objects—

The application of the revenue to the discharge of the public debt and the reduction of the revenue—

that of the reduction of the revenue, is of great importance, and the plan suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury, which is to reduce the duties on certain articles, and to add to the free list many articles now taxed, and especially such as enter into manufactures and are not largely, or at all, produced in this country, is commended to your candid and careful consideration.

In his second annual message of December 4, 1854, he said:

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury presents a series of tables showing the operation of the revenue system for several successive years, and as the general principle of reduction of duties, with a view to revenue and not protection, may now be regarded as a settled policy of the country, I trust that little difficulty will be encountered in settling the details of a measure to that effect.

In his third annual message, he said:

It is now generally conceded that the purpose of revenue alone can justify the imposition of duties on imports: that in readjusting the import duties and schedules, which unquestionably require essential modifications, a departure from the principles of the present tariff is not anticipated.

Again, in his fourth annual message of December 2, 1856, he said, after referring to the revenues:

These considerations will justify a reduction of the revenue from customs so as not to exceed forty-eight or fifty millions. I think the exigency for such reduction is imperative, and again urge it upon the consideration of Congress.

THE REVENUE TARIFF OF 1857.

In February, at the second session of the Thirty-fourth Congress, a tariff bill was passed to carry out the recommendations of the President. It passed the Senate by a vote of 38 to 8, and the House by 124 to 71. Existing rates of duties were considerably reduced. The reduction upon distilled spirits and cordials was 60 per cent. Duties upon most manufactured articles of wool and iron were reduced 6 per cent. Wool, costing not more than 20 cents per pound, unmanufactured brass and copper, tea and coffee, dyestuffs, prints and spices, books, and apparatus for schools and public institutions, and other articles were placed upon the free list. This act went into force July 1, 1857. The effect of this reduction of duties upon articles coming in competition with similar articles produced in this country was the same as had been produced by all previous tariff legislation which either in whole or in part had removed protection from our industries.

The very moderate prosperity we had enjoyed under the tariff of 1846, and in consequence of conditions in Europe which had afforded us an unusually profitable market abroad for our surplus products, the expenditure by the Government of large sums to carry on the Mexican war, and the great yield of gold by the mines of California was destroyed. Our Treasury was depleted; our industries were suspended; our public works stopped; labor was deprived of employment, and the country was plunged into bankruptcy and ruin. Poverty and distress were universal. Although, as I have said, the new tariff act only went into effect on the 1st of July, 1857, the great financial crash of 1857 almost immediately followed, and by the 2d of December following, a period of five months and two days, the condition of the country had become so alarming as to require a Democratic President to present it to Congress in the most graphic language, and this most disastrous condition of our industries, our finances, and our revenues continued as long as the Democratic party controlled the Government.

A DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT COMPELLED TO CALL THE ATTENTION OF CONGRESS TO THE ALARMING CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY, PRODUCED BY FREE-TRADE LEGISLATION.

President Buchanan, in his first annual message, alluded to the then condition of the country in the following language:

In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture, and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactories suspended, our public works retarded, our enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

In his second annual message he again refers to the unsatisfactory condition of the country, and in attempting to give the causes, said:

The people were obliged to restrict themselves in their purchases to articles of prime necessity. In the general prostration of business the iron manufacturers in different States probably suffered more than any other class, and much destitution was the inevitable consequence among a great number of workmen who had been employed in this useful branch of industry. There could be no supply where there was no demand. To present an example—there could be no demand for railroad iron after our magnificent system of railroads, extending its benefits to every portion of the Union, had been brought to a dead pause. The same consequences have resulted from similar causes to many other branches of useful manufactures. It is self-evident that where there is no ability to purchase manufactured articles these can not be sold, and consequently must cease to be produced.

And subsequently, discussing the financial condition of the country, he said:

In connection with this subject it is proper to refer to our financial condition. The same causes which have produced pecuniary distress throughout the country have so reduced the amount of imports from foreign countries that the revenue has proved inadequate to meet the necessary expenses of the Government. To supply the deficiency, Congress, by act of December 23, 1857, authorized the issue of $20,000,000 of Treasury notes; and this proving inadequate, they authorized, by the act of June 14, 1858, a loan of $20,000,000 to be applied to the payment of appropriations made by law.

No statesman would advise that we should go on increasing the national debt to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. This would be a most ruinous policy. In case of war our credit must be our chief resource, at least for the first year, and this would be greatly impaired by having contracted

a large debt in time of peace. It is our true policy to increase our revenue so as to equal our expenditures. It would be ruinous to continue to borrow. Besides, it may be proper to observe that the incidental protection thus afforded by a revenue tariff would, at the present moment, to some extent increase the confidence of the manufacturing interests and give a fresh impulse to our reviving business.

In his third annual message, sent to Congress December 19, 1859, referring to the fact that, from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, it was probable there would be a deficiency of revenues, and advising against further loans, he said:

Should such a deficiency occur, as I apprehend, I would recommend that the necessary revenue be raised by an increase of our present duties on imports.

In his last annual message, sent to Congress the 3d of December, 1860, he said:

It is now quite evident that the financial interests of the Government will require a modification of the tariff during the present session, for the purpose of increasing the revenue.

On March 3, 1859, the last day of the Congress, President Buchanan sent to Congress a special message, from which I take the following:

An imperative sense of duty compels me to make an appeal to Congress to preserve the credit of the country. This is the last day of the present Congress, and no provision has yet been made for the payment of appropriations and to meet the outstanding Treasury notes issued under authority of law.

From the information which has already been communicated to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury it is manifest that the ordinary receipts into the Treasury, even under the most favorable circumstances, will scarcely meet the ordinary expenses of the Government during the remainder of the present fiscal year, ending the 30th of June. At that time nearly eighteen millions of Treasury notes will have become due, and many of those not yet due are daily paid for duties at the different ports, and there will be no means in the Treasury to meet them. Thus the country, which is full of resources, will be dishonored before the world; and the American people, who are a debt-paying people, will be disgraced by the omission, on our part, to do our duty.

These recommendations for increased duties upon imports, forced from a Democratic President by the condition of our industries and our finances, are remarkable when it is remembered that the Democratic party, then and now, deny that the then distressed condition of the country and the condition of the Treasury were caused by the tariff for revenue only of 1846 and 1857; and have even gone so far as to allege that the country prospered under and in consequence of that legislation.

A REVIEW OF THE TARIFF LEGISLATION PRIOR TO 1861.

Reviewing the history of tariff legislation prior to 1861, humiliating as the fact is, the act of 1833, by which protection to our industries was gradually removed, was passed at the behest of the South, enforced by the threat of disunion. Henry Clay, who had been an eloquent and constant advocate of the American system, explained his course in proposing a compromise by referring to the treasonable threats of South Carolina, and by saying that if the friends of protection did not then yield to the demand for a modification of the tariff, that at another Congress the opponents of the system would be strong enough to destroy it.

It appears that the tariff legislation of 1824 and 1828, under which the country enjoyed an era of prosperity unexampled in our history, during which every industry flourished, everyone was employed, individual and national prosperity assured, and the Treasury was overflowing, was overthrown at the command of Southern slaveholders, who emphasized their command with treasonable threats; overthrown because also of the fears of the friends of the protective system, who, to appease the South, abandoned their principles by making unreasonable concessions. The disasters to the industries of the country which followed the compromise act of 1833 produced a political revolution, brought the Whigs into power, who, in 1842, enacted a protective tariff, which started the country again on a career of prosperity, revived old industries, started new ones, and furnished employment to laborers. Upon the accession, however, of the Democratic party to power, at the demand of the South, a Democratic Congress again in 1846 struck down protection; and the policy of maintaining a tariff for the protection of American labor and American industries did not again prevail until the Republican party came into power.

It was not until after the enactment of the act of 1828 that the Southern opposition to the tariff assumed importance. Mr. Calhoun, as we have seen, had favored the tariff of 1816, with the avowed purpose of protecting American manufactures, but he now changed his position. It had become apparent that manufactures could not be conducted with slave labor, and, therefore, could not be established or profitably maintained in the South, and that protection helped to build up the industries of the North. The politicians of the South followed the lead of Calhoun. From that time forward hostility to the protective tariff and the extension of slavery became the leading principles of the political creed of the Southern Democracy. The Southern hostility to the tariff produced the nullification acts of South Carolina, and threatened the dissolution of the Union.

THE CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY FROM 1846 TO 1861.

The period from 1846 to 1861 is cited by the advocates of a tariff for revenue only as a prosperous period under a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. There were exceptional causes which prevented our industries from feeling at once the full effect of the changes in the tariff; and the supposed prosperity of the country has been greatly exaggerated. From 1847 to 1861 the balance of trade against us was more than $431,000,000, and there were but two years in the whole period when the balance trade was in our favor.

Under ordinary circumstances the country could not have paid this balance for a single year without producing great financial as well as business derangement. But the discovery of gold in California and the great yield of that metal from 1848 to 1860 enabled us to pay the balance of trade against us. We were, however, thereby deprived of the beneficial effect of the great production of gold, and Europe received in exchange for her products almost the entire yield of our mines.

The large importations of foreign goods under the tariff of 1846 not only prevented the development and prosperity of our manufactories, but the foreign market for our agricultural products was not greatly increased on account of our larger importations. The English corn laws were repealed in 1846. The Mexican war caused the expenditure among our people of many millions in excess of the ordinary expenses of the Government. The famine in Ireland and the revolutions in Europe followed in 1848, which so disturbed the industries of Europe that exportations to the United States were limited, while an increased demand was created abroad for our surplus agricultural products.

From 1846 to 1861 we exported only 65,440,173 bushels of wheat, while during a single year, the year 1872, under protection, we exported 72,000,000 bushels—6,000,000 more in a single year than the aggregate exports of the entire fifteen years under a revenue tariff. In each of the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1885, 1887, and 1891 we exported more wheat than we exported during the whole period from 1846 to 1861 under the Walker tariff. Mr. McKinley, in a public speech at Beatrice, Nebr., May 2, 1892, stated that—

We exported in a single year more wheat than was exported from 1790 to 1861 a period of seventy-one years. More wheat in a single year than during all the years from Washington to Lincoln.

I can not do better in discussing the causes which contributed to our very moderate prosperity for the ten years succeeding the tariff of 1846, than to quote the utterances of one of our most distinguished statesmen, from a speech made by James G. Blaine at New York City during the Presidential election of 1888. He stated the causes which contributed to postpone the culmination of the disastrous effects of the tariff of 1846, as follows:

THE EVIL DAY PUT OFF BY SPECIAL CAUSES.

Great apprehension was felt by Whigs and Democrats alike as to what effect the tariff of 1846 would have upon the industrial interests of the country. The protectionists expected that bad results would be visible within a year, but an extraordinary series of incidents, or accidents, if you please, postponed the evil day. Coeval with President Polk's approval of the tariff bill came the declaration of war with Mexico. That led to a demand of more than 100,000 men for enlistment and camp-followers, and caused an outlay of $150,000,000 beyond the ordinary expenditures of the Government within the ensuing two years. Before the great stimulus given to all departments of trade by these large disbursements began to lessen a great famine occurred in Ireland. That led to an altogether unprecedented export of breadstuffs, and that, of course, brought large shipments of money from Europe. Before the effect produced on our trade by the famine had ceased the European revolution of 1848 began, and trade and manufactures over the whole continent, from Madrid to St. Petersburg, were disturbed, and in many cases thrown into hopeless confusion and panic. This stopped importations and gave to the American manufacturer a far larger field than he could have had if a normal condition of business had existed in Europe.

THEN CAME THE DISCOVERY OF GOLD.

While these causes were in full operation and were producing a prodigious effect upon our prosperity the whole country was electrified, at the close of the year 1848, by the tidings that gold had been discovered in California, which we had acquired only a few months before from Mexico. The precious metals flowed to us in rich streams from the Pacific Slope for the next six years and opened avenues of trade unknown before. It drew young and vigorous men by hundreds of thousands from the older States, and gave to this great metropolis of the continent, the city of New York, an impulse the like of which it had never experienced before.

It was a historic epoch in the advancement of the country, and when, at the beginning of 1854, the output of gold showed signs of decline, a European war supplied fresh stimulus to the trade of the United States. The three leading powers of Europe, as powers were then reckoned, England, France, and Russia, engaged in a giants' contest on the shores of the Black Sea, and the confusion which resulted throughout Europe for the next two and a half years afforded a rich harvest for the United States. Peace came in 1856. The spindles and wheels and looms, the forges and factories and furnaces of Great Britain and France were set going with renewed energy. The seas were once more unvexed and Russia poured forth her grain in the markets of western Europe to compete with the shipments from America.

RESULTS OF DELUSIVE PROSPERITY.

The last of the causes which has contributed to our prosperity in these ten years of happy accident was at an end and its course had so deluded our people with the Democratic fallacy that a low tariff leads to prosperity as surely as a protective tariff, that in the spring of 1856 Congress passed a brief tariff act lowering the duties still farther, and the United States set forth to depend upon its own energies, with a tariff that brought it directly in competition with the low-priced labor of Europe. We were no longer sustained by some extraordinary accident like war, or famine, or revolution

abroad, or the discovery of vast deposits of the precious metals at home. I need not tell the result. The panic of 1857 came upon the country with crushing and disastrous effect. Every interest was prostrated, and a Democratic President, within a year from the end of the last of the extraneous causes that helped us, was compelled in his message to Congress to portray the disastrous condition of the country in as strong colors as even protectionists would have painted. Mr. Buchanan said:

"With unsurpassed plenty in all the elements of national wealth, our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want."

And that was the downfall of the famous tariff of 1846. When left to stand alone it stood just one year. The people had not sufficiently heeded the tremendous influence of the accidental causes I have cited, and mistakenly believed that the ten years of prosperity were due to a low revenue tariff.

I will add the testimony of one more witness as to the effect of the tariff act of 1846 on our industries and the wages of labor. I read a letter from William Welch to the Boston Herald of October 5, of the present year:

TARIFF AND WAGES—LABOR WORKED SEVENTY-TWO HOURS A WEEK FORTY-SEVEN YEARS AGO AND FOR LESS MONEY.

HOPEDALE, MASS., *October 5, 1893.*

To the Editor:

In your issue of September 27 are a few lines headed "Its Tariff Record." Among other things the article says:

"Let it now make the Democratic tariffs of 1846 and 1857 its model, and renew the achievement which compelled enthusiastic praise from even the strongest of its political opponents."

I was about 12 years of age in 1846 and worked in a cotton mill in Rhode Island, and received $2 a week for doffing. The wages paid in the cotton mills at that time were fully 50 per cent lower than paid for the same work to-day. Back boys received $1.25 a week; mule spinners did not average $7 per week. Weavers on four looms did not average over $3.50 per week. It was a very good overseer who received over $9 a week. Good mechanics could not earn over $8 a week. Card strippers only received 58 cents a day, and they were men; card grinders from $4.50 to $5 a week. We all worked seventy-two hours a week. The best flour was $7 a barrel at retail. Sugar was at least one-third dearer than now. Prints were 12 cents a yard, and everything in clothing was equally as high.

These wages and prices continued till 1857, when nearly all the mills shut down and there was little work to be had. Soup houses were established in the cities, and in the towns mill people were assisted by the town. In the spring of 1858 business looked a little brighter and the factories again began to start. Our wages were reduced 25 per cent. There was no further change till about the second year of the war, since which time wages have been higher and people have had better food and better clothing than ever before.

Doffers receive on an average $4.50 a week, back boys from $3 to $5, and mule spinners earn from $11 to $15, and some even more. Weavers average over $6 per week, and overseers $3.50 a day the country over Mechanics command, or have until within a few months, $2.50 a day. Card strippers get $1.05 a day, and card grinders from $9 to $10.50 per week. Now they work 58 hours a week in Massachusetts and 60 in the other States. Provisions, clothing, and in fact everything, is at least 40 per cent lower than in 1846 and 1857.

Can it be that the Herald wants the laboring people to be reduced to the condition they were in 1846 and 1857? Such would seem to be the case by advocating a return of the tariff which brought about such a distressful state of affairs. I am at a loss to understand how the Herald, of which I have been a reader for many years, and which has always seemed fair in its discussions of public matters, should advise a state of affairs so deplorable as that of 1846 and 1857.

WILLIAM WELCH.

OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM AT THE MERCY OF FREE TRADERS.

How long the South, if it had been less aggressive on the slavery question, could have controlled the Democratic party and the Government, and have maintained a tariff for revenue only, with a selfish regard for the cotton-planters of the South and a total disregard for the welfare of the free laborers of the North, whom the slaveholders contemptuously called "mud sills," is uncertain; it, however, not only determined to maintain a tariff which would prevent the development of the Northern States and the prosperity of the laboring classes of the North, but it determined also to maintain the system of slavery and to force its extension into the Territories, to require the capture and return of escaped negro slaves by the people of the North, against their convictions of right. The time came, however, when the South could not control the Northern contingent of the Democratic party upon the subject of slavery.

The party then divided; and the party of liberty and protection, the party opposed to the further spread of slavery, triumphed, and Abraham Lincoln became President of the United States. Then that portion of the Democratic party which so long had controlled and shaped its destinies saw that the scepter of its power had departed and it attempted to destroy the Union. Grave Senators who had taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States conspired against the Government, resigned their offices, and joined the Confederacy.

Officers of the Army and of the Navy, educated at public expense, living off of its bounty, and under moral and legal obligations to maintain its honor, glory, and integrity, deserted the service of the Government to join the ranks of traitors. States passed resolutions of secession. The flag was fired upon. The Union was imperiled. President Buchanan asserted that there was no power under the Constitution to suppress rebellion. The Republican party came into power. President Lincoln was inaugurated, and announced his intention to enforce the laws and maintain the Union. He called for volunteers, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific a wave of patriotism swept the North, gathering up the men who had been sneeringly called the "mud sills" of society, and hurried them to the defense of the national capital and of the Union. The war on one side was waged for the preservation and extension of slavery, for free trade, for servile labor, for a system which degraded labor and lowered the standard of manhood: on the other, for freedom, the Union, and for protection: for the system which dignifies labor and elevates and ennobles the laborer.

The senior Senator from Connecticut some time ago in a speech in the Senate said, substantially, that in the great contest which followed there could have been read between the stars and bars, as they floated at the head of the Confederate forces, the words "Slavery and free trade;" and between the stars and stripes upon the flag of the Union, as it was borne by the boys in blue to victory, the words "Liberty and protection." The cause of liberty and protection triumphed, the latter to be overthrown again in 1892 by the installation of the Democratic party—the same Democratic party as of old, in complete control of the South, dictating the tariff policy of the country, administering the beneficence of the Government, and measuring out the gratitude of the nation to the men who risked their lives and imperiled their health to put down the rebellion.

The Republican party came into power with an empty Treasury, with an impoverished country, under a revenue system which neither protected American industries nor furnished sufficient revenue for the economical conduct of the Government; when the Government was without credit, and when our bonds, drawing 12 per cent interest, sold in the markets of the world at 17 per cent discount. When treason stalked openly in the land, the National Capital was in jeopardy, the Union on the verge of dissolution, the Navy scattered, our arsenals plundered, the Treasury robbed, the whole Government service poisoned with treason, without money, without credit, without a Navy, without an army or munitions of war, the Republican party took control of the Government. It manned the ship of state, with President Lincoln at the helm, and with courage, with loyalty to the Union and republican institutions, with a belief in the justice of its cause, with confidence that in the end right would prevail, with hope and patience and determination, it entered upon the gigantic task of preserving the Union and of restoring the industries of the country. It raised immense armies, it provided a navy, it raised the funds necessary to carry on the war, it subdued the rebellion, and preserved the Union.

But it did more. Though hostile armies traversed and retraversed portions of the Union destroying industries and property and devastating the country, though millions of men were withdrawn from industrial and productive pursuits to engage in destructive and deadly warfare, though hundreds of thousands of lives were freely offered as a sacrifice upon the country's altar, though thousands of millions of dollars were expended to support and maintain an army and navy, it brought prosperity out of ruin and disorder. It started the wheels of industry. It gave employment to labor. It established the credit of the Government. It paid immense sums in the reduction of the public debt. It brought about a period of prosperity which, with slight interruptions consequent upon the inflation of the currency and the return to specie payments, continued for nearly a third of a century: a period of progress in all that makes a nation great and powerful and its people prosperous and happy, such as was never before witnessed in any country.

It adopted a policy which has healed the industrial wounds caused by the war, which has brought every portion of the country into closer relations of trade and commerce and mutual interest, which has caused the civilization which three-quarters of a century ago rolled across the Alleghanies to sweep over the Mississippi Valley and over the great plains and the Rocky Mountains, to find its western barrier only in the Pacific Ocean; which has caused the continent to be spanned by a network of railroads reaching every productive quarter, and the once American desert to be converted into homes of millions of free, intelligent, and happy people, and to be carved up into wealthy, prosperous, and populous States of the Union; which has caused great mercantile and manufacturing centers to grow up in every portion of the Union, giving profitable employment to millions of American citizens, and by domestic competition to decrease the cost of living by decreasing the price of many of the necessities of life; which has caused the capital, the skill, and the energy of the North to invade the South to open mines of useful metals, to erect factories and mills, and secure the prosperity of that section.

THE DISASTROUS RESULT OF THE DEMOCRATIC VICTORY OF 1892.

After nearly a third of a century, during which, with the exception of one Presidential term, and then there was a Republican majority in the Senate, the Republican party was in control of the Government, the Democratic party secured control of both branches of Congress and elected the Chief Magistrate of the Nation. In its national convention it was demonstrated that the

South was again in control. The party was committed by its platform to the ultra Southern view of the tariff; and the same causes which in 1841 induced President Harrison to convoke Congress in extraordinary session, forced Mr. Cleveland to call a special session of Congress, stating as the reason for doing so the following:

Whereas the distrust and apprehension concerning the financial situation which pervades all business circles has already caused great loss and damage to our people, and threatens to cripple our merchants, stop the wheels of manufacture, bring distress and privation to our farmers, and withhold from our workingmen the wage of labor.

Note the parallels in our history. It will be seen that by Democratic control of the Government, and the control of that party by the South, by the passage of the compromise act of 1833 under threats of disunion, the tariffs of 1824 and 1828 were stricken down, our industries were destroyed, the public revenues diminished, our finances demoralized, and the country brought to a condition which produced a political revolution and made Gen. Harrison President, and that within less than two weeks after his inauguration the condition of the country induced him to issue a proclamation convoking Congress in special session "to consider the weighty questions of the condition of the revenue and finances of the country."

The Democratic party has come into power again, and, wedded to free trade, unwilling to be convinced by the great object lesson our present industrial condition affords that its tariff theories are wrong, denies that the Democratic success and the threat of free trade has stricken down our great industrial fabric, and deprived millions of our citizens of that employment necessary to secure their daily bread; and blind and obtuse as they ever have been when dealing with financial questions, our Democratic friends ransack history, and draw on their imaginations for causes to account for existing conditions. But the fact will go down in history to future generations that at the time of the last annual message of President Harrison the country enjoyed a wonderful degree of prosperity. Every department of human industry flourished. Every forge and loom and spindle was in operation, labor everywhere was employed, and the country was advancing with unabated rapidity in its grand march of civilization and of individual and national prosperity.

As time advanced the extent of the calamity which had overtaken the cause of protection became apparent; it was found that not only had the Democratic party elected a President and secured the control of the House of Representatives, but that the Senate, which under the previous Administration of President Cleveland, being Republican, had prevented the passage of the Mills bill, would be controlled by the Democrats, and that there was nothing in the way of the Democratic party carrying into execution the threat and promise contained in its platform to destroy the protective system. When this startling fact was fully realized the wheels of progress were immediately stopped. The mills, the furnaces, and the factories were closed. Every business industry began to prepare for the coming storm. Business operations were curtailed. Collections were forced. Confidence was shaken. Labor was thrown out of employment, banks failed, and bankruptcy and ruin everywhere prevailed.

The contrast between the general prosperity prevailing under the Harrison Administration and the business and financial distress which followed the succession of the Democratic party in November last, is admirably shown by the following extracts from President Harrison's annual message in December last, and the message of President Cleveland transmitted to Congress, convened in extraordinary session on the 8th of August last.

Opening of President Harrison's message to Congress, December, 1892.

In submitting my annual message to Congress I have great satisfaction in being able to say that the general conditions affecting the commercial and industrial interests of the United States are in the highest degree favorable. A comparison of the existing conditions with those of the most favored period in the history of the country will, I believe, show that so high a degree of prosperity and so general a diffusion of the comforts of life were never before enjoyed by our people.

Opening of President Cleveland's message to Congress, eight months later, August, 1893.

The existence of an alarming and extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives in Congress, to the end that, through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty with which they are solely charged, present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.

Is not the case complete? Does not our history conclusively prove that we have always prospered under a protective tariff, and that when the protective policy has been threatened or stricken down, individual and national prosperity has been destroyed?

IS THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INEQUALITIES OF WEALTH?

Our Democratic friends delight to contrast the wealth of the New England States, of New York and Pennsylvania, and other old States where manufactures flourish and where great centers of trade exist, with that of the new States of the Union and that of the Southern and Western States, which are almost exclusively devoted to agriculture, and to argue from the comparison that inequality of wealth is caused by unjust legislation—by legislation which promotes the interests of the few instead of that of the many. This is a superficial view of the subject.

If our friends would advance further into the subject they would find that this inequality is mainly the result of natural causes and is capable of a satisfactory explanation. The wealth of the New England States, of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and other manufacturing States has been accumulating for two hundred years. Much of it had been accumulated when all the States of the Northwest were still a wilderness, without a trace of civilization. It represents the accumulations of labor for more than two centuries. Wealth invested, money loaned out at interest, constantly produces wealth, so that the yearly accumulations of these old States, with their great manufacturing industries and moneyed corporations, represent not alone the wealth created by the labor for the year, but also the increase for vast amounts of property representing the accumulations of the product of labor in past years.

These great centers of trade in these older States have, from natural causes, become the great fields of financial operations, the Mecca of the successful business men of every portion of the Union. The great railroad corporations, no matter where their roads are located, have their principal offices in New York and Boston, or some one of the great Eastern cities; and the principal and interest of their bonds and dividends on their stocks are made payable there.

The great trust companies are also located and controlled in the great money centers. The great life and fire insurance companies, with their accumulated capital, are located there also; and as the profitable field for capital and the operations of great business enterprises is where capital is accumulated and business men congregate, all the great enterprises of the country are naturally drawn to these great moneyed business centers. If a mine of the useful or precious metals is discovered in one of the Rocky Mountain States, the discoverer forthwith goes to New York or Boston to endeavor to interest capital for the development of it, or for the purpose of selling it; and, if it is successfully worked, it is generally by a corporation located in some Eastern city and by Eastern capital.

If a railroad is projected to furnish the means of transportation to some remote section of one of the Western or Southern States, the aid of Eastern capital is sought, and the road, if built, represents Boston, New York, or Philadelphia capital. If a great irrigation ditch is to be constructed for the development of agriculture in the arid regions, appeal is made to Eastern capital to carry on the enterprise. If by some good fortune a citizen of one of these Western or Southern States secures wealth, he naturally drifts East; and though he may still continue to conduct business in the State he leaves, he becomes a resident of New York or Boston, and helps to swell the aggregate wealth of one of those cities.

While the New England and the other Eastern States have a population which has inherited the accumulated wealth of two hundred and fifty years, and its wealth is constantly increasing by the natural and legitimate income derived from its investments, and the natural and constant flow of capital to the money centers from every quarter of the Union, the population of the new States of the Northwest is composed largely of men who have left the older civilization of the East to become pioneers upon our western frontier; either young men who have not inherited wealth, and who were dependent for a livelihood upon the daily labor of their hands, or older men who had unsuccessfully struggled to acquire a competence in the older States, or who, beginning life with a competence, had been overwhelmed with adversity, and, in advanced years, turned to the newer States or Territories to find a home upon the public domain.

These new States, wealthy in the possession of an intelligent, enterprising, industrious citizenship, have not the accumulations of preceding generations. Their location and advantages do not draw to them the great moneyed establishments of the Union, and their accumulations of wealth by a natural law are constantly drawn to the great money centers. The yearly accretions of their wealth are mainly from the rewards of labor. Their citizens, as a rule, settled there without means. If the wealth of the East had not followed them, and been distributed by the much-abused loan agencies, they could not, in many instances, have provided themselves with shelter and the implements of husbandry. If they have given mortgages then these mortgages are evidences of prosperity. They show that their condition has been so improved that they have property which is good security for loans. The mortgages represent improved

farms, modern implements of husbandry, modern homes, churches, and schoolhouses. By means of money secured on the security of these mortgages, day laborers have become independent farmers, certain means of livelihood secured, and homes for families created where contentment and comfort reign.

Everyone who had carefully considered the matter knew that the census investigation would show just what it did establish—that mortgages, especially upon farms, are, in the main, evidences of prosperity. They represent the purchase price of farms by young men, the purchase price of lands which prosperous farmers have added to their original farms, the cost of valuable improvements upon farms, to add to their productiveness or the comfort of their owners. They represent improved labor-saving machinery; and when they are not evidences of prosperity they represent in most instances money squandered in idleness and dissipation. Ninety-five per cent of all the mortgages in this country represent and were the means of the improved condition of the mortgagors.

The continual talking about the unequal distribution of wealth, and the causes to which it is attributed by a class of people in this country not inaptly called "calamity howlers," and the continued falsifying of the facts, has for its object the creation of dissatisfaction with existing conditions, the rendering of personal and property rights insecure, the weakening of the respect of our citizens for law and order, the sapping of the foundations of republican government. The prosperous and wealthy are not alone concerned in the maintenance of law and order and in the prosperity of the country. The laboring, dependent classes, above all others, are interested in maintaining a stable government, in the maintenance of the laws which provide protection to all citizens alike, whether rich or poor, in such protection to capital as will secure its active employment in the great industries of the country which give employment to labor.

Discussion of propositions for legislative enactments to show their effect upon the condition of the people is legitimate and desirable; but I denounce the man who, for the purpose of advancing his own personal interests or the interests of his party, appeals to the prejudice of a class and seeks to array one class of citizens against another and to mislead the people by false statements, as an enemy to his country, deserving no better fate than that which has always overtaken men false to their country, men willing to sacrifice the country for a little temporary personal or party advantage. Concerning such a man we may ask, in the language of Addison:

> Is there not some chosen curse, some hidden thunder in the stores of Heaven, red with uncommon wrath, to blast the man who owes his greatness to his country's ruin?

THE CONDITION OF FARMERS AND LABORING MEN UNDER REPUBLICAN RULE WAS NOT AS BAD AS REPRESENTED.

I need not rely upon Republican testimony to show that the condition of the farmer and laborer has been constantly improving for the last twenty years. The junior Senator from Texas was chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means in the Fiftieth Congress and prepared and reported in the House the tariff bill which bore his name and secured its passage through the House. He is justly considered one of the most intelligent and able advocates of a tariff for revenue only.

In his able speech in the Senate recently in favor of the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law he presented a table showing the decline in prices of the products of the agriculturist and of articles consumed by farmers and laborers, which clearly shows that whatever the causes have been the decline of prices of articles consumed by farmers and laborers has been very much greater than the decline in the prices of agricultural products. At the same time he declared, what every one knows is true, that wages had constantly increased during the whole period under consideration. It has rarely been my good fortune in discussing a question to draw from an opponent so conclusive an argument to support my conclusions as this presentation of the junior Senator from Texas affords.

No one will question the accuracy of the figures presented. The only question upon which there can be a difference of opinion is as to what is the cause of the great decline in the price of articles of necessity. It will be observed that nearly all the articles named in the table which farmers buy are dutiable articles, and that in the brief period of twenty years these prices have declined 50 per cent and in some cases 75 per cent.

This table proves that domestic competition in the United States, which can only be induced under protection from foreign cheap labor products, has been and is still forcing down the prices of domestic products. This decrease in prices occurred under a protective tariff.

Our free-trade friends endeavor to account for this decrease and for the prosperity of the country in general by attributing it to every other possible cause. They are compelled to admit the fact of the great prosperity of the country, and when they are unable to account for it they say the country prospers in spite of bad legislation.

The showing made by the Senator from Texas as to the prices of articles produced by farmers and the prices of articles consumed by them applies with double force to show the improvement in the condition of the laboring classes not engaged in agriculture. While, as stated, wages have constantly increased, the prices of articles consumed by them, including agricultural products, have greatly decreased. The Senator said:

> I have constructed a table which I present here for the consideration of the public. I have taken the prices of silver from the report of the Director of the Mint. The prices of cotton, corn, wheat, bacon, lard, pork, beef, butter, cheese, and tobacco I have taken from the Statistical Abstract. These are the articles which the farmer sells. Then I have taken the articles which the farmer buys. Some of them are from the Statistical Abstract and others from the report of the Committee on Finance; the freight rates are from Poor's Manual, a standard authority on railway matters. The articles which the farmer buys are refined sugar, nails, iron, coffee, tea, sheeting, drilling, shirting, standard prints, print cloth, quinine, goblets, window glass, undershirts, ginghams, carpets, pepper, and molasses. I have also included steel rails and freight rates. All these articles have fallen since 1873, as is shown by the table.

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891.

Years.	Silver, per fine ounce.	Gold value of silver dollar.	Articles that farmers sell.									
			Cotton, per pound.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Bacon and hams, per pound.	Lard, per pound.	Pork, per pound.	Beef, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.	Tobacco, per pound.
			Cents.	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents*
1873	$1.32	$1.004	18.8	61	$1.31	8.8	9.2	7.8	7.7	21.1	13.1	10.7
1874	1.30	.988	15.4	71	1.43	9.6	9.4	8.2	8.2	25.0	13.1	9.6
1875	1.23	.964	15.0	84	1.12	11.4	13.8	10.1	8.7	23.7	13.5	11.3
1876	1.17	.894	12.9	67	1.24	12.1	13.3	10.6	8.7	23.9	12.6	10.4
1877	1.18	.929	11.8	58	1.17	10.8	10.9	9.0	7.5	20.6	11.8	10.2
1878	1.16	.891	11.1	56	1.34	8.7	8.8	6.8	7.7	18.0	11.4	8.7
1879	1.12	.868	9.9	47	1.07	6.9	7.0	5.7	6.3	14.2	8.9	7.8
1880	1.13	.886	11.5	54	1.25	6.7	7.4	6.1	6.4	17.1	9.5	7.7
1881	1.12	.881	11.4	55	1.11	8.2	9.3	7.7	6.5	19.8	11.1	8.3
1882	1.13	.878	11.4	66	1.19	9.9	11.6	9.0	8.5	19.3	11.0	8.5
1883	1.10	.858	10.8	68	1.13	11.2	11.9	9.9	8.9	18.6	11.2	8.3
1884	1.10	.861	10.5	61	1.07	10.2	9.5	7.9	7.6	18.2	10.3	9.1
1885	1.06	.823	10.6	54	.86	9.2	7.9	7.2	7.5	16.8	9.3	9.9
1886	.99	.769	9.9	49	.87	7.5	6.9	5.9	6.0	15.6	8.3	9.6
1887	.97	.758	9.5	47	.89	7.9	7.1	6.6	5.4	15.8	9.3	8.7
1888	.97	.727	9.8	55	.85	8.6	7.7	7.4	5.3	18.3	9.9	8.3
1889	.93	.724	9.9	47	.90	8.6	8.6	7.4	5.5	16.5	9.3	8.8
1890	1.06	.809	10.1	41	.83	7.7	7.1	6.0	5.4	14.4	9.0	8.6
1891	.98	.764	10.0	57	.93	7.6	6.9	5.9	5.6	14.5	9.0	8.7
Average decrease	26	26	53	6	30	14	25	24	27	32	31	19

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891—Continued.

Years.	Articles that farmers buy.																			Freight rate, per ton per mile.
	Refined sugar, per pound.	Cut nails, per pound.	Bar iron, per ton.	Steel rails, per ton.	Rio coffee, per pound.	Tea, per pound.	Sheeting, per yard.	Drilling, per yard.	Shirting, per yard.	Standard prints, per yard.	Print cloth, per yard.	Quinine, per ounce.	Goblets, per dozen.	10 by 14 window glass.	Undershirts.	Ginghams, per yard.	Carpets, 2-ply ingrain, per yard.	Black pepper, per pound.	Molasses, per gallon.	
	Cts.	Cts.			Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.		Cts.			Cts.		Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
1873	11.6	4.90	$86.00	$120.50	18	95	13.31	14.13	19.41	11.37	6.69	$2.65	85	3.40	$1.41	13	$1.14	19	69	2.00
1874	10.5	3.99	67.00	94.25	20	100	11.42	11.75	18.04	9.75	5.57	2.50	80	2.97	1.25	11	1.02	20	71	------
1875	10.8	3.42	60.00	68.75	18	60	10.41	11.12	15.12	8.71	5.33	2.25	70	3.18	1.12	10	.92	17	70	------
1876	10.7	2.98	52.00	59.25	17	55	8.85	8.71	13.58	7.66	4.10	2.00	65	3.08	1.00	10	.82	14	55	------
1877	11.6	2.57	45.00	45.50	20	55	8.46	8.46	12.46	6.77	4.38	3.00	50	2.97	.91	8	.81	14	54	------
1878	10.2	2.31	44.00	42.25	17	45	7.80	7.65	11.00	6.09	3.44	3.50	45	2.42	.87	8	.75	12	40	------
1879	8.5	2.69	51.00	48.25	14	40	7.97	7.57	11.62	6.25	3.93	3.60	40	2.42	.83	8	.67	12	36	------
1880	9.0	3.68	60.00	67.50	15	40	8.51	8.51	12.74	7.41	4.51	3.00	40	2.42	.83	9	.85	14	53	1.26
1881	9.2	3.09	58.00	61.13	13	35	8.51	8.06	12.74	7.00	3.95	2.60	35	2.12	.83	8	.75	14	43	1.25
1882	9.7	3.47	61.00	48.50	10	35	7.45	8.25	12.95	6.50	3.76	2.45	35	2.12	.79	9	.78	17	50	1.23
1883	9.2	3.06	50.00	37.75	8	33	8.32	7.11	12.93	6.00	3.60	1.80	35	2.29	.79	8	.74	16	52	1.22
1884	7.1	2.39	44.00	30.75	11	33	7.28	6.86	10.46	6.00	3.36	1.43	33	2.16	.75	7	.66	15	50	1.12
1885	6.4	2.33	40.00	28.50	9	33	6.75	6.36	10.37	6.00	3.12	.83	30	1.91	.70	6	.58	14	45	1.04
1886	6.7	2.27	43.00	34.50	9	33	6.75	6.25	10.65	6.00	3.31	.70	28	2.01	.70	6	.58	14	44	1.04
1887	6.0	2.30	49.00	37.08	15	28	7.15	6.58	10.88	6.00	3.33	.53	28	1.70	.66	7	.60	15	40	1.03
1888	6.3	2.03	44.00	29.83	15	23	7.25	6.75	10.94	6.50	3.81	.49	27	1.76	.66	6	.53	15	38	0.97
1889	7.6	2.00	43.00	29.25	16	23	7.00	6.75	10.50	6.50	3.81	.38	26	1.70	.66	6	.52	13	39	0.97
1890	7.0	2.00	45.00	31.75	19	25	7.00	6.75	10.90	6.00	3.34	.35	26	1.70	.64	6	.48	10	40	0.93
1891	5.7	1.86	42.00	29.92	16	25	6.83	6.41	10.64	6.00	2.95	.30	25	1.70	.62	6	.50	9	32	0.92
Average decrease	50	62	51	75	11	73	48	55	45	47	56	89	70	50	56	54	56	52	53	54

Average reduction in ten farm products, 26.1.

Average reduction in nineteen other products, 55.4.

This table shows that from 1873 to 1891 silver fell 26 per cent, cotton 53, corn 6, wheat 30, bacon and hams 14, lard 25, pork 24, beef 27, butter 32, cheese 31, and tobacco 19. These are the articles which farmers sell. The average decline of the ten articles is 26.1 per cent between 1873 and 1891. During the same time refined sugar declined 50 per cent, nails 62, bar iron 51, steel rails 75, Rio coffee 11, tea 73, sheeting 48, drilling 55, shirting 45, standard prints 47, print cloth 56, quinine 89, glass goblets 70, 10 by 14 window glass 50, undershirts 56, ginghams 54, carpets 56, pepper 52, molasses 53.

These are the articles the farmer buys. Now, if what he buys declines at an equal ratio with what he sells he is just as well off at one time as another. But if what he buys falls more in price than what he sells he is benefited. When we average the articles he buys we find that the decline is 55.4 per cent. He has been benefited by the fall in prices, but the decline in silver has had nothing to do with it. * * *

These prices in the table show conclusively that the farmer has been benefited by the general fall of prices, because his products would buy more in 1891 than in 1873. In 1873 cotton was worth 18.8 cents per pound, and 1,000 pounds was worth $188, and at that time it would buy 766 gallons of illuminating oil, or 1,620 pounds of refined sugar, or 4½ tons of pig iron, or 2 tons of bar iron, or 1½ tons of steel rails, or 3,832 pounds of nails, or 1,412 yards of sheeting, or 1,330 yards of drilling, or 970 yards of shirting, or 1,653 yards of standard prints, or 2,810 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 1,000 pounds of cotton was worth $100, and at the prices of these same things at that time it would buy 1,428 gallons of oil, 1,754 pounds of sugar, 5½ tons of pig iron, 2½ tons of bar iron, 3½ tons of steel rails, 5,322 pounds of cut nails, 1,464 yards of sheeting, 1,560 yards of drilling, 940 yards of shirting, 1,666 yards of prints, and 3,389 yards of print cloth.

With the exception of shirting, it would buy more of every other article enumerated, and the difference in that was very small. One thousand pounds of beef would buy in 1873 231 gallons of oil, 555 pounds of sugar, 1,282 pounds of nails, 490 yards of sheeting, 462 yards of drilling, 338 yards of shirting, 583 yards of prints, or 888 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 800 gallons of oil, 982 pounds of refined sugar, 3,010 pounds of nails, 849 yards of sheeting, 873 yards of drilling, 526 yards of shirting, 933 yards of standard prints, or 1,898 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of pork would buy in 1873 289 gallons of oil, 571 pounds of refined sugar, 1,319 pounds of nails, 504 yards of sheeting, 475 yards of drilling, 348 yards of shirting, 600 yards of standard prints, or 914 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 842 gallons of oil, 1,035 pounds of refined sugar, 3,172 pounds of nails, 853 yards of sheeting, 920 yards of drilling, 554 yards of shirting, 983 yards of standard prints, or 2,000 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of bacon and hams would buy, in 1873, 345 gallons of oil, 682 pounds of refined sugar, 1,554 pounds of nails, 602 yards of sheeting, 568 yards of drilling, 415 yards of shirting, 716 yards of standard prints, or 1,091 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,085 gallons of oil, 1,157 pounds of refined sugar, 4,086 pounds of nails, 1,111 yards of sheeting, 1,185 yards of drilling, 714 yards of shirting, 1,266 yards of standard prints, or 2,576 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of butter would buy, in 1873, 779 gallons of oil, 1,539 pounds of refined sugar, 3,553 pounds of nails, 1,359 yards of sheeting, 1,281 yards of drilling, 938 yards of shirting, 1,616 yards of standard prints, or 2,461 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 2,071 gallons of oil, 2,543 pounds of refined sugar, 7,795 pounds of nails, 2,123 yards of sheeting, 2,262 yards of drilling, 1,362 yards of shirting, 2,416 yards of standard prints, or 4,915 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of tobacco in 1873 would buy 413 gallons of oil, 833 pounds of sugar, 1,886 pounds of nails, 721 yards of sheeting, 680 yards of drilling, 498 yards of shirting, 898 yards of standard prints, or 1,307 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,243 gallons of oil, 1,526 pounds of refined sugar, 4,677 pounds of nails, 1,273 yards of sheeting, 1,357 yards of drilling, 819 yards of shirting, 1,450 yards of standard prints, or 2,949 yards of print cloth.

One hundred bushels of corn in 1873 would buy 279 gallons of oil, 551 pounds of refined sugar, 1,273 pounds of nails, 487 yards of sheeting, 458 yards of drilling, 336 yards of shirting, 579 yards of standard prints, or 881 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 820 gallons of oil, 1,007 pounds of refined sugar, 3,085 pounds of nails, 840 yards of sheeting, 896 yards of drilling, 539 yards of shirting, 956 yards of standard prints, or 1,954 yards of print cloth.

One hundred bushels of wheat in 1873 would buy 590 gallons of oil, 1,176 pounds of refined sugar, 2,509 pounds of nails, 1,030 yards of sheeting, 964 yards of drilling, 611 yards of shirting, 1,225 yards of standard prints, or 1,840 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,328 gallons of oil, 1,631 pounds of refined sugar, 5,000 pounds of nails, 1,342 yards of sheeting, 1,453 yards of drilling, 853 yards of shirting, 1,550 yards of standard prints, or 2,784 yards of print cloth.

From these figures, and maybe extended to other articles, it is clear and conclusive that the decline in prices has given all farm products a greater purchasing power. And yet it is urged that opening our mints to the unlimited coinage of silver will restore its price of 1873; and as all products have fallen through pure sympathy with it they will still sympathize with it and rise to their prices of 1873. If they did, the farmers would be ruined. If he is oppressed now, he would be confronted with bankruptcy if one-half or one-third of the purchasing power of his products should be taken away, and that would be the effect of a restoration all around of the condition of 1873. In that year the freight rate per ton per mile was 2 cents; in 1891 the freight rate per ton per mile was .929 of 1 cent, and 81,210,154,523 tons were moved 1 mile by all our railroads, for which, at the rate of .929 of 1 cent, they received as freight charges $754,183,910.

If the opening of the mints to free coinage is to restore the price of silver and all other articles to the rate of 1873, then that freight would cost $1,624,203,090. And that is much more than twice the sum that was paid in 1891. Did silver bring these freight rates down? Then to restore silver is to carry back the freight rates to 1873.

WHILE THE COST OF ARTICLES CONSUMED BY LABORING MEN HAS GREATLY DECREASED IN RECENT YEARS THERE HAS BEEN A STEADY RISE IN WAGES.

The United States Department of Labor recently collected for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, the wage rates in the United States for the period from 1840 to 1891, inclusive, a period of 52 years, the rates being taken from actual pay rolls. The investigation extended to almost every class of laborers, and from the information thus obtained the course of wages can be told with certainty.

The general result of the investigation is stated in an article by Hon. Caroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, in the Forum for October last. In this article the wages paid to a great many classes of laborers are stated for the periods of 1840, 1860, 1866, and 1891. A statement of the rates of wages is made for 1866, because, owing to the conditions growing out of the war of the rebellion, the inflation of the currency, and the depreciation of our paper, there was a great increase in the rates of wages between 1860 and 1865.

Assuming wages in 1860 to be represented by 100, the investigation shows wages in 1840 would be represented by 87.7 as compared with 1860; that in 1866 they stood at 152.2 as compared with 1860, and in 1891 they had increased to 168.6; that is to say, wages had increased in this country since 1860, under Republican rule and the protective system, 68.6 per cent.

These statements are supported by quotations of wages of skilled and unskilled workmen at the periods mentioned, taken from actual pay rolls in such a manner as to leave no doubt of their accuracy. Laborers in 1891 received gold or its equivalent, which certainly has greater purchasing power than legal-tender notes had in 1866, 86.6 higher wages than in 1860, and during the same period, as we have seen, the prices of articles consumed by laborers decreased upon an average of 55.4 per cent.

The distinguished Senator from Texas, in the speech already

referred to, discussed the subject of wages, and I quote from his speech as follows:

Mr. President, the wages of labor in this country and all over the world for a hundred years have been tending upward. They are higher to-day than they have been at any time in the past, and the wage earner, in whatever occupation employed, is deeply interested in the preservation of a standard of values as fixed and immovable as it is possible to make it. A few years ago our friends on the other side of the Chamber directed the Committee on Finance to make an investigation and report to this body the movement of wages and prices for a number of years. They took the year 1860 as a basis and compared it and other years with 1890. They intended to use these figures in their tariff battle of 1892. They intended to show that wages had been rising and prices had been falling, and the credit was due to a protective tariff.

When that time comes I will discuss with them the conclusions to be drawn from these facts. It is enough here to state the facts. Taking 1860 as the basis and calling it 100, the rate of wages increased to 1864 to 125.6 or 25.6 per cent, and to 1890 to 160.7 or 60.7 per cent. In 1860 and 1890 there was a gold standard, and in 1864 a depreciated paper standard. Wages went up in four years 25.6 per cent, but the money which the laborer earned was only the instrument which enabled him to procure the necessaries of life, and while it went up the ladder a few rounds, the necessaries of life that his wages had to buy to sustain himself, his wife, and children, had ascended the rounds of the ladder till they were lost in the clouds. The annual average wages of laborers in manufactories in 1860 was $288.95. The average monthly wage was $24.08, in gold. In 1864 it was 26.6 higher, or $30.24 in paper, and in 1890 it was 60.7 per cent higher than in 1860, and was $38.69 in gold. Now taking the official prices given by the Bureau of Statistics and the Finance Committee, the result is shown by the following table:

Purchasing power of wages of labor.

Articles.	1860. Monthly wages, $24.08.		1864. Monthly wages, $30.24.		1890. Monthly wages, $38.69.	
	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.
	Cents.		*Cents.*		*Cents.*	
Standard sheeting, per yard	8.73	275	52.07	58	6.83	566
Standard drilling, per yard	8.92	270	53.02	57	6.41	602
Bleached shirting, per yard	15.50	155	48.35	62	10.64	363
Standard prints, per yard	9.50	253	33.25	90	6.00	645
Print cloth, per yard	5.44	442	23.42	129	2.95	1,311
Cut nails, per pound	3.13	769	7.85	385	1.86	2,077
Refined sugar, per pound	10.00	240	30.00	101	4.00	859
New Orleans molasses, per gallon	53.00	45	150.00	20	40.00	128
Rio coffee, per pound	13.00	185	36.00	84	18.50	209
Tea, per pound	65.00	37	130.00	23	25.10	154
Ticking, per yard	17.00	141	70.00	43	12.00	322
Matches, per gross	48.00	50	100.00	30	37.00	104
Denims, per yard	15.00	160	88.00	34	11.00	351

WHO ARE THE TRUE FRIENDS OF THE FARMER AND LABORING MAN?

The men who are constantly endeavoring to make the agricultural and laboring classes dissatisfied with their condition, and who seek to array them against the manufacturing and wealthy classes, are not the true friends of the farmer and laboring man. There will not be in this country a general distribution of the wealth of the country per capita. The Government is never going to issue money for gratuitous distribution. There never will come a day when wealth will cease to be the product of labor usefully employed. The prosperity of every class of our citizens is intimately connected with the prosperity of every other class. A blow aimed at the manufacturing classes will fall heaviest upon the agricultural and laboring classes. My sympathies are with the great army of laborers. A considerable portion of my life has been spent upon the farm and at hard manual labor. All that I have, or have accomplished, is the result of hard work. I have no use for a man who despises labor and will not work.

All my life I have advocated those measures which I have believed to be in the interest of the masses. I attached myself to the Republican party because it was opposed to slavery and in favor of free labor; because it was in favor of protecting American labor; in favor of providing the means of general education and making American citizens free, intelligent, and independent. The Republican party abolished the system of labor which tended to degrade labor in this country and has sought to dignify and to protect labor. It provided homes to American citizens by the homestead law. It has sought by the protective policy to provide employment for all who are willing to work. It secured to settlers the means of reaching our vast public domain and provided them with the means for transportation of their products to market. It has, when in control of Congress, been constantly legislating in the interest of the laboring man. It has reduced the number of hours in a day's work upon public works. It has legislated against the importations of coolies, and against the coming to our shores of laborers under contract. It has established a Department of Agriculture to impart useful information to the people, to make costly experiments for their benefit, to distribute seeds and new varieties of fruits, vegetables, and grasses, for the protection of fruits, vegetables, and grasses from insects and blights, and for the prevention of diseases among domestic animals. It has provided for meat inspection, and successfully labored to secure the introduction of our products abroad. It has provided for the improvement of waterways, and the regulation and control of railroads to cheapen transportation.

If the time would permit, I might greatly extend the enumeration of legislation Congress has enacted in the interest of the laboring and producing classes. I have, in this body, supported every measure in my judgment calculated to benefit laboring men, sometimes even measures concerning which I feared the power of Congress to enact was doubtful. There have been visionary, impracticable schemes advocated in this body, in the alleged interest of the laboring classes, which would not have benefited any class of our citizens, and would have brought nothing but disaster and ruin upon every class, which I have not favored.

Standing as I stand to-day, opposing a policy fraught with misfortune and dire disaster for the laborer, a distinguished man, long since gone to his reward, used this language—language which I emphasize and adopt:

I have been, and I am for anything that will guarantee to the laboring classes that happiness which I in my youth saw them enjoy, and which I enjoyed with them. If the laboring class be to perish, perish, I say, the whole nation.

And so say I.

You can not reduce the laborer to a state of starvation and degradation without also destroying national prosperity.

HOW AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS ARE BENEFITED BY A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Upon the question still discussed as to the effect of a protective tariff on agriculture, I find in examining the proceedings of the Senate of March 19, 1824, a valuable report from the Senate Committee on Agriculture, submitted by its chairman, Mr. Van Rensselaer, for a unanimous committee, from which I quote. It shows that at that early day the fact that protection to home industries through undue foreign competition lessened competition in agriculture, and created a home market for agricultural products, and thus benefited farmers, was well understood. This report is found on page 1857, volume 2, first session of the Eighteenth Congress. The quotation is as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the resolution of the House of Representatives, instructing them to inquire if an increase of the duty now established by law, on any article of foreign growth or manufacture, will be for the interest of the agriculturist, and if there be any such article, to name the same, together with the additional amount of the duty which they deem beneficial to the agricultural interest, respectfully submit the following report:

That in the apprehension of your committee whatever increases the consumption of its products, whether at home or abroad, necessarily advances the interest of agriculture. He who cultivates the soil looks beyond the supply of his own wants for the profits of his labor. He looks to a market for the surplus products of his industry. The home market, in the opinion of the committee, is at all times to be preferred to the foreign market, when the reward of agricultural pursuits is equal, the former is less precarious than the latter; it is also more permanent and certain and above the reach of restraining and prohibitory duties of foreign hostility; and when the home market can be increased in its demands, without diminishing in a greater degree the foreign consumption, it would seem wise and prudent to promote its extension by every rational means within the sphere of legislation.

Your committee consider the increase of duties on many foreign articles now imported into the United States would promote the agricultural prosperity of the nation. A portion of population engaged in manufacture would necessarily depend on the farmer for subsistence, and create a more perfect and profitable division of labor than now exists. A new market would be opened and a new demand created for all the raw materials which new manufacturers would consume. It can not be denied that if all the manufactured articles now consumed by the people of the United States were manufactured within the bounds of our country from the raw material furnished by ourselves the value of our lands would be increased and the profits of agricultural labor considerably augmented. Demand and consumption would be directly extended—a great extent of soil now devoted to the growing of products that afford no sufficient stimulus to cultivation. The soil and climate of the United States are capable of producing the various articles necessary for such manufacturing establishments as will most naturally flourish in this country, and of such as would inevitably be consumed providing manufacturing labor should be extended.

By a comprehensive and rigorous system of policy calculated to unfold our agricultural resources a spirit of emulation and industry would be diffused over the land, a vast and active system of internal exchange would rise up, the expense of transportation in heavy articles would be in a great measure saved, and, in fact, that which should be ardently wished for in every agricultural country, a home market, would appear; this, too, would prove a market at once various in point of demand, but sure, steady, and unchanging. The policy, the caprice, the selfishness, and the hostility of other nations could not affect it. On this point, therefore, the committee can not entertain any doubt. The extension of domestic manufactures, depending on the production of such raw materials as can be found in this country, must increase the demand and consumption of those materials, and of course secure a new and ready market.

THE STOCK ARGUMENTS OF FREE TRADERS.

The two stock arguments made by the advocates of free trade are, first, that of unrestricted trade, the right to buy where we can buy cheapest; and, second, the securing of a wider market for our exports. I have, on several occasions, discussed these propositions at length in the Senate, and shown their fallacy;

and I do not care at this time to repeat what I have heretofore said. It is sufficient to say that to buy where we can buy cheapest, that is, to buy goods abroad for home consumption with the privilege of bringing them into this country free of duty, is for consumers in this country to avail themselves of the poorly paid labor of Europe and the pauper labor of Asia, to prefer the welfare of foreign manufacturers and foreign laborers to our own; to stop the manufacture of things we need in this country and to depend upon foreign countries for them; to take employment from our own people to give it to foreigners; to reduce the standard of wages in this country to the standard of wages in other countries.

All history shows that no nation can be prosperous which does not protect its own industries and its own citizens and, as far as possible, do its own work. The junior Senator from Texas, in his able speech upon the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, ridiculed the idea that protection tended to reduce the price of products, and used the oft-repeated assertion, that adding to the price of a commodity does not cheapen it. But it has often been shown that the duty upon dutiable articles is largely borne by the foreign producer; and, without discussing the proposition at length, I assert that domestic competition does reduce prices; that when, by a duty on a foreign commodity, which places American manufactures upon an equality with foreign manufactures, industries are built up, home competition is induced, and the skill, the enterprise, the energy and inventive genius of our people very soon reduce the price of the commodity to the lowest figure consistent with reasonable returns to capital invested and fair wages to labor, and often, indeed generally, the price is reduced far below that of the article at the time the protective duty was imposed.

Let those who wish advocate the interests of England, of China, and India, and prefer the welfare of foreign laborers to that of American citizens. For myself, I prefer the interests of my own country to those of any foreign nation, and the welfare of American citizens to that of the pauper class of Europe, the ryots of India, and the coolies of China. I want nothing I consume (and no true American does) cheaper than it will be manufactured under sharp competition, consistent with fair returns to capital and fair wages to labor, by a nation of seventy-six millions of people, the freest, most enlightened, and most energetic in the world.

That domestic competition under a protective policy does reduce the price of commodities, if proof is needed, is shown by our own experience. The table presented by the Senator from Texas, in his speech before referred to, shows a great depreciation of prices, not only of agricultural products, but of manufactured articles, for a series of years. This table, coming from so prominent a member of the Democratic party, and so distinguished an advocate of a tariff for revenue only, is worthy of careful consideration. It shows that under the protective system in this country the price of everything consumed by the laborer has greatly decreased, while wages have constantly increased.

Now, let me examine, for a moment, the argument that free trade would give us a wider market for our surplus products. The assertion is constantly made that if we do not buy of foreign countries they will not buy of us. I have, on former occasions, called attention to the fact that we do not buy of any foreign nation; that is, of the government; and no foreign nation buys of us. Our foreign commerce is carried on by individuals, and is regulated, like all commercial transactions, by selfish interests. If an importer is about to purchase goods, he does not stop to inquire whether the balance of trade is in our favor or against us, or what the tariff laws of other countries are. He buys where he can buy what he wants cheapest, and pays for his purchases with gold.

If a wheat merchant in Liverpool wants a cargo of wheat, he does not care what duties are levied on British products in American ports, but buys his wheat where he can buy cheapest, quantity and quality considered, whether what he buys is the product of our western prairies or of the Argentine Republic, whether it has been raised by Russian serfs or by Indian ryots. If exchange were carried on between nations only, or by barter, that is, by the exchange of products only, there might be something in the proposition that if we do not buy of foreign countries we can not sell to them. But foreign trade is not a system of barter. Gold is a tool of international commerce and the universal measure of value and the medium in which balances of trade are settled.

Our own experience shows that the balance of trade with other countries may be largely in our favor for years and the balance be received in gold. Our experience with other countries, Brazil for instance, shows that we continue a large foreign trade although the balance of trade may be, for many years, against us. The balance of trade between the United States and Brazil has been for years against us to the extent of about $50,000,000 per annum. The fact is that other countries buy of our products every year all they need for consumption. They would continue to do so if they could buy as cheaply of us as elsewhere, even though we were to build a Chinese wall around this country to prevent the importation of foreign products. And if we were to admit everything produced in foreign countries free of duty these same foreign countries, or rather the inhabitants of these countries would not buy a dollar's worth of our products unless these products could be purchased upon the most advantageous terms, or their necessities compelled them to purchase.

We might adopt free trade, and our wheat, corn, cotton, pork, and beef would still be compelled to compete in the markets of Europe with the products of every other country under the sun produced by cheap lands and cheap labor, and their price in London would be fixed, as it now is in London, in gold, by the universal law of supply and demand. Mr. President, there never was a greater fallacy than that free trade would give us a wider or better market for our agricultural products. It would, on the contrary, drive millions of men now engaged in manufacturing to agricultural pursuits, resulting in increased production and depreciated prices.

WHAT FREE TRADE MEANS.

Free trade does not mean that custom-houses are to be abolished and no revenue collected by duties upon imports, but it means a tariff system similar to that maintained by Great Britain, a system of tariff for revenue only: duties laid upon articles which do not come into competition with domestic productions, and the free admission of articles which do come into competition with articles of domestic production. It means, first, that goods manufactured in foreign countries shall be admitted into this country free of duty if the condition of the revenues admits of it. It means that the half-starved, underpaid and unemployed millions of Europe shall be given work which under a protective tariff would be done by American laborers, enabling these American laborers to live comfortably, to educate their children, and become independent. It means that the pauper laborer of India and China shall be brought into direct competition with American workingmen. It means either the closing of our mills and factories or that the return for capital invested in manufacturing industries shall be reduced to the rate of interest in the old countries, and that the wages of our workingmen shall be reduced to the starvation wages of laborers on the eastern hemisphere.

In a word, it means leveling down in this country of the condition of American laborers to that of the ignorant, half-starved, half-clothed masses of the countries of Europe and Asia. It means that the wheels of progress shall stop; that the development of our resources shall cease; that the prosperity we have enjoyed under Republican rule shall be destroyed.

The disastrous effect of threatened free-trade legislation has not been confined to manufactures or the particular interests directly affected by legislation or threatened legislation. All the industries of the country are inseparably connected, and all have suffered and will suffer alike; and if mills and factories are closed by tariff legislation, the idle operatives will crowd into other employments, producing competition and overproduction, low wages and low prices. If the manufacturer is forced to take small and continually decreasing profits upon his investments, investors in all other industries will receive smaller profits. If laborers in manufacturing industries are forced to submit to reduction of wages laborers in all other industries will be compelled to submit to a similar reduction. The success of the Democratic party and its control of Congress renders the repetition of the Democratic action in 1833 possible, and, so far as human foresight can tell, inevitable.

THE INDUSTRIES OF THE PACIFIC COAST IN JEOPARDY

If some evil genius, determined to blast and destroy the Pacific coast, had presided over and controlled the House Committee of Ways and Means, no more certain and speedy scheme could have been devised for that purpose than the bill agreed upon by the committee. The people of that portion of the Union west of the Rocky Mountains are almost entirely engaged in agriculture, lumbering, and mining. Manufactures are in their infancy, and as yet comparatively unimportant. Wheat growing, wool growing, the raising of cattle and horses, fruit raising, and hop growing, fishing, lumbering, and mining, are the principal industries. Every one of these industries will be stricken down and destroyed, or made unprofitable, by the passage of the Wilson bill.

The number of sheep in California, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Nevada, and New Mexico, in 1892, was 13,981,901, almost one-third of all the sheep in the United States. A large portion of the rugged soil of that region, unfit for cultivation, is utilized for sheep pasture. Thousands of pioneers make a living for themselves and their families by wool-growing; but the success of the Democratic party, upon a platform which denounces the protective system as a robbery and as unconstitu-

tional, in connection with the fact that whenever the Democrats in either House of Congress have had an opportunity they have voted for free wool, and that President Cleveland in his free trade message of 1887 advocated placing wool on the free list, has had the effect to discount Democratic tariff legislation, to curtail the purchase of domestic wool by manufacturers to present needs, and to reduce the prices of wool nearly or quite to free-trade rates.

The House committee has now confirmed the worst fears of the wool-growers and sounded the death knell of this great industry in the United States. The prosperity of the State of Oregon, more especially of the western portion of the State, is largely dependent upon the wool-growing industry. Last year wool brought there 16 cents per pound. This year, the highest price offered has been 10 cents. The prosperity of Montana and of other Pacific coast States, like that of Oregon, is largely dependent upon wool-growing; and wool in Montana has been worth this year only from 6 to 7 cents per pound. In Chicago, in the early days of September last, fine wool was worth from 14 to 16 cents, and coarse wool from 13 to 15 cents; while in the year 1891 the price of fine wool was 33 cents per pound, and of coarse wool 31 cents per pound; and 30 cents for fine, and 29 cents for coarse wool during 1892. These figures require no comment. They show that with free wool the wool-growing industry of this country will be destroyed.

I have received a communication from Hon. Charles Hilton, an extensive wool-grower of eastern Oregon, stating the effects which placing wool on the free list would have on that industry in Oregon, which I incorporate in my remarks. It is as follows:

THE DALLES, OREGON, *December 6, 1893.*

DEAR SENATOR: In a short time the question of the removal of the present tariff on many commodities will come before the United States Senate, and from what the papers tell us it is fairly reasonable to suppose that the principal industry of eastern Oregon (wool-growing) is seriously menaced.

Some time since, anticipating the action of the Democratic Congress, you asked me for some figures, which you could perhaps use in an argument you intended making in opposition to the removal of the tariff on wool, as you know my experience in wool-growing has been considerable, and I have been fairly successful.

I have been engaged in the business for eighteen years and have run from ten to twelve thousand head. I have made it a point each year for a period of thirty days to accurately ascertain the actual cost of all my sheep camps in the way of supplies, and you can accept the following figures as trustworthy, since they are an average from all these records.

COST OF RUNNING 2,000 SHEEP ONE YEAR.

Herder, at $35 per month		$420.00
Board, at $15 per month		180.00
Camp tender to help move and furnish camp		200.00
Salt, 2 tons, at $30		60.00
Hay, 50 tons, at $8		400.00
Extra help during lambing season		100.00
Extra help during winter feeding season		50.00
Shearing 2,000 sheep, at 7 cents per head		140.00
Board of shearers		30.00
Extra help sacking wool, etc		25.00
50 wool sacks, at 40 cents		20.00
Feeding horses used to supply camp, etc		180.00
Shoeing horses used to supply camp, etc		36.00
Furnishing camp—tents, blankets, rope, etc		30.00
Hauling 16,000 pounds wool to railroad, at ¾ cents		120.00
Cost of 16,000 pounds wool, as per above		1,991.00
16,000 pounds wool, at 6 cents	$960.00	
700 lambs, being increase, $1.25	875.00	
		1,835.00
Net loss on above basis		156.00

The only possible reduction that can be made in the cost of running a band of sheep is in wages—as the plow has driven the stock so far back into the hills that the cost of feed is greater, as there is so little land that will produce, and freight to and from the railroad figures largely in salt and other supplies, and shipping wool (my ranch is 80 miles south of Arlington).

Thus you will see that at 6 cents per pound for wool, which is the highest price we can expect with free wool for the class of wool raised here, calculating the weight of each fleece at 8 pounds, which is about the average, and the increase at 35 per cent (which is all an ordinary band of stock sheep will produce, as we have to carry the male until 2 years old and past before they are suitable for market and can not breed the ewes until 2 years old) the owner would be about $200 loser on the year's work. This leaving out of consideration all the taxes, interest on capital invested, and wear and tear to camp accoutrements, which is considerable.

If a wool-grower were running but one band of sheep several of these items would be greater, such as the expense of camp tending and horses—which I have divided by three—as one outfit attends to three sheep herders. Again, the average loss caused by wild animals and by accident during a year is at least 5 per cent, and this taken with the interest at 6 per cent on investments in real estate or the rent which must be paid to secure a winter range and feeding ground will considerably increase the loss of the wool-grower.

You are of course better posted than we can be as to the probable reduction in cost in manufactured material to be brought about by the annihilation of the wool industry in this country.

But when we are told that only three or four pounds of scoured wool goes into a suit of clothes, it does not seem probable that so small a reduction will be of any great advantage to the consumer, as the protected manufacturer is evidently to have so much the best of it that he will probably be given, or take, this small margin also.

For the last four or five years I have averaged 15 cents per pound for my wool and $2.75 for my mutton sheep. The latter can not now be sold for more than $1.50 (at the ranch), and our wool is now being sold in Boston for 10 cents. The cost of freight, including insurance and commissions, amounts to about 4 cents a pound.

But for the unfortunate accident of Democratic success in electing a majority in both Houses of Congress and a President, the price of this year's clip would have been considerably higher than before, as the immense amount of rags and shoddy imported during the six months before the McKinley law went into effect is about consumed, and the manufacturers who are now idle would be at work on our wool.

I am sure that you are working earnestly in opposition to free trade, and I sincerely hope that a resolute stand, such as you will take in our interest, will be successful.

There is one thing which you may not have had brought to your notice, and that is, that destruction of the sheep industry means the abandonment of thousands of acres of land which now furnish good sheep pasture in Eastern Oregon (and which once, though not arable, furnished bunch-grass range of high value for cattle-growing, have been so heavily stocked for a series of years that the bunch grass has been destroyed and will never return).

The only vegetation which now exists is weeds and the small sheep grass which will support nothing but sheep, and upon which they will thrive; take away the sheep and this is waste land and can never be anything else.

It would be impossible for us to continue the business under free wool; we would have to quit breeding and dispose of our sheep for mutton as they become of suitable age.

When the industry is destroyed in the United States, I apprehend, the foreigner will raise the price of wool probably to more than we have received under protection; but we will have no sheep, and it takes a long time to stock up a range, as sheep do not increase very rapidly. I am,

Yours very truly,

CHAS. HILTON.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH, *Washington, D. C.*

Not content with striking down this great industry of the Pacific coast the committee have threatened the existence of other leading industries of the coast by absolute free trade. Scattered all over the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and the plains of California and the valleys of Oregon and Washington are fruitful orchards and vineyards, giving employment to thousands of American citizens and furnishing the finest of fruits to almost every section of the Union. Grapes, olives, oranges, lemons, prunes, plums, apples, peaches, pears, and all the smaller fruits are raised in abundance and in perfection, and with proper protection can be raised in sufficient quantities to supply the domestic demand. But a portion of our common country, that portion which controls the dominant party in Congress, and which has selfishly taken care of its own industries in the House bill, proposes to strike a disastrous blow at the fruit industry of the Pacific coast by placing some fruits upon the free list and by greatly reducing the tariff upon importations of others. The great industry of prune-raising in Oregon, Washington, and California is to be jeopardized by largely reducing the duty upon imported prunes.

I am in receipt of a letter from a large fruit-raiser in Oregon concerning the prune industry, which I will incorporate in my remarks:

SALEM, OREGON, *December 10, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: In regard to the duty on prunes I would say, in behalf of the fruit-growers of the Pacific Northwest, that it is necessary to maintain the protective tariff now in force to enable producers on this coast to establish that industry and develop it to perfection.

As yet prune-growing here is in its infancy, but when the trees planted in California are in full bearing, they will produce, in good season, 150,000,000 pounds of cured prunes. In five years, or less, Oregon and Washington will produce 50,000,000 pounds. The present year's product of this coast is about 40,000,000 pounds, for the season is not very favorable. There are many districts of Oregon and Washington where fruit-growing can be carried on, and our fruits are all exceptionally choice.

As you are aware, I have been for many years producing and curing prunes, and have given my experience to the public through the press. My experience shows that only the best methods of cultivation can succeed. In all countries fruit-growing is an uncertain business and subject to vicissitudes of climate as well as exigencies of trade and commerce. Our fruit-growers have to learn the best varieties to grow, the most effective and successful treatment of orchards, as well as ways and means for curing fruits to put them in the world's markets; not least, also, the best markets for cured fruits after they are produced.

The choice prunes of the present year's crop command only 4½ to 7 cents per pound, and will never go to any much higher figure. If the tariff is removed, or too greatly reduced, prices will go so low as to leave no inducement for care of our orchards, much less any inducement to plant wider areas. The issue involves the success of fruit-growing at large and the success of thousands who have predicated their hopes and efforts on the existing conditions. Fruit-growing at large is dependent, as our orchardists consider prunes their most important staple. If that fails it will discourage all effort.

Already the influence of the proposed change causes discouragement and makes men lose faith.

Grant us continued protection, and we will fully test the possibilities and capabilities of production and reach the greatest possible excellence, and place fruit-growing in this region on the best plane of artistic and scientific enterprise. We will not only supply fully the home demand, but establish our products in foreign markets and command success on the basis of excellence. The time will soon come when we shall furnish prunes throughout the United States at the lowest figure consistent with a living profit, and can defy free trade.

During the present year fruit-growers have reaped small returns on the Pacific coast. The citrus groves of San Bernardino, the vineyards and orchards of Middle and Northern California, the fertile reaches of the wide North Pacific have all gathered and marketed the fruits of 1893 without averaging to pay fairly the expenses of production. The prospect is not too encouraging at the best, and to remove the duty and admit foreign prunes free will cause such decadence of this widespread industry as will replace beautiful and well-kept orchards with more than desolation.

We respectfully object to the degradation of labor that must result from such reduction of duty, and ask for effective and reasonable protection as encouragement and support while we are struggling with a difficult problem—replacing the primeval forests of the late wilderness with fruitful orchards; with effort that can not succeed on the Atlantic, and it remains to be seen if they can prosper on the Pacific.

Give us needed aid and encouragement, and you will see that all we claim will be accomplished, and all we promise will be performed.

S. A. CLARKE.

Hon. J. N. DOLPH, *United States Senate.*

In Oregon and Washington hop-raising is an important and rapidly growing industry, furnishing employment to thousands of laborers, and largely adding to the wealth of those States. If this industry were properly protected the two States would soon furnish hops in sufficient quantity to supply the domestic demand; but that industry, too, is to be embarrassed in the general onslaught. The present duty upon hops is 15 cents per pound. By the Wilson bill it is proposed to reduce the duty to 8 cents per pound. The reduction, so far as it affects prices, must come from the profits, or supposed profits, of the hop-growers, and the result of the reduction of the duty will be to enable foreign hops to successfully compete with the domestic product, to prevent the growth of the industry, and destroy or render it profitless in this country.

Not content with the injury these proposed changes would work to the Pacific coast, it is proposed that the protective duties on many agricultural products provided for by the McKinley bill and previous legislation shall be removed, the barrier which we have erected against agricultural productions from Canada and other foreign countries broken down, and American farmers placed in free competition with Canadian producers. The provision of the Wilson bill in this regard may be briefly stated as follows:

Buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, oats, oat meal, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour are to pay a duty of 20 per cent; but each of the above articles shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States.

Of course, no country importing largely of our agricultural products will impose a duty upon them, and this provision of the Wilson bill means free trade with Canada, and with all other countries in the articles mentioned. Barley, under the McKinley bill, is subject to a duty of 30 cents per bushel, which has had the effect of limiting the amount of barley imported from Canada and stimulating its production by our farmers. But, by the Wilson bill, barley, barley malt, and barley pearled, patent or hulled, is subjected to a duty of only 20 per cent ad valorem. Duties upon live animals are largely decreased by the Wilson bill, and fixed at 20 per cent ad valorem. Duties upon dairy products, and upon beans, peas, hay, potatoes, and other vegetables which are not placed upon the free list, are largely reduced. The duty is reduced upon raisins and other dried grapes to 1½ cents per pound. Apples, green or ripe, apples dried, desiccated or evaporated, bacon and hams, beef, mutton, and pork, and meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved birds, and land and water fowls, cabbages, eggs and yolks of eggs, fish and insects, fresh fish, and many other products of agriculture are placed upon the free list.

Turning my attention to other provisions of the bill, I find that the great lumber interests of the coast are jeopardized. It is proposed to remove the tariff on lumber, and admit the products of the forests of Canada, manufactured from timber cut upon government lands purchased for a nominal consideration and by cheap labor, to compete with the products of our mills, manufactured from valuable timber by high-priced American labor; a change in our tariff laws which, if it should be consummated, will result in stopping our mills, in making profitless $300,000,000 of capital invested in the lumbering business, and in throwing out of employment thousands of men now employed in the industry.

I can not do better, in describing the effect of the removal of duty upon lumber and other products of wood, than by quoting an editorial from the Puget Sound Lumberman, as follows:

Fifty million dollars in round numbers represent the capital employed in the lumber industry on the Pacific coast. There are 840 sawmills and 404 shingle mills in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, whose output of lumber footed up last year 2,300,000,000 feet of lumber and 2,200,000,000 shingles, of the aggregate value of $27,000,000. The number of men employed in the logging camps of these States is 27,000, to whom are paid in wages annually $18,000,000. Naturally this industry, the mainstay of at least Washington and Oregon, is vitally interested in the tariff question.

British Columbia, which will compete with the three States above mentioned, possesses a greater lumber area than the three States combined. Last year Washington and Oregon shipped into California, which is a great lumber-consuming State, 325,000,000 feet of lumber and shipped eastward to the prairie States 150,000,000 feet and 1,100,000,000 shingles. It is conceded that British Columbia will cut seriously into the California trade, and perhaps compete to some extent with Washington and Oregon lumber in the Eastern States if lumber is placed on the free list.

The large cargo mills of British Columbia employing Chinese and kanaka labor, there being little or no restriction to the importation of alien labor there, are in a position to unload into California vast quantities of lumber in competition with the mills on this side of the line, which pay white labor higher wages than obtain in any other lumber industry section in this country. As fully one-half of the exports of lumber from Washington and Oregon find their way to California, this is a very serious matter. So far as the Eastern trade is concerned, there will be but little direct competition, the British Columbia mills not having found a market as yet, but directly a lot of cheap lumber from Eastern Canada gets into the prairie States via the lakes and on the Atlantic seaboard it will naturally handicap the shipment of Pacific Northwest fir, cedar, and spruce by rail.

I incorporate, also, in my remarks a communication from the Pacific Pine Lumber Company of San Francisco, to the House Committee of Ways and Means, setting forth the conditions of the lumber trade on the Pacific coast, and the effect which the removal of the present duty would have upon the lumber interest there. The communication is as follows:

PACIFIC PINE LUMBER COMPANY,
San Francisco, Cal., November 22, 1893.

To the honorable the Ways and Means Committee
of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: The lumber trade of the Pacific coast engaged in the manufacture of Douglas fir (commonly termed Oregon pine), spruce, and cedar lumber, noting per newspaper publication and otherwise the disposition of your honorable committee to place lumber on the free list in the proposed modification of the tariff, view such possibility with the gravest apprehension, and this company having taken an active interest in this question in 1888, is requested to submit to your honorable committee the condition of the lumber trade and the effect of such action, with especial regard to the situation on this coast and its relation to British Columbia, on the north.

In such direction, it premises by assuming that the only justification that can be alleged for removing the present duty on lumber is, either a limited supply within the territory of the United States (and accessible to its people), or a possibility that the present standing timber may, in holdings, be concentrated in the hands of a few, with the effect of unfairly raising the prices to the consumer. In refutation of such allegations, it would respectfully submit that the most casual investigation will determine the nonexistence of the first as a fact, or the second as a potentiality.

A few years ago the first of above-named positions had emphasis from the very great inroads made upon the standing timber of the northern frontier of the United States, with the coincident apprehension that the continuance, in the ratio then existing, would very soon leave the country without a source of supply within its own borders. So wedded was the main consuming class to the use of the principal product of said section that for a time no source of supply was deemed available except that existing in Canada, contiguous thereto; hence a temporary leaning towards the abrogation of duty on white pine, in order that such supply might be available.

The trend of sentiment in that direction was, however, of short life; the vast areas of yellow pines in the Southern States attracted marked attention, and the liberal investment of capital led to a phenomenal development of the lumber industry in that section, supplemented by so great an activity in the introduction of its products in the Territory previously the domain of white pine, that to-day the substitution is so fully accepted that any reliance upon Canadian timber is absolutely unnecessary, with the further certain effect that should same find entry to displace the Southern product, it would be a deathblow to this industry that in the past five years has so greatly enlarged the taxable values of that section.

Additionally to the "entree" of the Southern products in the Middle West of the United States, is a growing shipment trade by rail from the Pacific coast, increasing yearly and to continue increasing hereafter, provided the exclusion of the products of our northern neighbors is maintained, and should the old Northwest be entirely denuded of her timber, the new Northwest of the Pacific coast jointly with the Southern States, from their vast areas of virgin timber (as affirmed by the forestry reports of the Interior Department), positively guarantees for generations a full supply for the nation within its territorial limits.

The question of supply for the future being so well established from said sources, and assuming that the same excess producing capacity exists in the Southern States in relation to consumption, that is a condition on the Pacific coast, (where such capacity is nearly three times the consumption), the competition thereby engendered becomes a certain assurance of low prices to consumers, and it is indeed difficult to imagine any grounds whatsoever for opening the markets of the United States to foreign lumber.

Thus far this presentation may be deemed as applying to the country at large; there are, however, conditions existing on this coast that further appeal to the consideration of your honorable committee. We refer to methods of transportation and the advantages to the mill owner in British Columbia growing out of the protective tendencies of its government.

The shipping ports of British Columbia are adjacent to those on the American side and no farther distant from points of consumption, whether the shipments are by the way of the Pacific Ocean to domestic coast ports or by rail to the Eastern States. The American mill owner is by the laws of the nation compelled to use in the coasting trade tonnage of American register exclusively, while if our domestic markets are opened to the mills of British Columbia without restriction, the owners on that side would have the choice of all flags in their carriers, thus to all intents and purposes interjecting foreign bottoms into the coasting trade, though technically the voyage is from a foreign port.

Analogous conditions exist in the relation of the lumber manufacturers and shippers of Maine to those of the provinces east of that State, while the markets of the Middle West and Eastern States, that the Pacific coast manufacturers are now cultivating, would be divided with British Columbia, and the shipments to points closest to destination on the Canadian border be made over a foreign railroad, built and subsidized by foreign capital (paralleling competing roads on the American side), to the exclusion of traffic desired by and due to the transcontinental roads in the United States.

Again, the stimulation of the lumber industry on this coast is a great aid to the development of its merchant marine. During the depression in the shipbuilding industry in other parts of the United States such industry has been fairly active on the coast, and its fostering is of more than local importance, inasmuch as the majority of vessels of recent construction are carrying our flag to foreign ports, where it has been hitherto almost unknown. The effect of permitting foreign tonnage, built and run at lower cost, to invade the coasting trade, would be the same as upon American deep-water shipping, now practically driven from the seas, as also to effectually end as an industry shipbuilding on this coast.

Your protestant would also most respectfully submit to your honorable committee, that the protective tendencies of English governments to the north of us, in subsidizing railroads, steamship lines, and offering to industrial enterprises concessions in the way of land, etc., and especially in the system of rentals to mills at a nominal sum per acre per annum of timber lands (by which investment therein is avoided), is of marked advantage to the lumber industry on that side, as compared with the ruling rates of stumpage on the American side, or the otherwise necessity of large investments in timber lands by purchase (the interest on which, with taxes, etc., exceeds said rentals), unless the American industry has maintained to it the present protection, which it is feared your honorable committee is about to disturb.

Your protestant would further submit to your honorable committee, that the lumber trade of the United States represents a larger investment and affords labor to a greater number of employés, than any other single industry, while on the Pacific Coast the ratio of both investment and employés, as applied to volume of business, is far beyond that of other sections. No other industry not its outgrowth, except coal (which is likewise menaced by the proposed tariff changes), exists in the new Northwest in all that area west of the Cascade Mountains; it increases the taxable wealth,

gives employment to hundreds of thousands in mills, in woods, and on land and sea; its commerce and the trade stimulated to supply the mechanical wants of its plants, and the physical requirements of the myriads depending upon it for a livelihood, has made populous, magnificent cities on the shores of Puget Sound, and it is incredible that its destruction can be considered, when such destruction will be the inevitable result of the abrogation of the existing tariff as to this industry.

It is not to be expected that the lumber manufacturers of this coast, with the accumulations of a lifetime in the balance, and struggling against the disastrous effects of overproduction and consequent competition of late years, can view with complacency the further jeopardy threatened by the intimated action of your honorable committee, but it is not alone in the menace to individual interests that this protest has emphasis; pride of section prompts the inquiry: What possible compensation can be offered for this proposed disturbance? What gain to the section, State, or nation, is expected in return for the surrender of American markets to British Columbia (that has no products to export that this coast has not in surplus and will have in surplus for years to come) when such surrender involves the certain obliteration of taxable wealth created by this industry alone; destroys the labor and trade of thousands, transfers to alien ships and railroads the traffic our own require, and even places the handling of the trade at ports of consumption with a nonresident class who will not contribute a dime to the revenues of the country, leaving only to the American citizen the payment of the bill.

Such a course would indeed be "giving to those that have," since the lumber manufacturers of British Columbia have "protection" enough from the paternalism of their own Government, without like aid from that of the United States; and against such aid in any form the entire lumber trade of the Pacific coast, regardless of party affiliation, have now and always to most emphatically protest.

This company has the honor, both in voicing this protest and submitting same to your honorable committee, to subscribe itself on behalf of its confreres.

Very respectfully yours,

PACIFIC PINE LUMBER COMPANY,
E. M. HERRICK, *President*.

A great many people on the Pacific coast are, or have recently been, engaged in silver-mining. The ore produced by their mines is mainly low-grade ore containing lead; and even in prosperous times the mines could not be profitably worked for the silver alone. Notwithstanding the blow which this industry has already received in consequence of the fall in the price of silver bullion, the Democratic party proposes to give it another blow, which will utterly destroy it, and prevent its revival by classing silver ore containing lead, more valuable for silver than for lead, as silver ore, and allowing the free importation of the lead product of Mexico, produced from mines of great richness, by labor receiving less than one-third the wages necessarily paid to American laborers, thus to drive out the American product and close our silver and lead mines. Our fisheries are to be rendered less profitable by being compelled to submit to a disastrous competition with the products of Canadian fisheries.

The duty is to be removed from coal, and that industry in western Washington and around Coos Bay in Oregon is to be jeopardized or destroyed by competition from free foreign coal, mined by cheap labor. This is all in accordance with the Democratic platform, in which protection was denounced as a robbery and unconstitutional. But the Democratic governor of West Virginia and a large delegation of Democrats from that State appeared before the House Committee of Ways and Means and advocated the retention of the protective duty upon coal; and it is reported that when the governor was asked if there was any industry in West Virginia, protected by the tariff, from which protection could be safely removed, he answered in the negative. Mr. President, the free traders should bestir themselves in West Virginia; there is heresy there. The doctrine of a tariff for revenue only is in danger. The integrity of the Democratic party is threatened. It is a dangerous condition of things when a Democratic governor, and a large delegation of leading Democrats, make a pilgrimage to the national capital to plead for the continuance of the protective policy.

I might continue this statement concerning the character of the legislation proposed by the House bill and the effect of the proposed changes upon the industries of the Pacific coast, but I will not. Suffice it to say, that if that bill should become a law, it means free trade as to all of our most important industries. The effect upon the Pacific coast if this proposed legislation should be enacted into law would be to destroy millions of invested capital, to paralyze every industry, and bring want, ruin, and bankruptcy upon our people, and to compel us, in order that any industry can be conducted, to require American laborers to work for greatly reduced wages—a condition of things never experienced on the coast, and one to which our people will everywhere unwillingly submit. Is it proposed to treat the South in this manner? No; rice is to continue to receive fair protection. Sugar, which is a product of the Southern States, and mainly of a single Southern State, is to receive continued protection. If cotton were not raised largely in excess of the domestic demand, that would have been protected also.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Putting iron ore, coal, lumber, and the principal agricultural products on the free list, will be especially disastrous to the belt of agricultural, lumbering, and mining States along the Canadian border. Under the House bill, if it should become a law, we would have free trade in these articles with Canada. Extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the United States and Canada lie side by side, divided only by an imaginary line, with similar forests and mines, with the same character of soil, but with cheaper lands, cheaper labor, and more undeveloped resources upon the Canadian side. It is proposed to throw down the barrier which had protected agriculture in the United States and compelled the Canadians to contribute largely to our Treasury, and to admit the products of the cheaper soil and cheaper labor of Canada into the United States free. It is proposed that we shall make an exceedingly foolish bargain with Canada, and give her the markets of sixty-seven millions of people for the privilege of sending free certain agricultural products into a country having five millions of people.

But this disproportion between the population of the two countries is not the worst feature of the proposed reciprocity. The raw products of Canada and those of the United States are substantially the same. Reciprocity with Canada would mean a very different thing from reciprocity with Mexico or South American countries, from which, with reciprocity, we might get, in exchange for our products, products of those countries which we do not produce; but with the duty removed or reduced upon the products of the forests, the mines, and the soil of Canada, the only result will be to make farming profitable in Canada, to increase the amount of Canadian products annually exported to the United States, to crowd out of our home markets a like amount of our own products. The amount of Canadian imports will not greatly affect prices in the United States, but will affect domestic production, and relieve the Canadian producers from the burden of paying duties at our ports. It will result in benefiting the Canadian producer, in loss to our Treasury, and to American farmers exposed to Canadian competition.

Our tariff upon agricultural products has made farming unprofitable in Canada, has protected farmers on our northern frontier from undue competition with Canadian products, has added greatly to our revenues, contributed, as every one admits, by the Canadian producer, has caused such a difference in the prosperity of the two countries as to induce a very large immigration of the most industrious, enterprising citizens of the Dominion to the United States. All these advantages are to be absolutely thrown away, without any compensating benefits; and only to carry out an unsound theory concerning free trade in raw materials. Our people are to be further taxed; new schemes of taxation are to be devised to make them contribute to the revenues the amount which, under existing laws, is now contributed by Canadians.

The McKinley bill considerably increased the duties on many agricultural products, protected and stimulated agriculture in the United States, increased taxation upon importations of Canadian products into this country; but under the House bill this policy is to be reversed. This is but another example of the insincerity of the Democratic party when it professes friendship for the farmer and laboring man.

During the debate upon the Mills bill, in both branches of Congress, our Democratic friends indulged in all sorts of denunciation of the manufacturers of the country. No epithet was too severe to be applied to them. The protective policy was denounced as being intended, and practically operating, to enrich the manufacturers at the expense of the agricultural and laboring class. But a change has suddenly come over the Democratic party.

The manufacturers are no longer robber barons, thriving by the oppression and robbery of the producing classes; they have suddenly become, in the estimation of the Democratic leaders, a class to be preferred and protected. The doctrine of free trade is to be applied to the products of poor farmers who tend their flocks upon the hillsides of the great West; to the laborers who fell the forests and manufacture them into lumber; to the men who work the silver and lead mines; to the poor fishermen, who make a precarious living by hazardous employment during a portion of the year; to the toilers engaged in producing the products of the soil, the mines and the forests. Protection to manufacturers is to be continued, and they are to be further favored by giving them a chance to buy what our Democratic friends call "raw material," produced by the half-fed and half-clothed laborers of Europe.

The blow threatened against manufacturers is to fall and expend itself at last upon the producers of raw materials, upon the agricultural and laboring classes. But let no one be deceived. The blow at the farmer, the lumberman, the miner, and the laborer, while it will fall first upon them, will reach and be felt by every industry, by all classes and all sections. Why is it proposed to put wool on the free list, and to destroy an industry which has heretofore afforded a living to 150,000 small farmers in this country, and employment for as many additional laborers; an industry which has made farming profitable upon portions of

the rugged soil of the Eastern States not adapted to agriculture, and enables the mountain regions of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah to be utilized? Why destroy an industry which, with proper protection, would eventually make this the most extensive wool-producing country in the world, and enable us to furnish the raw materials for our own manufacturers?

As the result of the legislation proposed by the House bill, the flocks that graze upon the mountain sides of the great West, and the smaller flocks of the smaller farmers of the East, will be driven to the slaughter pen, the wool-growing industry will be destroyed, thousands of laborers thrown out of employment, thousands of farmers ruined, and all to make a market for the wool of Australia and South American countries, raised upon cheap lands with cheap labor, and with climatic advantages we do not possess. Foreign countries, as soon as our flocks are destroyed, will obtain a monopoly of our markets, and wool will probably be no cheaper to the manufacturer than it would have been with adequate protection to our wool-growing industry.

During the late Presidential election and since, there has been much said about Mr. Cleveland being better than his party. This was probably true so far as the question of free coinage of silver is concerned. But there has never been any reason to suppose that upon the tariff question he was not fully committed to free trade, or that, as many people have affected to believe, he would prevent radical tariff legislation and preserve American industries. He is more responsible for the present attitude of the Democratic party toward the tariff than any other Northern Democrat. He commenced the contest for free trade by his tariff message of 1887. By the use of Administrative influence he whipped his party in the House of Representatives into line with him, and has been perfectly consistent in fully indorsing and urging the passage of the Wilson bill, as follows:

After a hard struggle tariff reform is directly before us. Nothing so important claims our attention and nothing so clearly presents itself as both an opportunity and a duty—an opportunity to deserve the gratitude of our fellow-citizens and a duty imposed upon us by our oft-repeated professions and by the emphatic mandate of the people. After full discussion our countrymen have spoken in favor of this reform, and they have confided the work of its accomplishment to the hands of those who are solemnly pledged to it.

If there is anything in the theory of a representation in public places of the people and their desires, if public officers are really the servants of the people, and if political promises and professions have any binding force, our failure to give the relief so long awaited will be sheer recreancy. Nothing should intervene to distract our attention or disturb our effort until this reform is accomplished by wise and careful legislation.

* * * * * * *

Manifestly, if we are to aid the people directly through tariff reform, one of its most obvious features should be a reduction in present tariff charges upon the necessaries of life. The benefits of such a reduction would be palpable and substantial, seen and felt by thousands who would be better fed and better clothed and better sheltered. These gifts should be the willing benefactions of a government whose highest function is the promotion of the welfare of the people.

Not less closely related to our people's prosperity and well-being is the removal of restrictions upon the importation of the raw materials necessary to our manufactures. The world should be open to our national ingenuity and enterprise. This can not be while Federal legislation, through the imposition of high tariff, forbids to American manufacturers as cheap materials as those used by their competitors. It is quite obvious that the enhancement of the price of our manufactured products resulting from this policy not only confines the market for these products within our own borders, to the direct disadvantage of our manufacturers, but also increases their cost to our citizens.

* * * * * * *

A measure has been prepared by the appropriate Congressional committee embodying tariff reform on the lines herein suggested, which will be promptly submitted for legislative action. It is the result of much patriotic and unselfish work, and I believe it deals with its subject consistently and as thoroughly as existing conditions permit.

I am satisfied that the reduced tariff duties provided for in the proposed legislation, added to existing internal-revenue taxation, will, in the near future, though perhaps not immediately, produce sufficient revenue to meet the needs of the Government.

The committee, after full consideration, and to provide against a temporary deficiency which may exist before the business of the country adjusts itself to the new tariff schedules, have wisely embraced in their plan a few additional internal-revenue taxes, including a small tax upon incomes derived from certain corporate investments.

* * * * * * *

In my great desire for the success of this measure I can not restrain the suggestion that its success can only be attained by means of unselfish counsel on the part of the friends of tariff reform and as a result of their willingness to subordinate personal desires and ambitions to the general good. The local interests affected by the proposed reform are so numerous and so varied that if all are insisted upon the legislation embodying the reform must inevitably fail.

The report of the tariff hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means at the late special session makes an interesting and valuable volume. The reason urged by all those representing American industries for maintaining the protective system was that if protective duties are removed the disastrous effect will mainly fall upon the workingman. Their testimony shows that free raw materials will not enable American manufacturers to compete with foreign manufacturers without a great reduction of wages. Those who speak on the subject, as a rule, attribute our business depression to the threat of hostile tariff legislation. I can only make some hasty references to it as my remarks have already been unduly extended.

Mr. Henry Brunt, of Baltimore, Md., engaged in pottery manufacturing, said:

I have been engaged in the pottery business for about thirty-five years, most of the time in England. Since I became a man, I have spent ten years of my life in the pottery industry in England under free trade. I have spent twelve years in the pottery industry in America under protection; so that I think I am in a position to speak somewhat of the benefits, or otherwise, under free trade or protection.

I have had an experience as a workingman in England in the pottery industry. I have been engaged as a manager in England, and as such I have had to pay wages and engage men. I have had an experience as a workingman in the pottery industry in America, and I have been a manager, and am now a manager; so that whatever I say in connection with it will be drawn from my own personal knowledge, and not collected from books.

I come here to ask you gentlemen to maintain the present rate of duty on pottery, and I do so for several reasons. One of the reasons—which you have heard many times before—is because if the duty is reduced, the burden will fall on the workingman. In connection with this, I want to make a little statement about the difference I have paid for some labor in America and in England. Most of these comparisons are made with English manufacturers, chiefly, I suppose, because reliable statistics are more easily procured in England than in some of the other foreign countries. We can, consequently, compare the conditions in England and America better than we can the price and condition of things in other countries.

I have not a very long list, although it is on a long piece of paper; but I have taken the average of what I consider to be the regular number of men that it requires to run a pottery. I have started with what we call the engineer in England. I paid $6 a week in England, and $11 in America for an engineer. There are many places which are filled by women in England and men in America.

Mr. Fred Walker, a potter, of Trenton, N. J., said:

We ask that the present duty be maintained, chiefly from the fact that if a reduction should take place it would affect the wages of the operatives in this country. We have never received as much wages at any time as we are at present.

* * * * * * *

We believe as workingmen, that seeing as we receive over 60 per cent difference in wages between the man paid in England, France, and Germany in several branches of our industry, that we ought to be satisfied as wage-earners. We ask you to consider this. In a number of States manufacturers have been trying to improve their lines of products. We are producing a better grade of goods than has ever been produced before. I wish to corroborate what the manufacturers have said about the matter. We have now two potteries in the city of Trenton in the hands of a receiver—namely, the Eagle and the Brewer—both old concerns. They branched out to make the higher grade articles and they are now both defunct. That shows that this pottery industry is not what it is supposed to be. There is not the money to-day in the business that there was several years ago, because competition has forced prices down in this business.

And again, on behalf of the floor, encaustic, vitrified, and enamel tile manufacturers, he said:

Our principal reason for not being able to compete with foreign manufacturers is the difference paid for wages, the rates in many instances being less than one-third of those paid in this country.

The time has now come when a further reduction in prices will necessitate a reduction in wages now paid, and we are of the opinion that the wages are not excessive, and would regret exceedingly to be compelled to take any steps toward a reduction.

Mr. Frank L. Bodine, of Philadelphia, president of the Cohansey Manufacturing Company of New Jersey, made an interesting statement of the value of labor that enters into the production of glass, as follows:

The wages paid in digging and washing the sand, quarrying and grinding the limestone, cutting the trees and manufacturing into boxes, preparing the fire clay for use, mining the coal for fuel, together with the labor of transporting, all of which must be paid in addition to wages at the furnaces, amounts to 20 per cent of the total cost of finished window glass at the works.

Labor at the works in handling the materials, converting them into glass, and assisting the skilled labor adds 20 per cent to the total cost. Wages paid skilled labor of a high class to finish the materials into merchantable window glass amounts to 45 per cent additional, making the amount paid for labor about 85 per cent of the total cost at the works, not including plant or interest paid on capital. Such large proportion of cost paid for wages is multiplied many fold in effect by supplying workmen the means to consume the products of the farm, and to pay other labor for homes, clothing, and other necessaries and comforts of life.

So marked is the effect of building a glass furnace in any locality it is generally made the basis for establishing a town and improving the value of adjoining land through local demand for products of the soil.

Although cheaper wages are the main advantage of foreign manufacturers, there are others to be overcome. These are higher cost of plant (foreign costs being less than half the cost in the United States), low interest rates on investment both for plant and active capital, continuous work all the year, including Sundays, making three hundred and fifty days' product, while American manufacturers, being idle on account of hot weather from June to September, work but nine months, less Sundays, about two hundred and thirty-five days, a comparative loss of one hundred and fifteen days, product, so that foreign furnaces have 50 per cent longer run at the same outlay for plant, interest, and general expenses.

Mr. Joseph Horton, chairman and vice-president of the American Iron and Steel Association of Philadelphia, Pa., made a very interestiug statement concerning the manufacture of iron and steel. I will make but two or three brief quotations from it. He said:

The magnitude of this interest, I think, is not always appreciated either by our friends or by our enemies. This industry has run over twenty-nine States, making pig iron, bar iron, steel, etc., and is widely disseminated, therefore, from North to South and from East to West, and I think the number of workmen actually engaged is about 450,000, which, by the rules of ordinary calculation that each married workman has a family of five, a wife and a family, and while the number is sometimes more than five, it makes an average of about five for each workman, and that makes a population of 2,250,000 who are directly interested in this manufacture of iron and steel.

* * * * * * *

These foreigners, the men who make goods to send to America, are not citizens of this country and are not amenable to our laws. They are not liable to conscription, or drafting, or anything of that kind, for filling up our armies in case of war. They pay no tax of any sort into this Government, and merely to equalize their case with that of our working people it is simply just to our working people that those foreign competitors of theirs should pay to the United States Treasury something in the nature of a tax for the privilege of coming in here, and, as I say, they do it. It does not come out of the pockets of the American consumer. It comes out of the pockets of the European, and that we are prepared to show.

* * * * * * *

Now, then, I may speak upon one other point which belongs to that general treatment of the subject. We hear a great deal about class legislation; about taking by legislation money out of one man's pocket and putting it into another man's pocket. Now, then, this is a fantasy, a kind of bugaboo, and it has no real existence. There is no law which says John Smith shall pay John Jones so much per annum; there is no law which says John Smith, if he thinks John Jones is getting too much of this world's goods, shall not go into the same line of business. The laws are such that any man can go into any kind of business whatever. Any section of the country which thinks another section of the country is prospering too greatly will probably find, if it pays attention to the subject, it can itself go into the manufacture of that product, just as in the South they have found in regard to the iron and steel business.

The statements made concerning the manufacture of tin plates in this country are very interesting in view of the fact that by the House bill as agreed upon by the Ways and Means Committee the destruction of this industry is determined upon. Mr. F. G. Niedringhaus said:

A little over twenty years ago the manufacturers of tin plate in England, their agents and importers, succeeded in having the duty reduced to a merely nominal one of a cent per pound, barely a duty for revenue only, and thereby they crushed out the small attempt at that time to manufacture tin plates in this country. Now, that same influence is at work to-day, not so much for the reduction of the duty on tin plate but mainly for the destruction of the tin-plate industry which really does exist in this country to-day. Millions of dollars have been invested and thousands of people are employed in the industry. The duty was raised under the last so-called McKinley bill $1.20 per box.

Now, on this $1.20 per box the English manufacturer reduced his price 50 cents a box, leaving the balance to be paid by the American consumer. But, however, it must be stated that the weight per box has been gradually reduced by the English manufacturer to about 90 pounds per box, and the American manufacturer (speaking now for my own company) furnishes 108 pounds per box, so that really, when you consider that, the price has hardly been advanced to the American consumer.

The prices we pay for labor are 150 per cent advance on the English price. The duty imposed is perhaps 70 per cent. Now, labor gets all of that duty imposed and 70 per cent in addition, or, in other words, the labor gets the benefit of all the duty and the natural advantages which we possess in America. If we had labor at English prices with our natural resources we can not only hold our own but we will beat them in their own market.

Now, if duty on tin plate is reduced to the former duty before the last act it will reduce labor wages one-third. If it is put on the free list it will put it to less than one-half. It was not only putting on the duty, but the American Congress attached to that duty in the last act a five years' limit, to allow the manufacturers and those who were willing to risk their money five years' time to demonstrate whether plate could be manufactured in America. Now, that has been practically demonstrated, and the mystery in which this business was clothed at the beginning has disappeared. The manufacture of tin plate is one of the most simple manufactures imaginable, and I can call your honorable chairman to testify in that respect, because he worked at the trade himself at one time.

Mr. W. C. Cronemeyer, of Pittsburg, Pa., said:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when, in former years, I appeared before this committee to plead for the American tin-plate interests, I had to make the statement that I represented an industry which did not exist in the United States. To-day I am happy to say that I represent an industry which does exist, and although it is yet very young (only about two years old) it is up to the present time a very healthy infant, which has grown vigorously under the most adverse circumstances.

I do not believe that any other industry, if ever so well protected, has been established so rapidly and with as few failures in the start as our young industry, and that in spite of its being called into life at the time of a serious depression caused by financial collapses in South America and England, and which had their reflex in this country, but the full force of which was happily averted because just at the time a tariff bill was passed by our Congress which filled our industries with new hope and our financial institutions with new confidence in the future of our industries. The tin-plate industry has grown in spite of a bill having passed the House of Representatives and hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles repealing the very law which only a few months previous had called this industry into life.

The following is a list of names of firms who have embarked in the tin and terne plate manufacture during the last two years, and the amounts which, according to their last report, they have invested in their plants:

Firms or companies.	Location.	Amount invested in tin-plate plant.
A. A. Thompson & Co	New York, N. Y	
Aliquippa Tin Plate Co	Aliquippa, Pa	$22,250.00
American Stamping Co	Brooklyn, N. Y	14,841.65
American Tin Plate Machine and Manufacturing Co.	Linfield, Pa	76,000.00
American Tin Plate Co	Elwood, Ind	300,000.00
Apollo Iron and Steel Co	Apollo, Pa	3,000.00
Baltimore Steel, Iron and Tin Plate Co	Baltimore, Md	
Britton Rolling Mill Co	Cleveland, Ohio	58,000.00
Blairsville Rolling Mill and Tin Plate Co.	Blairsville, Pa	100,000.00
Cleveland Tin Plate Co	Cleveland, Ohio	12,000.00
Cincinnati Corrugating Co	Piqua, Ohio	2,000.00
Coates & Co	Baltimore, Md	
Cumberland Rolling Mill and Tin Plate Co.	Cumberland, Md	90,000.00
Columbia Tin Plate Co	Piqua, Ohio	4,000.00
E. Morewood & Co	Gas City, Ind	125,000.00
Falcon Tin Plate and Sheet Iron Co	Niles, Ohio	110,000.00
Griffith & Cadwallader	Pittsburg, Pa	15,000.00
Gummey, Spering & Co	Philadelphia, Pa	$25,000.00
Hughes & Patterson	do	
Indiana Tin Plate Manufacturing Co	Atlanta, Ind	
John Hamilton	Pittsburg, Pa	25,000.00
Kahn Bros	New York, N. Y	
Marshall Bros. & Co	Philadelphia, Pa	125,000.00
Matthar, Ingram & Co	Baltimore, Md	
McKinley Tin Plate Co	Wilkinsburg, Pa	25,000.00
Merchant & Co	Philadelphia, Pa	2,000.00
Moorewood Tin Plate Manufacturing Co.	Elizabeth, N. J	95,000.00
N. and G. Taylor Co	Philadelphia, Pa	400,000.00
Norton Bros	Chicago, Ill	400,000.00
New Castle Tin Plate Co	New Castle, Pa	200,000.00
Norristown Tin Plate Co	Norristown, Pa	
Phillips Tin Plate Co	Philadelphia, Pa	
P. H. Laufman & Co	Apollo, Pa	50,000.00
Pittsburg Electroplating Co	do	
Pittsburg Tin Plate Works	New Kensington, Pa	23,147.42
Record Manufacturing Co	Conneaut, Pa	30,000.00
Jas. B. Scott & Co	Pittsburg, Pa	10,500.00
St. Louis Manufacturing Co	St. Louis, Mo	400,000.00
Somerton Tin Plate Works	Brooklyn, N. Y	238,640.50
United States Iron and Tin Plate Manufacturing Co.	Demmler, Pa	250,000.00
Wallace Banfield & Co	Irondale, Ohio	250,000.00
Total		3,496,379.57

I could not ascertain the investment of ten of these above firms.

The following figures, taken from Special Agent Ayer's report, will illustrate more clearly the growth of this industry:

	Pounds.	Pounds.
First year.		
Quarter ending—		
September 30, 1891	26,922	
December 31, 1891	1,409,821	
March 31, 1892	3,209,225	
June 30, 1892	8,200,751	
		13,646,719
Second year.		
Quarter ending—		
September 30, 1892	10,952,725	
December 31, 1892	19,756,491	
March 31, 1893	29,566,399	
June 30, 1893	35,000,000	
		95,275,615
Total		108,922,334

The product in the last quarter of the fiscal year 1893 was 4,232 times greater than the production in the first quarter of the fiscal year, 1892. Did you ever hear of any other industry increasing to such an extent within years?

Mr. Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia, made an interesting statement concerning the wool industry, from which I quote:

More than half the whole clip of the United States is raised west of the Mississippi River. When the tariff law was passed in 1867 there were comparatively no sheep west of the Mississippi River. Our sheep were east at that time, with the exception of a few in Texas. That tariff made the duty 12 cents a pound, or 11 per cent ad valorem, and the high price which prevailed outside made the duty fully 15 per cent ad valorem protection. Under that condition of affairs the wool clip of the United States increased with strides and bounds. We outstripped every other nation in the world in that respect. We beat Australia, even, with its large acreage of perennial pasturage.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. JUSTICE. From the time of the passage of the law in 1867 up to its repeal in 1883. It was repealed in 1883, went into effect in 1884, and wool declined very rapidly from that time. From 1873 to 1884 the tariff on wool in the United States was under the law of 1867. In 1884 the repeal of the law had got into full operation, and the effect was fatal. The number of sheep in the United States in 1873 was 170,000,000. When the tariff of 1867 was repealed the tariff law of 1883 reduced the duty to 10 cents a pound. Woolens that had been protected by a duty of from 13 to 15 cents under the law of 1867 had increased enormously. With the reduction in 1883 to 10 cents a pound, a number of sheep in the United States were slaughtered. That tariff was inadequate. It was a protective tariff and not a revenue tariff. When a tariff fails to be protective it is a revenue tariff.

Under the revenue tariff of 1883, so far as wool was concerned, the wool clip of the United States decreased from 340,000,000 pounds in 1884, the first year after the new law went into effect, 12 per cent; but from 1873, under the tariff law of 1867, up to 1884, when it was repealed, the wool clip of the United States measured by the number of sheep had increased 100 per cent. No other nation in the world had approached us. Australia had increased in the same time from 280,000,000 pounds in 1873 to 460,000,000 pounds in 1883, while the United States had increased 100 per cent.

Take Great Britain, the only country which competes with us, and our condition is more favorable. In England sheep are fed. Although the winters are much harder the amount fed is less. The British clip decreased 19 per cent, while the United States was increasing 100 per cent. During the same years, while the wool clip was increasing 100 per cent, the Cape of Good Hope, with free trade, increased only 6 per cent.

* * * * * * *

Now, we will take the second period of inadequate protection from 1884 up to the time of the McKinley law. The increase in Australia was unchanged. During that second period, from 1884 to 1890, Australia increased 29 per cent; the Argentine Republic, under free trade, increased 23 per cent, and Great Britain had held its own. The Cape of Good Hope increased 6 per cent, and the United States (the only nation in the world to do so) decreased 12 per cent in her wool clip. It was because of this that the wool-growers of the United States demanded increased duties; and when the McKinley bill was passed they were accorded the beggarly increase of 12 per cent; but there was so much noise made about it that some think it was increased many times more than that amount.

* * * * * * *

It is fair to assume that what has happened to manufacturers will occur again; and if the tariff law which lasted from 1884 up to the passage of the

McKinley law was inadequate protection, then under a repeal the wool crop of the United States will be destroyed.

* * * * * * *

United States Consul-General Wallace, in his report, which is on file, states the reasons why wool in Australia is 12 cents a pound. It is because their land is largely owned by the Government, and fenced by the Government. The sheep do not even require to be herded. The only cost is the labor in shearing and the marketing of the wool and the sheep. Can we produce wool for 12 cents a pound?

This wool [indicating] will net 1 cent a pound on the basis of to-day's London values. The wool-grower of the United States is getting 1 cent a pound, while his competitor in Australia is getting 12 cents a pound. If there is any manufacturer present he knows that the farmer of America would have no market for his wool when it is only worth 1 cent a pound.

* * * * * * *

Mr. WHITING. Is in not a fact that nearly all the manufacturers have memoralized Congress that the present depression is due to the financial condition of the country?

Mr. JUSTICE. I think the best opinion of the manufacturers——

Mr. WHITING [interposing]. Have they not said it?

Mr. JUSTICE. They have said that the silver bill is the cause of it. When you repeal the silver law you will find that they fear tariff revision, and will think that it was the only cause of this depression; and there will not be a single mill started until they can see their way throught it. I am only repeating what has been said to me by manufacturers. I happen to know one or two cases where they are running now on full time. I am telling what I know. I know where mills have started up only because the wages were reduced 10 to 20 per cent. The mills I have in mind particularly have run out of orders, and have shut down. One man said to me: "We can not make goods at the present wages."

But the most unexpected defense of the protective system came from Hon. W. A. McCorkle, governor of West Virginia. He said:

We are to-day looking down to the sunny seas of the South for the glory and progress of West Virginia. We are looking there to-day for the magnificent development which we have begun in our region, which is pouring the golden dollars into the beautiful Kanawha.

We are asking that our coal may go down the Ohio, through the Mississippi jetties which you have built, and in a short time through the Nicaragua Canal. I tell you to give West Virginia a chance and she will certainly drive out the coal which comes from the Australian dominions of Her Majesty the Queen.

Now, I am a Democrat, and I am talking from a Democratic standpoint. I say that the spirit of selfishness should not reign supreme. I do ask that this committee will not lay its hands upon the industry, which will paralyze my beautiful State, and will render sterile her fair valleys. I know that perhaps you gentlemen are tired of these discussions; but you are here to-day to consider the question of the tariff on coal. I know nothing of the special refinements of the tariff, but I do know that if you take away this protection the interest must die. All we ask is our fair share of the policy of the country. I care nothing for the learned gentlemen who claim to know all about this question. I know not where they get their learning, but I know the people of West Virginia, I know the miners of West Virginia, I know the coal-land owners of West Virginia, and I know the men who dig the coal and they are here to-day. I do know the storekeepers in West Virginia, and in fact I know the people from the wealthy coal baron down to the poor devil whose house is at the mouth of the mine. I care not what your theories are. You will never strike a man who is interested in the coal industry but you will strike the coal miner, the railroad transporter, and the river man.

If you take the tariff off coal, which is less in proportion than the average duties, I believe it will hurt you; but putting aside the refinement of theories and controversies, the great proposition remains that you will hurt every man, woman, and child engaged in the coal industry. Therefore, I say, take your hands off the tariff on coal and leave it as it is.

Another thing I do know, and that is that politics to-day plays a part in that portion of the State. I mean to say that we were raised up as a buffet for armies to march against, when men pursued each other with cannon. We are to-day in that same border warfare in the great politics of this country; therefore I say, meaning no threat, "don't do it."

This appeal of the Democratic governor has been supplemented by similar appeals from Alabama and other portions of the South. The Southern position on the tariff is not in accord with that of the men who now control the recently developed mining and manufacturing industries in that region, and it is apparent that the appeals which have been made to the committee for protection to the industries of the South are but the beginning of a movement which will grow until in many of the Southern States the sentiment in favor of protection will be as strong as it is in New England.

The success of the Democratic party, even with the control of both the Senate and House, in 1888, would not have shaken confidence and demoralized business as its success on the platform of 1892 has done. In the Democratic national platform of 1888 a promise was given that in changing the tariff laws existing industries should not be destroyed. A similar provision, contained in the platform reported by the committee on resolutions at the last Democratic national convention, was deliberately stricken out, and protection denounced as robbery and unconstitutional.

Those who affect to believe, if there are any such since the President's message was received, that the protective system is not to be destroyed under the present Administration assume that the Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress will disregard the pledges of their party, abandon their position upon the tariff, and become suddenly converted to the doctrine of protection. No appeals on behalf of the industries of the country for continued protection to capital and labor will be of any avail. The protective policy is doomed so far as its fate can be determined by the Democratic party, as at present constituted. The hostility of the South to the protective system is portrayed in the following extract from the Louisville Courier-Journal, republished in the Press, of New York, with the comments of the Press, as follows:

STOP THIS! COL. WATTERSON.

"The more thorough and sweeping the reform the surer and speedier the relief. Every evil prediction is the voice of Mammon shrieking the torment of the damned. Every threat of ruin and confusion is the devil's bellman vainly seeking to sound hell's fire alarm. The long night is over. The dawn of a longer day has come. Presently its glorious sun will rise to brighten every prospect, and as the painted harlot of Protection, her orgy ended and her beauty gone, wends her way over the hill to the boneyard, millions of honest people will rejoice, wondering how the bleared and beastly thing could work so many spells and last so long."—*Henry Watterson in Louisville Courier-Journal.*

Yes, the dawn of a longer day's work and less pay for the American workman! The dawn of a period of unprecedented depression and ruin for American industries! The dawn of poverty and lack of employment for those who under protection have always found plenty of work and good wages. The glorious sun rises, it is true since the Democratic victory, but not over brightened prospects. Its bright rays reveal closed factories and mills and warm the forms of idlers in the market place and public squares. The Press wishes the long night was over, but fears it has but begun, and that the devil's bellmen, in the shape of sheriff and auctioneer, have started on their rounds of ruin and desolation.

Mr. President, it is assumed that the political majority in Congress has been commissioned by the American people to strike down the protective system, and enact a tariff for revenue only, to adopt the English system of free trade, and upon the face of things, there is ground for the claim. The last Presidential election was fought ostensibly upon the tariff issue. The platform of the Democratic party contained a more radical declaration against a protective tariff than ever before made by any political party, and the issue was squarely made by the Republican platform. The Democratic candidate for President was the great apostle of free trade in this country, and at the election received a majority of votes. The result of the election was to make it possible for the Democratic party to put its threat against the protective policy into execution.

But I have my own views as to the causes which defeated the Republican party and placed the Democratic party in power. I do not think the result was a deliberate verdict of the people upon the tariff question. The Democratic victory was rather the result of a world-wide dissatisfaction with existing conditions and government everywhere, because it is charged with the execution of the laws, the maintenance of public order, and the protection of personal and property rights—a dissatisfaction increased and intensified in this country by the unfortunate labor troubles at Homestead and elsewhere.

But whether I am right or wrong about the causes of the Democratic victory, one thing is now as certain as anything can be which has not been ascertained by actual demonstration, and that is, that present conditions have furnished an object lesson which has had a wonderful effect in the campaign of education upon the tariff question. The closed mills, silent machinery, broken banks, and unemployed millions are more eloquent advocates of the protective system than human orators. Wherever the people of the North have had an opportunity, since the Presidential election, to speak, their voice has been, with no uncertain sound, for the protection of American labor. If a vote could be taken to-day upon the question whether the protective system should be maintained or destroyed, the verdict would be overwhelmingly in favor of its maintenance.

Persistent attacks upon the protective policy, gross misrepresentations as to the purposes and effects of protection, exaggerated statements concerning the unsatisfactory condition of the agricultural and laboring classes, and pretended sympathy with the laboring classes in their controversies with their employers, the long period of prosperity under Republican administration and Republican policy, during which our previous experiences under a tariff for revenue only were forgotten, and the general dissatisfaction with the existing order of things brought the Democratic party into power. But the threat of legislation hostile to our great industries, coupled with the power of the Democratic party to put the threat into execution, was sufficient to arrest the tide of our business prosperity and bring upon the country industrial and financial distress.

As the great industries of the country closed, laboring men learned, what those who had studied the question in the light of our history and experience knew before, that the prosperity of our great industries is necessary to their prosperity; that money invested in business industries must be idle unless it can be profitably employed; that idle capital means idle men, and idle men means starvation; that a hostile blow aimed at the manufacturing interests falls heaviest on the laboring classes. The experience of the country since the 4th of March last has taught the people a lesson which all the efforts of the friends of protection failed to teach.

The late contest in Ohio was fought squarely on national issues. The tariff question was the overshadowing issue. Governor McKinley, on the one side, represented the Republican

policy of protection, while Mr. Neal, the man who in the Democratic national convention of 1892 moved to strike out the tariff plank of the platform as reported from the committee, which contained a recognition of the fact that there is a difference in wages in this country and in foreign countries, and which also contained a promise that existing industries should not be ruthlessly destroyed by a revision of the tariff, and who in lieu thereof submitted a resolution declaring that protection was robbery and unconstitutional, represented, on the other side, the tariff-for-revenue-only policy. The result was a sweeping victory for protection. The Republican majority in Ohio was the largest ever given in that State, except when Vallandigham was beaten in the midst of the war of the rebellion.

Accepting the claim insisted upon by the Democrats that in electing Mr. Cleveland the people indorsed, and, so far as their votes went, committed the Government to the policy of a tariff for revenue only, then our Democratic friends, in order to be consistent, must acknowledge that the evidences that public sentiment concerning the tariff has changed since the election of Mr. Cleveland, as afforded by the result of the late elections, are not confined to Ohio. The victories in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, and Iowa leave no room for doubt that there has been a complete revulsion of public sentiment on the question. We have witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the Democratic governor and leading Democrats of a great State, committed by their national Democratic platform to the doctrine that protection is robbery and unconstitutional, pleading with a committee of another branch of Congress for the continuance of protection to the industries of their State.

Mr. President, ordinarily I would not attempt to prevent the Democratic majority from committing an act that would prove to be political suicide; but so great and disastrous will be the consequences of a destruction of the protective system, that I sincerely hope our Democratic friends will pause in their purpose to force free trade upon the people of the United States, and that they will take notice of the changed public sentiment of the country, and taking this notice, they will cease in their efforts to destroy the industries of the country.

Mr. BERRY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1893.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

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

ALEXANDER AND CHALMERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Attorney-General transmitting the papers in the claim of Alexander & Chalmers for service in defense of Indians; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointments:

Mr. MAHON, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BUNDY, as a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, and also as a member of the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

ANNIE V. MUMFORD.

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the desk (H. Res. 101) for the relief of Annie V. Mumford, widow of Oliver Mumford, late captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

The joint resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I wish to ask the gentleman whether this case is an exception to the class of cases covered by the bill which passed the Senate a few days ago?

Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania. I think not. I think this case will be covered by that bill if it ever becomes a law.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I see no occasion for this special legislation, as a bill passed the Senate a few days ago, which will soon come before the House and which will comprehend all such cases as this.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the *Whole* on the state of the Union for further consideration of the pending appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. HATCH in the chair).

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the pending bill, the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4763) making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on Saturday last unanimous consent had been given that general debate should be closed to-day at the expiration of three hours, an hour and a half to be under the control of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] and an hour and a half under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if it be agreeable to the minority, we will begin the debate this morning, and I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I had no thought of taking any part in this discussion, nor would I do so now were it not that gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber have charged the present Administration with being unfriendly to our Union soldiers. Especially have they mentioned in that connection the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions. Mr. Chairman, I deny the charge. I confess that my relations with the President are not of that intimate, confidential, social character claimed by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN]. [Laughter.] I have never been taken into his confidence, never invited to his councils. I have not talked with him on the question of finance, the question of pensions, the question of tariff reform, or on the Hawaiian affair; in fact, I have never talked with him upon any question at all. I have been willing—as has every Democratic and Populist member of this House—to advise the President on these questions. I have been especially desirous to advise with him regarding the distribution of the political patronage of my Congressional district. And yet, Mr. Chairman, I have full faith and confidence in President Cleveland, and I am in full accord with his Administration. I know him to be an honest man and a just man, and, as such, I know him to be the friend of the honest soldier. It has been my good fortune to have come into closer relations with the Secretary of the Interior. Prejudiced at first, from my acquaintance I have learned to honor and to respect him. He is a big, broad-gauged, brainy man, as honest and as just as God makes men, and the honest soldier need have no fear from his administration of the affairs of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, it would ill become me as a Representative from the State of Minnesota to sit silently in my seat while gentlemen on the other side of this House are impugning the motives and questioning the actions of the Commissioner of Pensions, one of the most distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth I have the honor in part to represent. After an intimate acquaintance with the character and reputation of Judge Lochren for nearly a score of years, I say without qualification that the men who fought to preserve intact the Union of States, which we all love, have no firmer friend, no warmer champion, no more self-sacrificing comrade than the gentleman who presides to-day over the Pension Bureau. For three years, commencing in April, 1861, William Lochren was himself a soldier, enlisting in the ranks in a regiment which has gone into history as one of the bravest, truest, and best organizations that graces the annals of our country.

He was, sir, the full partner of the best and bravest in all the sufferings which have been so sentimentally and so eloquently portrayed by our Republican friends. He endured the wearing marches; joined in the songs and story of the bivouac when the day's toil was over; was awakened at dawn by the same long roll, and went into the conflict carrying his life in his hand as ready as the readiest to deliver it up at the demand of patriotic devotion. He suffered with them uncomplainingly the cold blasts of the wintry wind and the torrid heat of the summer sun. He made acquaintance, as they, with wounds at Gettysburg and with disease in the fever-infected swamps of the Chickahominy. He

was no pampered soldier, with wealth, or position, or family influence that might provide for him a soft berth and hand down unearned promotion by the utterance of the wish.

Sir, through three years of storm and stress, from private soldier to the rank of captain, every honest step of his promotion was marked by scars, every sentence of his well-won commissions punctuated and accented by deeds of courage and constancy. He was the soldier without fear and without reproach. Is it necessary to recall to this House the heroic charge of the First Minnesota at Gettysburg—a charge that ranks with Thermopylæ in courage, in which more than 70 per cent of those engaged went down in wounds and death? Sir, there was no Minnesota name marked "missing" at the vesper roll call on that fatal 2d of July, 1863. Dead, or wounded, or present. Such is the record embalmed in the record division of the War Department in this city. Every man accounted for. No stragglers; no shirkers; no deserters; no coffee-coolers! My honored fellow-citizen, Judge Lochren, was one of the immortals of that famous charge—an event, Mr. Chairman, which stands to-day and will stand for all coming time as one of the sublimest acts of courage and devotion to duty embalmed in the history of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, does it look reasonable that any man with that history behind him could under any possible combination of circumstances be unfair or dishonest or ungenerous toward the comrades who marched beside him, fought with him, and suffered with him? Is it not a fact, sir, that all history shows that the purest and most self-sacrificing friendships are born of the comradeships of danger and distress and suffering?

Mr. Chairman, in Minnesota we all know Judge Lochren. We know him to be as brave, as faithful, as generous, as kindly as the Chevalier Bayard of old. But we know him to be just. In some of the details of his pension policy he may be mistaken, but in so far as one man can, he will stop peculation and rascality in that department of the civil government. He will have no pension attorney for a silent partner, no relative doing business "on the side" with that Bureau. If injustice is done to one of the suffering veterans it will be by accident, but I believe millions will through his efforts be saved to the people's Treasury from the chicane of pension sharks and undeserving claimants.

And the policy will be his policy. He will not hide behind President Cleveland or Secretary Smith, but will push forward courageously and honestly and faithfully, that justice may be done to the real, deserving veterans, as well as to those dishonest leeches who would fasten themselves upon the nation's Treasury.

Judge Lochren believes, as I do, that there is urgent need for pension reform; and for that reason he is, as I am, a pension reformer; a pension reformer from the soldier's standpoint, and in the interest of the worthy, deserving soldier.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlemen on the Republican side of this House oppose and resist all attempts in the direction of pension reform? Are they not alarmed at the tremendous annual expenditures for pensions? Can they believe that an honest pension roll would cost this Government $165,000,000 annually? Do they realize that this enormous expenditure is a tax, and that the people will soon weary of it; or has their experience in billion-dollar Congresses so familiarized them with enormous expenditures that this pension item is a mere bagatelle?

Does not the fact that six hundred and fourteen men on the pension roll from an Ohio regiment that served but one hundred days in the war, never in action, never on the skirmish line, never smelled the smoke of powder, never scented the battle even from afar, do not these facts excite a faint, nay, a strong suspicion that here was fraud and that an investigation is needed? If you ask me, as you have asked others, if I know of cases of pensions obtained through fraud, I answer yes, many of them, but I deny the right of any member here to demand of me the names of these pensioners. At another time and place I may give the names and prefer the charges, and, proving the charges, have these men stricken from the rolls.

I am a pension reformer in the interests of the worthy, deserving soldier. I desire to purify the pension rolls. I want to make it indeed a roll of honor. I do not believe that I offend any worthy, honest pensioner when I say that it is my belief that the pension roll is polluted by the names of cowards, perjurers, bounty-jumpers, and coffee-coolers. I say this as a soldier and a friend of the worthy, deserving soldier. I will do anything, more than has been done or more than is promised, for this class of soldiers, but I shall wage war against the men who are on the pension rolls through fraud. And yet the fault is not so much with the soldier who is pensioned through doubtful means as it is with the law that grants him the pension. In my judgment the pension act of 1890 is almost infamous. It invites the soldier to fraud and perjury. This backed up by the pension sharks, and instructions to the examining boards to deal liberally with applicants for pensions, and the sentiment encouraged by politicians which exists among our soldiers everywhere that the intent of the law of 1890 was to pension all soldiers—can we wonder that men honest in all things else have been dishonest in their methods for procuring pensions?

On Saturday last I charged the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] with too much indulgence of sentiment in his treatment of the pension question. Naturally the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] would indulge in sentiment. He was not a soldier, and therefore has a sentimental idea of the dangers, the privations, the hardships of the soldier. But the gentleman from Iowa was a soldier. He I doubt not has about the camp-fires of his army post, fighting over his battles again, agreed with the boys, as we all agree, that our years in the army, despite the hardships, the privations, and the dangers, were the happiest, the jolliest, and the best of all our lives. The laborer on our streets, in our mines suffers greater hardships, greater privations, and is liable to greater dangers in some instances than were the soldiers of our Army during the war. And if they knew the difference in conditions, would gladly change their toilsome days, their discomforts and privations for the better condition of the soldier.

I speak as one who had his full share of the privations, the hardships and the dangers of the Iron Brigade, a member of a regiment of that brigade that, I believe, did more fighting than any regiment in the United States service, and by the record of the War Department lost more men in battle than any other regiment in the Union armies. Nearly four year's service, twice wounded, seventeen months a prisoner in Southern prisons, I think I am competent to speak of the hardships, the privations, and the dangers of the soldier, and yet all these have I suffered to an equal extent in my experience in camp as a civil engineer. Why, Mr. Chairman, to many the war was a great, big, protracted picnic. And so I beg the gentlemen to discard some of their sentiment and get down to business on this pension question. And will these gentlemen claim that all this great army of pensioners are disabled as a result of their army service? Do they not know that the tendency of army life was to better the physical condition of men, and to lengthen rather than diminish the length of life? Was it patriotism that took us to the defense of the Union, or was it the hope of bounties and pensions? We used to hear much of the sentiment of patriotism. Now we hear little of patriotism, but a good deal of pensions. I have said that the pension law of 1890 was the worst that could have been enacted. There is the fault. A law which makes little or no distinction between the men of the call for the first three years' troops, in the spring of 1861, without bounty or promise of bounty, and the men who enlisted for ninety days, or the men who were drafted, or the men who were paid bounties of from hundreds to more than a thousand dollars, or the bounty jumpers, or the foreign hirelings, or deserters, coffee-coolers, and camp-followers. Under such a law is there not need for reform? And I say to our Republican friends, why have you not inaugurated this reform? Do so now, and let us follow and assist you in the good work. Why do you say to us, why do you say to me and my Northern friends, whenever the question of pension reform is raised in this House, "Hands off"? Is it because, as is charged, you own the soldier vote, and that under your pension legislation this vote is costing the people of this country $165,000,000 annually? In spite of your opposition, pension reform has got to come. The people can not and will not much longer stand this tremendous burden you have placed upon them.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the pensioner treats the pension law of 1890 almost as a huge joke. Let me give an incident which came under my own observation. I was in conversation with a pensioner whose pension was based on that painful, disagreeable disease, piles. I said to him that I had been a sufferer for twenty years from that disease, and had found relief and a permanent cure from a surgical operation; and I suggested such treatment in his case, assuring him that the expense would not exceed $25. "Surgical operation be damned!" was his reply; "I wouldn't take $500 for these piles. No piles, no pension." [Laughter.]

I have said that in the interest of the worthy, deserving soldier I am in favor of pension reform. They have nothing to fear from the reform I would work; not one of that worthy, noble band of heroes would I disturb. I would do more than pension them. I would scatter them about in the employment of the Government Departments of this beautiful city. They should have the preference in all Government employment regardless of their political faith. [Applause.] We have not done enough, we can not do too much for the worthy, deserving men who have preserved to us this glorious Union. I hope a reform has begun which will purify our pension roll and make it what our worthy, deserving soldier would have it, a roll of honor. I believe the provision of the bill now pending appropriating $200,000 for special examiners, is in the line of pension reform, and for that reason I shall vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the time of Mr. BALDWIN expired.

On motion of Mr. MORGAN, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BALDWIN to print the remainder of his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois was recognized and yielded thirty minutes to Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MORSE, desired five minutes additional on Saturday, which he was unable to obtain, I now yield him that amount of time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] for yielding to me a portion of his time.

Mr. Chairman, I was unable to conclude my speech on Saturday evening, and asked unanimous consent, to which objection was made, to incorporate in my remarks what I now send to the Clerk's desk to have read. Before it is read I desire to say that among the wrongs and harm done the pensioners by the present policy of the Pension Bureau in suspending the soldier's pension without notice and without a hearing, and through the medium of the present secret spy system—I say among the wrongs done the soldier is the constant fear created in the mind of all the pensioners of the country that their little stipend, upon which they have come to depend, may be stopped at any moment, and that the next mail may bring the appalling news, "suspended."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has correctly stated that many of the pensioners are old men now. While many of the soldiers are still in the vigor of manhood, all of us members of this House that served in the army on either side of the great struggle that began at Sumter in 1861 and ended at Appomattox twenty-eight years ago next April—I say that those of us that served on either side of the great struggle are boys no more; with us all the shadows are lengthening, and the soldiers of the war of the rebellion are on the sunset side of this mortal life.

Many of the pensioners are now old men, suffering from disease and wounds and disabilities of increasing years; some no doubt weak in body and mind both.

I send to the Clerk's desk to be read an extract from the last report of the chairman of the board of trustees of the Massachusetts Soldiers' Home, who happens to be no less a person than John G. B. Adams, at present commander-in-chief of the national department of the Grand Army of the Republic. Commander Adams describes the effect of this fear upon the inmates of the home, and gives an illustration of the one of the fraudulent pensioners discovered by Commissioner Lochren and described by the President in his message. I send the same to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Within the past six months another trouble has arisen that has caused much anxiety and unhappiness to our sick men; that is, the constant fear that they will be suspended from the pension rolls, and their families be deprived of what they now receive. This anxiety is not without cause, for the ax of the Commissioner of Pensions has already fallen. In order that you may fully understand the case, I include it in this report.

Silas Force, formerly of Company A, Second Massachusetts Infantry, was admitted to the home June 23, 1893. August 8 he received the following letter:

"[3-510. Finance division. E. M. E. S.]

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
"*Washington, D. C., August 7, 1893.*

"SIR: I have to advise you that it appears from medical evidence on file in this Bureau that you are not ratably disabled for earning a support by manual labor under act June 27, 1890, from the effect of disease of rectum. Payment of pensions on your certificate, No. 683768, has therefore been suspended, pending the receipt of such answers as you may desire to make; all statements of yourself or others to be made under oath. If after a period of sixty days from this date you have failed to satisfactorily rebut the evidence referred to, and no sufficient reason appears why an extension of time should be made, your name will be dropped from the pension roll.

"Such evidence must be submitted in the form of affidavit, and the envelope inclosing them to this Bureau should be addressed to the Commissioner of Pensions, and marked in the lower left-hand corner 'Finance Division.' This letter should be returned therewith.

"Very respectfully,

"WILLIAM LOCHREN,
"*Commissioner.*

"Mr. SILAS FORCE,
"*227 Spencer Avenue, Chelsea, Suffolk County, Mass.*"

Now, what are the facts in this case? Since Mr. Force was admitted to the home he has been a patient in the hospital, totally disabled; can not get from his bed to a chair; can not feed himself without assistance, and requires the constant attendance of another person. All these facts were known to the Pension Department months before the letter suspending him from the rolls was written, as in May last he forwarded an affidavit from Dr. Holbrook, of Revere, who was his attending physician, that he was totally disabled and would never again be able to perform manual labor; and this statement was supported by two reliable comrades belonging to the same post of the Grand Army, who had been acquainted with Mr. Force for the past ten years.

Mr. Force now being suspended, he can receive nothing until he again proves his claim and the suspension removed. Sworn certificates of his disability have been forwarded by Dr. Pratt, surgeon of the home, and statements made to the Pension Bureau by the superintendent and others in regard to his disability.

If it takes as long as it does to get an original pension Silas Force will be with his comrades "in the Home beyond the river," where no letters from the Pension Commissioner can trouble him.

Mr. MORSE. Referring to the position of the Pension Office in regard to the suspension of pensions and its interpretation of the disability act of June 27, 1890, and also with reference to the Commissioner's letter addressed to me in August last and given by him to the press—the following opinions from various newspapers covering a large section of the country, may be a source of information to the Commissioner, to Congress, and the country, and is added to my speech under the leave to print voted by the House:

[From the Boston Journal.]

BUMPTIOUS MR. LOCHREN.

The ostensible reason for the insulting letter which Pension Commissioner Lochren addressed to Congressman MORSE was that the latter had made use of a "penalty envelope" in sending to a veteran the reply of the Pension Bureau to his application, together with his own comments on the decision.

The penalty envelope in question had been sent to the Congressman by the Commissioner for the express purpose of permitting the former to forward the decision of the Bureau, and the offense of Mr. MORSE, if an offense was committed, was in inclosing or permitting his clerk to inclose his own letter with it. For this act, the Commissioner, in a letter happily without parallel in official correspondence for coarse and vulgar abusiveness, assumed to hold the Congressman up before Congress and the country as attempting to cheat the Government out of a 2-cent postage stamp.

This was all that the Commissioner's attack upon Congressman MORSE was founded on, and if the latter had been guilty of a technical violation of the law, in making this use of a penalty envelope, the letter of the Commissioner would still be a deplorable example of petty malignity.

It appears now, however, that there was not even a technical violation of the law, but that the use which the Commissioner accused the Congressman of making of the penalty envelope was precisely such a use as the law contemplates. Upon this point the following decision, reported by the Washington Post, is conclusive:

"A few days ago Mr. Edwin S. Hopkins, who is acting as secretary to Representative MOON of Michigan, inquired of the Post-Office Department whether a communication to a pensioner could be forwarded in the penalty envelope sent by the Pension Bureau containing the status of a claim. The question was examined into by Assistant Attorney-General Thomas, of the Post-Office Department, who in reply quoted the section of the postal laws and regulations which allows the penalty envelope to be used for 'official information and indorsements relating thereto.'

"Under the provisions of this section,' wrote Mr. Thomas, 'a member of Congress may make indorsements on a letter from the Pension Office sent to him for transmission to a claimant.'

"As this decision did not cover a letter inclosed with the papers from the Pension Office, another inquiry was made, eliciting a reply that the Congressman's letter need not be written upon the official papers, but could be separately inclosed."

If the Commissioner is not totally wanting in honor, it would seem fitting for him to make an apology for his exhibition of bad manners as public as his offense.

[From the New York Press.]

THE RETREAT OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

The pretense is advanced that the Cleveland Administration has merely "modified" its outrageous order arbitrarily suspending scores of thousands of Union pensioners and requiring them to reproduce testimony proving their right to draw pensions within sixty days or be dropped from the rolls. This pretense is a particularly thin and silly sham. The Administration has not "modified" its position toward the gray-haired men whose valor and patriotism upheld this Republic; it has been ignominiously driven from the stand it has taken.

For the present, at least, the rout of the soldier-haters is complete. Public indignation, aroused by the Press, has forced them to precipitate retreat. Not even Bourbonism is rash enough to invite certain disaster by defying public opinion or face assured defeat before the courts of justice.

The order of Mr. Cleveland's Secretary of the Interior reversing every principle of justice by assuming that Union veterans were guilty of fraud in drawing legally granted pensions, and requiring them to prove their innocence to the satisfaction of boards of Democratic partisans, was as indefensible in law as in morals. From the moment when the issue of the legality of Hoke Smith's wholesale suspension of pensions was raised by the Press, the outcome was certain. The Administration would have been overwhelmingly beaten if it had ventured to contest the point in the courts. The path of inglorious retreat was the only way out of the dilemma.

The Press will not hesitate in its championship of the interests of the men who crushed secession and human slavery. It will not fail to scrutinize with the utmost vigilance every move of the Administration which threatens injustice to Union veterans, their widows, or their orphans. It will keep up the fight for the rights of the soldiers until those rights are made secure by the return of the Republican party to power in the National Government.

[From the Biddeford (Me.) Journal.]

Comrade Lochren may have been a wise and impressive judge, but he is the lightest weight Commissioner of Pensions the country ever had. His vulgar 2-cent insult to Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts has earned him the contempt of self-respecting men of all parties.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren has a temper that he ought to be as much ashamed of as he should be of his treatment of some of his old comrades. The man who could write such a letter as that sent by Lochren to Congressman MORSE, of Massachusetts, is not fit to be at the head of the Pension Office.

[From the Hingham (Mass.) Journal.]

Congressman E. A. MORSE's correspondence with Pension Commissioner Lochren is something funny. Lochren made a great mistake in a "2-cent" allusion. Supposing that Mr. MORSE did use a Government stamped envelope; what has that to do with the important question involved—a thoroughly disabled pensioner put on the rack? Lochren will be made to apologize. Mark it down.

[From the Cambridge (Mass.) Chronicle.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren ought to have known better than to accuse ELIJAH A. MORSE of trying to cheat the Government out of a 2-cent postage stamp. Those who know Mr. Morse know he isn't that kind of a man. His hand and purse are always open to the poor, and especially to the veteran soldier.

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine.]

There is reason to believe that the vigorous letter of Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE, of Massachusetts, to Commissioner Lochren, and the wide pub-

licity that was given to it, was very largely responsible for the back-down of the Pension Department from its high-handed policy of suspension.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Journal.]

Representative MORSE comes back at Commissioner Lochren for charging that he used a penalty envelope sent to convey information to a pensioner for private correspondence. Those who know the Massachusetts Representative, who was born Indiana, will laugh at the idea of his saving 2 cents, as he is not only wealthy, but generous and far above petty meanness. Mr. MORSE says his clerk might have used the envelope through ignorance, inclosing a private letter in it; but if that is the case, the envelope will show by the handwriting, and the Commissioner has the envelope.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier.]

As Pension Commissioner Lochren has been compelled to reverse himself in the matter of the veterans' suspension order, it is now in order for him to reverse himself in his indecorous conduct toward Congressman MORSE. As a late judge on the bench, with a favorable local reputation, Mr. Lochren ought to show some consideration for his former constituents by maintaining a dignified bearing in his new office.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette.]

Congressman E. A. MORSE, of Canton, will make the bumptious United States Pension Commissioner very weary before he gets through with him, or we miss our guess. Mr. MORSE does not stay crushed worth a cent, and this time he has just cause for complaint. The insinuation of the Pension Commissioner's letter, that a man of MORSE'S standing, who is easily worth a million of dollars, would attempt to cheat the Government out of 2 cents by using a penalty envelope is too ridiculous to seriously consider.

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press.]

The correspondence between Congressman MORSE and Pension Commissioner Lochren is interesting and spicy. So far the Congressman seems to have the best of it. To charge a Congressman with defrauding the Government of 2 cents is no answer to a serious accusation. The Commissioner seems to have a curious lack of tact. The country did regard the pension list as a serious burden, and believed that there were many frauds, but it did not ask and does not want a wholesale suspension for technical irregularities. Mr. Lochren might have done the country a service, but he seems to be engaged in making his Department odious.

[From the North Attleboro (Mass.) Chronicle.]

The pension discussion between Congressman MORSE and Commissioner Lochren has attracted much attention throughout the country. Partisans of the Commissioner seem to think that the Chief of the Pension Department sat heavily on Mr. MORSE and that the Congressman would not be able to rise. Mr. MORSE did his plain duty in the case and the Commissioner lowered himself greatly in the estimation of candid men by his treatment of the Congressman. There was too much of saying "you are another" by the official possessed of a little brief authority.

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Standard Union.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren was a judge before he took service under Mr. Hoke Smith, the eminent Georgian, who just missed the late war, but who is trying to make up for it by knocking out Union pensioners. Judge Lochren was also a Union soldier, but it isn't pleasant to dwell on that fact—what will impress the average reader who peruses the correspondence between him and the Hon. ELIJAH MORSE, member of Congress from Massachusetts, is the fact that Judge Lochren does not possess a judicial mind, the peculiar tone of his official communications warranting that belief. Mr. MORSE wrote in behalf of a constituent, a veteran whose pension had been monkeyed with by some of Smith's men, and it appears, by some inadvertence of a clerk, a Government "penalty" envelope was used. Mr. Lochren did not like Mr. MORSE'S remarks, and permitted himself to speak of the Congressman as "an ill-informed demagogue," with "a capacity for willful and malignant lying," and also used the envelope incident on which to have a charge of "sordid meanness," intimating that Mr. MORSE was willing to violate a law of Congress "in order to save 2 cents"—a charge that only a Democratic mind seems capable of stooping to. Mr. MORSE'S offense was in standing up for a soldier whom Judge Lochren's chief had "turned down."

[From the St. Albans (Vt.) Messenger.]

Whatever may be the merits of the particular pension case about which a controversy has arisen between Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts and Pension Commissioner Lochren, there will hardly be two opinions as to the want of dignity displayed by the Commissioner in his reply to the Massachusetts member. It would not in the least affect the justice or injustice of the action of the Bureau in suspending a pensioner that Mr. MORSE used a Government penalty envelope to convey a letter to him, and the charge that he sought to "swindle the Government out of the sum of 2 cents" is puerile and contemptible in the extreme. Other portions of Mr. Lochren's letter savor altogether too much of bluster and billingsgate to be worthy of the Commissioner or the position he unfortunately occupies. Both the Secretary of the Interior and his subordinates have need to learn that they do not embrace all there is of the Government of the United States, and that even a veteran pensioner has some rights they will be compelled to respect even if their claims for fair and courteous treatment are disregarded.

[From the Dover (N. H.) Republican.]

Commissioner of Pensions Lochren has got himself into a nice pickle by writing a saucy and impudent letter to Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts in regard to a veteran whom Mr. MORSE wants to get onto the pension roll. Judge Lochren shows himself to be as much of an ass and as bitterly opposed to veteran soldiers as his superior and master, Hoke Smith, is; both seem to be determined to cut off ten pensioners from the roll to every one they put on. How long are the patriotic people of this country going to suffer this sort of abuse of veterans to go on?

[From the Portsmouth (N. H.) Chronicle.]

In accusing Hon. E. A. MORSE of using a United States penalty envelope to save 2 cents, Commissioner Lochren shows that he is no gentleman but a man worthy to be the lickspittle of Hoke Smith and the other ex-Confederates who are now taking ample revenge upon the Union soldier for the beating they received thirty years ago. It is a pleasure to see that the better class Democratic newspapers condemn Judge Lochren in unmeasured terms for his insult.

[From the North Attleboro (Mass.) Chronicle.]

Commissioner Lochren has modified his decision regarding the suspension of pensions, so that no more suspensions will be made except in cases where the record plainly shows that the recipient of a pension is not entitled to it. The Commissioner should never have departed from this solid ground. In bringing about this result, the controversy with Congressman MORSE no doubt exerted the greatest influence. It is a great victory for Mr. MORSE, and we congratulate him on the vindication which has come to him in the action of the Department itself.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin.]

Commissioner Lochren was wrong again when he charged Congressman MORSE of Massachusetts with misusing a franked envelope. The Post-Office Department decides that Congressman MORSE violated no privilege. Gen. Lochren owes an apology to the gentleman from Massachusetts for his bad manners.

[From the Old Colony Memorial, Plymouth, Mass.]

WELL ANSWERED

Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE, who so ably represents this district in Congress, has, without distinction of party, always stood by the interests of the men who fought the war for the Union, himself having been one of the very first to go to the front when the call was made for defenders of the flag. He has no sympathy with the present policy of punishing patriotism which has obtained under the change of parties, and in his communication to Pension Commissioner Lochren shows the stuff of which he is made.

The letter is in answer to one from Mr. Lochren refusing to reopen examination of the case of a pensioner, William H. Rollins, of Brockton, which had been rejected on what appeared to Mr. MORSE and all others knowing the circumstances to be erroneous grounds. Lochren's answer was so ungentlemanly that the correspondence has attracted much attention, and the opinion of fair-minded men is that so boorish an official ought no longer to hold a position which he fills with such ill grace and manner, whatever may be his other qualifications.

The feeling at Washington is general that the wide publicity given the Morse-Lochren correspondence caused a back down of the Pension Office, as shown by a new rule governing suspension of pensions, issued on Friday morning.

[From the Plymouth (N. H.) Record.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren evidently thinks he is a "biger man" than a member of Congress, and has written a letter scoring Congressman MORSE, of Massachusetts, for having inadvertently used a penalty-stamped envelope for private mail. Mr. MORSE replies in a dignified way, and it may be ardently hoped that this old soldier, whose sole occupation seems to be to beat old soldiers out of their pensions, will soon hear from the lively member from Massachusetts.

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Me.]

We publish elsewhere in this issue a scathing letter of Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE, of Massachusetts, in reply to a sloppy and vituperative communication from the Hon. William Lochren, the tool through whom Hoke Smith, of Georgia, does the dirty work of the ex-Confederacy in raiding the pensions of Union veterans. Mr. MORSE'S letter is dignified but vigorous. He refuses to descend from the level of a gentleman into the mire of billingsgate, or to employ the vituperative threats used by Commissioner Lochren, but he does not fail to make himself very clearly understood.

It will be remembered that Congressman MORSE has stated some significant facts which men who stood for the integrity of the Union in the dark days of civil strife will do well to seriously consider. Mr. MORSE is not in the slightest degree intimidated by the bullying tactics of Mr. Lochren. He is not a man to be disconcerted by the vaporings of political light-weights, especially such a one as Lochren, who is notoriously a mere figurehead; a political jumping jack operated by strings in the hands of Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and the ex-Confederate influences that dictate his action.

Mr. MORSE calls timely attention to the notorious fact that vastly more pensions are now being suspended or canceled than there are new ones issued. He sets the ratio at 10 to 1, which, judging from such reports as the department has deigned to make public, we should say was an exceedingly conservative estimate. Another fact that Mr. MORSE calls attention to is the appointment of ex-Confederates upon boards of pension examiners.

Some weeks ago the Journal called attention to work of the Pension Bureau under the Cleveland régime in making the boards of pension examiners solidly partisan. It cited as a case in hand the pension board at Augusta, which under Harrison was composed of two Republicans and one Democrat, and under Cleveland is composed of three Democrats, as an example of the way in which this work was being done. We did not apprehend at that time, however, that men who bore arms against their country would ever be placed in position to pass upon the disabilities of Union veterans; but such things appear to come naturally and easily under the sway of a Georgia Bourbon. The unholy and vindictive assault which is being made upon the pensions of Union veterans by men who were either active exponents of or sympathizers with treason during the dark days of the rebellion is well calculated to make the blood of loyal citizens boil with just indignation. In calling attention to its outrages and refusing to hold out false hopes to deserving veterans during the continuance of the present Administration, Mr. MORSE is doing the country and his constituents a most worthy service.

[From the Westboro (Mass.) Chronotype.]

Congressman MORSE and Pension Commissioner Lochren have been having a sharp tilt on the pension question, and for gentlemanly treatment MORSE has the best of it, and seemingly the most just cause.

[From the Philadelphia Press, August 28.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren was severely criticised by members of Congress to-day for the letter he wrote to Representative MORSE of Massachusetts, and which he has given to the public. There has been a growing feeling of dislike toward the Interior Department on the part of both Republicans and Democrats, because of the course that has been followed in making wholesale suspensions in pension cases. As shown in a recent article in the Press, these suspensions are really in effect a condemnation of a man before trial and a sentence to punishment without an opportunity to be heard. The policy has been openly condemned by so prominent an administration mouthpiece as Senator VOORHEES, and the feeling has been general that the head of the Interior Department and the head of the Pension Office, as well as the President himself, have very little sympathy with the veterans.

The letter made public to-day by Mr. Lochren, addressed to Mr. MORSE, discloses the Pension Commissioner in light of a bully. The Commissioner in this letter denounces Mr. MORSE in language that no gentleman would use toward another. He speaks of "specimen of Mr. MORSE'S capacity for willful and malignant lying," and of his "sordid meanness." He charges Mr. MORSE with "swindling" the Government out of 2 cents. The whole tenor of the letter and the language used, coming from the head of the most important Bureau in the Government, is generally condemned by members of Congress, as showing the Pension Commissioner to be a man unfit for his place.

Mr. MORSE intends to call the matter up in the House, and the policy of the Administration in making wholesale suspensions of pensions without giving the pensioners a hearing is likely to bring on a debate which will show that a great majority of the House does not uphold the Administration in that course. The subject has already been brought before the Senate, and if it were not for the silver debate it would be likely to occupy attention there also.

[From the New York Press, August 28.]

AND THIS IS LOCHREN.

As to the merits or demerits of the dispute between Hon. ELIJAH A. MORSE and Commissioner of Pensions Lochren, the Press does not assume to judge.

We do know, however, that a bureau official should at all times conduct himself with dignity, and answer all communications with politeness and decency.

Secretary Mr. Hoke Smith can not afford to sustain his subordinates in such cheap, discourteous bluster as this: In a letter, replying to Mr. MORSE, Mr. Lochren suggests that Mr. MORSE is an ill-informed "demagogue" with "a capacity for willful and malignant lying," and afflicted further with a development of "sordid meanness," which impels him to violate a law of Congress by wrongfully using a Government penalty envelope to convey a "silly libel," and thereby "swindle his Government out of the sum of 2 cents."

What manner of man is Lochren to thus fill up the Government copybooks and waste the time of Government stenographers in writing such balderdash as the above? And all because Mr. MORSE wanted some poor soldier's pension adjusted.

[From the Boston Traveler, August 28.]

AN UNWORTHY ANSWER.

Pension Commissioner Lochren, in his answer to Congressman ELIJAH A. MORSE'S letter, has gravely erred, in temper, wording, and regard for official and personal propriety. Mr. MORSE'S letter was pertinent and courteous, and bore upon a matter in which he had the right to be actively interested.

That he should desire to bring to the attention of the Pension Department the case of a disabled soldier, who is in destitute circumstances and dependent upon charity, is certainly not to his discredit. To reply with a petty charge of the unwarranted use of an official envelope in another case for the purpose of cheating the Government out of 2 cents, is unworthy of the Pension Commissioner. Moreover, it is utterly beside the question. It is the "you're another" retort of the school-boy, and can not excuse the departmental delay in dealing with the deserving claim of one of the nation's defenders.

It is to be hoped that Mr. MORSE'S dignified rejoinder will recall the Commissioner to a sense of his duty, and that there will be no more bandying of picayune charges in a matter which is of vital import to a man who served his country in her hour of need.

[From the Boston Traveller, August 30.]

No one who regards the proprieties of official station in this country will defend for a moment the extraordinary response of Commissioner Lochren to Congressman MORSE, which the Traveller published a few days ago. As to the merits of the case in controversy we do not presume to judge, but nothing in that case can possibly excuse the indecency of the Commissioner's reply.

[From Boston Journal, August 29.]

COMMISSIONER LOCHREN'S OUTBREAK.

Pension Commissioner Lochren has a reputation for gallantry in the field, and he has usually been assumed to be a gentleman, but neither courage nor courtesy is apparent in his letter to Congressman MORSE. We do not support Mr. MORSE in all his controversies, but it must be clear to any unprejudiced person that in this instance he has been made the object of a petty insult, such as ought to be impossible in the relations between a Department officer and a representative of the people in the national House.

Mr. Lochren's attempt to present Mr. MORSE to Congress and the country as guilty of saving a 2-cent stamp by using a penalty envelope is a bit of cheap malice which hurts the man who makes the charge rather than the object of it. The charge is entirely unsupported, but all that it amounts to, on Mr. Lochren's own statement of it, is that in a penalty envelope which the Commissioner inclosed to Mr. MORSE for the purpose of forwarding to a pensioner the reasons of the office for refusing a pension, there was also sent a letter from Mr. MORSE to the pensioner, conveying his opinion of the transaction.

Whether the Congressman's clerk sent his letter in a separate envelope, or whether he was careless enough to inclose it in the same envelope which conveyed the explanations of the Pension Office, is a question which only a small-minded man could suppose would be of any public interest. The idea that Mr. MORSE intended to swindle the Government out of the value of a 2-cent stamp is too ridiculous to be seriously stated.

For his public acts we have felt that a good deal of allowance ought to be made for the Commissioner of Pensions, as the tool of the Georgian, Secretary Hoke Smith, who is at the head of the Department of which the Pension Office is a bureau. But this exhibition of small personal malignity is a painful surprise, and makes it difficult to respect the officer who is guilty of it.

[From Wellesley (Mass.) Review.]

Pension Commissioner Lochren has the notoriety of having written to Congressman MORSE the most scurrilous insulting letter that, it is safe to say, ever disgraced department official correspondence—so narrow, mean, and malicious as to have been an antidote to its own poison, and made its author contemptible for his vicious attempt at spiteful revenge.

The Commissioner addressed an open letter to a pensioner of MORSE'S district for his indorsement, in an official "penalty envelope" as customary. MORSE made his reference to the matter on another sheet instead of indorsement of the Commissioner's letter and forwarded in same inclosure to his constituent, as he had a perfect right to do under postal regulations. Whereupon the Commissioner calls him liar and swindler, in trying to cheat the Government out of 2 cents by meanly and illegally using the official envelope for private use. Now that Lochren is publicly exposed as an "ignoramus," as well as a blackguard, he will best serve his own interests by apologizing to MORSE and subsiding to common official decency.

The following, from an indignant physician, is self-explanatory and a specimen of other letters I have received from the medical profession:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *September 8, 1893.*

HON. ELIJAH A. MORSE:

DEAR SIR: I wish to express to you the interest the whole medical profession will have in regard to the stand you have taken in regard to pensions. The Pension Bureau seems to regard all veterans and physicians as liars, and of late seems to utterly ignore our (sometimes) hard work in making out affidavits. He does not seem to recognize the fact that an honest physician will not examine a pension applicant unless he thinks his case a just one. During a practice of seventeen years I have suffered mental disturbance on account of injustice done to deserving soldiers, and have seen some of them die before their pensions were granted. One case that I am interested in now is H. P. Gavitt, of this city, who has double hernia, produced by kick of a horse while on duty. He has had his papers completed for a year or more, and has been required to send duplicates, but can get no satisfaction from the Commissioner. And Hon. NELSON ALDRICH has written two or three times in regard to it, but the Commissioner does not condescend to answer the Senator at all.

One of the cases you have taken up—Rollins, I think his name is; the one with the injured eye—is liable to be much worse than he is now, for it would not be strange if he lost the other eye by sympathetic ophthalmia.

I hope that you will be able to teach the Commissioner manners as well as morals, and you may be sure of the hearty support of many outside as well as in your district.

Respectfully, yours,

———.

The above is from an eminent physician. I regret that I have not permission to use his name.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the appropriation made by this bill contemplates an expenditure for special pension examiners twice as large as that of last year and of the year before, with a force twice as large, it seems to me that there should be some further explanation than has yet been given of the necessity for such an increase.

If the purpose of this increased appropriation is to enable the Pension Office to investigate applications now pending for pensions, with reference to expediting the same, either for allowance or for rejection, there can be no question of its propriety. And yet, when I look at the work which the Pension Office has been accomplishing during the past six months in this direction, with a force already 50 per cent larger than last year, I must confess that I do not see any increase of adjudications to justify the increased cost of a force enlarged from 139 last March to 241 on November 1. Indeed, there have been 35 per cent less adjudications in the first four months of the present fiscal year than in the same period of the preceding fiscal year; showing that, whatever may have been the object in enlarging this force, the increase has not resulted in expediting the adjudication of cases in the Pension Office.

If, on the other hand, the object of the increase is to investigate in good faith probable fraudulent pensioners now upon the rolls, and there is any reason to believe that the force is not already large enough for this purpose, there will be no objection to any increase required by the public interests.

The only question which is raised in my mind in reference to these points arises from the fact that nothing has been presented thus far in any information that has been laid before the committee which seems to show that there is a necessity for such a largely increased force for either of these legitimate objects. Yet in matters of administration like this, where the administrator must be left to his own judgment, in large measure at least, as to expenditures for the purpose of promoting the public interests, I do not feel justified in standing in the way of whatever appropriation the responsible majority of this House may think necessary.

While taking this position with reference to this expenditure, I desire to add that from remarks which have been made on the other side, especially by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], it would seem that this increase of expenditure is justified by them mainly on the theory that the pension list is "honeycombed with fraud." The gentleman from Tennessee has made that distinct charge. Even the President of the United States in his recent message to Congress has stated that there are "gigantic and wholesale frauds" to such an extent that "thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners."

Mr. Chairman, I desire to take exception to this increase of expenditure so far as it is placed upon any such assumption as that. There is nothing in any of the facts that have been presented either to the committee or to Congress that justifies any such theory. The gentleman from Tennessee was pleased to say that we on this side of the House are criticising this increased expenditure and this increased force because we do not desire to remove fraudulent pensioners from the roll. I repel the insinuation as unjust and unfounded. Wherever any appropriate measures can be taken with a view of removing from the roll any fraudulent pensioner, I am sure that this side of the House will cheerfully coöperate in any appropriation that may be necessary for the purpose of accomplishing this object. What we and all other friends of the Union soldier object to is the attempt to create the impression that the pension roll is honeycombed with fraud, with a view of discrediting the pension system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without detaining the committee at this time with any general discussion of the pension question that may be at issue, I wish to call attention in the first place to the fact that the investigations into alleged or suspected cases of fraudulent pensioners by this increased force of special examiners in the eight months from March 4 to November 1 clearly show that there is no foundation for the charges that the pension rolls are honeycombed with wholesale and gigantic frauds. These special examiners in the field have been increased from an average of 155 last year to 241 on the 1st of November. During these eight months there have been referred to and reported on by examiners in the field 1,560 cases of alleged or suspected fraudulent pensions.

These 1,560 cases referred and reported upon have shown only 388 cases where pensioners have been dropped from the roll on account of alleged fraud—in many cases only technical fraud. It must be supposed that all cases of alleged or suspected fraud

have been referred to the force in the field for investigation; yet the whole number so far reported upon (and undoubtedly these cases have been made special) has been only 1,560; and the whole number in which the allegation of fraud has been sustained is only 388.

And I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in a corresponding period of last year, with a force in the field very much less than now, when there was no studied attempt made in official circles to create the impression that wholesale frauds existed in the pension rolls, 345 pensioners were dropped from the rolls for frauds in cases reported by those special examiners then in the field. So that with this increased force only 43 more cases of fraud have been sustained by the investigations of this force in the field than were sustained by the reduced force with the reduced expenditure one year ago.

Now, when you bear in mind the small proportion of these cases of alleged or suspected fraudulent pensioners upon the roll, only 1,560 cases committed to and reported on by the force in the field in eight months, and only 388 in which the reports sustain the allegation, and when you bear in mind that on the 1st day of July last there were 966,000 pensioners upon the pension roll—743,643 of them Union soldiers and sailors—you will see at once how exceedingly small the percentage of fraudulent names upon the rolls must be.

And I say now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], who has made these allegations of wholesale fraud, as well as to President Cleveland, that there can not be shown in the adjudications of any court of claims in the land a smaller proportion of fraudulent or improper adjudications than is shown in the case of the Pension Bureau. I say further to the gentleman that I should be entirely willing to compare the determinations by Congress itself, approved by the President, of applications or claims on account of war claims, so called, with the adjudications in the Pension Office, and I am sure that the Pension Bureau would not suffer in the comparison.

I have alluded, Mr. Chairman, to these facts for the purpose of removing from the mind of the House and so far as possible from the public mind the impressions which seem to have prevailed for sometime in view of the allegations which have been made, that the pension roll was "honeycombed with fraud"—meaning by that to carry the impression that the proportion of fraud was so large as to make the adjudications by the Pension Bureau an exceptional object of criticism and condemnation as compared with the adjudication of claims by any other court or quasi court in the land.

In all things human it inevitably happens that there are imperfections. There is no court whose adjudications are always right. There is no body of men, no organization on the face of the earth, that does not contain some men who ought not to occupy that place.

What I object to, Mr. Chairman, is the constant presentation of the small proportion of the fraudulent cases that are proved in connection with pension adjudications, the parading of them before the public as if they were specimens of the general character of the work that is done in the Pension Bureau. I am sure that when we fully examine the facts we shall find that the adjudications of the Pension Office, considering the magnitude of the work that has been accomplished, considering the difficulties inevitably attending that work, have been on the whole wonderfully correct and wonderfully free from fraud. Even the Norfolk and the New Mexico cases which have been alluded to were not all cases of pensioners already upon the rolls; they were in part, at least, cases of applications for pensions where the pension attorney had forged evidence, where, of course, the examiners in the field were called upon to look up the evidence of fraud in that connection. In many of the cases the claimants had not been placed upon the roll.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow an interruption there?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I think the gentleman will find that he is mistaken. If he will examine the testimony he will find that some of these have been placed on the roll.

Mr. DINGLEY. Some of them have been, but as I understand the great mass of them have not been.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But if the gentleman will examine the testimony he will find he is mistaken in that statement.

Mr. DINGLEY. Well, I have been informed that the great mass of those where forgery had been alleged or proved were not placed on the roll.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to say to my friend from Maine, if he will permit me, that that is just where he is mistaken. They were on the rolls.

Mr. DINGLEY. All of the cases?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I can not say that all of them were, but the great majority—nearly all.

Mr. DINGLEY. However that may be, Mr. Chairman, my experience in dealing with the Pension Office in the adjudication of pension claims is that when a name has been improperly placed upon the rolls by fraudulent means it does not take but a short time for the neighbors of such person, or someone connected with him, who has discovered the fraud, to report the facts to the Pension Office.

But, as I was about to say, we must all admit that in all human affairs there is a liability to some errors and some fraud. It can not be avoided, and all that can be done is to endeavor to prevent, so far as possible, any such frauds from creeping in; but this does not justify the use of them as an argument against the whole system.

Mr. Chairman, neither is there anything arising from the large number of suspensions of pensions under Secretary Hoke Smith's order of May 27 which justifies the inference which has been made, that they show gigantic and wholesale frauds. On the contrary, the result of these suspensions proves the reverse. Over 12,000 pensioners—12,822, I believe, to be exact—were suspended under this order between the 27th day of May last and the 1st day of November. Now, the impression that was given when these suspensions were made was that the pension roll was honeycombed with fraud, and that this was an effort to purge it.

Yet as a matter of fact within three months from the time of these suspensions the Pension Office itself, in most cases without a single scrap of new evidence being presented, on their own motion, or rather under a modified order of Secretary Smith, incited thereto undoubtedly by popular indignation, restored 9,128 of the suspended 12,822 pensioners and resumed the payment of their pensions. This act of itself shows that the action of the Pension Office under the order of Secretary Smith, on the 27th of May last, was unjustifiable and was confessed by the Secretary himself to be such, and that it was a wholesale assault on the pensioners of the land, without any justice or justification or good reason; because if there had been any just cause for continuing the suspension of these 9,000 soldiers they would not have been restored to the rolls without new evidence.

And there is no pretense now that any considerable number of the remaining 3,700 pensioners still suspended November 1, were suspended for any fraud or for any cause except the fact that Secretary Smith had so changed the construction of the law of 1890 from the construction which had been given to it for two years and a half, that a large number of soldiers pensioned under the old construction of the law had now been declared by Secretary Smith to be no longer entitled to pension under his construction of that law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we look at all of these facts it seems to me that the evidence is as conclusive as any evidence can possibly be that there is no ground for the cry which has been set up from one end of the country to the other that the pension rolls of this land are so honeycombed with fraud that there must be such unjust proceedings instituted as we have seen in the last six months, in order that they may be restored to their proper condition.

I desire again to emphasize the fact that, so far as there are any names on the pension rolls that are fraudulent, I am sure that no gentleman in this House, no friend of the Union soldier desires to interpose any objection to the purifying of the list from the names of any which should not be upon them. What we object to, Mr. Chairman, upon this side of the House, what the Union soldiers of the country object to, is the attempt under this general cry of wholesale and gigantic fraud to create prejudice and hostility to the whole system of pensions and thereby injure the interests not only of the Union soldiers but of that great portion of our people who sympathize with them and believe that to the men who went forth, taking their lives in their hands in the defense of the Union, we owe the fact that to-day we have a nation.

We object to any action in this respect unjust and discriminating in its character. We say that whenever a name is placed upon the pension rolls payment should not be suspended until the pensioner himself has had notice and an opportunity to be heard in his own defense, and then, if it can be shown that he is not entitled to be the recipient of the pension which a grateful Government gives, let him be dropped from the rolls. But this wholesale suspension of men from the pension rolls without an opportunity to be heard or to present any evidence, after adjudication of their rights by a department of the Government, and this branding of them throughout the country as fraudulent pensioners, we condemn as wrong and unjustifiable; and in behalf of the Union soldiers of the country, speaking for them as I think I may, I protest with all my heart against such an indignity.

I desire to say right here, before taking my seat, as an act of justice to the Commissioner of Pensions, that when interrogated by the Committee on Appropriations he disclaimed the belief that there were wholesale and gigantic frauds upon the pension rolls, and I call attention to exactly what he did say in response to the questions propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

CANNON]. It will be observed, too, that he was speaking in this connection of persons not placed on the roll, but of applications for pensions where there was more liability to be cases of forgery or fraud than in the cases of the names which had been already placed on the rolls.

I quote from the hearings before the committee:

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In your judgment what percentage of claims is fraudulent?
Mr. LOCHREN. I could not give you any percentage.
Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it not exceedingly small compared with the whole?
Mr. LOCHREN. It is not large, I trust.
* * * * * * *
Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And really, dishonesty is the exception?
Mr. LOCHREN. I think that is true in all human transactions.

To the credit of the Commissioner of Pensions let it be said, that when examined by the Committee on Appropriations in reference to this matter, he disclaimed any responsibility for the representations which have been made all throughout this country that the pension roll was honeycombed with fraud, filled with gigantic and wholesale frauds. On the contrary, he intimated without question his belief that the proportion of frauds upon the pension roll is no larger than in the case of any other human transaction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with that fact in view, that so far as the pension roll is concerned the proportion of fraudulent names is no larger than in the adjudications of any court of claims, or the adjudications in Congress itself, I ask you why there should be circulated broadcast throughout this land the impression, put in exact words, almost, that this pension roll is honeycombed with fraud? For I say to you that the investigation thus far made, even the investigation of the Commissioner of Pensions, has shown that the percentage of frauds is exceedingly small; and the attempt to create the impression of the existence of exceptional fraud in pension adjudications, when a similar charge is not presented against the courts of the land, is unjust and uncalled for. [Applause on Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COOPER].

[Mr. COOPER of Indiana addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

[Mr. BINGHAM addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. VAN VOORHIS].

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to that part of this appropriation which is to be used, as the Commissioner says, for the purpose of helping out the pending cases; that part of it which is to be used by examiners in getting evidence, that the applicants are not strong enough or able to procure. That is all right. I am only opposed to using this appropriation for the purpose of hunting down pensioners whose pensions have heretofore been granted by the various Pension Commissioners who have held that office.

The great argument which the Democratic party advances against the whole pension business is the argument of economy. It has been the policy of this country not to have a standing army. Instead of having a standing army, we rely upon a volunteer army; and in all the wars in which we have been engaged, we have always agreed with the volunteer when he enlisted that we would pay him a certain sum per month for the time he was in the service, take care of him if wounded or disabled, and take care of his family if he was killed.

That is a part of the contract, in every war, with every volunteer; and as soon as the war is over the volunteer goes back to his farm or to his work bench and ceases to be a soldier. Now, if we had a standing army, as Germany has, of 500,000 men, it would cost this country $400,000,000 to maintain it. We have no such standing army. Our few regulars cost us about $20,000,000 a year, and there are just about enough of these for national police. Adding that to the pensions, our whole military establishment does not cost us more than $180,000,000. That is much less than the cost of maintaining an army of defense by any of the great powers.

Has the volunteer the right to have his contract fulfilled on our part? He certainly has.

Every Congress that has heretofore had the subject under consideration has voted that he has. I do not suppose that the Democratic party to-day would give any soldier a pension if the question was considered *de novo*. But pensions have been granted. We have a pension roll, and it is not very convenient to abolish it. Now, what is a pension? The law establishes it, and the law establishes a court before which a claimant shall appear and present his case. That court is presided over by a judge. That judge is the Commissioner of Pensions; and when he has passed upon a given case, he has decided the law and the facts of that case, and that case enters into a judgment, and is *res adjudicata*; and you can not take that man's right to a pension away except under some known mode of attacking a judgment.

The Government may appeal from the judgment to the Secretary of the Interior, but that is never done. You may attack it for fraud; but you must allege your fraud. Fraud is never presumed. You must not only allege it, but you must prove it; and until you prove it the pensioner holds his pension; and if Grover Cleveland or any other man suspends it, then he commits an act in violation of law. He commits an arbitrary and despotic act.

I agree that if you give the man notice that he has obtained a fraudulent judgment granting him a pension, and give him an opportunity to appear and cross-examine the witnesses against him, and have his day in court, then, if the judge finds that he did get his judgment fradulently, it is all right to set it aside; but if you do not take that course, you commit a violation of the law, and when this administratien suspended 20,000 pensioners because it disagreed with a former Commissioner who had passed upon the cases, it acted in violation of law, and its action can not be sustained.

What right has one judge to sit in review of another judge of coördinate jurisdiction? None whatever. What right, for instance, has Commissioner Lochren to sit in review of Commissioner Dudley or Commissioner Raum? Does not the law give to each of them the same jurisdiction? Were not Dudley or Raum charged with the same duty, to pass upon cases, that Lochren has, and when either of them has passed upon a case, can another Commissioner reverse his action because he differs with him upon the law or the facts? Not at all. You can not appeal sidewise from one judge to another of the same jurisdiction. If this were not so, one Commissioner of Pensions might spend his entire time and employ the entire force of the Pension Bureau in reëxamining the cases decided by his predecessors.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Suppose this case, which has actually occurred. A man obtained a pension under the law on the ground that he had served ninety days, and it turned out that he had been only thirty days in the service; does the gentleman think that he ought to continue to receive that pension?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I will answer the gentleman. When they have notified that man that he has got a pension wrongfully, that he was only thirty days in the service, and have given him a chance to show that they are mistaken, and then they have gone forward and proved their case, of course he should not longer receive the pension.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But *pendente lite* he must have the pension; is that the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Yes, sir. There is no power given by law to suspend a pension *pendente lite*. The fraud must be proved before the pension can legally be suspended.

The Commissioner might mistake the law and hold that thirty days' service entitled him to a pension. It may have been an error of fact. Whether it be an error of law or an error of fact, it must be legally established before the pension can legally be suspended.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. When the record shows that he served only thirty days instead of ninety days, must he continue to draw the pension pending further inquiry?

Mr. PICKLER. The record does not show that, or else he would not have got his pension.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It does show that.

Mr. TRACEY. The records of the War Department would show it.

Mr. PICKLER. No sir; that is an impossibility as the gentleman puts the case.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. The sweeping accusation of the President against Union veterans and the widows of Union veterans finds no support in the facts. He said:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners, and recent developments by the Bureau establish appalling conspiracies to accomplish pension frauds.

I represent a district which has in it nineteen towns and a city divided into twenty wards—a present population of at least 200,000. At the latest Congressional election in that district 41,321 votes were cast, being 15,752 more than were cast at the same election in the district of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], who made his usual vituperative and dyspeptic speech against the old veteran pensioners on Saturday, and 25,142 more than were cast at the election in the Fifth district of Georgia, represented by the leader on this floor of the attack on the Union soldiers and their widows who draw pensions. In fact the vote in my district lacks but 427 of being equal to the combined votes of the districts represented by these two gentlemen.

The gentleman from Georgia could name but one case of fraud in his district, while the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe, could mention none. These frauds are always afar off. They are in New Mexico or Iowa or Norfolk.

Charges of frauds in pension cases have been made by Southern Democrats continually, ever since the first pension was granted to a Union soldier. There is nothing serious in it. That there should now and then be a fraudulent case, out of more than a million of claims, is to be expected. But the frauds in pension cases, so far as they have been ascertained, are far less in proportion than in banking or any department of business.

It is the interest of every honest pensioner that no one should receive a pension unjustly, and when this extraordinary charge appeared in President Cleveland's message, it immediately attracted the attention of Commander-in-Chief John B. Adams, of the Grand Army of the Republic, and his response came with the directness and vigor characteristic of the man. He issued a general order calling attention to the President's statement, and urging comrades, posts, and departments to—

report to the honorable Commissioner of Pensions, Washington, D. C., any person known to be in receipt of a pension not justly entitled to the same under the law, and to forward a duplicate of said report to these headquarters at once. Let the cases of fraud be proven, not implied.

Commander Adams also improved the opportunity to say in his order:

The information that comes to these headquarters daily of comrades totally disabled whose pensions have been suspended, and of widows, whose husbands were killed in battle, being suspended until they can prove that their husbands were naturalized citizens of the United States, leads the commander-in-chief to believe that the statement is broader than can be substantiated by facts. If these wrongs actually exist, the commander-in-chief pledges the support of the Grand Army of the Republic to those who attempt in the line of duty to rectify these wrongs, assuring them that the Union veterans are as anxious to guard the Treasury of the nation in time of peace as they were to defend its flag in time of war.

Now, to return to Monroe County, N. Y., which comprises the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent in this House. As I have already said, there are twenty wards and nineteen towns in that district, and probably at least half a thousand neighborhoods, and several thousand veterans. In 1881, in order to disclose frauds if any existed, the veil of secrecy was removed from the pension roll, and the name, residence, and amount of pension of every pensioner, with the designation of his company and regiment and the amount of pension, was gazetted in the public press. There were just about one thousand pensioners then in my district, and their names were published in the four daily papers of Rochester, and in some of the weeklies. There were on an average about two pensioners to a neighborhood.

Not a single fraudulent case was discovered. And I may add that my district is a fair sample in this respect of the whole country. The case is not different now. Judge Lochren, the Commissioner of Pensions, when questioned on the subject by the Committee on Appropriations, said:

I think that there have been instances where considerable frauds are shown to have been committed, as in Norfolk, New Mexico, and to a certain extent in Iowa. The examination of cases has developed the fact that the claims have come through attorneys who are shown to have been engaged in the commission of extensive frauds. The principal cases occurred at the places I have mentioned.

The only frauds which are mentioned are frauds alleged to have been committed by pension attorneys. No soldier or soldier's widow has committed any fraud. No one will justify or apologize for frauds of attorneys. The attorneys who are charged with fraud are exceedingly few in number.

There is one at Norfolk, one in New Mexico, and one in Iowa, and no others mentioned. These are all that can be found in the forty-four States and four Territories. And we have had during the last year 247 men on the hunt for them. Two hundred and forty-seven special examiners ought to find a good many fraudulent pensioners if, as the President declares, "fraudulent pensioners" exist in thousands of neighborhoods. It does not appear that this battallion of 247 special examiners have found a single "fraudulent pensioner" in any neighborhood. It does appear that there are 2,753 cases in which fraud "is alleged or suspected."

It does appear that 15,698 pensions were suspended between May 1 and November 1, 1893, and many before that, and that 8,871 cases remained suspended on November 1, 1893. These suspensions were on suspicion and not on evidence. The fact that between May 1 and November 1, 1893, nearly 10,000 suspended cases were resumed, shows that there was no legal evidence against the pensioners. The amount of money of which pensioners have been deprived by these improper suspensions from May 1, 1893, to December 1, 1893, is $1,130,259.06.

In overruling his predecessors, the Commissioner has obeyed, without doubt, the directions of his superiors, the Hon. Hoke Smith, Secretary of the Interior, and the Hon. Grover Cleveland, President of the United States. Judge Lochran was a soldier himself and all his sympathies are naturally with the Union veterans. The raid on the pensioners is ordered by the President. The libelous defamation of the pensioners was uttered by him in his message. What has been done against the pensioners has been ordered to be done by the President of the United States. He and his party must bear the responsibility.

I quote the following answers of Commissioner Lochren to questions submitted to him by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in his recent hearing before that committee:

The CHAIRMAN. There is in the urgency deficiency bill an estimate of $300,000 for a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of special examiners for 1894. Will you please explain to the committee why you ask for this sum?

Mr. LOCHREN. We have in the hands of the special examination division for examination between 17,000 and 18,000 cases. The present appropriation with the force in the field will not last more than three months, or until January. Unless there is an increase in the force those cases will have to wait.

The CHAIRMAN. Under your present distribution of examiners and with the number of cases undergoing examination the appropriation would expire in January, so that if you continue the examination of present cases and such other cases as may arise, which you think it will be proper to examine, there would be no money to do that work after January?

Mr. LOCHREN. Not after some time in the latter part of January.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the character of these 17,000 or 18,000 cases which are now undergoing examination?

Mr. LOCHREN. The character is various. In a large part of them the testimony which has been furnished by the claimants is not sufficient apparently, and they have sent special examiners into the field to get the testimony the claimants are unable to get—testimony of parties of whom the Bureau has knowledge but whose testimony the claimants are unable to get. These are perhaps the largest class of cases. In all the other cases the testimony is doubtful and unsatisfactory, and we have to reëxamine witnesses whose testimony has been presented. There is also a class of cases where the testimony is suspicious, and to get other witnesses whose testimony would be necessary or which would show fraud, as the case might be. Generally it is for the purpose of getting at the truth where evidence is not satisfactory to the examiners in the Bureau, or where it fails to be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. In what mode is an examination of these cases inaugurated?

Mr. LOCHREN. The board of review sends cases down to the special examination division for the purpose of a special examination. They are looked over, and if it is deemed proper that they ought to be sent to the field, they are sent to the examiner who is stationed at the place nearest to the residence of the witness, and he is instructed as to what particular points the examination is to cover. In the course of his examination he may find, and often does, that he can examine other witnesses.

It is all right to aid claimants and investigate pending cases in this way, and to appropriate a sufficient amount for that purpose. But the appropriation should be limited to that. This appropriation is not so limited. This money should not be used for the purpose of worrying existing pensioners. It should not be used for the purpose of setting bloodhounds upon their track. It should not be used in a vain endeavor to smell out fraud where there is no sign of fraud.

The law gives the soldier a pension if he proves his case. When he has proven his case and his pension has been granted, that is final. No arbitrary power exists anywhere to take it away from him. His pension is part of the law of the country. If the President stops his pension arbitrarily he breaks the law. The President should not be a lawbreaker. His authority is not paramount to that of the law. The law does not empower the Executive to stop a soldier's pension at his will.

It takes money and a good deal of money to pay the pensioners, but the money has been earned and is justly due. We should perform our promises, and we will. This nation has always paid its pensioners, and it always will. It pays them gratefully, as paying for value received. The enemies of our veterans will not long prevail. They may hold the reins for the time being, but "the triumphing of the wicked is short," and Grover Cleveland will go out of office on the 4th of March, 1897.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent that all gentlemen who have spoken, or who shall speak, in this general debate may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD, so that both sides may have an equal opportunity.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of this committee during the short time I shall talk, to the real question presented by this proposed appropriation. To do this fairly, it seems to me that I should begin by asking the Clerk to read the portion of the bill now under discussion, which will be found on page 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENSION OFFICE.

For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, $200,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I have heard one voice raised during this debate against the making of this appropriation. What is this appropriation for? It is for the pur-

pose of carrying out existing law. The law in its present form has been enforced since 1882, although it was amended as late as the act of March 3, 1891. What is the purpose of making this appropriation, and for what are these special examinations authorized by law? Beginning with the law of 1862, amended in 1864 and again in 1872, and again in 1882, I call the attention of the committee to section 4744 as it appears on page 22 of the "Laws of the United States concerning the payment of the army and navy pensions" issued by the last Commissioner of Pensions in 1892. It will be seen that the matter of making these appropriations has obtained at least since 1882, if it did not begin as early as 1862. What is the existing law upon this subject? I now ask the Clerk to read section 4744 as amended by the act of July 30, 1883.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4744. The Commissioner of Pensions is authorized to detail, from time to time, clerks or persons employed in his office to make special examinations into the merits of such pension or bounty land claims, whether pending or adjudicated, as he may deem proper, and to aid in the prosecution of any party appearing on such examinations to be guilty of fraud, either in the presentation or in procuring the allowance of such claims; and any person so detailed shall have power to administer oaths and take affidavits and depositions in the course of such examinations, and to orally examine witnesses, and may employ a stenographer when deemed necessary by the Commissioner of Pensions, in important cases, such stenographer to be paid by such clerk or person and the amount to be allowed in his accounts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, by this it is plainly to be seen that there is no purpose in this appropriation at all to authorize the sending abroad of spies or detectives; and I am sure I am not going outside the truth when I say that such a thought has never entered the mind of the Commissioner of Pensions in asking for this appropriation. While I shall vote for the appropriation, I would be glad if it were so limited as to make it certain that no part of the fund shall be used for any such purpose. But at any rate, it seems clear from the language of this law that no clerk or other officer could be detailed from the Pension Bureau for any such purpose as that.

I desire also to call attention to section 4744 as it appears on page 22 of the volume already referred to, and to section 3, on page 59 of the same volume:

SEC. 4744. The Commissioner of Pensions is authorized to detail, from time to time, clerks in his office to investigate suspected attempts at fraud on the Government, through and by virtue of the provisions of the pension law, and to aid in prosecuting any person so offending, with such additional compensation as is customary in cases of special service; any person so detailed shall have the power to administer oaths and take affidavits in the course of any such investigation.

SEC. 3. "That in addition to the authority conferred by section 184, Title IV, of the Revised Statutes, any judge or clerk of any court of the United States in any State, district, or Territory shall have power, upon the application of the Commissioner of Pensions, to issue a subpœna for a witness, being within the jurisdiction of such court, to appear, at a time and place in the subpœna stated, before any officer authorized to take depositions to be used in the courts of the United States, or before any officer, clerk, or person from the Pension Bureau designated or detailed to investigate or examine into the merits of any pension claim and authorized by law to administer oaths and take affidavits in such investigation or examination, there to give full and true answers to such written interrogatories and cross-interrogatories as may be propounded, or to be orally examined and cross-examined upon the subject of such claim; and witnesses subpœnaed pursuant to this and the preceding section shall be allowed the same compensation as is allowed witnesses in the courts of the United States, and paid in the same manner."

I desire to call attention to the fact that section 3 of the act of March 3, 1891, was reported from the Committee on Appropriations, of which the honorable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was then chairman, and the appropriation now under consideration proceeds in the same direction. It seems to me, therefore, that there need be no hesitation on the part of the most ardent friend of the soldier in voting for this appropriation, and voting for it with the confident belief, with the absolute certainty, that not one penny of the money which we appropriate by this bill will be used for the purpose of sending unauthorized spies and detectives into the field, but that it all will be employed for the purpose of furthering the liberal pension laws of the United States and aiding worthy applicants in the adjudication of their claims.

Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me it would be entirely out of the question for me to enter into a general discussion of many matters which have been talked about during this debate. These things of which I have endeavored to speak hurriedly and brokenly are those, it seems to me, which are immediately pertinent to the question presented to us when we are asked to vote for or against this appropriation.

As to various questions which have been alluded to—the suspension of pensions, order 164, order 240, repealing or suspending the previous order, the Weike case and the Bennett decisions, and the proper construction of the law of June 27, 1890—I hope in the future to have ample opportunity in this body to discuss each one of these questions fairly, freely, fearlessly.

While I can not undertake to now discuss those questions, yet by reason of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has in his remarks specially called my attention to certain things, and because of allusions which have been made by my colleague on the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], I wish to make a single remark in order to avoid the possibility either here and now, or in the future and elsewhere, of being misunderstood in regard to this matter. On the first day of the present session of this House I had the honor to introduce the first bills upon any subject introduced into this body, being House bills 4406 and 4407, as expressing my sentiments upon certain phases of this question.

I ask the Clerk to read section 1 of House bill 4406.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any pension heretofore or that may hereafter be granted to any applicant therefor under any law of the United States authorizing the granting and payment of pensions, on application made and adjudicated upon, shall be deemed and held by all officers of the United States to be a vested right in the grantee to that extent that payment thereof shall not be withheld or suspended until, after due notice to the grantee of not less than thirty days, the Commissioner of Pensions, after hearing all the evidence, shall decide to annul, vacate, modify, or set aside the decision upon which such pension was granted. Such notice to grantee must contain a full and true statement of any charges or allegations upon which such decision granting such pension shall be sought to be in any manner disturbed or modified.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this very bill is now under consideration by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the honor to be chairman, it would be manifestly improper for me to go into the discussion of that measure at this time, but I hope I may have the opportunity in this House to discuss it in the future. The language of that bill, as I understood it when I prepared it and as I understand it today, is the expression of my opinion as to the order of things in one particular which should govern in the adjudication of pension claims. I believe further that persons who undertake to interfere in the administration of pension claims should be held to a strict accountability for the truth of every word they utter. With that conviction in my mind I prepared House bill No. 4407, of which I will ask the Clerk to read the first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person to willfully communicate or cause to be communicated, either verbally or otherwise, to any officer or other employé of the United States having any duty or act to perform in connection with the administration of any law of the United States authorizing the granting, increase, or payment of pensions to any persons, any false statement with intent to thereby defeat or suspend the granting or payment of any pension to any pensioner or applicant for a pension under any such law.

SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person to communicate or cause to be communicated, in any manner, to any person who has been granted a pension under any law of the United States, a false statement that such pension has been withdrawn or payment thereof suspended by the action or decision of any officer of the United States who, by any law, has any duty to perform in connection with the administration of any law of the United States authorizing the granting, increase, or payment of pensions.

SEC. 3. That it shall be unlawful for any person to communicate, or to cause to be communicated, to anyone who shall then have pending, under any law of the United States authorizing the granting, increase, or payment of pensions, an application for the granting, increase, reissue, or payment of a pension, any false statement that such application has been either granted or denied by any officer of the United States having a duty to perform in connection with the adjudication of such applications.

SEC. 4. That it shall be unlawful for any person to circulate or report any false statement that any application for the granting, increase, reissue, restoration, or payment of any pension under any law of the United States concerning the granting of pensions, has been either granted or denied by any officer of the United States having any duty to perform in connection with the adjudication of any such application.

SEC. 5. That any person who shall willfully commit any act declared unlawful by either of the preceding sections of this act shall be guilty of a criminal offense against the United States, and be subject to prosecution therefor in the courts of the United States, and, upon conviction therefor, shall be fined in any sum not less than $100 nor more than $1,000, to be collectible as are fines in other crimes against the United States.

SEC. 6. That any person who shall commit any act declared unlawful by either of the first four sections of this act shall be guilty of fraud, and no person shall be entitled to profit thereby in any manner; and the person guilty of such fraud shall be liable, as in tort, in damages to any person injured by such fraud.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, these two sections of these separate bills express my opinion that the pensioner is entitled to notice before his pension is suspended, and that the man who induces a suspension by making a false statement ought to be punished, even if his statement is not made under oath.

There is another matter to which I wish to allude, although I can not enter into a discussion of it at this time. I refer to the alleged frauds in the pension rolls. I wish to call the attention of the committee to expressions made by Commissioner Lochren when he was before the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. LOCHREN. A great many cases of forged testimony have been shown by special examination.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is that rare, or the exception?

Mr. LOCHREN. I trust it is the exception. There were many in Norfolk, and a great many in New Mexico. Perhaps the practice of some of the attorneys, and the claims coming from particular claim agents, may be honeycombed with fraud.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In your judgment, what percentage of claims is fraudulent?

Mr. LOCHREN. I could not give you any percentage.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Is it not exceedingly small compared with the whole?

Mr. LOCHREN. It is not large, I trust.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. We all trust it is not large.

Mr. LOCHREN. I think where it does occur it is more often the result of the dishonesty of claim agents than from any other cause.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. In connection with this Bureau, considering that the amount of money involved is $150,000,000 to $160,000,000 a year, is it not true, in your judgment, that honesty averages quite as well in that Bureau as it does in the ordinary adjudications throughout the country, or the world?

Mr. LOCHREN. I think the old soldier is as honest as other men—quite as much so.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. And really, dishonesty is the exception?

Mr. LOCHREN. I think that is true in all human transactions.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire to record here and now this declaration, coming from my experience in matters of this kind—never as a claim agent, but as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House during three Congresses—that no action of this House can make the pension roll a roll of honor, for it is one to-day. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, did the treason of Benedict Arnold reflect upon that great body of patriots who made American independence possible? It did not; it simply branded upon his own brow his own crime; but it detracted nothing from the gallant men who went through that war upon the side of the colonists. Is it possible that any man will urge that the cowardice of Hull reflected upon Andrew Jackson and Gen. Scott and the armies which a second time marched to victory in the second war for American independence—the war of 1812? No; it did not.

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand here as the apologist of fraud; but I do say that the fact that some men like Newby, who is now being punished for his crime, have been able to get upon the pension roll is not a disgrace to the laws under which he sought a pension, and is no disgrace to the brave men who are drawing pensions under our laws to-day. [Loud applause.]

(Here the hammer fell.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will occupy a portion of his time now.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, it is a great luxury to us to listen to a speech like that which has just been uttered by my friend from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN]. We have been accustomed heretofore to see the Democratic management of this House in its attacks on the pension system put forward to deride the old soldiers of the Union army, men who were disqualified for so mean a task by personal bravery and gallant service in the war for the preservation of the Union, and who, in the service of their party, had learned to despise their comrades' service of their country.

I have sometimes thought that the line which marks the distinction of opinion on the pension question is not a line drawn altogether by the civil war, because the best speech heard in this House in behalf of the disability pension act of 1890 was delivered by our friend Mr. Coleman of Louisiana, who had been himself a Confederate private, and the speech against the old soldiers which seemed to me to reflect the least credit on the debate was delivered by a gentleman whose record was such as to warrant him in saying that he not only fought for his country, but had suffered in a rebel prison as well. We will be excused, therefore, if we believe that the line of difference is, in a degree at least, the line of politics; and it is, if I may be permitted to so express it, the poison of Democracy rather than the experiences of the rebellion that perverts men's ideas and opinions on the pension question, and enables that party to look without decent consideration upon the claims of the surviving soldiers of the national army.

I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to enter upon any crimination of the President, who has originated the odious policy which prevails to-day in the Pension Bureau, or of the Secretary of Interior, who is nominally responsible for it, or upon the Commissioner of Pensions, who has, with more than necessary good-cheer, presided in its execution. I give to the Commissioner of Pensions the benefit of all of the eulogy which was read here this morning by his friend from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN], and while it was disfigured by an unnecessary libel upon Gen. Raum, the late Commissioner of Pensions, I do not seek to disparage the gallantry of the gentleman who occupies the position of Commissioner of Pensions under the present Administration.

If the gentleman from Minnesota had been in the last Congress, however, he might have known something of the troubles of his friend from Indiana [Mr. COOPER] and his friend from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] and might display less disposition to slander the late Commissioner of Pensions. For these two very active gentlemen spent the entire term of that Congress in collecting alleged testimony againt Gen. Raum, and yet their own Democratic associates in the House despised it with such contempt that they did not even notice the matter during that entire Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I rose, however, to call attention specially to a few instances in my own neighborhood growing out of the prevailing pension policy of the present Administration. For after all, this pension business is to be judged, not by what is said here or there, but by the facts which are within the reach of the public, and these will in the end control public opinion on the question. We take the position that the methods by which the present pension roll has been made have afforded greater assurance of the justice of these claims than can possibly be secured in the secret proceedings by which thousands of the pensioners have been dropped from the pension roll without even such a hearing as the law gives to the most worthless criminal. We claim, that in the suspension of these pension claims, whatever be its motive, the facts exhibit a negligence that has already made the Administration offensive throughout the United States wherever the spirit of national gratitude has not been smothered by avarice or supplanted by sectional passions.

For example, in the community in which I live, in the State of Iowa, resides an old shoemaker who has been crippled, disabled, and left helpless for many years. He was drawing a pension, but was dropped from the rolls and was notified that he had sixty days in which to make good the claim which by patient waiting had been allowed him in the orderly adjudication of the Department, and to-day this old man enjoys the sympathy of every citizen in his neighborhood, without regard to politics, because they all know the injustice that had been done to him. If, however, it is said that you can not prove a general charge of injustice against the Department by citing a single case of that character, let me give another one. In the neighboring county to the one in which I reside, an old soldier was dropped from the rolls a few weeks ago, and the effect upon his shattered strength was such that he became violently insane and was removed immediately to the insane asylum. Here is a man who was pensioned for mental disability, whose pension was suspended wrongfully, and he is now a public charge in the insane asylum of the State.

But if it be said that that is not enough to show the gross negligence of the Department in the selection of these cases, I would direct your attention to a case occurring in Jasper County, Iowa, where a widow, hardly yet returned from the grave of the soldier, was comforted by this delicate expression of the national sympathy—a printed circular reciting the cheap and false pretense that the soldier's "disability no longer existed in a pensionable degree." That was true, for the man, dying of the disease for which he was pensioned, had gone out of the reach of either gratitude or malice. I will make a still more perfect illustration of the criminal negligence that seems to guide these stupid efforts to unearth fraud.

In the city of Winterset, one of the thriving cities of Iowa, the interested inquirer can verify the case of an old soldier whose widow, seven months after his death, received notice that the medical evidence on file in the office of the Commissioner showed that the soldier's disabilities no longer existed in a pensionable degree.

Now, I would like to inquire of any intelligent man, without regard to his politics, how the Pension Office, if it is acting fairly and carefully and truthfully, can send a notice like that to a man's afflicted family, without even taking the pains to know that death had taken him from the pension roll seven months before the notice was issued.

We have a good many patriotic Democrats out in Iowa like my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN], who understand both the rights of the citizen and the rights of the soldier; and through cases like these our people, practically without distinction of party, have come to believe that this reform is an effort on the part of the President of the United States, covering his action by the gallant record of the Commissioner, to make the pension system odious in the United States and to bring injury and injustice upon the surviving veteran of the old Union Army; and I have taken the floor here to-day to protest in the name of the old veterans of Iowa, without respect to their politics, against an administrative policy which may fitly be described in the language of the New York Sun, applied to another subject as "a policy of national infamy." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking any part in the discussion over this appropriation bill, and I would not have done so if I had not seen a tendency in the debate to make the subject of pensions and the pension list and the pension administration somewhat of a partisan question.

I am not personally familiar with the course of the previous discussions in this House upon this subject, but I have been under the impression—and it has been a source of infinite pride and satisfaction to me—that the legislation in Congress upon the subject of pensions has not been marked by partisan or sec-

tional divisions. I have been glad to see on the part of men who were my adversaries in the great conflict a generous and chivalrous disposition to accord pensions to every worthy Union soldier, and I hope that disposition will continue as long as any of us on either side survive.

I am unwilling to admit, Mr. Chairman, that any party in this country has a right to claim exclusive credit for a desire to do justice to the Union soldier. Certainly so long as I have a voice to raise here, or anywhere, my honorable political adversaries on the other side shall not have that privilege. I take it for granted, Mr. Chairman, that every member of this House on either side desires to eliminate from the pension rolls every name that is not honorably there. I assume that the officers of the Government, charged with the execution of the pension laws, are desirous of performing their duty in order that no name shall be placed on the pension list by them which should not go there. I hope, sir, to see this question, if possible, kept out of politics, and kept aloof from all sectionalism. The only way to do that is to keep the pension roll, as it was designed to be, a roll of honor.

Now, as to the general charge that the pension list is honeycombed with fraud, with gigantic and wholesale frauds permeating it, I do not believe that statement to be true. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] My intercourse with soldiers who receive pensions, many thousands of them in my State, authorizes me to repel that charge as unfounded and unjust to them. [Renewed applause.]

Here in this debate we have had cited to us a number of prosecutions instituted and conducted during the fiscal year, a few over 100, and the number of convictions 73, out of a pension roll to-day of 966,000. Compare that record with the records of the courts of this land, bringing to their aid counsel learned in the law, and the utmost discrimination in the sifting of testimony, the utmost care in the pure administration of justice; and in the records of those courts we will find thousands of cases, compared with these hundred cases, where imputations of fraud have been cast wholesale over the administration of justice. Near me sits an honorable member of this House [Mr. BLACK of Illinois] who presided over the Pension Bureau for over four years. I would like to ask him how many of the cases he adjudicated, in which he allowed pensions, were in his judgment impeached by fraud? I do not believe that in his administration he ever allowed one pension case to pass his hands without being thoroughly satisfied that it was honestly deserved.

Now, sir, in this incidental debate on an appropriation bill, I do not care to go extensively into the subject; but at the proper time I shall have much to say upon it. To-day I content myself with repelling this imputation, thus generally cast upon the good faith and integrity of my comrades in arms. [Applause.] I do not believe it is true, and I say this, in conclusion, that no party will long rule in this country, and no ruler will possess or deserve the confidence of the American people, who casts unmerited stain upon the pension rolls of this nation. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I thought the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] did not use all his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has ten minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have long been accustomed to such assaults upon the pension roll as has recently been indulged in by the President of the United States. For a long time it has been the habit of many gentlemen, members of this House, and in other places, to indulge in assaults upon the pension roll. We have become accustomed to it.

I assure the members of this House that there is no one more willing than myself that the pension roll should be purged of everything that brings upon it dishonor, and no member of the House upon this side would object to the erasure of every unworthy name upon the roll.

But the opposition that there is to the proposition before the House is the settled belief that it is not for the purpose of simply taking from the rolls the names of those that ought not to be there, if there be such, but it is for the purpose of harassing, disturbing, and terrorizing those whose names are or ought to be there. Two hundred and forty thousand dollars was borne by the last appropriation bill for the purpose of this class of examinations, the sum supposed to be ample for the purpose for the entire fiscal year; yet we are now told that that is already or will speedily be exhausted. What has become of it?

It was deemed amply sufficient for the legitimate purposes of investigating in the field, for the purpose of the investigations in regard to these claims that have been pending and are now pending. The exhaustion of the appropriation shows that it has been used for the illegitimate purpose of trying to spy out, trying to find in an improper and ignoble way something that will justify these charges that have been so lavishly made.

Now, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BALDWIN] comes in with a new assault upon the pension roll. No one has heretofore been ready to decry the services or to belittle the sufferings and fortitude of those who aided in putting down the most gigantic rebellion that was ever known.

Ah, gentlemen, was not that a herculean task! The records of time show no such achievements as were accomplished by the Federal army. Think of it! Eleven millions of brave, chivalric, warlike people absolutely overcome in the short space of four years. Think of the difficulties that nature threw in the way. The broad rivers, the ranges of mountains, the narrow cañons that had to be passed, scaled, and crossed by the invading forces, every one of them defended by brave, chivalric men. In other countries—in the late war between France and Germany—there were broad highways of travel, there were bridges, there were cantonments for their troops, they had to carry no commissary supplies; they lived upon the country. A dense population gave camps and shelter to the invading troops.

Not so with us. And yet the gentleman from Minnesota tells us that this was a mere play spell, a protracted, prolonged picnic, a mere hilarious and joyous occasion. Why, does not that gentleman know that 67,000 brave men, his comrades, perished on the field of battle; 43,000 died of wounds received in battle; 29,000 perished in the prison pens of the South; 25,000, it is estimated, died from casualties, and 235,000 died of disease contracted in the service while their names were still upon the muster rolls. Four hundred and ten thousand men of that grand army perished while their names were still upon the muster roll.

Think of it! If you could resummon their shades, if you could place them in their old places, constituting a grand army corps, armed and equipped with a necessary train as it should be supplied with, and started upon a march for the city of Boston, the rear guard would not have left the city of Washington when the advance guard would have reached its destination. This great destruction of life is more than 25 per cent of the actual participants in battle, and yet the gentleman from Minnesota tells us that this was a protracted, prolonged picnic, that their service was scarcely such service as entitled them to recognition now from a grateful country!

Ah, and gentlemen of his ilk inveigh against the magnitude of the pension roll. One hundred and sixty-five million, they tell us, and sometimes over, expended, and, sometimes under their breath they tell us, squandered for the payment of pensions.

Why, gentlemen, the pension roll is a necessary part of our system of military defense. Our fathers started upon the theory of a small standing army and a large volunteer force for purposes of emergency. You must be just and true to the old volunteer soldier if you expect the volunteer portion of our system to continue to be effective. Contrast our system as a whole in the matter of cost with others. Five hundred and fifty thousand men compose the standing army of Germany. It costs $117,000,000 annually. Five hundred and fifty thousand of the flower of their youth are withdrawn from the productive energies of that nation. Suppose their average earning capacity to be $200 a year—ours is shown to be $409 a year, but suppose that they earn on an average less than half as much as we do—there you have $110,000,000 more to be added to the cost of the military system of Germany; making a total of two hundred and twenty-seven millions as compared with our one hundred and eighty millions. Look at France, where 490,000 men constitute her standing army, costing $150,000,000. Add the other $100,000,000 lost to the state because of the withdrawal of that number of men from the wealth-producers of the land, and you have $250,000,000 that the military system of France costs as compared with our $180,000,000.

Even in point of economy, measured by dollars and cents, and taking the flood time of cost in our own system, it is still infinitely better, infinitely cheaper than theirs, and the pension roll and honesty in the observance of the obligations of the pension roll are absolutely essential to our system. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has been consumed. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has thirty-four minutes remaining.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that the gentlemen on the other side who have participated in this debate do not intend to vote against the provision in this bill which has been the excuse and not the cause of this discussion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], my courteous colleague on the committee, said substan-

tially that the main object of this provision is to aid the somewhat careless and ignorant applicant for a pension certificate who has not made out his claim properly and for whom the Government makes this provision in order that his claim, if an honest claim carelessly made out, may be put into proper shape and allowed. I take it for granted that that gallant soldier will not, for a political purpose, refuse to grant to his somewhat careless and ignorant comrades this generous mode of having pension certificates issued for their benefit.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] practically admitted that they did not intend to antagonize this provision. We are, therefore, really in the attitude of having a political discussion for the purpose of exciting political prejudice, and having the old soldier brought forward again, not for his benefit, but for the benefit of those for whom he may be hereafter expected to vote. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I shall not enter into that domain of discussion, nor have I any defense of the Commissioner of Pensions, the Secretary of the Interior, or the President of the United States.

Defense intimates that there is cause for censure. Defense is hypothecated upon the implied admission that somebody has done wrong. If any wrong has been committed in the administration of any one of these great offices—for the office of Commissioner of Pensions is great, not in its pay, but in its relation to these vast expenditures, and to the worthy and honorable objects for which it was created—if any wrong has been done in the administration of these great offices, I want the strictest and most rigorous investigation, and whatever searchlight science may invent that can give us full knowledge of the archives and the practices in that great Bureau will receive from me most ready assistance. That Bureau has been held to be sacred ground upon which no ordinary man shall tread, a Holy of Holies, into which no ordinary man shall enter.

The mission of the Democratic party, if it have any in this respect, is to tear away the veil, open it to the light of honest investigation, put the taxpayer by the side of the Commissioner of Pensions, honestly enroll every gallant soldier who deserves it, and drive out of that Pension Office every fraudulent man whose name has gotten upon those rolls. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is the whole of it. Whoever under these statutes has the right to be put upon that pension roll give to him an inexpensive and expeditious mode by which he can obtain his certificate.

Whatever there is in the statute that makes it expensive or makes it slow for the honest pensioner to obtain his pension, I will unite with my friends on either side to repeal. If there has grown up, by decisions or otherwise, anything which ought to be removed in order to give to those pensioners, rapidly passing away by the lapse of time, the certificates to which they are entitled, let us remove it. But, gentlemen, do not put yourselves in the attitude of using this generous and universal sentiment in favor of the honest pensioner for the defense of the fraudulent claim agent or the fraudulent applicant.

The Representative from Iowa talked of an object lesson. He said that there were in the country wounded Federal soldiers and wounded Confederate soldiers, and that the youth of the country saw in these object lessons that pecuniary reward followed those who had adhered to the flag, whilst only the diseases and injuries of war, succeeded by a heroic struggle in the battle of life followed treason. Do not add to that object lesson a picture for the youth of the country where they shall see the claim agent a convict in the penitentiary, a fraudulent applicant receiving the money, and distinguished Representatives refusing to help to put other fraudulent men in the penitentiary and defending the fraud. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, what are the facts? This is no new provision. We gave $580,000 in 1885 and $580,000 in 1886; and I shall put in my remarks a list of these appropriations up to two years ago. We have now given $200,000; and as it is not enough, we give $200,000 more, which was less than was given at any time during the period from 1884 up to the last two years.

Then the act of 1890 had gone into effect. The whole force of the Pension Office so far as could well be done was turned upon those applications. The need for examinations in the field was not supposed to be so great: and so that appropriation was cut down to $200,000. The cases which could readily be decided under that act have now been adjudicated. Frauds have arisen, and *a priori* they must necessarily arise under the construction that was given to that act by the Commissioner of Pensions and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. I hold in my hand a copy of the act of 1890.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Will the gentleman from Kentucky allow me a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman will excuse me. I have only thirty minutes in which to cover this whole case.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I yielded to the gentleman; and I would like to ask him a single question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Very well.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Do you claim that a pension is obtained by fraud, if the Commissioner in granting it makes an error of law?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I can not better illustrate what I claim than by referring to an application for a pension which was based upon a service of over ninety days. Through an error of the War Department the records seemed to show that this man had served ninety-five days, when he had in fact served only thirty days. He obtained his pension therefore absolutely in violation of law. He knew that he had served only thirty days, even if nobody else had known it. He was a fraudulent pensioner. What right had he to ask anything except that his name should be stricken from the rolls? That is a concrete case, and that is my answer to the gentleman from New York. I will insert in the RECORD a letter showing the facts in that case.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. I thought you were complaining of erroneous rulings by one Commissioner which had been changed by another Commissioner.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I say that under the ruling of the Commissioner there necessarily resulted a certain carelessness in that Department: for there can not be on the part of the head of a Department a construction evidently erroneous (I use no language stronger than that) without those under him being animated by his spirit in the construction and administration of the law.

When the act of 1890 was under consideration we heard from eloquent gentlemen on both sides of the House that among these old soldiers were many with whom the warfare of life had gone badly; that some of them were supported by charitable associations; some were in almshouses; that disabilities which had their root in the war had developed by operation of time or mischance and now could not be proved to have originated during the war. So an act was passed by which those worthy old people suffering under disabilities, the victims really of the war and the objects of local charity, were no longer to be humiliated by accepting local charity, but were to be put upon the pension roll, the burden of their support being thus distributed over the whole country.

And in order that this act might include only persons who were thus deserving, certain conditions precedent were specified in the act: first, the service must have been for not less than ninety days; second, the discharge from the service must have been honorable; third, this disability must in the first place be of such a character that it did not result from the soldier's own vicious habits, and in the second place, it must incapacitate him from earning a living by manual labor. It was not supposed that the beneficiaries under this law would be a very large class. The second section of the act of June 27, 1890, provides as follows:

SEC. 2. That all persons who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now, or who may hereafter be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding $12 per month and not less than $6 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support; and such pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Pension Office after the passage of this act, upon proof that the disability then existed, and shall continue during the existence of the same.

But there was placed upon that law very soon, by Order 164, a construction which substantially changed the whole law by making the disability under it not one which would incapacitate the soldier from earning his living by manual labor, but merely such as amounted to a pensionable disability under the old law. Now, pensionable disabilities under the old law were not determined with reference to incapacity for manual labor. No idea of manual labor was embraced in that old law. A man was pensioned for losing one finger or for being a little deaf—$15 a month was the rate at that time—or, for the loss of one eye, a pension of $17 a month was granted.

So under order 164 the applicant for pension did not have to prove himself incapable of earning his living by manual labor, but simply that he had incurred a pensionable disability.

In regard to fixing rates of pensions under act of June 27, 1890.

That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitate them for the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above $6 and less than $12, shall be rated the same as like disabilities of service origin; and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above $12 per month, shall be rated at $12 per month.

GREEN B. RAUM, *Commissioner.*

Approved:
CYRUS BUSSEY, *Assistant Secretary.*

Accordingly in the Bennett case and in a great many other cases pensions were allowed to men who were entirely capable of earning their own living—whose disabilities did not affect their capacity in that respect in the least degree.

In the administration of that law no effort was made to ascertain, nor was the applicant required to prove, that the disability, whatever it was, had not been occasioned by his own vicious habits. Practically the only question considered was whether the man had been in the service for ninety days and whether he had incurred a pensionable disability. Altogether there were issued under this law alone over 400,000 certificates.

Under such an open violation of law in that department (for no clerk, whether he had passed a civil-service examination or whether he had been sanctified by the civil service act by reason of having been in the department before its passage, could fail to have sense enough to know that such was not the law) pensions were issued with great rapidity and with the utmost carelessness. It could not but occur to me in examining this matter that it would be found there was not a single provision of the act which had not been carelessly administered or misconstrued.

So I said to the Commissioner, "Will you do me the favor to look into your archives and find me (I do not care to have you go into the matter very largely) cases of persons who have received pensions in spite of a dishonorable discharge, or cases of persons who have received pensions without serving the full time specified by the law." And in less than twenty-four hours the Commissioner sent me the particulars of a case where a man had been dishonorably discharged, yet received his pension, and the case of a man who had served only thirty days and received his pension. I append the letters of the Commissioner as to those cases.

There are cases arising in connection with two Delaware regiments where men received pensions because upon the face of the papers the regiments claimed to have been organized at a certain time and discharged at a certain time, when in point of fact the regiments were not called out until long after the day of organization, so that none of their members served ninety days.

Now this provision requiring service for a period of ninety days, this requirement of the honorable discharge, this incapacity to earn a living by manual labor were a part of the conditions precedent which this Congress put upon the applicant before he could require others of our citizens equally meritorious, equally deserving of our consideration, to put their hands in their pockets to pay the pensioner anything.

One would judge from what we hear in this debate that the General Government has some inexhaustible fund from which may be drawn at any time any amount that may be needed for this purpose. Not one dollar does this great imperial corporation, known as the United States of America, own, save in the coined sweat of her citizens, earned by their own labor and taken by the taxgatherer to pay it obligations. Every dollar that is given to one of these pensioners comes perhaps from some widow, some laborer, some toiler, who has a right to demand and to know that the money taken out of his pocket before it shall go to the support of other people and their children shall be properly expended, and that the person to whom it is given shall come within the terms of the law.

No number of gallant soldiers, no number of dead and wounded heroes brought by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] from the battlefields of the war, is or can be an excuse for the illegal and dishonest confiscation of the money of the taxpayers of this country for the payment of fraudulent pensions obtained by fraudulent means or by the official declarations of careless officers at the heads of bureaus. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, $1,520,000,000 have been paid to the pensioners of the late war. The burden of payments to be hereafter made reaches down to our grandchildren; for the Revolutionary widows are still on our rolls. Whosoever in the war bore himself well, whosoever under these acts is entitled to be put upon the roll, I for one would like to see the act consummated to have him put upon that roll as speedily as possible. Let us make out the rolls of those who are entitled to the bounty of the Government as rapidly as we can, so that we may know exactly the burden that we have to bear on this account. But when gentlemen say it is a mere bagatelle, these frauds, they are wholly mistaken.

I hold in my hand the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, which shows that thirty-seven hundred and odd cases were examined by the experts between the 1st day of June and the 30th of November, of which number 2,040 were recommended for admission, that is, they were honest applicants, with sufficient claims, who had their claims made up properly by the examiners, and they obtained the benefit of the salary paid to the examiners who investigated the cases. Seventeen hundred and forty claims of the total were recommended for rejection; that is to say, the taxpayers got the benefit of that number of cases submitted.

In other words of the thirty-seven hundred and odd claims the proportion was 2,040 out of the total of honest claims that were made clear by the examination and recommended for allowance, and 1,700 of them were fradulent on an examination of the claims and were rejected by the examiners.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And four-fifths of them were Republicans.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. And my friend says four-fifths of them were Republicans. I am not going into the political question.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] says that the frauds now existing are small. I do not know what he means by gigantic frauds. In a great city like Philadelphia with her mighty population, a glorious city which I love and which has grown rich and prosperous, built upon economic laws which drain the people who live where I come from, I say to such a city it may be that these numbers do not mean something gigantic. But I find here fraudulent claims in number nearly as large as the population of half of the cities in the district I represent: New Mexico 1448, Iowa 599, Indian Territory 534, Tennessee 71, New York 96, and with this comment as to New York:

This investigation is only in its preliminary stage. It will no doubt exceed in extent the New Mexico investigation.

Here are frauds where 1,448 persons have received the sum of $150,000 who were not entitled to anything. Is this a fairly gigantic fraud, when they are to receive the money through a series of approaching and coming years? When four thousand fraudulent claims are being presented is it not a gigantic fraud, not perhaps to Philadelphia with her great wealth, but to some humble home where dollars are very scarce, where the tongue and buckle rarely can be made to meet, where every night the snow falls the track of the wolves' feet are found to be at the door when they rise in the morning to begin their ceaseless labors of another day. These things are appalling to the President of the United States, and thank God he is the President of the common people who work for a living. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, let us think for a minute. The amount annually paid is $160,000,000. Last year it was $156,000,000. This year it is $165,000,000, and it will be $160,000,000 next year, an average of $160,000,000. This is not capital: it is income—so much a year. It is as if we owed a debt that was capitalized and we were paying the interest. We can borrow money at 3 per cent. What is the debt thus capitalized at 3 per cent? It is a debt of $5,330,000,000 resting upon the shoulders of the American people, more by $500,000,000 than the entire taxable value of the sixteen Southern States in 1890, more than the taxable value of any State of the Union, excepting the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania.

Five thousand millions of dollars is the capitalized debt upon which we pay the interest to this vast army of pensioners. I do not complain of the honest money paid under these statutes, but I complain of every effort made by any gentleman to incite passion and prejudice that will keep on this roll those who are not entitled to go thereon. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], I arraign, with the utmost courtesy, at the bar of public opinion to-day, not for their defense of the true soldiers of the country, but for the effort which in their names they are making to prevent this Administration from purging that roll of fraud. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Can we not lay aside the partisan differences that may divide us upon economic questions, and take this up as a question of practical business expediency? Here is the amount that is to be paid. Here are the soldiers that are entitled to it. Here are the widows that are entitled to it. Here is an army, not numerous, not vast, but persistent, clamorous, unscrupulous, who carry the banner of the Union, who dress themselves in the uniform of the soldier, who are championed by pension agents, who march with beating drums into this House and say to members, "If you do not put us on the roll, in the name of the old soldier we will send you to private life." I for one am in favor of driving that army of mercenaries out of the Capitol and of saying to them, in the name of the true soldier, "You disgrace the flag, you dishonor the uniform, who desire to steal from the part that is set aside for your brethren who fought in the field." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, once before when I discussed this question, I alluded to the personal circumstances that connected me with the late war. I do not desire to repeat what I then said, but I can say this afternoon, in the presence of God and this august body, that in this work and duty that I have had to perform, there has been nothing but the utmost kindness for the Federal soldier. One of the men, whom I love best in all the world, beside my own sons, is a Federal soldier now residing in this city.

As chairman of this committee, I appeal to the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if I did not furnish him with every opportunity to make the investigation as searching as possible. In controlling the time that was allotted to me I gave to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SICKLES] and to my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] part of the time, though they might not agree with me in the views I hold.

I have but one purpose. In the late canvass the Democratic party made a pledge that, as to the currency, it would take up the question and try to solve it so that we should have a flexible and yet a stable currency, in which the legislation would be just to the industrial activities of the East, to the mine-owning and growing interests of the West, and to the great exporting product of the South: that on the question of the tariff it would turn its face in the other direction, and make a tariff that would take burdens off labor, tear down barriers between us and foreign peoples, make the sea ours, and give to our manufacturers the markets of the world; that it would in this question of pensions find where the lines that run in the interests of the taxpayer and the lines that run in the interests of the pensioner would meet, so that generosity to the old soldier would still be justice to the taxpayer; and this afternoon I feel only desirous of carrying out that pledge.

Wherever there is a Federal widow, wherever there is a wounded soldier, wherever there is a man or woman entitled to a pension, I am ready to legislate for him or her all that is necessary to give a cheap and expeditious mode of receiving his or her dues. Let us not, in their name, give to honesty its defeat and crown fraud with the rewards of profitable victory. [Applause on the Democratic side].

APPENDIX.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: In answer to your verbal request for a brief statement as to the necessity existing for the additional appropriation asked of $300,000 for the per diem and expenses of special examiners of this Bureau, I will say that there is now in the hands of the special examination division upwards of 18,000 cases sent from the adjudicating divisions to be examined; that there are now in the field about 240 men employed in this work, and that the appropriation for their per diem and expenses will be exhausted in the latter part of the month of January next, if the present force is retained in the field. Unless an additional appropriation is granted the work must be discontinued, the force recalled, and probably a large number of the special examiners discharged. The adjudicating of the cases requiring special examination will be thereby indefinitely postponed.

The cases sent by the adjudicating divisions for special examination are of various kinds:

1. A large class consists of cases where the claimants are unable, or fail in some way, to furnish sufficient evidence to establish their claims, and there seems to be probability that in the hands of experienced special examiners the lacking evidence may be found.

2. Cases where the evidence may on the face of it appear sufficient, but is of a character to arouse well-grounded suspicion of fraud. In such cases the special examiners interview the witnesses and other persons whom they ascertain to have knowledge of the matters testified to, and take their depositions if deemed of importance; but after notice to the claimant and opportunity given to participate and to bring forward other witnesses.

3. Cases where information is received tending to the belief that the claim is fraudulent.

As all the evidence filed in support of a claim for pension is *ex parte*, the only possible way to protect the Government against the grossest fraud and imposition is by sending suspicious cases to special examiners. The fact, well known throughout the country, that the evidence in cases is liable to be thus tested has doubtless a salutary influence to deter the unscrupulous. But still in several cases very extensive frauds have been discovered by special examiners, usually arising from the dishonest transactions of a single claim attorney.

At Norfolk, Va., one W. R. Drury, a claim attorney, imposed upon the Bureau false and forged declarations and evidence of mythical witnesses, sharing the proceeds with the negroes whom he caused to represent the colored soldiers. Through the work of special examiners he is in the penitentiary, and over 200 of his pensioners dropped from the rolls. In 167 of these cases allowed under the act of June 27, 1890, the Government had paid $54,074.43. The future payments on these same certificates, as estimated according to life-insurance tables, would amount to $343,260.39. The trial of Drury's accomplices has begun before the United States court; and since I began this letter I am advised of the conviction of one of them, followed by sentence this day to five years in the penitentiary and a fine of $2,000. It is estimated that the Government has paid in pensions in all of Drury's fraudulent cases about $150,000, and that the future expectancy of the same cases would amount to nearly four times that sum.

In Socorro, N. Mex., a claim agent adopted the same plan of forgery, perjury, and false personation of soldiers. His practices were discovered by special examiners, and he is in the penitentiary under a seven years' sentence, and his cases are now, and for several months have been in the hands of a competent corps. His operations were even more extensive than those of Drury.

In Iowa a claim attorney adopted a different plan, and by corrupting witnesses, and to some extent certain medical boards, procured pensions to which the claimants were not entitled, or at higher rates than they were entitled. This also was discovered by special examiners, and much convincing evidence of his guilt obtained by them. Seven hundred and upward of these cases have been sent to special examiners, and the trial of the claim attorney is expected to take place at the term of the United States court now in session.

To cripple the special examination division or its work would hinder or stop the work of the Bureau in a large class of cases. It would encourage fraud, and make it usually successful, by removing the only barrier against it which exists. The importance and beneficial results of the work of this division has always been recognized, and the appropriation for it during several years exceeded $500,000 each year.

Yours very truly,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. J. D. SAYERS,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 16th instant, and invite your attention to the case of Frederick Daus, pensioned under the act of June 27, 1890, by certificate 680869.

The first War Department report in this case gave ninety-five days' service. The second report from the same Department, which was a correct report, gave thirty days' service only. The soldier was pensioned on the first report at $12 per month, from April 25, 1891, to May 2, 1892. This is one case of a large number of the same character.

It might be well to state in this connection that the first reports of the War Department indicated that the Fifth and Sixth Delaware Volunteers served from November, 1862, to August, 1863. Quite a large number of claims were allowed to these persons in consequence of these reports. On April 8, 1891, the War Department, however, informed this Bureau, in a general letter, that none of the men of the Fifth and Sixth Delaware Volunteers served ninety days during the war of the rebellion, inasmuch as Gen. Schenk did not call them into actual service prior to June, 1863.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE,
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS, OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1893.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your verbal request, I have to invite your attention to the case of Alexander Cabasher, pensioner by certificate No. 511482, act of June 27, 1890. Pension was granted in this case at $8 per month on the 8th day of December, 1890, to date from July 5, 1890, on account of injury of left leg and resulting varicose veins and rheumatism.

The original record shows this man to have been discharged with forfeiture of all pay, allowances, and without final statements, the enlistment involving fraud upon the part of the soldier. The soldier received a pension notwithstanding the fact that the act of June 27, 1890, forbids the granting of a pension except in cases where the soldier had an honorable discharge.

A second call was made upon the War Department to test the correctness of the original record. In a report dated July 7, 1893, the War Department states as follows:

"Inasmuch as Alexander Cabasher, the soldier referred to herein, was discharged the service with forfeiture of all bounty pay and allowance due, and without final statements, the enlistment involving fraud upon his part, his discharge is not viewed as honorable."

Upon this report of the War Department the pensioner was dropped from the rolls on the 4th day of November, 1893. How an allowance could have been made in this case originally surpasses comprehension. The name, in fact, was placed upon the pension rolls in actual violation of law.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE,
Chairman Subcommittee on Urgent Deficiency Bill,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1893.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 14th instant, asking for the following information:

First. The entire number of applications that have been filed for pension certificates in this office, growing out of the late war between the States; how many have been issued, and how many remain pending?

Second. What has been the entire amount of payments to pensioners on account of the late war; and of expenses of the Pension Office and system, excluding payments to pensioners?

In response, I have to advise you that up to and including the 14th day of December, 1893, there had been filed in this Bureau 1,741,275 original claims growing out of disability and death due to the United States service since March 4, 1861. During the same period there were issued by this Bureau 1,241,744 original certificates of the classes of pensioners above described. There remained pending, at the close of business on the 14th day of December, 1893, 499,531 original claims growing out of the war of 1861.

It is not practicable to furnish to you a statement showing the amount expended in the payment of pensions to war of 1861 pensioners, as distinguished from other persons who have been receiving pensions at the same time. Between July 1, 1860, and June 30, 1893, there was disbursed for pensions a total of $1,576,503,544.42. This, however, includes disbursements made to survivors and widows of the war with Mexico, survivors and widows of the war of 1812, and all pensions granted for disabilities contracted either in the military or naval service of the United States prior to March 4, 1861, but on account of which pensions have been paid since March 4, 1861. No attempt was ever made prior to the fiscal year 1876 to report separately the amount disbursed for pensions and expenses of disbursement. Since that time, however, the amount expended under each item of appropriation has, as required by the statute, been accounted for separately. Prior to 1876 the amount expended for pensions, and the expenses incident thereto, were reported in one gross sum.

This is the full information which is afforded by the records of this Bureau on the subjects of your inquiry.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN, *Commissioner.*

Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE,
Chairman Subcommittee on Urgent Deficiency Bill,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Appropriations for per diem of special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for special examinations.

1885.		
Special examiners	$220,000	
Clerks detailed	360,000	
		$580,000
1886.		
Special examiners	220,000	
Clerks detailed	360,000	
		580,000
1887.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	320,000	
		510,000
1888.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		415,000

Appropriations for per diem of special examiners, etc.—Continued.

1889.		
Special examiners	$190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		$415,000
1890.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		415,000
1891.		
Special examiners	190,000	
Clerks detailed	225,000	
		415,000
1892.		
Special examiners and clerks detailed		215,000
1893.		
Special examiners and clerks detailed, including deficiency of $25,000		225,000
1894.		
Special examiners and clerks detailed		200,000

Comparative statement showing number of cases pending special investigation on July 1, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, and 1893; the average number of special examiners employed, the number of reports made, the average cost per report, and the total cost of expenses of the special examination division for each fiscal year.

Year.	Average number of examiners.	Number of cases pending July 1.	Number of reports submitted.	Average cost per report.	Total cost.
1884	352	2,000	7,452	$45.98	$342,646.58
1885	308	13,169	29,356	15.40	514,269.18
1886	277	8,924	29,395	15.86	466,467.93
1887	253	9,081	31,010	13.33	427,404.20
1888	241	17,950	32,747	12.51	409,762.29
1889	254	15,806	41,164	10.62	412,374.32
1890	230	10,534	32,598	11.95	389,411.90
1891	198	3,517	24,359	14.27	347,599.80
1892	114	5,967	14,461	13.78	199,257.21
1893	129	14,551	17,101	13.02	222,586.07

The above data was obtained from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, which failed to show the average cost per case of each completed investigation.

Number of cases pending investigation December 1, 1893, in which fraud is alleged or suspected.

Location.	Number.
New Mexico	1,448
Iowa	599
Indian Territory	539
Tennessee	71
New York (*a*)	96
Total	2,753

(*a*) This investigation is only in its preliminary stage. It will, no doubt, exceed in extent the New Mexico investigation.

Statement of work received and disposed of by the special examiner's division from March 1 to December 1, 1893.

Month.	Number of cases received.	Number of cases disposed of.		
		Sent to board of review.	Sent to other divisions	Sent to adm. files.
March	1,253	739	202	2
April	1,745	546	107	1
May	2,145	444	158	3
June	3,684	459	677	2
July	2,182	415	308	0
August	1,274	559	328	1
September	1,226	557	362	3
October	1,538	688	246	4
November	1,680	785	298	6
Total	16,727	5,192	2,686	22
				2,686
				5,192
Cases on hand March 1, 1893	9,054	Total		7,900
	25,781			
	7,900			
Number of cases in division	17,881			

I now call for the reading of the bill by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time allotted for general debate is exhausted. The Clerk will read the bill by sections under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill by sections, read as follows:

Customs service: To defray the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs, being additional to the permanent appropriation for this purpose, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, $500,000.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to this increasing expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer any amendment?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was but a few years ago that the general appropriation, amounting to $5,500,000 per annum, and the amount coming to the Treasury from fines, penalties, and forfeitures, substantially covered all the expenses of collecting the customs revenue.

But within a few years these several deficiency bills have been coming in, and I know that they are increasing annually. For instance in the Fiftieth Congress there were in both sessions only $480,000 required. In the Fifty-first Congress there were $685,000 required. In the Fifty-second Congress there were $950,000 required to make up this deficiency, and here at the very beginning of this session we are asked to appropriate $500,000 as a beginning of the amount which will be required to defray these additional expenses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it is high time that the Treasury Department be called upon to exercise greater care in these matters, and to diminish these expenditures; and for that purpose, that the attention of the committee might be called to these increasing expenditures—unnecessary, because the expense of collecting revenues from customs is not one which increases annually—I have moved to strike out the last word, and made these few remarks. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries: For supporting roof, strengthening floors, and general repairs to the so-called Armory building, now occupied jointly by the United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries and United States National Museum, including reconstructing elevator, and for standpipes and fire-escapes, the work to be done under the supervision and direction of the Architect of the Capitol, $7,100.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after line 5, insert:

"That the appropriation made by the act approved August 5, 1892, entitled 'An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes,' for the introduction of water supply to the station of the United States Fish Commission, Lake County, Colo., be, and is hereby, made available for the purchase of such properties adjacent to such station, and the water and other rights appertaining to the same, as will vest in the United States the practical control of the water supply of Rock Creek, and as also for any further expenditures for the introduction of said water supply."

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. What is that amendment?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is an amendment introduced at the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. The amendment is all right.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (to Mr. CANNON of Illinois). It is to make a fund already appropriated available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pension Office: For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside the District of Columbia, for special examiners or other persons employed in the Bureau of Pensions, detailed for the purpose of making special investigations pertaining to said Bureau, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, $200,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after the word "dollars," in line 23, insert the following:

"*Provided, however*, That the clerks and other persons who shall be paid per diem and expenses under this appropriation shall be employed exclusively upon the investigation of original pension claims and claims for increase of pension."

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized to offer his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky, having charge of this bill, what amount now remains of the $200,000 appropriated for special agents for the present fiscal year?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The Commissioner said the amount would be enough to run his office until the 1st of February—the last of January or the 1st of February.

Mr. HOLMAN. He did not state the exact amount of money remaining.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It is impossible for him to state the exact amount.

Mr. HOLMAN. The committee is aware of the fact——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It was impossible for the Commissioner to state the exact amount of money, for the men in the field have not all returned their accounts.

Mr. HOLMAN. The committee is aware of the fact that the estimates for special agents to examine into pension claims for the present fiscal year and last fiscal year was $215,000 each year.

Mr. SAYERS. But the gentleman from Indiana will remember that the Commissioner of Pensions would not inform the committee as to what estimates were submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HOLMAN. I know that the committee had no information on the subject at all.

Mr. SAYERS. He declined to give us the information.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly; the Commissioner of Pensions refused to state the estimate he submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, but we all know the estimate submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury for this purpose for the years 1893 and for the present fiscal year 1894. I have no doubt the amount was reduced by the Secretary of the Treasury; and the Committee on Appropriations, after careful consideration of the subject, finally reduced the amount for both years from $215,000 to $200,000. I should have been glad if the committee had been accurately informed as to what portion of the $200,000 appropriated for this year still remains, and also as to the exact manner in which this $200,000 additional is proposed to be expended.

That there should be more or less fraud in such a vast transaction as the pensioning of a million of Union soldiers, their widows, and orphan children would be very natural and probable. But I must say, speaking from my own personal experience, that as a rule what are called frauds in granting pensions are largely technical frauds; and both Houses of Congress have at every session for years passed bills granting pensions to persons who for mere technical reasons have been dropped from the pension roll. In every session for many years past Congress has favorably considered such bills.

In all the cases that have come under my own personal observation, where there have been charges alleged of fraudulent methods in getting pensions, the ground upon which the pension was finally revoked was technical and not a real substantial case of fraud. There is not a session of Congress, I repeat, in which these technical irregularities or considerations are not set aside and the pensions granted or regranted if the pension had been revoked.

I do not wish anyone to have a pension unless justly entitled to it under the laws. The pension roll should be in every sense a roll of honor. If this $200,000 is intended, as it is alleged, to facilitate the adjustment and settlement of pension claims now pending and claims for increased pensions, I have no objection to the appropriation. My amendment simply requires that the expenditure of the money shall be for those purposes. But I protest against a general raid in any form on the pension roll. Democrats and Republicans are equally responsible for the laws under which these pensions have been granted. Both of the great parties have administered the Pension Office.

There is no evidence before Congress to justify the charge of widespread fraud in the granting of pensions. The Pension Office has already ample means for the detection of frauds if they exist. I assure you gentlemen the country will not tolerate any general charge of frauds in the pension roll on mere suspicion, nor will the country tolerate any revocation or suspension of a pension unless for fraud fully established nor until the pensioner shall have had a full and fair hearing.

[Here the hammer fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise for the purpose of hearing a message from the President: after which I will move to go back into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HATCH, from the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that they had had under consideration H. R. 4763, the urgent deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HAWAII.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President in response to a resolution of the House.

The message was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution passed by your honorable body on the 13th instant, I hereby transmit a report of the Secretary of State, with copies of the instructions given to Mr. Albert S. Willis, the representative of the United States now in the Hawaiian Islands, and also the correspondence since the 4th day of March, 1889, concerning the relations of this Government to those Islands.

In making this communication I have withheld only a dispatch from the former minister to Hawaii, numbered 70, under date of October 8, 1892, and a dispatch from the present minister, numbered 3, under date of November 16, 1893, because in my opinion the publication of these two papers would be incompatible with the public interest.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, December 18, 1893.

The SPEAKER. This message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and printed. The Chair also lays before the House another message from the President.

[For message see Senate proceedings.]

At the conclusion of the reading there was applause on the Democratic side.

Several members addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. This message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the instructions to Minister Willis, for which the House resolutions called.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent any part of the papers accompanying the message can be read.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the House called for those instructions. The reading of that message is merely the reading of an argument.

The SPEAKER. This message has no relation to the resolution of the House. The response of the President to that resolution has been already read and referred.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I understood that the message just read was in direct response to the resolution of the House.

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that it certainly can not be the design of anybody, and I know very well that it is not the design of the Speaker of the House, to take advantage of any misconception which may have existed on this floor. The understanding certainly was, among the membership on this side, so far as I know, and, I think, generally throughout the House, that the message just read was in response to the resolution of the House; and if it be true that the President has transmitted certain documents with another brief message which has been slipped through here and referred with all the documents called for, without attracting the attention of the House, that certainly should not preclude us from obtaining the information which we called for and which has already been read in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Debate is not in order.

Confusion in the Hall.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to debate. I am rising to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The House will please be in order. The Chair will state the question. It requires unanimous consent to have these papers, or any part of them, read.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am rising to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has heard the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I beg the Chair's pardon, but I have not concluded.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman will proceed and will confine himself to the question of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will endeavor to do so, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a question of privilege, and make the point that when the House of Representatives, in its capacity as one of the coördinate branches of this Government calls upon another branch, under its constitutional power and authority, to furnish this House certain information, we ought to be permitted to have that information, and that no technical advantage should be taken—a technical advantage which certainly can have no permanent effect, because this matter will all go into the papers to-morrow morning—that no technical advantage should be allowed to prevent us from having the information for which the call has been made and which has already become the property of another branch of the Legislature by being read at its desk. It was called for as a matter of right and——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the gentleman from Maine is confining himself to the question of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I am. I desire to do so, and I ask the Chair——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Maine will allow the Chair to state what has occurred, the Chair thinks the gentleman will see himself that he is not in order except in asking unanimous consent. The House of Representatives adopted a resolution calling upon the President to furnish, if not inconsistent with the public interest, certain correspondence. That message has been sent to the House this morning; that message has been submitted to the House with the accompanying documents; that message has been read; and that message has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But, Mr. Speaker, that was not understood——

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. It has already been referred.

The SPEAKER. The message last read is the message which the President in his annual message to Congress stated that he would at a subsequent period communicate, in relation to the Hawaiian matter.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Speaker will pardon me for saying that I rose immediately after the Clerk finished the reading to raise this question and to make this demand, so that the Speaker will not surely state——

The SPEAKER. Debate was not in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair surely will not hold that the reading of this second message precludes me from the right which I am now claiming?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman seems to think it customary to read the documents which accompany a message of this kind. The letter of instructions to which the gentleman refers, and which I hold in my hand, which I personally would be very glad to have read with the consent of the House, is not a part of the document in such a sense that it must be read to the House. It is one of the "accompanying documents." The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to this extract from the Digest, page 421:

Whenever taken up messages from the President are always read at length, the House never, as in the case of other communications, dispensing with the reading, but documents accompanying the messages are not usually read by the Clerk; and the message (but not the documents) is entered in full in the Journal.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Undoubtedly that is the usage of the House; but the fact that a member rises and demands the reading of a document of this kind takes it out of the category of "usage."

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The reading would not have been in order if the gentleman had asked it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why, it is very frequently the case that when a bill is reported the accompanying report is not read, or the bill itself is not read *in extenso* upon the first or second reading. It is the usage of the House to pass a bill through those readings without the reading *in extenso;* but certainly when a member demands the reading of a bill at any such stage it becomes his right to have it read. And the Speaker will allow me to say—I need not remark that I do not undertake to speak as a parliamentary expert—that I can not conceive that the House should properly be called upon to act on a motion to print and refer documents concerning which it has no knowledge. The document in question might be incendiary; it might be obscene; it might be in contravention of public morals. [Laughter].

I will not characterize this particular document, for I am not undertaking to discuss the merits of this question: but it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, when I am called upon, as I have been, and am about to be again, to vote upon the question of the printing of a document and its reference to a committee of this House, I have a right as a member to call for the reading of the document. Whether we should read this vast mass of communications—whether the reading would be an advantageous use of the time of the House—is a question of expediency. But in the exercise of what I believe to be my right, I have called in this case for the reading of the *res gestæ*—the document of all others called for by our resolution; and it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, it is my right to call for that reading. I shall of course submit to the ruling of the Speaker upon this subject with great cheerfulness, because I have every confidence not only in his fairness, but in his ability as a parliamentarian.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that whilst he does not consider it a matter of right that this communication should be read——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will remind the Chair that it is referred to in the document just read.

The SPEAKER. It is. The letter is quite short, only three and a half pages of typewritten matter; and if there be no objection, the Chair will direct that it be read.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Let us understand what document it is the reading of which is called for.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, it is the letter of instructions from the Secretary of State to the present minister.

Mr. McMILLIN. If it is to be read let it be done with the understanding that it is by consent.

The SPEAKER. By consent.

Mr. McMILLIN. Because the establishment of a precedent of this kind would not do.

The SPEAKER. The document, if read, will be read by consent.

Mr. HITT. I ask that the Chair direct also the reading of two telegraphic dispatches of instruction appended to the letters of instruction of November 28 and December 3. They are very brief, and they cover the exact point now in question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will read these several documents.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. Do I understand that the papers about to be read were directly transmitted with the message?

The SPEAKER. They came with the message.

The Clerk will read

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[No. 4.—Confidential.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, October 18, 1893.*

SIR: Supplementing the general instructions which you have received with regard to your official duties, it is necessary to communicate to you in confidence certain instructions for your guidance in so far as concerns the relation of the Government of the United States towards the *de facto* Government of the Hawaiian Islands.

The President deems it his duty to withdraw from the Senate the treaty of annexation which has been signed by the Secretary of State and the agents of the Provisional Government, and to dispatch a trusted representative to Hawaii to impartially investigate the causes of the so-called revolution and ascertain and report the true situation in those islands. This information was needed the better to enable the President to discharge a delicate and important public duty.

The instructions given to Mr. Blount, of which you were furnished with a copy, point out a line of conduct to be observed by him in his official and personal relations on the islands, by which you will be guided so far as they are applicable and not inconsistent with what is herein contained.

It remains to acquaint you with the President's conclusions upon the facts embodied in Mr. Blount's reports, and to direct your course in accordance therewith. The Provisional Government was not established by the Hawaiian people or with their consent or acquiescence, nor has it since existed with their consent. The Queen refused to surrender her powers to the Provisional Government until convinced that the minister of the United States had recognized it as the *de facto* authority and would support and defend it with the military force of the United States, and that resistance would precipitate a bloody conflict with that force.

She was advised and assured by her ministers, and by the leaders of the movement for the overthrow of her Government, that if she surrendered under protest her case would afterwards be fairly considered by the President of the United States. The Queen finally wisely yielded to the armed forces of the United States then quartered in Honolulu, relying upon the good faith and honor of the President, when informed of what had occurred, to undo the action of the minister and reinstate her to the authority which she claimed as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.

After a patient examination of Mr. Blount's reports the President is satisfied that the movement against the Queen if not instigated was encouraged and supported by the representative of this Government at Honolulu; that he promised in advance to aid her enemies in an effort to overthrow the Hawaiian Government and set up by force a new government in its place, and that he kept this promise by causing a detachment of troops to be landed from the Boston on the 16th of January and by recognizing the Provisional Government the next day when it was too feeble to defend itself and the constitutional Government was able to successfully maintain its authority against any threatening force other than that of the United States already landed.

The President has therefore determined that he will not send back to the Senate for its actions thereon the treaty which he withdrew from that body for further consideration on the 9th day of March last. On your arrival at Honolulu you will take advantage of an early opportunity to inform the Queen of this determination, making known to her the President's sincere regret that the reprehensible conduct of the American minister and the unauthorized presence on land of a military force of the United States obliged her to surrender her sovereignty for the time being and rely on the justice of this Government to undo the flagrant wrong.

You will, however, at the same time inform the Queen that when reinstated the President expects that she will pursue a magnanimous course by granting full amnesty to all who participated in the movement against her, including persons who are or have been officially or otherwise connected with the Provisional Government, depriving them of no right or privilege which they enjoyed before the so-called "revolution." All obligations created by the Provisional Government in due course of administration should be assumed.

Having secured the Queen's agreement to pursue this wise and humane policy, which it is believed you will speedily obtain, you will then advise the executive of the Provisional Government and his ministers of the President's determination of the question which their action and that of the Queen devolves upon him, and that they are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority.

Should the Queen decline to pursue the liberal course suggested, or should the Provisional Government refuse to abide by the President's decision, you will report the facts and await further directions. In carrying out these general instructions, you will be guided largely by your own good judgment in dealing with the delicate situation.

I am sir, your obedient servant,

W. Q. GRESHAM.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram sent through dispatch agent at San Francisco.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, November 24, 1893.*

The brevity and uncertainty of your telegrams are embarrassing. You will insist upon amnesty and recognition of obligations of the Provisional Government as essential conditions of restoration. All interests will be promoted by prompt action.

W. Q. GRESHAM.

MR. GRESHAM TO MR. WILLIS.

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, December 3, 1893.*

Your dispatch, which was answered by steamer on the 25th of November, seems to call for additional instructions.

Should the Queen refuse assent to the written conditions you will at once inform her that the President will cease interposition in her behalf and that, while he deems it his duty to endeavor to restore to the sovereign the constitutional government of the islands, his further efforts in that direction will depend upon the Queen's unqualified agreement that all obligations created by the Provisional Government in a proper course of administration shall be assumed, and upon such pledges by her as will prevent the adoption of any measures of proscription or punishment for what has been done in the past by those setting up or supporting the Provisional Government. The

President feels that by our original interference and what followed we have incurred responsibilities to the whole Hawaiian community, and it would not be just to put one party at the mercy of the other.

Should the Queen ask whether, if she accedes to conditions, active steps will be taken by the United States to effect her restoration or to maintain her authority thereafter, you will say that the President can not use force without the authority of Congress.

Should the Queen accept conditions and the Provisional Government refuse to surrender, you will be governed by previous instructions. If the Provisional Government asks whether the United States will hold the Queen to fulfillment of stipulated conditions, you will say, the President, acting under dictates of honor and duty as he has done in endeavoring to effect restoration, will do all in its constitutional power to cause observance of the conditions he has imposed.

GRESHAM.

[During the reading of the foregoing, after the words "You will say that the President can not use force without the authority of Congress," there was loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. There is no question before the House. This matter is referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. These documents so clearly disclose the fact that the privileges of this House, as a constituent part of the Government of the United States, have been invaded——

Mr. ENLOE. I rise to a point of order. This speech is not in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I prefer to make my motion to the Speaker, and not to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ENLOE. Let the gentleman make his motion, then.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I trust the Speaker will allow me——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please send up his resolution.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want to finish my sentence.

Mr. ENLOE. You want to finish your speech. You would better have your paper read first.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I object to any speeches. Debate is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Objection having been made, no debate is in order until it appears to the House that there is some question of privilege presented.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am on the floor, speaking to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The question of privilege must be stated or read from the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am stating it.

The SPEAKER. It must be read from the desk. The gentleman will send it up.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The Chair does not hold that I may not state my question of privilege?

The SPEAKER. It must be read from the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let us understand——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a question of privilege, which I send to the Clerk's desk. [Cries of "Too late," on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is recognized.

Mr. BLANCHARD. You are too late.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have sent to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution——

Mr. COCKRAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I trust the Chair will not make a mistake——

The SPEAKER. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request gentlemen to resume their seats. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] is out of order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does the Chair decline to allow me to have the question of privilege read?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine is out of order. The gentleman from New York is recognized. [Applause on the Democratic side and manifestations of derision on the Republican side.] Gentlemen will please resume their seats.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. What ruling?

Mr. BOUTELLE. That I have not the right to state a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not made any such ruling. The Chair has ruled that the gentleman has no right to rise to a privileged resolution and debate it until the resolution is read at the desk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I tried to send it to the desk, and the Speaker prevented me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair directed the gentleman to send it up.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But the Speaker cut me off by recognizing the gentleman from New York. I offered to send up my resolution, and I offer to send it now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears in the message of the President——

Mr. BOUTELLE. I object, if this requires unanimous consent, while I have the floor——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] objects to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BOUTELLE demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 154, noes 20.

Mr. BOUTELLE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] makes the point that no quorum has voted.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yes, we will have the yeas and nays, and afterward a call of the House.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 0, not voting 188; as follows:

YEAS—165.

Alderson,	Cooper, Tex.	Hunter,	Pence,
Alexander,	Covert,	Hutcheson,	Pendleton, Tex.
Arnold,	Cox,	Ikirt,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Bailey,	Crawford,	Kilgore,	Pigott,
Baker, Kans.	Cummings,	Kribbs,	Reilly,
Baldwin,	Davey,	Kyle,	Richards, Ohio
Bankhead,	Davis,	Lane,	Richardson, Mich.
Barnes,	De Armond,	Latimer,	Richardson, Tenn.
Bartlett,	De Forest,	Lawson,	Robbins.
Barwig,	Dinsmore,	Layton,	Robertson, La.
Bell, Colo.	Dockery,	Lester,	Russell, Ga.
Bell, Tex.	Donovan,	Lisle,	Ryan,
Berry,	Dunphy,	Livingston,	Sayers,
Black, Ga.	Edmunds,	Lynch,	Schermerhorn,
Black, Ill.	English,	Maddox,	Sibley,
Blanchard,	Enloe,	Magner,	Simpson,
Bland,	Epes,	Maguire,	Sperry,
Boen,	Erdman,	Mallory,	Springer,
Bower, N. C.	Everett,	Marshall,	Stallings,
Branch,	Fellows,	Martin, Ind.	Stevens,
Brawley,	Fielder,	McCreary, Ky.	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fithian,	McCulloch,	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Forman,	McDannold,	Strait,
Bretz,	Fyan,	McDearmon,	Talbert, S. C.
Brookshire,	Geary,	McEttrick,	Tarsney,
Brown,	Geissenhainer,	McKaig,	Tate,
Bryan,	Gorman,	McLaurin,	Taylor, Ind.
Bunn,	Grady,	McMillin,	Terry,
Bynum,	Griffin,	McNagny,	Tracey,
Cabaniss,	Haines,	McRae,	Turner,
Cannon, Cal.	Hall, Minn.	Money,	Warner,
Caruth,	Hall, Mo.	Morgan,	Washington,
Catchings,	Hammond,	Moses,	Weadock,
Causey,	Hare,	Mutchler,	Wells,
Clark, Mo.	Harris,	Oates,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clarke, Ala.	Hatch,	O'Neil,	Whiting,
Cobb, Ala.	Hayes,	Outhwaite,	Wise,
Cockran,	Heard,	Page,	Wolverton,
Coffeen,	Henderson, N. C.	Paschal,	Woodard.
Coombs,	Holman,	Patterson,	
Cooper, Fla.	Hooker, Miss.	Paynter,	
Cooper, Ind.	Hudson,	Pearson,	

NAYS—0.

NOT VOTING—188.

Abbott,	Bartholdt,	Brickner,	Campbell,
Adams,	Belden,	Broderick,	Cannon, Ill.
Aitken,	Beltzhoover,	Brosius,	Capehart,
Aldrich,	Bingham,	Bundy,	Chickering,
Allen,	Blair,	Burnes,	Childs,
Apsley,	Boatner,	Burrows,	Clancy,
Avery,	Boutelle,	Cadmus,	Cobb, Mo.
Babcock,	Bowers, Cal.	Caldwell,	Cockrell,
Baker, N. H.	Brattan,	Caminetti,	Cogswell,

Compton,	Hartman,	McCall,	Sherman,
Conn,	Haugen,	McCleary, Minn.	Sickles,
Cooper, Wis.	Heiner,	McDowell,	Sipe,
Cornish,	Henderson, Ill.	McGann,	Smith,
Cousins,	Henderson, Iowa	McKeighan,	Snodgrass,
Crain,	Hendrix,	Meiklejohn,	Somers,
Culberson,	Hepburn,	Mercer,	Stephenson,
Curtis, Kans.	Hermann,	Meredith,	Stone, C. W.
Curtis, N. Y.	Hicks,	Meyer,	Stone, W. A.
Dalzell,	Hilborn,	Milliken,	Storer,
Daniels,	Hines,	Montgomery,	Strong,
Denson,	Hitt,	Moon,	Swanson,
Dingley,	Hooker, N. Y.	Morse,	Sweet,
Dolliver,	Hopkins, Ill.	Murray,	Talbott, Md.
Doolittle,	Hopkins, Pa.	Neill,	Tawney,
Draper,	Houk, Ohio	Newlands,	Taylor, Tenn.
Dunn,	Houk, Tenn.	Northway,	Thomas,
Durborow,	Hulick,	O'Ferrall,	Tucker,
Ellis, Ky.	Hull,	Payne,	Turpin,
Ellis, Oregon	Johnson, Ind.	Perkins,	Tyler,
Fitch,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Phillips,	Updegraff,
Fletcher,	Johnson, Ohio	Pickler,	Van Voorhis, N.Y.
Funk,	Jones,	Post,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Funston,	Joy,	Powers,	Wadsworth,
Gardner,	Kem,	Price,	Walker,
Gear,	Kiefer,	Randall,	Wanger,
Gillet, N. Y.	Lacey,	Ray,	Waugh,
Gillett, Mass.	Lapham,	Rayner,	Wever,
Goldzier,	Lefever,	Reed,	Wheeler, Ill.
Goodnight,	Linton,	Reyburn,	White,
Graham,	Lockwood,	Ritchie,	Williams, Ill.
Gresham,	Loud,	Robinson, Pa.	Williams, Miss.
Grosvenor,	Loudenslager,	Rusk,	Wilson, Ohio
Grout,	Lucas,	Russell, Conn.	Wilson, Wash.
Hager,	Mahon,	Scranton,	Wilson, W. Va.
Hainer,	Marsh,	Settle,	Woomer,
Harmer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Shaw,	Wright, Mass.
Harter,	McAleer,	Shell,	Wright, Pa.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

Mr. DURBOROW with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut

Mr. JONES with Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky with Mr. WEVER.

Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.

For this day:

Mr. TURPIN with Mr. RAY.

Mr. CADMUS with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee.

Mr. TYLER with Mr. HULL.

Mr. BRICKNER with Mr. HARMER.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. CAPEHART with Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts.

Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. WALKER.

Mr. BOATNER with Mr. HOOKER of New York.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi with Mr. CURTIS of ——.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. CHICKERING.

Mr. RITCHIE with Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. SNODGRASS] is detained from the House by sickness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, chairman of 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. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices for the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 165; the nays none. No quorum has voted.

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

The question was taken.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The motion is agreed to——

Mr. BOUTELLE. Division.

The SPEAKER. And the House stands adjourned until to-morrow morning at 12 o'clock.

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HATCH (by request): A bill (H. R. 4830) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 4831) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a high wagon bridge at or near Sioux City, Iowa," approved March 2, 1890, as amended by acts of April 13, 1890, and February 7, 1893—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4832) to repeal the duties on woolen goods, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 4833) to establish a bureau of public health within the Treasury Department of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4834) to validate all outstanding soldiers' additional homestead certificates, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FORMAN: A bill (H. R. 4835) for the erection of a public building at the city of East St. Louis, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4857) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PENDLETON of West Virginia: A resolution setting apart a day for the consideration of House bill 415—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A resolution to print 12,000 copies of the fourteenth annual report of the Director of the Geological Survey—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 4836) for the relief of Hannah A. Frisbie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) granting a pension to Mrs. George D. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of Mrs. William Loring Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) for the relief of James K. Bowman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 4840) for the relief of the estate of Michael Fillion, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 4841) for the relief of Mrs. A. Shirley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CABANISS: A bill (H. R. 4842) for the relief of Hugh V. Washington, of Macon, Ga.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill (H. R. 4843) to amend an act of Congress approved May 12, 1890, granting to the Aransas Pass Harbor Company the right to improve Aransas Pass—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 4844) for the relief of Sarah Grisson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) for the relief of Francis M. Perkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORMAN: A bill (H. R. 4846) granting an honorable discharge to Charles Held, late captain of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 4847) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. B. F. Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) to reimburse the State of Montana the sum of $120 for fees erroneously expended in certain land selections—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4849) authorizing the restoration of the name of Thomas H. Carpenter, late captain Seventeenth United States Infantry, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4850) granting a pension to Marcus D. Box, of Company D, First Missouri Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A bill (H. R. 4851) for the removal of the charge of desertion against Joseph Wright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4852) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamship Tallapoosa—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON: A bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of Sarah M. Hadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4854) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March

3, 1883, and commonly known as the "Bowman act"—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4855) making appropriation for the harbor of Saugatuck, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of William E. Keene—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania: A joint resolution (H. Res. 101) for the relief of Annie V. Mumford, widow of Oliver Mumford, late a captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of W. T. Conley and 81 others, of Haverhill, Mass., for the passage of House bill for the establishment of a Government telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of all the employés of the Pittsburg Plate Glass Company, of Tarentum, Pa., against change of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against change of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employers of labor, workingmen, and others, citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., against change of tariff duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FYAN: Petition of workmen of plate-glass works at Crystal City, Mo., against reduction of duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of the farmers and growers of cigar leaf tobacco and their employés and those interested in the cultivation of that product in the town of Hartfield, Mass., against the proposed reduction of duty on foreign wrappers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Protest of W. McNabb and 516 other citizens of Superior, Wis., against certain bills to authorize the building of bridges between Superior, Wis., and Duluth, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 123 workingmen of Ford City, Pa., protesting against any change of duties on imports as will close the various industries of the country or force permanent reduction of wages—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 100 workingmen of Ford City, Pa., protesting against any change in the duties on imports as will close the various industries of the country or force permanent reduction of wages—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERMANN: Protest of Sellwood Lumber Manufacturing Company of Oregon against the repeal of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest from H. R. Duniway and other lumber manufacturers of Oregon against repeal of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HITT: Memorial and resolution of the Illinois Humane Society indorsing House bill 4182 for an international maritime conference for the better protection and care of animals in in transit—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William Heller, of Savanna, Ill., in favor of 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Petition of and papers in regard to the pension claim of David T. Stonebreaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: Petition in reference to House bill 996, first session Fifty-third Congress, on claim of owner of steamer Leesburg—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McALEER: Papers to accompany House bill 4769—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McETTRICK: Memorial of granite cutters and polishers, employés of Quincy (Mass.) granite industry, protesting against any reduction of the present ad valorem duty on dressed granite—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Typographical Union of Boston, Mass., and Central Labor Union of Boston, Mass., not to build Government Printing Office by contract—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of John C. Tobin and other workmen employed by the Roxbury Carpet Company, of Boston, Mass., protesting against any reduction of the present duty on carpets—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany House bill 4824—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Remonstrance of 16 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 5 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 60 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 93 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 46 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 79 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of 80 citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, against putting petroleum on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Protest of the brewers of Peoria, Ill., against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on malt liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Protest of the employés of John H. Seardefield, of New York City, manufacturers of gold leaf, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of citizens of La Crosse County, Wis., farmers and dealers in barley, against the reduction of the duty on barley, and the change from the plan of specific to ad valorem, as proposed by the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELL: Seven petitions of citizens of South Carolina, praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the navigation of the Congaree River from the present head of navigation to the city of Columbia, a distance of about 2 miles—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Memorial of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the use of public funds for the support of sectarian or ecclesiastical institutions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Memorial from the board of supervisors of Gogebic County, Mich., regardless of party, protesting against the placing of iron on the free list and showing that such action would depopulate the county and practically confiscate by destruction all the people have accumulated by prudence and economy in more prosperous times—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURPIN: Petition of 2,246 citizens of Birmingham, Ala., protesting against putting iron ore and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 636 citizens of Gurnee, Ala., praying that iron ore and coal be not put on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 246 citizens Bessemer, Ala., praying that iron ore and coal be not put on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 217 citizens of Blassburg, Ala., protesting against putting iron ore and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 126 citizens of Johns, Ala., protesting against putting iron ore and coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 144 citizens of Blocton, Ala., praying that coal and iron ore be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 275 citizens of Robertson, Ala., praying that coal and iron ore be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 351 citizens of Columbianna, Ala., against the placing of coal and iron ore on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 127 citizens of Montgomery, Ala., praying that iron ore and coal be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 41 citizens of Bibb County, Ala., praying that coal and iron ore be not placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Memorial of R. S. Newbold & Son, Harrison Townsend, and other employers of labor, workingmen, and

others, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Potts Bros. Iron Co., Limited, employés, workingmen, and others, of Pottstown, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 450 employés of M. J. Whittall's mills, Worcester, Mass., protesting against reduction of duty on carpets—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT of Massachusetts: Remonstrance of Benjamin M. Warner and 63 others, tobacco growers of Hatfield, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Thomas Williams and 181 others, employés of the Blackinton Woolen Mills, of Blackinton, Mass., against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1893.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. 288) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4243) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad, and other improvements, over and on the West Mountain of the Hot Springs Reservation, Hot Springs, Ark.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I have some morning business I wish to present.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from Texas will not insist upon the motion now.

Mr. MILLS. If we do not dispose of the business to-day I fear there will be no opportunity to do it before the holidays.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a little morning business I should like to have disposed of before the motion is made.

Mr. MILLS. Very well. After the routine business is over I will make the motion. The business I desire to have disposed of will not take more than fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Texas allow me before he presses the motion to put a question to him?

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Texas is withdrawn.

Mr. HOAR. I merely desire to say that I made a motion yesterday in relation to the disposition of the matter then before the Senate, the President's message, and had expected to call the attention of the Senate to it at the conclusion of the morning business this morning. I have been appealed to by two Senators, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], who desires to address the Senate and is to be absent from the city, I believe, after he has completed his remarks, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER], who gave notice of an intention to address the Senate this morning.

It is not my purpose, therefore, to press the motion until those two Senators have finished their remarks, and I suppose that when they have finished their remarks and the executive session which is desired has been concluded, it will be so late in the day that it is better not to press the motion until to-morrow morning. Therefore I shall not press it to-day. If any other Senator chooses to do so, I have no choice about that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the Royal Bag Manufacturing Company, of Charleston, S. C., praying that the so-called Wilson tariff bill be so amended as to prevent undue discrimination against burlaps and burlap bags; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented a memorial of the board of supervisors of Gogebic County, Mich., remonstrating against the reduction of duty on iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of Guernsey Lodge, No. 147, Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, of Cambridge, Ohio, remonstrating against a reduction of duty on sheet iron and steel; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Mrs. Jennie Turnt, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the removal of the charge of desertion from the record of the late Capt. F. Turnt, Company H, One hundred and third New York Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of George W. White and 15 other cigar-makers of Grafton, W. Va., praying for a uniform rate of duty of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT. I present a petition which purports to be the petition of 8,000 farmers of Hartford County, Conn., praying for the retention of the present rate of duty on imports of Sumatra tobacco. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE presented a petition of the Minnehaha County Medical Society, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., adopted at a meeting held December 7, 1893, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a bureau of public health in the Treasury Department of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

He also presented additional papers to accompany the bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Albert E. Redstone, of Tulare County, Cal., heretofore introduced by him; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of importers, dealers, and manufacturers of tin and terne plates, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against a change from specific to ad valorem duty, as proposed by the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the reduction of the duty on barley, as proposed in the so-called Wilson tariff bill, and also against any change from a specific to an ad valorem duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORDON presented the petition of George R. De Saussure, of Atlanta, Ga., praying that State banks of issue be organized under such regulations as will secure a uniform currency; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented a memorial of Buhl Sons & Company and others, of Detroit, Mich., importers and manufacturers of tin and terne plates, remonstrating against a change from specific to ad valorem duties on imports, as provided in the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Supervisors of Gogebic County, Mich., remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, praying for the passage of House bill No. 4182, providing for an international maritime conference for the better protection of animals in transit; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Pittsburg (Pa.) Petroleum Stock and Metal Exchange, remonstrating against the placing of petroleum on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Typographical Union, No. 2, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the placing of "all scientific publications, either of individuals or of institutions," on the free list as proposed by the so called Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRICE presented a petition of the board of directors of the Cincinnati (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, praying for the passage of House bill No. 3188, providing for the punishment of train robbers, wreckers, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of soldiers of the late war, citizens of Lincoln, Poland, Byesville, Brooklyn Village, Fayetteville, Carroll County, Licking County, and Toledo, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the Pension Bureau; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the National Lithographic Artists and Engravers' Association, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for an increase in the duty on lithographic plates; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 63, of Toledo, Ohio, and a petition of Typographical Union, No. 237, of Sandusky, Ohio, praying for the erection of a building for the Government Printing Office, and requiring all work and the preparation of all material for the building to be done by day's