

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1894.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John T. Lesley, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Tampa, in the State of Florida.

MEMBER MISSOURI RIVER COMMISSION.

Maj. Charles J. Allen, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Missouri River Commission.

MEMBER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Lieut. Col. Amos Stickney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

POSTMASTERS.

Jesse K. Willett, to be postmaster at Waldboro, in the county of Lincoln and State of Maine.

William N. Hood, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 1, 1894.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Journal as read will be approved.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York raises the point that no quorum is present. The Clerk will call the roll.

During the call of the roll,

The SPEAKER said: The Doorkeeper will require the attendants at the doors of the galleries to see that no more people are admitted during the proceedings of the House than can be comfortably seated. The crowd at several of the doors is such that it is impossible that order may be maintained; and the Chair is inclined to think it is hardly safe to have so many assembled in the doorways as there are at three or four of the gallery doors. The Doorkeeper will require some of the citizens who are crowded in those doorways to give way, so that those who are in the Hall may be comfortably seated and that order may be maintained.

The call of the roll having been concluded, showing the presence of 256 members, the Journal as read was approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I move that the House take a recess until 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order under the order of the House. The special order adopted some weeks ago provides the order of business during the pendency of the tariff bill, and excludes any motion except those enumerated in that order.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a motion to adjourn would be in order, I think.

The SPEAKER. Not until a later stage of the proceedings is reached. The Chair will lay before the House several executive communications.

B. L. BROCKWAY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to House resolution of the 27th ultimo, information relative to the appointment of B. L. Brockway to the Naval Academy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED AT TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read twice and referred as stated:

A bill (S. 1022) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1403) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niobrara River, near the village of Niobrara, Nebr., and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WEADOCK, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for ten days on account of important business.

COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports. A bill of the following title was reported, read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed and referred to the Calendar named below:

SECTION 2455, REVISED STATUTES.

By Mr. McRAE, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 4952) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the House Calendar.

TARIFF.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the special order.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the tariff bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday afternoon when the committee rose the committee was dividing upon a motion to close debate on the pending amendment. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] were appointed tellers. That vote not having been concluded, these gentleman will now take their places and the vote will be taken. The question is on the motion to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. How much time is allowed?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is to close debate now. The tellers will take their places.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 179, noes none.

Accordingly the motion to close debate was agreed to.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it. The gentleman will, however, suspend until gentlemen in front of the Chair take their seats and cease conversation. The Chair can not hear the parliamentary inquiry which the gentleman wishes to make.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. The parliamentary inquiry which I desire to make, Mr. Chairman, is, Should the Committee of the Whole decide by their vote to put a prohibitory duty upon barley, can that question come up for a yea-and-nay vote in the House when the bill is reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole can not make a decision that will bind the House; but all amendments that are adopted to a pending bill in Committee of the Whole may be voted upon separately in the House if a separate vote is demanded.

As to whether or not there will be a yea-and-nay vote, will depend upon whether one-fifth of those present call for it, as provided by the Constitution. The Chair will state the parliamentary status if the committee will be in order. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] has offered an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 190, page 29, by striking out the word "twenty" in line 23, and inserting "twenty-five," and by striking out "thirty" in line 24, and inserting "thirty-five."

The CHAIRMAN. To this amendment the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY] has offered an amendment, and the vote will first be taken upon the amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "thirty-five" and inserting the word "forty."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TRACEY. I demand a division. The Committee on Ways and Means have accepted this amendment, as I understand.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 91, noes 109.

Mr. TRACEY. Tellers.

Tellers were refused, only nine members seconding the demand.

Accordingly the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a substitute pending, offered by

the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "20 per cent ad valorem" in lines 23 and 24, and insert "20 cents per bushel;" and in lines 24 and 25 strike out "30 per cent ad valorem" and insert "30 cents per bushel."

The CHAIRMAN. To this substitute the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] offers an amendment. The Chair understands that this amendment has been printed in the RECORD, and is the present law, the provisions of the McKinley law, so called.

Mr. PICKLER. I will be glad to have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment, if it is demanded.

The Clerk began the reading of the amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with, if the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. PICKLER is as follows:

Amend Schedule G, agricultural products and provisions, as follows: Amend by striking out paragraph 188, page 29 and inserting the following as paragraph 188:

"188. Animals, live: Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem. Cattle, more than 1 year old, \$10 per head; 1 year old or less, \$2 per head. Hogs, \$1.50 per head. Sheep, 1 year old or more, \$1.50 per head; less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head. All other live animals, not specially provided for in this act 20 per cent ad valorem."

Amend by striking out paragraphs 189 and 190, on page 29, and inserting the following in lieu thereof as paragraph 189:

"189. Breadstuffs and farinaceous substances: Barley, 30 cents per bushel of 48 pounds. Barley malt, 45 cents per bushel of 34 pounds. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 2 cents per pound. Buckwheat, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds. Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds. Corn meal, 20 cents per bushel of 48 pounds. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 2 cents per pound. Oats, 15 cents per bushel. Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound. Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound: uncleaned rice, 1½ cents per pound; paddy, three-quarters of 1 cent per pound; rice flour, rice meal, and rice, broken, which will pass through a sieve known commercially as No. 12 wire sieve, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound. Rye, 10 cents per bushel. Rye flour, one-half of 1 cent per pound. Wheat, 25 cents per bushel. Wheat flour, 25 per cent ad valorem."

Amend line 13, page 30, paragraph 193, by striking out the word "four" and inserting the word "six;" so that the paragraph when so amended shall read:

"Butter and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound."

Amend line 15, page 30, paragraph 194, by striking out the words "twenty-five per cent ad valorem" and insert the words "six cents per pound;" so that the paragraph when so amended shall read:

"Cheese, 6 cents per pound."

Amend line 24, page 30, paragraph 198, by striking out the word "two" and inserting the word "four;" so that the paragraph when so amended will read:

"Hay, \$4 per ton,"

Amend line 7, page 31, paragraph 203, by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "twenty-five;" so that the paragraph when so amended shall read:

"Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel of 60 pounds."

Amend by adding to paragraph 195, page 30, the following words: "Eggs, 5 cents per dozen," and strike eggs from free list.

Amend by striking out word "two" in paragraph 224, page 34, and insert word "three;" and strike out of said paragraph the word "three" and insert word "five;" so that paragraph when so amended shall read as follows:

"Poultry, 3 cents per pound; dressed, 5 cents per pound."

Amend line 12, page 31, paragraph 205, by striking out the word "twenty" and inserting the word "thirty;" so that the paragraph when so amended shall read:

"Flaxseed or linseed, poppy seed, and other oil seeds not specially provided for in this act, 30 cents per bushel of 55 pounds; but no drawback shall be allowed on oil cake made from imported seed."

The question being taken on the amendment offered by Mr. PICKLER, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PICKLER demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 93, noes 137.

Accordingly the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The question being taken on the substitute of Mr. PAYNE, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. PAYNE demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 86, noes 143.

Mr. PAYNE. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 91, noes 108.

Accordingly the substitute was rejected.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I desire to offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute for the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "twenty-five per centum ad valorem" and "thirty-five per centum ad valorem," and add barley to the free list.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD].

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I would like to inquire whether that substitute is in order under the resolution adopted by the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman as to why it is not in order.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I understood the House had just resolved to close all debate and vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. HEARD. I rise to a point of order. The confusion is so great that we can not hear one word that is being said.

The CHAIRMAN. That point of order is well taken. The Chair has no hesitation in deciding that. Gentlemen will take their seats.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have it reported if gentlemen will restore order on the floor. Gentlemen desiring to converse must retire to the cloakroom, and all visitors will please cease conversation. The Clerk will now report the substitute which the gentleman desires to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

In paragraph 190, page 29, lines 23, 24, and 25, strike out the words, "twenty-five per centum ad valorem," and "thirty-five per centum ad valorem," and add barley to the free list.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Is that amendment debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not. The committee has closed debate. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD].

The question being taken, the substitute was rejected.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I have another substitute, Mr. Chairman, that I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send it up and the Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

In place of 25 per cent ad valorem, insert 10 cents per bushel, and in place of 35 per cent ad valorem, insert 20 cents per bushel.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to explain that amendment.

Several MEMBERS. Debate is not in order.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by inserting in place of "10 cents" "18 cents," and inserting 28 cents per bushel on barley malt instead of 20 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will first be taken on the amendment to the substitute.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 94, noes 135.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum has voted.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I demand tellers.

Several MEMBERS. Too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already announced the result. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LOCKWOOD].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 13, noes 169.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused, only 16 members voting therefor.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, so as to make the rate 22 cents per bushel on barley and 32 cents per bushel on barley malt.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will reduce his amendment to writing and send it to the desk.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. TAWNEY, the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 134.

Mr. TAWNEY. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN (during the count by tellers). The tellers will suspend the count. The hour has arrived when, under the order of the House, the committee must rise and report this bill with the amendments and pending amendments to the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, said: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, under the order of the House I now report the bill to the House with sundry amendments which have been agreed to by the Committee of the Whole. Under the order of the House, I also report that there are now pending two amendments, one offered by the gentleman

from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] to amend paragraph 190, page 29, lines 23 and 24, by striking out the word "twenty" in line 23 and inserting "twenty-five," and by striking out the word "thirty" in line 24 and inserting "thirty-five." To this amendment there is pending an amendment to place the tax on barley at 22 cents per bushel and on barley malt at 32 cents per bushel.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reports that they have had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and have directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to by the Committee of the Whole, and with two pending amendments. Under the order of the House, the bill is now open for debate for three hours, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. [Prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] desires to speak longer than the hour allowed by the rule, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed without limit.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], but as I understand the debate is to be limited to three hours I suggest that the time ought to be divided equally between the two sides. That would give the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] an hour and a half.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then I ask consent that the gentleman from Maine be permitted to speak for an hour and a half.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, in this debate, which has extended over many weeks, one remarkable result has already been reached, a result of the deepest importance to this country. That result is that the bill before us is odious to both sides of the House. It meets with favor nowhere, and commands the respect of neither party. On this side we believe that while it pretends to be for protection it does not afford it, and on the other side they believe that while it looks towards free trade it does not accomplish it.

Those who will vote against this bill will do so because it opens our markets to the destructive competition of foreigners, and those who vote for it do it with the reservation that they will instantly devote themselves to a new crusade against whatever barriers are left.

Whatever speeches have been made in defense of the bill on the other side, whether by gentlemen who were responsible only to their own constituencies or by the gentleman from West Virginia, who ought to have been steadied by his sense of responsibility to the whole country, have one and all, with but rare exceptions, placed their authors uncompromisingly, except for temporary purposes, on the side of unrestricted free trade.

It is evident that there is no ground for that hope entertained by so many moderate men, that this bill, bad as it is, could be a resting-place where our manufacturing and productive industries, such as may survive, can reestablish themselves and have a sure foundation for the future, free from party bickering and party strife. Hence, also, there can be no foundation for that cry, so insidiously raised, that this bill should be passed at once, because uncertainty is worse than any bill can possibly be. Were this bill to pass both branches to-day, uncertainty would reign just the same.

This result was inevitable. Although this bill professed to open to the manufacturers a new era of prosperity and professed to be made in the interest of some of them, the moment it came to be defended on this floor the great bulk of it could not be defended on any other ground than the principles of free trade. Hence, in this discussion, the precise terms of this proposed act count for nothing, and we are left to the discussion of the principles which underlie the whole question. That question may not be decided here and now upon these principles, but the ultimate decision by the people can have no other foundation.

After this statement it would be entirely natural that a feeling of weariness should come over this audience, for if anything seems to have been discussed until human nature can bear it no more it is the tariff. Nevertheless the fact that the subject is still before the people shows that the last word has not yet been said, and that the subject has not yet been exhausted or understood.

The history of protection has been most remarkable. Fifty years ago the question seemed to be closed. Great Britain had adopted free trade, the United States had started in the same direction, and the whole world seemed about to follow. To-day the entire situation seems to be reversed. The whole civilized world except Great Britain has become protectionist, and the very year last past has witnessed the desertion of English principles by the last English colony which held out. This has

been done in defiance of the opinions of every political economist in England who wrote prior to 1850, and of most of those who have written since.

When you add to this that the arguments against it have seemed so clear and simple that every school boy can comprehend them and every patriot with suitable lungs could fill the atmosphere with the catchwords [laughter], the wonder increases that in every country it should still flourish and maintain its vigor. Ten years ago it was equally true at one and the same time that every boy who graduated from college graduated a free trader, and that every one of them who afterwards became a producer or distributor of our goods became also a protectionist.

The arguments of the political economist, clear as crystal, do not seem to have convinced the world, nor, what is much worse, do they seem to have made any substantial progress. On the contrary, these economists have taken up the task of tearing each other to pieces, so that to-day there is hardly a namable important proposition on which they agree, and the more the facts of the universe are developed the more confusion seems to reign among them. Meanwhile the world has proceeded in its own way without much regard for their theories and their wisdom. I do not mean that studious men have not discovered great truths and had glimpses of still greater, but in the main they have only passed from one inaccuracy to another, because they have forgotten that the whole race is wiser than any man. [Applause.]

You and I, Mr. Speaker, can not hope to do much better than these famous men, except so far as we view with tolerance what great masses of our fellow-men are doing, and assume that they are probably right instead of assuming that they are probably wrong in matters which so deeply concern them.

It is often said that the truth is the simplest. That is so, after you understand the truth, but when you do not a lie is far simpler. [Laughter.] When Copernicus discovered the theory of the universe it took centuries for men to believe it. The Ptolemaic theory was so simple that anybody by using his eyes could see that the sun rose in the east and set in the west just like the moon, and both in the same way revolved around the earth, and to-day most men accept the Copernican theory, not on their own understanding, but on the general belief of mankind.

I shall not therefore, in what I have to say, be able—being, as I hope, on the side of truth—to rival the charming simplicity of the gentlemen opposite, or like them to compress the universe into the nutshell of a speech. I regret this the less because I know that many a philosopher has put the world into a nutshell only to find that the nutshell contained a world in which nobody ever lived, or moved, or had his being, and consequently a world which was of no human account.

I shall not attempt to deal much with the metaphysics of this discussion or to cite statistics which have no meaning except to the student, and so often mislead even him. I shall for the most part confine myself to large facts, which are known of all or can be ascertained in the simplest possible way.

Whether the universal sentiment in favor of protection as applied to every country is sound or not I do not stop to discuss. Whether it is best for the United States of America alone concerns me now, and the first thing I have to say is, that after thirty years of protection, undisturbed by any serious menace of free trade, up to the very year now last past, this country was the greatest and most flourishing nation on the face of this earth. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Moreover, with the shadow of this unjustifiable bill resting cold upon it, with mills closed, with hundreds of thousands of men unemployed, industry at a standstill, and prospects before it more gloomy than ever marked its history—except once—this country is still the greatest and the richest that the sun shines on, or ever did shine on. [Renewed applause.]

During that period of growth which lifted us from a position so low that we actually had human slavery within our borders to our present condition of freedom and prosperity, we struggled through a dreadful war which desolated one-half of the country and so strained the resources of the other half, both in money and in men, that its impress to-day is visible every year on our tremendous pension roll, although almost obliterated from our public debt. After the war ceased our prosperity was clouded with a six-years' struggle with a disordered currency and the reconstruction of labor and industry in the South. No nation in the world's history ever passed through in so short a time two ordeals so trying and so severe.

In spite of both these misfortunes, not only have we studied the country east of the Mississippi all over with mills and workshops, factories and furnaces, covered it with railroads, exploited the oil and gas fields of Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio, and turned into light, heat, and production the fierce, imprisoned energy of a thousand mines of coal, but beyond the Mississippi, that mighty country which some day will astonish the

world with its exceeding riches, we have built four great trans-continental lines across the Rocky Mountains, and have driven the great American desert off the maps and off the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Nor have we in any way exhausted the future. This country is ten times more capable to-day of further development than it was in 1860. Let me state one little item, sample of a thousand. Only last year, at Rumford, in my own State, were brought under harness waterfalls which will give to the productive energies of this country 40,000 horse power for every day in the year. Three hundred and fifty thousand just such horse power runs to waste every day in New England alone. Whenever our citizens are rich enough to employ these great resources my hope is that they will be rich enough to consume their products themselves.

So utterly undisputed and so distinctly visible to every human being in this audience has been our growth and progress, that this hasty outline is all that is needed to remind you of one great fact, that whatever the future industrial system of this country may be, the past system is a splendid monument to that series of successful statesmen who found the country bankrupt and distracted, and left it first on the list of nations.

But we must not leave this matter to our own praises. Let others speak, and above all the citizens of that land which is our great rival, at whose feet American statesmanship in this House now sits.

I have here an article in the Fortnightly Review, wherein Mr. J. Stephen Jeans, a British free-trade writer, in December, 1892, declares that—

America has for many years enjoyed an amazing degree of prosperity, so much so indeed that, to use the eloquent words of Edmund Burke, "generalities which in all other cases are apt to heighten and raise the subject, have here a tendency to sink it. Fiction lags after truth, invention is unfruitful, and imagination cold and barren."

When I read these words I recalled a scene in this House, and said how differently men look at the same things!

Here is a cool-blooded Englishman who, in talking of the "not unreasonable hopes"—I use his very words—which his countrymen entertain "that the greatest market in the world and probably in the world's history is once again to be found lying at the feet of British industry and commerce," declares that "America has for many years enjoyed an amazing degree of prosperity, so much so, indeed," that he has to use the words of Burke to say that he can not even describe it. And yet, in this very Hall a member of the Committee of Ways and Means, himself a countryman of Edmund Burke, and whose wonderful eloquence moved this assembly as I never saw it moved before, allowed himself, amid "laughter and applause on the Democratic side," to compare this amazing prosperity to a "prolonged debauch," from which the country could rescue itself only by the free use of the committee's dilution of the original beverage. [Laughter.] It seems, somehow, almost a desecration to put the facts over against the figure of speech.

Here is a little book of letters of an editor, Mr. Carr, of the Cardiff Mail, to his wife. It is full of expressions of surprise over this "wonderful country," "phenomenal prosperity," "extent and strength of the enormous interests created by the American policy of protection."

Only last November Mr. W. H. Mitchell, an English lecturer fresh from a three months' visit to our country, addressed the Textile Society of Bradford, England. He was here in the interest of trade. Hence what he had to say smacks of trade.

The importance—

Says he—

of America as a trade outlet was very obvious. It had 65,000,000 people who spent more money on dress than any other people on the face of the earth. Again, in spite of the wonderful development which had taken place, the possibilities, he might say the certainties, of future progress were marvelously illimitable.

"Marvelously illimitable." These were his very words. How the mouths of the Textile Society of Bradford must have watered as he detailed to them the hopes he had that such fruitage would be lifted to their very lips. [Laughter.] But of that by and by.

Without further quotation, unnecessary for this audience, for whom all that a foreigner can say is but a reminder, it only remains to ask if all this prosperity has been at the expense of the laboring man, of those who furnish service whether of brain or muscle? If it has been at their expense, for one I say down with it. The lowest depths of the Wilson bill are not half low enough for such a civilization.

That, however, can hardly be so, from the testimony itself. "Sixty-five millions of people, who spend more money on dress than any other people" on earth, and whose "certainties" of progress in that direction are "marvelously illimitable," have evidently not been sacrificed to the Moloch of accumulated wealth.

Editor Carr, already quoted, says this country "is the paradise of the workingman." All the bigotry of free trade can not wipe that out.

The further my inquiries extend—

Says he—

the more convinced I become that the real truth of the matter is that in this country a workman earns twice as much as he would in England, and the cost of his living, except in the matter of rent and clothing, is about the same. Even in the matter of clothing the difference is not great, except as it is brought about by the general use of much better clothing.

Says Mr. Francis A. Walker in substance, for I quote only from memory, and from a newspaper at that, "If the workman of America would be content with the meager life beyond seas he could save two-thirds of his entire wages."

These quotations, also, are only reminders, for you, Mr. Speaker, and all who hear me, know that the American who has been long enough here to know his opportunities has found the best place for wages in the world.

Lest anyone might doubt the condition of our laborer, and knowing that to many men the declaration of a tariff reformer imports absolute verity, I cite my eloquent associate on the committee, the gentleman from New York. It is not from his speech on the tariff, but from the speech made while the Democracy were assuring the country that the repeal of the silver act was all that stood between them and prosperity. [Laughter.]

I hold here in my hand the Aldrich report, which comes to me with the approval of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, and which emanates from a Democratic Bureau of Statistics. The accuracy of its figures has never been impugned; and it shows that never in the history of human civilization have wages been so high, measured by gold. [Applause.]

Lest there should be any doubt as to the application of all this to our own workingmen, I cite again:

Through long strikes and suffering and woe labor has improved its condition in this country until, by the figures of this Aldrich committee, we find that it enjoys to-day the largest proportion of that which it produces that it has ever enjoyed in the history of the world.

We may safely assume, then, Mr. Speaker, that a country which has become in the last thirty years the "richest country in the world," to quote Mr. Jeans again, a country which during all that period was a "paradise for laboring men," does not need to try any dubious experiments. A good thing in this world of disappointments is not to be lightly left. A better thing we should desert with still more reluctance, and nobody but a misguided man would leave the best thing ever known in the history of the universe unless he had such a glimpse of the future as would place him securely among the prophets and not land him among those unhappy martyrs whose blood is the seed of no church. [Laughter.]

What are the reasons why any change of principle should be had?

Of course we are not to change the history of the last thirty years and the principles of a hundred years because some gentlemen specially gifted with sonorous voices have distributed epithets. [Laughter.] We are not going to risk our all upon fragments of ancient platform speeches, upon loud outcries and abusive language.

There must be addressed to us some solid arguments, or at least the opinions of wise men who have proved their wisdom by the actual test of human life. Surely we are not going to venture into the unknown because political economists bid us do so while they still leave unproved every principle upon which they found their advice. So long as they can not agree among themselves on any of their propositions, they can not be cited as a body to force our conclusions. On no trackless future will we venture unless the prospect of increased happiness is large enough to justify risk and exposure.

Is there any example in the history of the world of any nation situated like ours which has taken the step to which we are invited?

Some gentlemen, perhaps, are hastening to say that England affords us the needed example; that we have but to turn to her history and find all that we need by way of examples, just as in the statements of her political economists we shall find all that is necessary for advice, for guidance, and instruction.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked there, and I am amazed to find how little the example of England can teach. According to the usual story that is told England had been engaged in a long and vain struggle with the demon of protection and had been year after year sinking farther into the depths, until at a moment when she was in her deepest distress and saddest plight her manufacturing system broken down, "protection having destroyed home trade by reducing," as Mr. Atkinson says, "the entire population to beggary, destitution, and want," Mr. Cobden and his friends providentially appeared, and after a hard struggle established a principle for all time and for all the world, and straightway England enjoyed the sum of human happiness. Hence all good nations should do as England has done and be happy ever after. [Laughter.]

This fairy tale has not the slightest resemblance to history. England, after three centuries of stationary life, during which the wages of her laborers remained without change, at the beginning of this century began to feel the pulses of a new life. Wages then commenced to rise, and in 1840 were 80 per cent higher in money than in 1800, and, measured by purchasing power, were 90 per cent higher than ever before. Coming as this did right after three centuries of stagnation it showed the great power of two things, protection and the establishment of the factory system. For England was enormously protected not only by duties such as we have, but by the laws which forbade the exportation of machinery, whereby she obtained or sought to obtain a monopoly of steam-driven methods.

It had so happened that England's development, owing to her insular position and her early efforts to obtain the results of skill which caused her to import Flemish weavers, to receive the Huguenots driven out of France, to welcome workers from everywhere, and in every way to encourage manufactures, had reached such a point that the invention of the steam engine was in her grasp and possible to her alone. Whoever has examined, even in the most cursory way, the history of the long line of inventions which culminated in the steam engine of James Watt can not fail to be satisfied that the condition of England at that period led to that line of invention, and that nothing else could. With the steam engine and the factory system England could so utilize human labor that no nation in the world could compete with her, no matter what the wages were, until the invention passed her borders.

Unfortunately, England at that time and for years afterward had no conception of its duty to its workmen. The only limit of work was human strength. It took the fiercest struggle to get slight remission of labor even for children. Shorter hours of labor were scorned not only by Cobden and Bright, but by every political economist of England, even down to 1883, when Bonamy Price denounced shorter hours of labor as a "repudiation of the great doctrine of free trade." The sole idea of the political economist of that class has always been as low wages as possible, as long hours as could be, and a product of as cheap a price as possible.

England also was a country where in the main the raw materials were scanty and few in number. Even the raw material of labor, wheat and other breadstuffs, could not be produced within her borders in sufficient amount for the consumption of her workers. Naturally enough, her theory of low prices for labor prevented a reasonable division of the tremendous increase of production caused by the steam engine and restricted her own market, and in 1840 she found herself in manufactures entirely ahead of her consumption. Her manufactures had grown out of proportion and could no longer subsist on English patronage alone. The workmen were pressing them for that regular increase of wages which I shall by and by show to be the natural progress of civilization, and therefore manufacturers commenced their agitation against the corn laws which resulted in their repeal.

Was that crusade the same as is waged here to-day? Are the gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee legitimate successors of Bright and Cobden and the Anticorn Law League? Not the least in the world. That was a fight by the manufacturers. This is a fight against the manufacturers. The manufacturers then desired no protection whatever. Turn over this big volume of Cobden's speeches until you come to the twentieth speech, seven years after he began; you will find hardly one allusion to protective duties to manufacturers, and even in the twentieth speech they are only alluded to to reiterate the declaration made in 1838, when the Corn Law League began, that all duties were to be abolished so as to make food cheaper. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am glad to see that my Democratic friends recognize a bit of truth, but I am afraid that it is by mistake. It so happens, Mr. Speaker, the corn laws were not, as these Democrats in their ignorance imagine, for the protection of the farmer. [Laughter.] What Cobden was fighting was an odious law enacted to enhance the price of bread, not for the benefit of the farmer, but of the aristocratic owner of land. Workingmen were clamoring for increase of pay. The manufacturers knew that decrease of the price of wheat was the equivalent of higher pay. Men do not work for money; they work for money's worth.

I have said the corn law was an odious law. It was more than that. In its workings it deprived the poor of food and put the enhanced price into the pockets of those who toiled not nor spun. Had that enhanced price gone to the farmers and farm laborers it might have been defended to-day on the ground that it was a fair means of distribution among the farmers of their share of the wonderful gains of the earlier manufacturing. But as it was, no more unjust law was ever attacked. Meantime what was the attitude of the manufacturers as to their own protective duties? Why, by the aid of these protective duties and the inventions they led to they had grown so powerful, had ma-

chinery so superior, and the factory system so firmly established they could hold their own markets, beyond clamor or dispute, with duties or without. No nation with capital as great and machinery as useful and productive and wages of skilled workmen lower by more than one-third, hung threatening over her border. Her machinery was so superior, that even the low wages of other countries could not affect her.

Not only were these manufacturers in condition to permit the duties to be taken off, but they knew it themselves. Not only did they know it, but they avowed it; not in a corner, but to Parliament itself.

I have here Hansard for February 8, 1842 (volume 60, page 133), where the Marquis of Lansdowne presents the petition of the woolen manufacturers of England, asking that all duties be abolished, including their own, but especially the corn laws. On page 137 of the same volume Lord Brougham declared that prior to that time he had "laid upon the table a petition from persons authorized by all the great manufacturing bodies of the Kingdom. They prayed for the repeal of every duty levied under the pretense of protection." I am using the very language of Lord Brougham. This, then, was a fight made by the manufacturers for the manufacturers against the aristocratic landowners over the question of cheap food in an island that could not produce a supply for its workmen.

The men who made the fight were not philanthropists or saints. They were good, honest, selfish men struggling for their own interests and never lost sight of them. Down to their latest day they resisted lesser hours of labor, and were deaf to all improvements which led to the elevation of the working classes. They held firmly to the doctrine that "as wages fall profits rise."

To sum this all up, England, when she became free trade, was a workshop wherein was manufactured the raw material of the rest of the world. Of raw material she herself had none. Her coal and iron and the invention of the steam engine had developed her manufactures so out of proportion to the wages of her workmen that she must have a larger market. At that time the only idea of a larger market was one that had more consumers. The notion that the market could be enlarged by those who were already consumers had not entered into the popular thought, yet her workmen were clamoring for more pay. Tariff had really ceased to be protection except on corn, and not on that in any true protective sense. It was only a tax like that on sugar. It made food dear. Repeal of the corn laws meant an increase of real wages. Repeal of tariff on manufactures meant nothing. The whole crusade of 1840 was for free food, and Cobden nowhere says anything else. Protection, in our modern sense, is never mentioned in any one of his free-trade speeches.

After this review of the story of England's change, will any man dare to say that he finds therein any justification for the present deed of violence which is called the Wilson bill?

Suppose England, instead of being a little island in the sea, had been the half of a great continent, full of raw material, capable of an internal commerce which would rival the commerce of all the rest of the world.

Suppose every year new millions were flocking to her shores and every one of those new millions in a few years, as soon as they tasted the delights of a broader life, would become as great a consumer as any one of her own people.

Suppose that these millions and the 70,000,000 already gathered under the folds of her flag were every year demanding and receiving a higher wage and therefore broadening her market as fast as her machinery could furnish production. Suppose she had produced cheap food beyond all her wants, and that her laborers spent so much money that whether wheat was 60 cents a bushel or twice that sum hardly entered the thoughts of one of them except when some Democratic tariff bill was paralyzing his business.

Suppose that she was not only but a cannon shot from France, but that every country in Europe had been brought as near to her as Baltimore is to Washington, for that is what cheap ocean freights mean between us and European producers. Suppose all those countries had her machinery, her skilled workmen, her industrial system, and labor 40 per cent cheaper. Suppose under that state of facts, with all her manufacturers proclaiming against it, frantic in their disapproval, England had been called upon by Cobden to make the plunge into free trade, would she have done it? Not if Cobden had been backed by the Angelic Host. History gives England credit for great sense. [Laughter and applause.]

While our wiseacres are reading British books of forty years ago with the emotions of great discoverers, what do the English themselves say about the actual facts? They come here in shoals. Naturally they do not like our system; but for it they could do our manufacturing for us. Nevertheless, prejudiced and prepossessed as they are, they are startled into some incautious

truths. Says Mr. Jeans, whom I have already quoted about the "amazing prosperity" of the United States:

It requires, I think, unusual temerity to allege that the tariff system of the United States has been a failure for that country.

What a prejudiced English free trader regards as "unusual temerity," and which he might have called unexampled rashness, is not only exhibited by our Committee of Ways and Means, but by every gentleman who can recite Sydney Smith's discourse on the taxed Englishmen under the impression that he is delivering an original speech. Mr. Carr, too, remarks the strange phenomena:

I am—

Says he—

a convinced free trader. Protection is to me an economical heresy, the fraud and folly of which

How like one of our own dear Southern statesmen he sounds—
[Laughter.]

the fraud and folly of which are capable of mathematical demonstration. * * * And yet, throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent, one is almost daily brought face to face with solid indisputable facts that seem to give the lie to the soundest and most universally accepted axioms of political economy.

Yes, not only do "solid, indisputable facts seem to give the lie to the soundest and most universally accepted axioms of political economy," but they do give it, and so does the whole history of this country. If what he calls "the soundest and most universally accepted axioms" had been axioms at all, this country ought to have been permanently for thirty years in the situation which it is now in temporarily after eleven months of this free-trade nightmare. We ought to have been halting in every branch of manufactures; we ought to have stopped progress and faltered to the rear, for we were wasting both capital and labor in unprofitable employment.

Our workmen, penned up in our little country while Englishmen reveled in the markets of the world, ought to be impoverished beyond all the experience of history. Instead of that, the Aldrich report, which deserves the high encomium of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], "with the approval of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury," even if it does "emanate from a Democratic Bureau of Statistics," shows that since 1860 money wages have risen 68 per cent. Or if you say, and you would be right in so saying, that wages should be measured by what they will buy, the result is still more striking.

The same report shows that, measured by prices of things bought, wages have risen, real wages, 79 per cent. By which I mean to say that where our people in 1860 received a dollar our people have now one dollar and sixty-eight cents and six mills in money, and a dollar and seventy-nine cents and one mill in consumable wealth. During the same period the hours of labor by average, in all the occupations calculated, have fallen from eleven to ten. If you count that and reckon the man's hour saved to be worth as much to him as it used to be to his employer—and it is—you have real wages raised 97 per cent, and you find the wage-earner to-day, after thirty-three years of protection, with \$1.97, where in 1860 he had but a single dollar. The history of the world shows nothing like it. The Aldrich report declares that there exists no thorough digest of facts relating to European wages; but if you will show me any figures of increase at all approximating what I have just described in free-trade England, you will discover what my search has not been able to find.

With wages rising, prices of manufactured goods falling, with lessening hours of labor, what more do you want except more of the same sort? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The truth is that this very question of rising wages is what makes a good many men free traders. People with fixed incomes think that anything which raises wages is inimical to them. Manufacturers who have foreign markets are naturally anxious to have wages on the foreign standard, and when a great cocoa manufacturer in Boston and a great agricultural tool-maker in Philadelphia proclaim themselves on the side of free trade, we find in both cases a large foreign trade and along with it a desire for foreign wages for their workingmen.

I confess to you that this question of wages is to me the vital question. To insure our growth in civilization and wealth we must not only have wages as high as they are now, but constantly and steadily increasing. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] No applause for this sentiment I notice on the Democratic side. This desire of mine for constantly increasing wages does not have its origin in love for the individual, but in love for the whole nation, in that enlightened selfishness which recognizes the great truth that your fate and mine, Mr. Speaker, and the fate of your descendants and mine, are so wrapped up in the fate of all others, that whatever contributes to their progress gives to us all a nobler future and a higher hope. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I do not mean to use the word "contribute" as adequate to describe the influence of wages on human progress. That would be to belittle the subject. In my judgment upon wages and the consequent distribution of consumable wealth is based all our hopes of the future and all the possible increase of our civilization. The progress of this nation is dependent upon the progress of all. This is no new thought with me. Our civilization is not the civilization of Rome, a civilization of nobles and slaves, but a civilization which tends to destroy distinction of classes and to lift all to a common and a higher level. [Cheers on the Republican side.]

There are some men in this world and in this nation who do not like that. When I talk about wages I use the word in its broadest sense as the price and value of service whether of brain or muscle. When I speak of constant and continuous increase of wages, I do not mean the caprices of benevolence or of charity, or the fantasy of a mind longing for the impossible.

The increase of wages which the service seller ought to have and the only useful increase he can ever get will be by the operation of natural laws working upon the opportunities which legislation may aid in furnishing. The increase will never come from the outside, will never be the gift of any employer. It must come from the improvement in the man himself. Can you get a carpenter or bricklayer to work for 25 cents a day? He did it in England in 1725. To-day in the United States it is a poor place where he can not get ten times that sum. Why does he have to have ten times as much? Because the carpenter of to-day could no more live as did the carpenter of 1725 than he could live in a cave and hunt snakes for food. The difference in wages means the difference in living, and the \$2.50 is as much a necessity to-day as the 25 cents was a hundred and fifty years ago.

Man is not a mere muscular engine, to be fed with meat and give forth effort. Man is a social being. He must have whatever his neighbor has. He can not grow unless he does. Every growth implies a larger consumption of consumable wealth, and by consumable wealth I mean whatever is made by man and contributes to his enjoyment, whether it be a loaf of bread, a novel, or a concert. The more a man wants of consumable wealth the more his wages are likely to be. But by wants I do not mean any wild longing for what is beyond reach, but such wants as are in sight and to supply which he has such longing as will make him work.

What is the rule and measure of wages? There has never been a subject on which so much ingenuity has been wasted and where the political economist has so befogged the world. He had a fund set apart in his mind which he called the wage fund. Divide the wage fund by the number of service sellers, having due regard to difference of service, and there it was plain as mathematics. True, nobody could calculate the wage fund, nobody had ever seen it. It was in nobody's bookkeeping, but it was a comprehensive answer and that was what he was after. Others of his disciples to-day dispose of it by the catchwords "supply" and "demand," and though the listener had acquired some words he had acquired very little knowledge.

In thus speaking slightly of "supply and demand" I do not mean to say that the relation between the worker and the work has no influence on wages. What I say is that it in no sense solves the problem. Only last week in this very city the builders and material men and the workers met together to see if in response to oversupply compared with demand concessions could be made. The material men were ready to yield, but the workmen, whose labor was the only perishable article involved, utterly refused. According to supply and demand they ought to have been hustling each other to see who could get into the job. Instead of that they are ready to struggle and to endure privations rather than give up what have become to them necessities of life. Of course in time they will have to submit unless this bill is beaten, but there are limitations beyond which you can not go. No nation can endure in peace any cut which goes into the quick. Necessities born of social life and advancing civilization are the real measure of wages.

This question of wages is all-important as bearing upon the question of consumption. All production depends upon consumption. Who are the consumers? In the old days, when the products of manufactures were luxuries, the lord and his retainers, the lady and her maids, were the consumers, a class apart by themselves; but to-day the consumers are the producers. Long ago the laborer consumed only what would keep him alive. To-day he and his wife and their children are so immeasurably the most valuable customers, that if the shop had to give up the wealthy or those whom it is the custom to call poor, there would not be a moment's hesitation or a moment's doubt.

Unfortunately the gentlemen on the other side have persistently retained the old idea, that the producers are one class and the consumers are another, and hence we hear on all hands such

stupidities of speech as those which sum up the workers in each branch and compare them with the whole people. One hundred and fifty thousand workers in woollens—you ask what are they compared with 70,000,000 of consumers; 200,000 workers in steel, what are they compared with 70,000,000 of consumers; 200,000 workers in cotton, what are they compared with 70,000,000 of consumers, and so on all through the long list, forgetting that all these people added together make the whole 70,000,000 themselves.

It so happens that America is filled with workers. There are idle people, but they are fewer here than elsewhere except now, when we are living under the shadow of the Wilson bill. If those workers are all getting good wages they are themselves the market, and if the wages are increasing the market is also increasing. The fact that in this country all the workers have been getting better wages than elsewhere is the very reason why our market is the best in the world and why all the nations of the world are trying to break into it. We do not appreciate the nature of our market ourselves.

I have given you already the glowing testimony of Englishmen who have seen us with their own eyes. "Amazing prosperity," "Greatest market in the world," "Paradise of the workingman." These are strong words; but let us see if cold mathematics do not put to shame the fervor of adjectives.

We are nominally 70,000,000 people. That is what we are in mere numbers. But as a market for manufactures and choice foods we are potentially 175,000,000 as compared with the next best nation on the globe. Nor is this difficult to prove. Whenever an Englishman earns one dollar an American earns a dollar and sixty cents. I speak within bounds. Both can get the food that keeps body and soul together and the shelter which the body must have for 60 cents. Take 60 cents from a dollar and you have 40 cents left. Take that same 60 cents from the dollar and sixty and you have a dollar left, just two and a half times as much. That surplus can be spent in choice foods, in house furnishings, in fine clothes, and all the comforts of life—in a word, in the products of our manufactures. That makes our population as consumers of products as compared with the English population 200,000,000. Their population is 37,000,000 as consumers of products which one century ago were pure luxuries, while our population is equivalent to 175,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If this is our comparison with England what is the comparison with the rest of the world, whose markets our committee are so eager to have in exchange for our own. Mulhall gives certain statistics which will serve to make the comparison clear. On page 365 of his Dictionary of Statistics he says the total yearly product of the manufactures of the world are £4,474,000,000, of which the United States produces £1,443,000,000.

I do not vouch, nor can anybody vouch, for these figures, but the proportion of one-third to two-thirds nobody can fairly dispute. We produce one-third, and the rest of the world, England included, two-thirds.

The population of the world is 1,500,000,000, of which we have 70,000,000, which leaves 1,430,000,000 for the rest of mankind. We use all our manufactures, or the equivalent of them. Hence we are equal to one-half the whole globe outside of ourselves, England included, and compared as a market with the rest of the world our population is equal to about 700,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I repeat, as compared with England herself as a market our people are equivalent to 175,000,000. As compared with the rest of the world, England included, we are equal as a market to 700,000,000. These figures more than justify the adjectives of the Englishman, and the cold facts of mathematics surpass the spasms of rhetoric.

Instead of increasing this market by leaving it to the steady increase of wages which the figures of the Aldrich report so conclusively show, and which have not only received the sanction of the member from New York, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Democratic Bureau of Statistics, but the sanction of everybody who hears me, our committee propose to lower wages and so lessen the market and then divide that market with somebody else, and all on the chance of getting the markets of the world.

Who have these markets of the world now? There is hardly a spot on the globe where three generations of Englishmen, Frenchmen, or Germans have not been camped in possession of every avenue of trade. Do you suppose that with machinery nearly as good as ours and wages at one-half these men are going to surrender to us the markets of the world? Why, the very duties you keep on show that you do not believe it. If we cannot without duties hold our own markets, how shall we pay freight, the expense of introducing goods, and meet the foreigner where he lives?

To add to the interesting impossibilities of this contention, the orators on the other side say they are going to maintain wages. How can that be possible? All things sell at the cost of production. If the difference between cost of production here and cost of production in England be not equalized by the duty, then our cost of production must go down or we must go out. Therefore our labor, the great component part of cost of production, must go down also. If you say this will come out of profits, then profits will be lessened in every occupation, for your own political economists teach you that the profits in protected industries can never be greater than in other occupations, and will not long consent to be less. Let it be noised abroad that any occupation is making big profits and straightway it will be swamped with competitors, so that overprofit is the sure precursor of no profits at all.

But all these questions of wages are to be met, says the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], by our superior civilization, and accuses me of "confessing that civilization at the highest level is incapable of meeting the competition of civilization at its lowest level." [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Now, it is a great truth that civilization can successfully meet barbarism, but it must do it with brains and not with rhetoric. How often have I heard this and similar eloquent outbursts about our superiority, and therefore inevitable conquest of the inferior. Survival of the superior! That is not the way that the great naturalist put it. "Survival of the fittest" was his expression; survival of the fittest to survive; not the superior, not the loveliest, not the most intellectual, but the one who fitted best into the surroundings. Compare the strong bull of Bashan with a salt-water smelt. Who doubts the superiority of the bull? Yet, if you drop them both into the Atlantic Ocean, I will take my chances with the smelt? [Laughter.] A little tomtit, insignificant as a bit of dust in the balance, can not compare with the domestic swan either in grace, beauty, or power. Yet, if both were dropped from a balloon hung high in air, I would rather be the insignificant tomtit than the graceful swan. If I had a job to dig on the railway the competitor for that job whom I should fear would not be my friend from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] [laughter], but some child of sunny Italy, so newly imported that he had not grown up to the wages of his adopted country.

But let us make these illustrations a little broader and take in a bit of history. Shortly after I entered Congress one Dennis Kearney began on the sand lots to address the world on the Chinese. He said these people were of a lower civilization; in fact, to use the very expression of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], he said it was "civilization at its lowest level." Indeed, to be strictly accurate, he used stronger expressions. [Laughter.] He denounced the Chinese, and instead of relying on superior civilization, on the flag of freedom in the air above us, the emblem of freedom on the earth beneath us, he actually wanted protection by law, and in spite of the jeers and flouts of us in the East he has got it at last and with our consent.

I know that when the gentleman learns these facts he will be so sorry that he was not here to tell these misguided men that having seized the lightnings and beat the miracles of Moses without being guilty of his mistakes [laughter], we must be able to beat the Chinese without law because of their lower level of civilization. What Mr. Kearney would have said to the gentleman from New York I do not dare to record.

Why did the work people of California object to the Chinese? Because they knew that if they swarmed here in sufficient numbers the law of wages would make our own wages impossible. Had the Chinese had the same wants, and been therefore forced to demand the same wages, they could have worshiped their ancestors here without let or hindrance. It was just because the higher civilization could not contend on a free field with the lower that the higher civilization had to put brains into the scale and protect itself. If, then, we protect ourselves against Chinese labor here, why should we not protect ourselves from a lower level of labor as represented by imported goods? Lower-priced labor can compete with our labor, whether it take the form of goods or of imported Chinamen.

But, says some gentleman, having heard some other gentleman say it, and having been struck by its epigrammatic point, but "labor is on the free list." Well, that sounds conclusive, does it not? Yet what utter nonsense it really is when you come to look at it. Does the Englishman, when he comes here, bring his rate of wages with him? I should like to see any immigrant who has been here long enough to know his bearings who does not demand as good wages as the rest. That is what they come here for. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Only last week the Hungarians and Poles and Slavs in Pennsylvania were trying to break up all work in the coal mines because our native citizens under the stress of the Wilson bill were consenting to take less wages? Obviously these gentlemen did

not bring their rate of wages with them. Why did we forbid the importation of contract labor? Because the price of it was tainted by the wage scales of a land on a lower level of wages.

Let me restate this: Men in America demand high and higher wages because their surroundings erect what used to be luxuries into necessities. Men who come here are soon affected by these same surroundings and are soon under the same necessities. But Chinamen, because they sequester themselves from these surroundings, and bales of goods, because they can not have the labor in them subjected to our influences, ought to be under the restriction of law. I do not mean to make the comparison go on all fours and have the goods prohibited like the Chinese. I only mean to convey an idea.

But is not it a dreadful business to tax people? Not necessarily. Taxes raised for a good purpose—like a schoolhouse, a road, an army, for payment of pensions, for the public debt, and indeed for all the purposes of a free people—are not only not bad but very good. Taxes to build a palace for the king's mistress or to place a barbarian queen on a deserted throne [prolonged laughter and cheers on the Republican side] would be dreadful; but we are not likely, owing to a series of fortunate accidents, to be called upon to do even the last.

But can you accomplish anything but oppression by taxes? Oh, yes; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] will tell you that taxation has regulated oleomargarine and can regulate stock sales. At least so he thinks. It has destroyed wild-cat banks.

On the question of the constitutionality of tariff taxation I shall spend no time. I have not been here as long as I have without learning that "constitutionality" and "unconstitutionality" on the other side of the Chamber are mere phrases, and that when a gentleman on the other side, with swelling voice, denounces the tariff as unconstitutional he merely means that he does not like it. [Laughter and applause.]

Inasmuch as nobody in a hundred years has even asked the Supreme Court to pass on that question, it seems hardly worth while to discuss it. If the Father of his Country, fresh from the convention, in signing the first tariff-tax bill, signed an unconstitutional act, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] and the whole Democratic party are better than George Washington—a thing not hitherto charged upon them. [Laughter.]

But do not the people pay the tariff taxes, and do they not go into the pockets of monopolists? Do you believe the consumer pays the tax or the foreigner? Well, I am going to be perfectly frank about that, and answer, sometimes one and sometimes the other, and sometimes both. The first thing the foreigner does when a tariff tax is laid is to see if he can get into our market without paying anything. If so, then he will not reduce his prices. If he can not, he looks over his margin of profit and sees if he can, by abating some part of these profits, get his goods in. So far as he does abate them he pays the tax. So far as he does not, the rest of the tax is paid by the consumer.

If the foreigner pays all the tax, then within the limit where his goods can circulate there may be protection or there may not. If after paying the whole tax he still has a margin of profit to sacrifice in the industrial war, there will be no protection, or very limited protection. But if there be only a slight margin which he can not sacrifice without rendering the market worthless, then there will be competition the same as if he manufactured here. In the latter case he at least can not shut up our factories.

In these cases the price will not be raised. But where the consumer pays any part of the tax by so much is the price raised. This is the general rule, but often it does not work so. After the act of 1890 large importations in anticipation of large profits, anticipations frustrated by the Baring failure panic, made great changes in the case. Many prices did not rise at all, and yet manufacturers, knowing that there would be a certainty at least that they could not be badly undersold, began work.

It often happens that men will begin manufacturing under a tariff that does not raise prices because they know that such a tariff will prevent them from going down.

It is not enough to have goods in the natural market at a price which will bring a profit. The manufacturer must know that the industrial enemy can not force the price below the range of profit. Then without any increase he may put up a plant. This operation of a tariff which does not raise the price is because industrial warfare sometimes assumes this shape. A rival maker may sacrifice his goods in order to sacrifice another man's factory, or to prevent the establishment of a competitor. If there be a tariff, then, which will not raise prices but which will maintain them, then the native manufacturer's risk in building a factory is limited. He may be put to hard struggle, but he can not be beaten out of hand. He will have a fighting chance.

There are, however, so many instances where the foreigner pays the tax that there is no wonder that the assertion has been

made broadcast. The Bermuda vegetable men appeared before this very committee to urge this very fact. Canada, both under the present law and just after the repeal of the reciprocity act, is a multitudinous witness all along our borders that the foreigner pays the tax. I venture to say that the lumber tax, lowered by the act of 1890, has all of it gone out of our Treasury into Canadian pockets.

It would be an interesting chapter in economic history if we could have in figures the abatement of foreign prices which have followed every increase of the tariff, for it would show what enormous profits have been made out of us by these people when no protection existed.

Having thus shown that even where tariff taxes are paid by the foreigner and the price not raised there may be some protection, let us face the question whether, where the price is raised and the consumer pays the whole tax or a part of it, there is any benefit to our country thereby. Does not the public suffer for the benefit of the few? Not for the benefit of the capitalist, for in the long run your own political economy will show you that protected industries will not obtain any greater remuneration than the unprotected. The same is all they ask for and more than they often get.

But we need not depend upon political economists, for they are always unsafe. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DRAPER] in his admirable speech has demonstrated the fact of equalization of profits.

In Massachusetts they have statistics so well collected that they mean something, and those statistics show that Massachusetts manufacturing stocks pay 3.87 per cent, Boston bank stocks 4.53 per cent, and in New England Railroad stocks 4.29 per cent.

Let me put the assertion in another form. If you will give me all that capital has made on railroads, an unprotected industry, I will give you all that capital has made on factories, and agree to feed the hungry crowds caused by the Wilson bill and not claim any virtue for my charity.

The public again do not suffer for the sake of the employes of the protected industries, for they get no higher wages than the unprotected. In fact the increase goes to one as much as the other. Who built the mills of Fall River? Who made the machinery? Who furnish the provisions and the other consumable wealth which Fall River and its mills demand? The answer must be the whole United States. "But," says my questioner, "if you only distribute among all of us who paid it, this money which was taken from us for the extra price, what is the good?" If that were all there was to it I could still answer that at least there was no loss. But beyond a question this system establishes diversified industries. Nobody can doubt that. Diversified industries call out all the working powers of the world. Some men are fitted for one thing, some for another.

The only way to utilize all the powers of body and mind in a nation is to have something which suits all. By this means the great army of the unemployed can be diminished. A nation which keeps its people employed is in the end sure to show the largest gains even of wealth. Diversified industries educate the people and give them a broader education than books can give, and so helps them on the road to greater civilization. We have already seen that greater civilization leads to higher wages, to greater production. In a country of high wages there are greater inducements for inventors, for they can save more by their inventions, which are therefore more readily adopted.

We were talking a while ago about higher wages. The question naturally comes up, how can these higher wages be got. There must be something for them to come from. Just think a moment what wages are. They are the devourers of consumable wealth. In order to have more consumable wealth you must have an incentive for its creation. Wealth will never be made unless a consumer stands ready. More consumable wealth, therefore, depends upon a broadening market. This I have already shown does not mean more purchasers, but purchasers with better purses, though for that matter in this country we have both.

But how can you make more wealth with the same number of workers? By using the forces of nature and by utilizing human brains. How can you do that? By incentives. The brain no more works without incentive than the body does.

To hear the discussions in Congress you would suppose that invention dropped from heaven like manna to the Jews. [Laughter.] You would suppose that James Watt reached out into the darkness and pulled back a steam engine. It was not so. All invention is the product of necessities and of pressure. When the boy who wanted to go off to play, and so rigged the stopcocks that the engine went itself, he was not only a true inventor, but he had the same motive—his personal advantage—that all inventors have, and like them was urged on by business necessities.

What originated Bessemer steel? Sir Henry Bessemer? No;

but the necessities of railroads, under public pressure for lower rates of traffic, which would, every one of them, been bankrupt without steel rails. If Sir Henry had not invented the process somebody else would. It detracts not one iota from the fame of Alexander Bell that a dozen men were close on his track. It has been so in every great invention. I say, therefore, that it was the diversification of our industries that has stimulated inventions. Otherwise all the inventive power of America would have run to waste; and when a man calculates the wonders of American inventive genius he knows where some of our wealth comes from. [Laughter and applause.]

As a further proof that invention is born of necessity, tell me why great inventions never come until the world is in such shape as to enjoy them? What would the Crusaders have done with railroads? There was not money enough in the world or travel or merchandise to keep them going a week. [Laughter.]

And this brings me to another fact. No invention is worth its salt which does not have increased consumption behind it. Take the very case of railroads; are railroads economical? "Certainly," you reply. "They can carry passengers for half a cent a mile, for a quarter of a cent, and a New York hack will cost you \$2, and even a lumbering coach may cost you 10 cents. Of course it is economical." But suppose you had only a stage load to carry every day, would it pay to build a railroad and would that conveyance be cheap? Hardly. You can make an ax handle with a machine in two seconds; without, in three hours. It would pay to build a machine to make a million of ax handles but not to make one.

Therefore I say that the great forces of nature and the wisest inventions are alike unprofitable except for a large consumption. Hence, large consumption is at the basis of saving in manufacture, and hence high wages contribute their share to progress. If you once accept the idea that necessity is mother of invention, instead of regarding invention as coming from heaven knows where, you can see how high wages stimulate it.

I saw at a machine-shop not long ago a great machine which could work only in one direction, and naturally consumed, in going back to place, as much time as in coming forward. It took three men at \$3 a day to run it. Half their time was lost. Could the speed of the return have been doubled, more than \$2 a day would have been saved. That invention was made because, being applicable to many machines, it meant much money. Had they been worked by men who were paid 50 cents a day, it is doubtful if it would have been demanded. Where wages are low invention is rare. It does not pay.

It has always seemed to me, until I heard the gentleman from New York the other day say to the contrary, that the establishment of new industries and not the destruction of old ones was the way to make two jobs hunt one man, to use the words I have ordinarily employed in putting it; but he says no, that is wasteful production, because you are employing capital in comparatively unprofitable occupation. That used long ago to puzzle me, and I used to put it this way: Suppose the nation to have a million dollars and no more, all employed at 6 per cent in that interesting dream of fancy "the most profitable employment," and a man should come along and say, "If you people will let me put a hundred thousand of this capital, my share, into a less profitable, a 5 per cent employment, I will do it on condition that you pay me and all people who come here and do the same enough to equalize my profits with the rest of you." At first sight that looks like mathematics.

It would seem incontestable that the nation would lose 1 per cent on a hundred thousand dollars or a thousand dollars every year. Yet I said if free traders are correct this, to a greater or less degree, is what the United States did even under the Walker tariff. Why is it that we have not gone to pieces long ago? Well, one of the fallacies of this demonstration is this: It proceeds on the assumption not only that one million is all the capital of the United States, but all the capital of the world.

Suppose that law which taxed the profitable employment coaxed in the \$100,000 from the rest of the globe, our nation would have gained \$5,000 every year, instead of losing \$1,000, for we should have had the whole \$1,100,000 earning 6 per cent less the tax laid on the whole to raise \$1,000. But you say, why should not the new \$100,000 come in and go into the 6 per cent most profitable employment; why should it select the 5 per cent employment? Just simply because that money does not come here by attraction of gravitation, but by the mind of a man, and men's minds are what play havoc with cut and dried political economy.

Suppose you go to a manufacturer of cotton in England and tell him that by putting his surplus capital into a Dakota farm he can make 10 per cent. The chances are he will not even look at it. Then you try him with a proposal to build a cotton factory in Georgia: show him he can make 6 per cent while he is making only 4 at home. The chances are that the cotton mill will

tempt him and not the farm. He knows the cotton business, but he is not a farmer.

This, in fact, is the history of the United States. Our laws have invited money and men and we have grown great and rich thereby. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] has noticed that men come here, and he does not want them to come; hence he is willing that our wages shall be lowered to keep people away. Well, this is not the time to discuss immigration; but while people are coming I am glad they have not yet imbibed the gentleman's ideas and have not yet begun to clamor for lower wages. I really can not help adding that when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] starts his reformed emigration of men who come here "unawed by influence and unbribed by gain" I hope to be there, for it would be a sight hitherto unknown on earth of men who forsook their homes without being either pushed or pulled. [Laughter.]

To sum it up, if this protection gives us money and men, and our vast country needs both, it may show why we have so wonderfully prospered. If it does, I am inclined to think that the way to have two jobs hunting one man is to keep on making new mills and try to prevent the Committee on Ways and Means from pulling down old ones.

"But," says some gentleman fuller of political economy than of sense, "why do you not transfer your capital from these protected industries to the more profitable?" Yes, that would be a good idea. We will commence in West Virginia and take up the coal-mine holes and stick them down somewhere else, unless we can utilize them as places of refuge for the committee after the election. There is what used to be \$8,000,000 worth of stuff belonging to the people that make screws. Let us take that up. But it is not worth \$800,000, let alone \$8,000,000. The bill has dropped \$7,200,000—that can not be transferred anywhere.

But what do you say about the farmer? Well, on that subject I do not profess any special learning, but there is one simple statement I wish to make and leave the question there.

If with cities growing up like magic, manufacturing villages dotting every eligible site, each and all swarming with mouths to be filled, the producers of food are worse off than when half this country was a desert, I abandon sense in favor of political economy.

One other thing I have noticed in this debate. When the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON] gets a little money ahead he does not put it into stocks in these immensely profitable manufactures. He has too much sense. He adds to his farm, and has told us so. Example is richer than precept.

If the hope of agriculturists is in English free trade, they had better ponder on the fact that while the wages of artisans have increased in England \$2.43 per week since 1850, the wages of agricultural laborers have only increased 72 cents, and while the Lancashire operatives in the factories live as well as anybody, except Americans, the agricultural laborers are hardly better off than the continental peasantry. England's example will not do for agriculture.

Here let me meet one other question, and let me meet it fairly. We are charged with having claimed that the tariff alone will raise wages, and we are pointed triumphantly to the fact that the wages of France and Germany, protected by a tariff, are lower than England, free of all tariff, and to America with a tariff and still higher wages. We have never made such a claim in any such form. Free traders have set up that claim for us in order to triumphantly knock it over. What we do say is that where two nations have equal skill and equal appliances and a market of nearly equal size and one of them can hire labor at one-half less, nothing but a tariff can maintain the higher wages, and that we can prove.

If there be two bales of goods side by side made by the same kind of machinery and with the labor of the human being in both of the same degree of skill, and if the labor of one bale cost only half, for example, as much as the other, that other bale can never be sold until the extra cost of the costlier labor is squeezed out of it, provided there is an abundant supply of the product of the cheaper labor. If the bale with the cheaper labor of England in it meets the bale with the dearer labor of America in it, which will be bought at cost of production? I leave that problem just there. The sale of the English bale will be only limited by England's production.

Now, as to France and Germany. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] makes the same blunder which he charges on us. He says the tariff makes lower wages, and asks us to compare the three countries, saying they are all the same, except the tariff. I do not read history that way. England had centuries of peace or distant war, while both France and Germany were the battlefields of Europe. Until Bismarck made Germany a nation she was not even big enough to enter successfully modern industrial warfare. To compare either of those nations in machinery or wealth to England, a hundred years in advance of

them both by reason of her history before 1850 and her tributary provinces, is absolutely farcical.

Let Germany and France get thoroughly established within themselves as good machinery as England now has, together with her factory system, and nothing but higher wages in those countries or a tariff in their own will ever save the English people from ruin. Lord Armstrong knew what he was doing when he established an English iron manufactory in Italy with English appliances and Italian labor at half price.

No, no; tariff does not make the blind see, the lame walk, nor does it raise the dead to life, but it is a good, sound, sensible policy for the United States for its growth in riches and civilization, and if it is stricken down the people who in their secret hearts will think us the most shortsighted will be the foreigners who profit by our folly.

There is still another argument which I desire to present out of the large number yet unused. What has made England rich? It is the immense profits which come of converting raw material into manufactured goods. She is a huge workshop, doing the most profitable work of the world; changing material to finished product. So long as she can persuade the rest of the world to engage in the work which is the least profitable and leave her the most enriching, she can well be content.

Let me give one item, and the figures shall be furnished by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], who told me in your presence that the value of all the cotton raised in the United States was only \$300,000,000, while the finished product of that cotton was \$1,750,000,000. When cotton leaves the field it is worth \$300,000,000; when it leaves the mill it is worth six times as much. On our own cotton crop alone we might in time make the profits on a billion and a half of manufactured goods. Nor is there anything to prevent such a result in a protective tariff.

Some men think, indeed, this bill and its author's speeches proceed upon the supposition that the first step towards gaining the markets of the world is to give up our own, just as if a fortified army, with enemies on all flanks, should overturn its own breastworks as the first preliminary to a march into the open. Even the foolish chivalry of the Marquis de Montcalm which led him to his death on the Heights of Abraham had not that crowning folly. Such is not the history of the world; such is not even the example of England. Tariff duties, whether levied for that purpose or for revenue, become a dead letter when we are able to compete with the outside world.

We are the only rival that England fears, for we alone have in our borders the population and the wages, the raw material, and within ourselves the great market which insures to us the most improved machinery. Our constant power to increase our wages insures us also continuous progress. If you wish us to follow the example of England, I say yes, with all my heart, but her real example and nothing less. Let us keep protection, as she did, until no rival dares to invade our territory, and then we may take our chances for a future which by that time will not be unknown. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Nobody knows so well as I do how much even of my own comprehension of the great argument which should control this vote I have failed to present. I have said not a word of the great fall of prices which has always come from the competition of the whole world within itself rendered possible by protection and substituted for the competition within a single island. I have said not a word of the great difference between the attitude of employers who find their own workmen their best customers in their own land, and who are, therefore, moved by their own best interests to give their workmen fair wages, and those who sell abroad and are therefore anxious for low wages at home, and on whom works unrestrictedly that pernicious doctrine, as wages fall profits rise. These and much more have I omitted, for there is a limit to all speaking.

We know, my friends, that before this tribunal we all of us plead in vain. Why we fail let those answer who read the touching words of Abraham Lincoln's first inaugural and remember that he plead in vain with these same men and their predecessors. Where he failed we can not hope to succeed. But though we fail here to-day, like our great leader of other days in the larger field before the mightier tribunal which will finally and forever decide this question we shall be more than conquerors; for this great nation, shaking off as it has once before the influence of a lower civilization, will go on to fulfill its high destiny until over the South, as well as over the North, shall be spread the full measure of that amazing prosperity which is the wonder of the world. [Prolonged applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

At the conclusion of Mr. REED'S remarks the Speaker called Mr. HATCH to the Chair as Speaker *pro tempore* and took the floor.

Upon rising, Mr. CRISP was greeted with prolonged applause by the Democratic side and in the galleries.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House will please be in order. Visitors in the galleries are admonished that they must preserve order.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, Embarrassed by the vast audience that is here assembled, embarrassed by the thought that I may not be able to meet the expectations of my friends, I yet shall undertake, within the time allowed by the rules, to answer and to make plain the error contained in the argument to which we have just listened. I assume that the cause of protection has no more able advocate than the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. I assume that the argument for protection can be put in no more alluring form than that to which we have listened to-day. So assuming, I shall ask you calmly and dispassionately to examine with me that argument, to see upon what it is based, and then I shall invoke the unprejudiced judgment of this House as to whether the cause attempted to be sustained by the gentleman from Maine has been sustained or can be before any tribunal where the voice of reason is heard or the sense of justice is felt.

The gentleman from Maine, with a facility that is unequalled, when he encounters an argument which he is unable to answer passes it by with some bright and witty saying and thereby invites and receives the applause of those who believe as he does. But the gentleman does not attempt, the gentleman has not to-day attempted, to reply to the real arguments that are made in favor of freer trade and greater liberty of commerce.

The gentleman points to the progress of the United States, he points to the rate of wages in the United States, he points to the aggregated wealth of the United States, and claims all this as due to protection. But he does not explain how we owe these blessings to protection. He says, we have protection in the United States, wages are high in the United States, therefore protection makes high wages. Why, sir, a distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] years ago upon the floor of this House analyzed and ventilated the error of an argument like that. He employed the weapon with which my friend from Maine is so effective, the weapon of ridicule, and he replied to this ridiculous argument, if I may be permitted so to name it, in this wise.

Mr. Cox. Thus argues the protectionist: England has free trade, England has low wages, ergo, free trade produces low wages. Again, the United States has protection, the United States has high wages; therefore protection produces high wages. Now, one may very easily parody such cholog as this. England has a House of Lords, England has low wages; conclusion, the Lords make wages low. Or, the United States is infested with tramps, the United States has high wages; therefore, tramps make wages high. Ireland has no snakes, Ireland has low wages, ergo, no snakes make wages low. [Laughter.]

When we ask the gentleman from Maine to give us a reason why a high-protective tariff increases the rate of wages he fails to give it, but points to the glory, the prosperity, and the honor of our country. We on this side unite with him in every sentiment, in every purpose, in every effort that has for its object the advancement of the general welfare of the people of the United States, but we differ from him as to the method of promoting their welfare. The gentleman belongs to that school who believe that scarcity is a blessing, and that abundance should be prohibited by law. We belong to that school who believe that scarcity is a calamity to be avoided, and that abundance should be, if possible, encouraged by law.

The gentleman belongs to that class who believe that by a system of taxation we can make the country rich. He believes that it is possible by tax laws to advance the prosperity of all the industries and all the people in the United States. Either, Mr. Speaker, that statement is an absurdity upon its face, or it implies that in some way we have the power to make some persons not resident of the United States pay the taxes that we impose. I insist that you do not increase the taxable wealth of the United States when you tax a gentleman in Illinois and give the benefit of that tax to a gentleman in Maine. Such a course prevents the natural and honest distribution of wealth, but it does not create or augment it.

The gentleman from Maine, not in his argument, but in that more carefully prepared statement which he has given to the country as the views of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means, amongst other strange things insists that whatever duty or tax is collected upon goods that are brought into this country from abroad is paid by the foreigner.

Now, the gentleman from Maine would be ashamed in his place on this floor to make such a statement as that; and yet, in preparing the views of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means respecting the pending bill, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BULLOCK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and all the distinguished Republicans who constitute that minority gravely say to the people of this country that the foreigner pays the tax which we impose upon goods which are brought to this country for sale. They say also in that report that the consumer pays the tax.

The gentleman from Maine and his associates, when dealing with a great question which must affect the business, the happiness, and the prosperity of all our people, make statements which are inconsistent with each other and are calculated to deceive; and yet the gentleman presumes to lecture this side of the House because, forsooth, we can not accept his conclusions thus arrived at.

That there may be no question that I have correctly quoted the gentleman, I read from the views of the minority: "By this bill the larger part of the burden of taxation is transferred from foreigners and borne by our own citizens." This fact they say should "always be kept in mind during the discussion."

Now, perhaps here and there may be found some benighted Republican who entertains that idea, but that is now one of the cast-off garments of protection, and yet our friends produce it again for use in this debate.

"The foreigner pays the tax."

At the expense of being charged by my friend from Maine with repeating an old argument, let us examine this. In 1892, under the McKinley bill, there was imported into the United States 48,000 pounds of woolen and worsted cloth, of the value of \$13,000. The duty on that cloth was \$21,000. If the foreigner paid the tax, he paid more than \$21,000 for the privilege of selling to the American people \$13,000 worth of goods [applause on the Democratic side]; and the foreigner "he paid the freight." [Laughter.] What nonsense this is!

In another part of this report the gentleman from Maine correctly states the effect of a tariff duty.

Our goods—

I want you to hear this, because it is the Democratic idea, and though in a Republican report it is the truth—

Our goods are now met by foreign goods on our own shores at a price made up of raw materials plus labor and plus the present rate of tariff on very nearly equal terms.

If you believe this statement to be true, and if you agree with your leaders you do, then you must admit, first, that the tariff is a tax; second, that the consumer pays the tax; and, third, that the home product of goods which come in competition with those which are sent here from abroad are increased in price very nearly, if not quite, the amount of the tariff that is put upon the foreign article.

It is true the statement that the foreigner pays the tax is somewhat inconsistent with the other statement that the consumer pays it, but I have never yet known a Republican arguing the advantages of a protective tariff to have any idea or conception of what consistency is. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us look at this report again. This is not an utterance given out hastily in debate, but is the carefully prepared views of six of the leading Republicans in the country. This report says that the protective tariff on plate glass and on cotton ties reduces the price to the consumer; but the protective tariff on steel rails and spool cotton increases the price to the consumer. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] It says that putting lumber on the free list will not reduce its price, but when the Republicans put sugar on the free list it greatly reduced its price. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It says that the protective tariff on leaf tobacco has given the farmer a better price for his tobacco, and yet has not increased the price of cigars. But the most marvelous statement in this report is that which foretells the effects of the pending bill on wool and woolen goods.

It says that putting raw wool on the free list and reducing the rate on woolen goods will reduce the price that the farmer gets for his wool, will reduce the wages that the spinner and the weaver gets for his labor, and yet will accomplish only an "imaginary and infinitesimal difference in the price of clothing." Now, if the manufacturer gets his wool cheaper, and if he gets his wages cheaper, let me ask you why he will not sell clothing cheaper? [Applause.]

You gentlemen of the minority state in your report:

If the tariff element be lowered, then something must be lowered on our side.

Here the tariff element is lowered; you say the price of the raw wool will be lowered; you say the price of labor will be lowered, and yet you say that the price of the finished product to the consumers in the United States will not be lowered, or if it is, the reduction will be only of an imaginary and infinitesimal character. If you were bound by any of the laws of consistency, you would feel ashamed of such a statement; but I fear you are not. [Laughter and applause.] You claim that we owe to protection the sunshine, the showers that fall, the fertile fields that surround us, the intelligence, the enterprise, the energy of our people—all these things you gravely credit to protection.

But when we point to the impoverished farmers throughout the country—when we point to the strikes of laboring men for higher

wages, when we point to the suspension of protected industries—you say all this is due to threatened reduction of the tariff. You take credit that you are not entitled to, and you seek to avoid responsibility for that for which you are clearly and undeniably responsible. [Applause.] Our friends of the minority say:

The consumer will take care of himself, if you look after the producer; for he is one and the same individual.

The audacity of the statement is only equaled by the inconsistency of this whole report. Assuming, if you please, for the purposes of the argument, what these gentlemen claim, that a protective tariff gives higher wages in protected industries, and still your proposition is wholly without foundation. The consumer and the producer the same! Why, Mr. Speaker, do you know the proportion the producers of protected manufactured products in this country bear to the producers of all other products? You do not pretend that your tariff raises the price of the farmer's wheat, or his cotton, or his corn, or his meats; yet in spite of this great class, which is as three to one or more against the other, you gravely say that the producer and the consumer are the same!

Will you tell me how your protective tariff benefits the man who raises cotton, or corn, or wheat, or meats? The producers of those great staples are forced to seek their market abroad. A hundred years of this fostering system has not yet built up a home market for more than one-third of the cotton produced in the United States. Our market is abroad. Will you tell me how this protective tariff benefits our agricultural producers? I can show you—I think I can demonstrate clearly—how the tariff hurts them; and I defy any of you to show wherein they are benefited by a protective tariff.

Suppose a farmer in Minnesota has 5,000 bushels of wheat and a farmer in Georgia has 100 bales of cotton. That wheat at 80 cents a bushel is worth \$4,000, and that cotton at 8 cents a pound is worth \$4,000. Let those producers ship their staples abroad. The Minnesota wheat-grower ships his wheat to Liverpool; whether he ships it there or not that is where the price of his wheat is fixed. The Georgia cotton-raiser ships his cotton to Liverpool; whether he ships it there or not that is where the price of his cotton is fixed. The wheat and the cotton are sold in that free-trade market. The wheat is sold for \$4,000; the cotton brings the same amount. The Minnesota farmer invests the \$4,000 he has received for his wheat in clothing, crockeryware, iron, steel, dress goods, clothing—whatever he may need for his family in Minnesota. The Georgia cotton-raiser invests the proceeds of his cotton in like kinds of goods. Each of those men ships his goods to this country and they reach the port of New York. When either undertakes to unload them he is met by the collector of customs, who says, "Let me see your invoice." The invoice is exhibited, and it shows \$4,000 worth of goods. Those goods represent in the one case 5,000 bushels of wheat; in the other case 100 bales of cotton. The collector at the port says to either of these gentlemen—the man who raises the wheat in Minnesota or him who raises the cotton in Georgia, "You can not bring into this market those goods for which you have exchanged your products unless you pay to the United States a tariff fixed by the McKinley law—a tax of \$2,000!"

The man will in vain refer the collector to the statement of the gentleman from Maine that the foreigner pays the tax. You can not convince that unrighteous United States officer that the foreigner is to pay that sum of \$2,000; he requires the Minnesota farmer or the Georgia farmer to pay it. What is the result? The goods that cost either of these men \$4,000 without the tariff cost him \$6,000 with it.

Ah, but says the gentleman, he ought to buy his goods at home. Let him try it. Let him go into the home market; and, according to the statement of the gentleman from Maine, when he enters the home market he will buy the home product almost on equal terms, in competition with those same goods which are sent here from abroad, embracing the cost of raw material, plus labor and plus the present rate of the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If he buys his goods abroad and pays the duty, it goes into the Treasury of the United States and is called a tax; if he buys the goods at home and pays the increased price that is put upon them by the tariff, it goes into the pocket of the protected manufacturer and is called "protection." [Applause.] In either case the increased price is practically the same amount, and in both cases the consumer pays it.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] very frankly stated—perhaps he did not know the full effect of the admission—he frankly stated that the corn laws in England, while made ostensibly for the benefit of the farmer, were really made for the benefit of the English nobleman who was the landlord. I say to him, and I say to the country, that an examination in regard to the operation of protective tariffs will disclose that whilst they are nominally made in the name of increased wages for the la-

borer, they are really made for the manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman cites, as an evidence of the prosperity of this country under a protective tariff, that report which bears the name of my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, the Aldrich report. I thank him for that citation. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Carlisle], who was a member of that commission, in discussing that report in the Senate of the United States, said:

The result of that investigation is shown by the report. The fifteen general occupations selected by the committee as fairly representative of the rates of wages received in all the general occupations of the country were as follows.

Bakers, blacksmiths, bricklayers, and so on. The result of it all is, that having classified fifteen industries which were not protected and fifteen industries which were protected by the tariff, the wages in the fifteen industries which were not protected had increased, and the wages in the fifteen industries which were protected had been diminished since the passage of the act. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] upon the floor of the House this afternoon refers to the high wages paid the carpenters and bricklayers as an evidence of the good wages paid in this country. We do pay good wages in this country, not because of the tariff, but because of our surroundings, the freedom of our people, the fertility of our soil, and our natural resources.

The carpenter is not protected. The bricklayer is not protected. It is a great mistake to assume that all the industries of the United States are protected by the tariff. High wages in this country, Mr. Speaker, are more dependent upon the independence of the laboring men, upon trades unions, upon labor organizations, upon the intelligence and capacity of the American laboring man to demand his rights than they are upon any protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The American laboring man wants what? He wants steady employment at reasonable wages. This protective system builds up industries which it is wasteful upon the part of the manufacturer to carry on. It destroys the natural industries of the people, and builds up an artificial industry. It takes away the natural right of every individual freely to exchange the surplus of that which he makes for the surplus of that which his neighbor makes. His neighbor, my friends, is the world.

Trade is not war. Trade is peace. Commerce knows no nationality. There is not a manufacturer in the United States, however highly he might have been favored, who will not send his goods to India, if by so doing he can get a little more for them than he can by selling them here; and he has the right to do it.

Gentlemen talk about a home market. What is a market? A market is where you buy and where you sell. If you say the market to which you allude is only that market in which I shall buy, then it is only half a market. A market is a place where you go to sell and where you go to buy. Restrictive protective tariff forces the American people to buy in the highest market on earth, and forces the great agricultural class which exports \$700,000,000 worth of their products every year to sell in the cheapest markets of the earth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When you tax that Minnesota farmer or that Georgia farmer 50 per cent on what he seeks to bring in return for his own goods, you are diminishing the purchasing power of that which he sells, and you are inflicting an injury upon him to that extent.

But, say my friends on the other side, we want an American system. We want an American system, too; but we differ as to what constitutes the American system. The Democratic idea of an American system is the largest liberty to all the people consistent with the individual rights of every person. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The idea of our Republican friends of an American system is a Chinese wall that will force our people to trade with themselves, and not permit them to trade with anybody else. Let us not forget that the same wall that shuts out the surplus products from foreign lands shuts in the surplus products that we make at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us bear in mind that if we do not sometimes buy from those to whom we ship our products they can not always buy from us. No man can always buy unless he can sometimes sell. The system fastened upon us by the Republican party is one that permits us to sell abroad, but does not permit those people to sell to us. We can deposit what we have there, we can exchange it for their goods, but when we bring them home we must pay a penalty to the American manufacturer because we have dared to exercise the liberty of an American freeman to buy where he pleases. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Whilst for thirty years the people of the United States have been burdened by these laws, whilst the protection idea has had possession of the Government and shaped itself into forms of

law, let me say to you that the reign of the protectionist has never been peaceful. It has never been quiet. And so long as men love liberty and equality and right they never will rest easy under a system which is oppressive and unjust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Wherever we have had an opportunity to go to the people upon this question they have been with us. The gentleman says for thirty years we have had protection. So we have, but for ten or fifteen years after the war the people were in no condition to discuss economic questions. The Republican party was then flushed with its great political victories. The people throughout the country were generally prejudiced against the South. Reason had not resumed its sway, and when Democrats talked about a reduction in the tariff, our kind and loving friends on the other side said, "Oh, go to the polls and vote as you shot, against the South," and that ended it.

That is all there was of argument about it. They continued making that statement to the people, and the people accepted it, and voted as they were told. They kept the Republicans in power, and that party, promising at every election to reduce the tariff whenever they got into power, again and again increased it. The Republicans have never been in power since the war that they have not increased the burdens put upon the people by the tariff system, yet I defy any Republican to show me an argument made by him before the people in favor of an increase of the tariff.

The people trusted them upon the idea that there would be a reduction; but just as soon as the party got into power, true to the principles which have governed them in these later days, they surrendered themselves bound hand and foot to the manufacturing interests of the country, and did what they were told by that interest to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Even my friend from Maine [Mr. REED], a gentleman usually free, in his public utterances at least, from reflections of that sort, in the conclusion of his argument to-day, thirty years after the war, seeks to arouse some of the feeling of that distant period.

Mr. Speaker, the cause must be intrinsically weak, the position must be indeed indefensible, which forces so able a gentleman as my friend from Maine, before so intelligent a body as this, to abandon the argument of reason and appeal to the feelings of prejudice. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Perhaps it is dangerous to enter a field where the gentleman from Maine invites one. The gentleman is so cunning of fence, so wily an adversary, that it may be dangerous to accept his challenge; yet I will venture. The gentleman says he hopes he will never hear again the old cry that we have free trade in labor, and then proceeds to say that the laborer who comes here from abroad does not bring his reduced rates of wages with him. Nobody ever contended that that was the purpose or effect of the foreign laborer coming here; but the argument which the gentleman from Maine derides has been made by gentlemen on the side of the question which I represent to show that whilst the manufacturers are seeking and the Republican party is granting them a high tariff to protect them from competition, yet that party has never passed any law to protect the wage-earner from competition, but any man from abroad may come here and compete with him for the employment which the manufacturer has to give. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As was said by my distinguished friend from New York the other day, the Democratic position would be rather in favor of two jobs seeking one man than of two men seeking one job. What we mean is that when you have absolute free trade in labor, when any man may come in here from any country in the world, then you have such a competition in the labor market as naturally tends to reduce the wages that the laborer receives. The Democrats believe, whether gentlemen on the other side do or not, that the law of supply and demand applies to all things, and therefore that it applies to the wage-earner as well as to anybody or anything else.

Hence it is that we reproach the Republican party with its professions of friendship for the laboring man, when at the same time it has never enacted any legislation which has really given him the advantages which it professed to desire to give him. But, Mr. Speaker, there is one nationality of people who are prevented from coming freely into this country—the Chinese. The Chinese are from a country where the doctrine and the practice of protection have existed for hundreds and hundreds of years. The soil of China is fertile. Its climate is delightful. It has the oldest known civilization. The rulers of that country have built a wall around it, and the people have traded with themselves and excluded the outside world, and the result is the production of a class of workingmen who are so reduced in the scale of civilization that the American people absolutely forbid them to set foot upon our shores. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the American workingman wants to see a type of what the Republican doctrine of high protective tariff carried to its log-

ical result will produce, we point him to the Chinese, who have had hundreds and hundreds of years of experience in trying to get rich by trading exclusively with themselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There are one or two other matters that I wish to speak of, and I must be brief. If there is any man in America who really believes that in a republican form of government, where the people rule, where laws should be made for the good of all, that any party has a right to so impose taxes or to put burdens upon one class in order to benefit another class, then, my friends, that man is unworthy of a place in the free country in which he lives. [Applause.] The Republicans of thirty years ago, so lauded by my friend from Maine, never advocated this tariff—never. Why, Mr. Speaker, the fathers of the protective system never dreamed of such rates as those of the McKinley bill.

If you reduce the tariff, says the gentleman from Maine—perhaps I had better read, so that I can not misquote him:

Our goods are now met by foreign goods on our own shores at a price made up of raw materials, plus labor, plus the present rate of the tariff, on very nearly equal terms. When the tariff element is lowered—

Hear him—
then something must be lowered on our side.

And he proceeds to say that it is the profits of capital and the wages of labor that must be lowered. The Democratic idea, Mr. Speaker, is that if you will reduce this tariff and give to the many industries untaxed raw material, that you will enlarge their business, that you will cheapen production and increase consumption; and that the result will be that those industries, instead of having a fitful existence, and working half or two-thirds of a year, will work all the year and give their laborers steady wages. One dollar and a half a day for 300 days in the year in a market where competition is permitted is infinitely more valuable to the laboring man than \$2 a day for 200 days with a market where monopoly prevails. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Our Republican friends tell us the laboring men should be independent. We agree to that. The great object and aim of the Democratic party is to contribute to the independence of the laboring men of this country. All classes of laboring men, the farmer in his field, the workingman in his shop, whether protected or unprotected; the carpenter, the blacksmith, and all of those people we desire to make independent; but we propose to do it by promoting abundance of everything that is necessary to sustain the lives of themselves and of their families. You can contribute most to the independence of man by furnishing him with a market where he can buy that which he needs cheapest. Then you make him most independent. He can then demand better wages than he can when the wolf is at the door; he can command better hours if he is able to get the necessities of life at reduced price; and he can command that natural freedom which all men desire, if he can feel that no unjust law taxes him to give to some petty favorite of a party in power. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

For twenty years the party represented by this side of the House has been striving for power; and the great issue on which we have gone before the people was a reduction of taxation. We promised them everywhere that if they would intrust us with the power to do so we would reduce the burdens placed upon them by unjust laws. After we got away from the period of prejudice which followed the war, after reaching that period of reason in which I hope we now exist, the people, after a full, fair, and free argument, intrusted us with the power to perform that work.

This House was organized. The Committee on Ways and Means was established; the gentlemen of that committee, representing this side of the House, with care and caution have proceeded to discharge the duty assigned them. They proceeded to do something to relieve the necessities of life from excessive taxation, something to cheapen to all consumers of the United States those things which they must have. That committee have presented a bill. It may not be an ideal bill. It may be that almost every gentleman here will find in it something that he does not like; and yet it can be said for that bill that which can be said for but few, that while many gentlemen have objections to something in it, yet this side, with a unanimity which is remarkable, accept the bill as a step in the right direction, and intend to pass it before adjournment this day. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, our friends on the other side criticised the bill because they said that it created a deficiency of \$75,000,000. We have tried to relieve ourselves from that criticism. We have amended the bill. We have established a new subject or another matter of taxation. We recognize the justness of the statement of the other side, that we ought to show in our bill where we propose to raise the revenue. We recognize that. There will be a deficiency of \$70,000,000 or \$75,000,000 on the basis of last year's

importations. We propose to raise \$10,000,000 by increase of the whisky tax; a little by the tax on playing cards, and a little on an increase of the tax on cigarettes; and we propose to raise \$30,000,000 by a tax on the incomes of corporations and on the net income of individuals. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] That makes, say, \$45,000,000. And we propose to meet the other deficiency if there be any, in the good old Democratic way—by reduction of expenditures. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

We propose in this new system simply to put part of the burden of the support of this Government upon wealth, and to take off a portion of the burden from consumption. Now, let us talk about that just a minute.

Our present system is a tax on consumption. Every dollar that goes into the Treasury of the United States as tax, internal or external, is a tax on consumption—on what people consume, not what they save. This suggestion of an income tax is not new. I have before me a citation from a very distinguished Republican, one of the fathers of the party, who was a great man in it even in the time of thirty years ago. Let me read this to you, so that you may see that the policy we are now adopting is no innovation; that we have simply arrived at the point where we must devise some method of taxation other than taxation exclusively upon consumption. Mr. SHERMAN of Ohio said in a speech on the 15th of March, 1872:

The public mind is not yet prepared to apply the key to a genuine revenue reform. A few years of further experience will convince the whole body of our people that a system of national taxes which rests the whole burden of taxation on consumption, and not one cent on property or incomes, is intrinsically unjust. Whilst the expenses of the National Government are largely caused by the protection of property, it is but right to require property to contribute to their payment.

It will not do to say that each person consumes in proportion to his income. This is not true. Everyone must see that the consumption of the rich does not bear the same relation to the consumption of the poor as the income of the one does to the wages of the other. As wealth accumulates, this injustice in the fundamental basis of our system will be felt and forced upon the attention of Congress.

[Applause.]

There, Mr. Speaker, is one of the leading Republicans of the United States saying twenty years ago that in time this question would be forced upon the attention of Congress. The time has come. We have suggested a system that exempts from tax incomes of \$4,000 or less. Some of our friends complain of this. I submit that they should not do so. In fixing that amount we proceed upon this theory—that \$4,000 is a consumable income. If \$4,000 is a consumable income, the present tariff laws tax every dollar of it.

Everything that we consume is taxed; and assuming that this is a consumable income, then if you tax incomes of a less amount than this you are imposing a double tax—a tax upon consumption and a tax upon it as accumulated wealth. But if you exempt incomes of \$4,000 or less and impose taxation on incomes in excess of \$4,000, you are taxing for the first time a species of wealth which under present laws is absolutely exempt from taxation. [Applause.] And I submit that this is no hardship.

The question presented to us is this: Shall we redeem the pledges that we made to the people? Shall we reduce their taxes? Shall we reduce their burdens? We agree that we should. We have formulated a bill that does reduce them to a large extent; and when we do it we find, perhaps, that the revenue is meager. It may be, as my friend from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] says, that this bill will produce ample revenue; but, my friends, we will not take any risk. The Democratic party stands pledged to redeem every promise the Government has ever made to any class. [Applause.] And we do not propose to take any risks on this question. We propose to have an abundance of revenue to pay the expenses of the Government economically administered; and we only ask accumulated wealth to contribute \$30,000,000 in taxation to support the Government which in turn protects them in everything they have.

Now, my party friends, my time is out and my strength is exhausted. We have all a great deal at stake in this matter. We must help each other. It will not do for a man to say, simply because there are things in this bill which he does not approve, that therefore he will not support it. Let him examine carefully and see what the things are that he disapproves and what the things are which he approves. Let him weigh the one against the other, and my word for it, he will find when he is done that in the interest of the plain common people of the United States he will be constrained to waive any objections that he may have to the bill and stand with the great body of his party in passing this substantial measure of relief. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have not done in this bill all that we should. There may be and doubtless are errors in it; but it is a step in the right direction; and if we are not mistaken, when this step is taken, before the next step is proposed some of these protected manu-

facturers who are now standing boldly in the way of reform will be found in the forefront of those who want to do something more to enlarge and extend the commerce and production of the United States. [Applause.]

Let us stand together; let us pass this bill; let us redeem this pledge as we must and will redeem every other pledge that we have made to the people. [Applause.] And if, my friends, we can crystallize this bill into a law, whilst there may be here and there some monopolists or gentlemen of large wealth who will criticise and condemn us, yet all over the country, in the homes of the farmers, in the homes of the workers, and in the homes of the men employed in every industry in the United States, there will be rejoicing and happiness. Agriculture will be encouraged; manufactures will be aided; commerce will be revived, and thus we will promote the general welfare of all classes of our people. [Enthusiastic and prolonged applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] is recognized. [Prolonged applause and cheers.]

[Mr. WILSON of West Virginia withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] The previous question is now ordered on the bill and pending amendments. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 190, page 29, lines 23 and 24, by striking out the word "twenty," in line 23, and inserting "twenty-five," and by striking out the word "thirty," in line 24, and inserting "thirty-five."

The SPEAKER. For this amendment the gentleman from Minnesota offers a substitute.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I suggest that further proceedings be suspended until the floor is cleared, so that we may do business in an orderly way.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has endeavored to bring the House to order.

Mr. BURROWS. It is impossible for us to commence voting until the floor of the House is cleared.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has appealed to gentlemen to preserve order on the floor.

Mr. BURROWS. But, Mr. Speaker, the floor should be cleared of those not entitled to occupy it before we commence to vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests all persons not entitled to the privileges of the floor to retire. The officers will see that this order is executed.

Mr. JONES (after a pause) addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] rises, as the Chair understands, to make a request. He will state it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague, the member elect from the Seventh Congressional district of Virginia, may now be permitted to come forward and take the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. REED. If the gentleman recently elected on our side in the city of New York were here, we should permit this to be done; but in his absence it would not be respectful to the people of that city if we did not object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES. I beg to say to the gentleman from Maine that we shall have enough votes, I hope, on our side without the vote of my colleague.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] and then the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]. The vote will first be taken on the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of West Virginia.

On page 29, lines 23 and 24, amend by striking out the word "twenty," in line 23, and inserting the words "twenty-five," and striking out the word "thirty," in line 24, and inserting the word "thirty-five."

The SPEAKER. To this amendment the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out in line 23 the words "twenty per cent ad valorem" and insert the words "twenty-two cents per bushel." And by striking out in line 24 the words "thirty per cent ad valorem and inserting the words "thirty-two cents per bushel."

The SPEAKER. The vote will first be taken on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. LOCKWOOD. I rise to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. It is that this amendment has never been agreed to in Committee of the Whole, and no determination has

been arrived at there. Further, I will say that this amendment has not the unanimous support of the Democratic side of the Committee on Ways and Means. It simply has the support of that portion of the committee who are free traders in theory and high tariff in practice.

Mr. WELLS. I make the point of order that debate is not in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states that he is rising to a question of order.

Mr. DINGLEY. But he is debating the amendment under the question of order.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. This question has not been passed upon by the Committee of the Whole, and under the rule or order under which the House is acting is not properly to be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause that part of the special order to be read which relates to this subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

That at the hour of 12 o'clock m. said bill, with all amendments recommended by or that may be pending in Committee of the Whole, shall be reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will observe that this changes the general rule to this extent, that not only shall the committee report the amendments that may have been recommended by it, but amendments that may be pending in the committee also.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. Then do I understand that all the amendments which have been passed up to the Speaker's table, are now before the House, and pending?

The SPEAKER. Not at all. There can be but four pending at any one time. In this case there were but these two.

Mr. LOCKWOOD. As I understand, the House in Committee of the Whole refused to pass upon this question, and, therefore, the refusal ought to be considered as a denial of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. TAWNEY demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 112, yeas 177.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Let the amendment be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 120, nays 193, not voting 33; as follows:

YEAS—120.

Adams, Ky.	Draper,	Johnson, Ind.	Reyburn,
Adams, Pa.	Ellis, Oregon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Robinson, Pa.
Aitken,	Fletcher,	Joy,	Russell, Conn.
Aldrich,	Funk,	Kiefer,	Scranton,
Apsley,	Funston,	Lacey,	Settle,
Avery,	Gardner,	Lefever,	Shaw,
Babcock,	Gear,	Linton,	Sherman,
Baker, N. H.	Gillet, N. Y.	Loud,	Smith,
Bartholdt,	Gillett, Mass.	Loudenslager,	Stephenson,
Belden,	Grosvenor,	Lucas,	Stone, C. W.
Blair,	Grout,	Mahon,	Stone, W. A.
Boutelle,	Hager,	Marsh,	Storer,
Bowers, Cal.	Hainer,	Marvin, N. Y.	Sweet,
Broderick,	Harmer,	McCall,	Tawney,
Brosius,	Hartman,	McCleary, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Bundy,	Haugen,	McDowell,	Thomas,
Burrows,	Helner,	Melkiejohn,	Updegraff,
Caldwell,	Henderson, Ill.	Mercer,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Cannon, Ill.	Henderson, Iowa	Moon,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Chickering,	Hepburn,	Morse,	Wadsworth,
Childs,	Hermann,	Northway,	Walker,
Cogswell,	Hicks,	Payne,	Wanger,
Cousins,	Hilborn,	Pence,	Wangh,
Curtis, Kans.	Hitt,	Perkins,	Wever,
Curtis, N. Y.	Hooker, N. Y.	Phillips,	Wheeler, Ill.
Dalzell,	Hopkins, Ill.	Pickler,	White,
Daniels,	Hopkins, Pa.	Post,	Wilson, Ohio
Dingley,	Hudson,	Powers,	Wilson, Wash.
Dolliver,	Hulick,	Randall,	Woomer,
Doolittle,	Hull,	Ray,	Wright, Pa.

NAYS—198.

Abbott,	Beltzhoover,	Brown,	Clarke, Ala.
Alderson,	Berry,	Bryan,	Cobb, Ala.
Alexander,	Black, Ga.	Bunn,	Cobb, Mo.
Allen,	Blanchard,	Burnes,	Cockrell,
Arnold,	Bland,	Bynum,	Coffeen,
Bailey,	Boatner,	Cabaniss,	Compton,
Baker, Kans.	Boen,	Caminetti,	Conn.
Baldwin,	Bower, N. C.	Campbell,	Coombs,
Bankhead,	Branch,	Cannon, Cal.	Cooper, Fla.
Barnes,	Brawley,	Capelhart,	Cooper, Ind.
Bartlett,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Caruth,	Cooper, Tex.
Barwig,	Bretz,	Catchings,	Cornish,
Bell, Colo.	Brickner,	Causey,	Covet,
Bell, Tex.	Brookshire,	Clark, Mo.	Cox,

Crain.	Hatch.	McGann.	Sayers.
Culbertson,	Hayes.	McKaig.	Sickles.
Cummings,	Head.	McKeighan.	Simpson.
Davis.	Henderson, N. C.	McLaurin.	Snodgrass.
DeArmond,	Hendrix.	McMillin.	Somers.
DeForest,	Holman.	McRae.	Sperry.
Denson,	Houk, Ohio	Meredith.	Springer.
Dockery,	Hunter.	Meyer.	Stallings.
Donovan,	Hutcheson.	Money.	Stockdale.
Dunn.	Ikirt.	Montgomery.	Stone, Ky.
Durborow,	Johnson, Ohio	Morgan.	Strait.
Edmunds,	Jones.	Moses.	Swanson.
Ellis, Ky.	Kem.	Mutchler.	Talbot, S. C.
English.	Kilgore.	Neill.	Talbot, Md.
Enloe.	Kyle.	Oates.	Tarsney.
Epes.	Lane.	O'Neill.	Tate.
Erdman.	Lapham.	Outhwaite.	Taylor, Ind.
Everett.	Latimer.	Paschal.	Terry.
Felder.	Lawson.	Patterson.	Tracey.
Fithian.	Lester.	Paynter.	Tucker.
Forman.	Lisle.	Pearson.	Turner.
Fyan.	Livingston.	Pendleton, Tex.	Turpin.
Geary.	Lockwood.	Pendleton, W. Va.	Tyler.
Geissenhainer,	Lynch.	Pigott.	Washington.
Goldzier.	Maddox.	Price.	Weadock.
Goodnight.	Magner.	Rayner.	Wells.
Gorman.	Maguire.	Reilly.	Wheeler, Ala.
Grady.	Mallory.	Richardson, Ohio	Whitting.
Gresham.	Marshall.	Richardson, Mich.	Williams, Ill.
Griffin.	Martin, Ind.	Richardson, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Hall, Minn.	McAleer.	Ritchie.	Wilson, W. Va.
Hall, Mo.	McCreary, Ky.	Robbins.	Wise.
Hammond.	McCulloch.	Robertson, La.	Wolverton.
Hare.	McDannold.	Rusk.	Woodard.
Harris.	McDearmon.	Russell, Ga.	
Harter.	McEttrick.	Ryan.	

NOT VOTING—33.

Bingham.	Davey.	Layton.	Sibley.
Black, Ill.	Dinsmore.	McNaguy.	Sipe.
Brattan.	Dunphy.	Milliken.	Stevens.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Graham.	Murray.	Strong.
Cadmus.	Haines.	Newlands.	Warner.
Cadmus.	Hines.	Page.	Wright, Mass.
Clancy.	Hooker, Miss.	Reed.	
Cockran.	Houk, Tenn.	Schermerhorn.	
Cooper, Wis.	Kribbs.	Shell.	
Crawford.			

So the amendment to the amendment was not adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. BRATTAN with Mr. HOUK of Tennessee, on the tariff bill.

Mr. SIPE with Mr. MILLIKEN, on the tariff bill.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania, for the rest of the day.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota is paired on the internal-revenue amendment to the Wilson bill with Mr. ALDRICH. If they had voted Mr. JOHNSON would have voted in the affirmative and Mr. ALDRICH in the negative.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 190, page 23, lines 23 and 24, by striking out the word "twenty," in line 23, and inserting "twenty-five," and by striking out the word "thirty," in line 24, and inserting "thirty-five."

The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 119, not voting 35; as follows:

YEAS—197.

Adams, Ky	Caminetti.	Forman.	Hudson.
Aitken.	Cannon, Cal.	Funk.	Hulick.
Alderson.	Cannon, Ill.	Funston.	Hull.
Aldrich.	Caruth.	Gardner.	Ikirt.
Avery.	Catchings.	Gear.	Johnson, Ind.
Babcock.	Causey.	Geary.	Johnson, N. Dak.
Bailey.	Chickering.	Geissenhainer.	Jones.
Baker, N. H.	Childs.	Gillet, N. Y.	Joy.
Baker, Kans.	Clancy.	Gorman.	Klefer.
Baldwin.	Cobb, Mo.	Gresham.	Lacey.
Barnes.	Coffeen.	Grosvenor.	Layton.
Bartholdt.	Cooper, Ind.	Grout.	Lefever.
Bartlett.	Cooper, Wis.	Hager.	Lester.
Barwig.	Cornish.	Hainer.	Linton.
Belden.	Cousins.	Hall, Minn.	Lucas.
Bell, Colo.	Crain.	Hammond.	Lynch.
Beltzhoover.	Curtis, Kans.	Hare.	Mahon.
Berry.	Curtis, N. Y.	Harmer.	Mallory.
Bingham.	Dalzell.	Harter.	Marsh.
Black, Ga.	Daniels.	Hartman.	Marshall.
Blair.	Davey.	Haugen.	Marvin, N. Y.
Blanchard.	De Forest.	Heimer.	McCleary, Minn.
Boutelle.	Dingley.	Henderson, Ill.	McDannold.
Bower, N. C.	Dolliver.	Henderson, Iowa	McDowell.
Bowers, Cal.	Donovan.	Hepburn.	McGann.
Brickner.	Donovan.	Hermann.	McKeighan.
Broderick.	Draper.	Hicks.	Meklejohn.
Brosius.	Durborow.	Hilborn.	Mercer.
Brown.	Ellis, Ky.	Hitt.	Meredith.
Bryan.	Ellis, Oregon	Hooker, Miss.	Meyer.
Bundy.	English.	Hooker, N. Y.	Montgomery.
Burrows.	Felder.	Hopkins, Ill.	Moon.
Bynum.	Fithian.	Hopkins, Pa.	Morse.
Cabaniss.	Fletcher.	Houk, Ohio	Murray.

Neill.	Reed.	Stone, C. W.	Waugh.
Northway.	Reyburn.	Stone, W. A.	Weadock.
Oates.	Richards, Ohio	Stone, Ky.	Wells.
Payne.	Richardson, Mich.	Strong.	Wever.
Pearson.	Richardson, Tenn.	Swanson.	Wheeler, Ill.
Pence.	Ritchie.	Sweet.	Whiting.
Pendleton, W. Va.	Robertson, La.	Tarsney.	Williams, Ill.
Perkins.	Robinson, Pa.	Tawney.	Wilson, Ohio
Phillips.	Russell, Conn.	Taylor, Tenn.	Wilson, Wash.
Pickler.	Schermerhorn.	Thomas.	Wilson, W. Va.
Pigott.	Scranton.	Turner.	Wise.
Post.	Shaw.	Turpin.	Woomer.
Powers.	Sherman.	Updegraff.	Wright, Pa.
Price.	Smith.	Van Voorhis, Ohio,	
Randall.	Somers.	Wadsworth.	
Ray.	Stephenson.	Wanger.	

NAYS—119.

Abbott.	Culbertson.	Kribbs.	Patterson.
Adams, Pa.	Cummings.	Kyle.	Paynter.
Alexander.	Davis.	Lane.	Pendleton, Tex.
Allen.	De Armond.	Latimer.	Rayner.
Arnold.	Denson.	Lawson.	Reilly.
Bankhead.	Dinsmore.	Lisle.	Robbins.
Bell, Tex.	Dockery.	Livingston.	Rusk.
Black, Ill.	Dunphy.	Lockwood.	Russell, Ga.
Bland.	Enloe.	Maddox.	Ryan.
Boatner.	Epes.	Magner.	Sayers.
Boen.	Erdman.	Maguire.	Shell.
Branch.	Fyan.	Martin, Ind.	Sickles.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Goldzier.	McAleer.	Simpson.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Goodnight.	McCreary, Ky.	Snodgrass.
Bretz.	Grady.	McCulloch.	Springer.
Brookshire.	Griffin.	McDearmon.	Stockdale.
Bunn.	Haines.	McEttrick.	Strait.
Burnes.	Hall, Mo.	McKaig.	Talbot, S. C.
Campbell.	Harris.	McLaurin.	Tate.
Caphart.	Hatch.	McMillin.	Taylor, Ind.
Clark, Mo.	Hayes.	McNaguy.	Tracey.
Clarke, Ala.	Head.	McRae.	Terry.
Cobb, Ala.	Henderson, N. C.	Money.	Tucker.
Cockrell.	Hendrix.	Morgan.	Tyler.
Conn.	Holman.	Moses.	Warner.
Cooper, Fla.	Hunter.	Mutchler.	Washington.
Cooper, Tex.	Hutcheson.	O'Neill.	Wheeler, Ala.
Covert.	Johnson, Ohio	Outhwaite.	Wolverton.
Cox.	Kem.	Page.	Woodard.
Crawford.	Kilgore.	Paschal.	

NOT VOTING—35.

Apsley.	Dunn.	Loudenslager.	Stevens.
Brattan.	Edmunds.	McCall.	Storer.
Brawley.	Everett.	Milliken.	Talbot, Md.
Cadmus.	Gillett, Mass.	Newlands.	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Caldwell.	Graham.	Settle.	Walker.
Cockran.	Hines.	Sibley.	White.
Cogswell.	Houk, Tenn.	Sipe.	Williams, Miss.
Compton.	Lapham.	Sperry.	Wright, Mass.
Coombs.	Loud.	Stallings.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments reported from the committee? If not, the vote will be taken upon the amendments in gross.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments reported from the committee be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote upon the three propositions relating to the wool schedule.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I ask for a separate vote on the provision in relation to petroleum.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the income-tax provision.

The SPEAKER. Separate votes have been demanded upon the amendments relating to wool, to petroleum, and to internal revenue. Is any other separate vote demanded? If not, the question is upon the amendments reported from the committee, with the exception of those upon which separate votes have been demanded.

The question was taken; and the amendments, with the exceptions above indicated, were agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas moved to reconsider the vote by which the several amendments were agreed to, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment, relating to the woolen schedule, on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 696 by adding the following proviso: "Provided, That this paragraph shall take effect immediately on the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to this amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, was there not another amendment adopted covering the same ground as that and contradictory of it? I understood that the effect of the adoption of the other amendment was to strike out that one?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment just read was not reported to the House by the Committee of the Whole, and that the vote must be taken upon the amendment which was finally

adopted and reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I want to be heard on that, Mr. Speaker. The first amendment adopted was as the Clerk has just read. Several days later the committee adopted an amendment amending that, leaving in three words of it and striking out the balance and substituting another date—the second day of August. So that the first amendment adopted was not stricken out by the later amendment; some of its words were struck out and other words substituted, but three of the original words were left in.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the vote must be taken by the House upon the amendment in the form in which it was reported to the House by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The rule is that:

All amendments agreed to by Committee of the Whole and reported by the committee to the House must be passed upon by the House, and where a separate vote is demanded each amendment that is agreed upon by the committee must be passed upon by the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Both these were passed upon by the House and adopted.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I call for the reading of the amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole and reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, paragraph 686, amend the proviso by striking out all after the words "take effect," and inserting the words "on and after August 2, 1894;" so as to make it read "provided that this paragraph shall take effect on and after August 2, 1894."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. That is the proposition that we are to vote upon.

The SPEAKER. It seems from the reading that the committee first adopted an amendment providing that the bill should take effect immediately as to wool, and that subsequently an amendment was offered to that amendment and agreed to, which struck out all of it except the words "shall take effect" and inserted another date as the time at which the bill should go into operation.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. That was the only one reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is whether both amendments were not reported to the House, both amendments having been agreed to by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. They were both reported; and the last amendment does not contain those three words "to take effect."

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I make the suggestion that the first amendment was abrogated by the passage of the second, so that the only amendment reported to the House is the committee amendment, or what is called the second amendment.

Mr. McMILLIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Would not the adoption of the second amendment take the place of the other and leave nothing pending but the second amendment to the original text? While I think it would have been in order to object at the time that the last amendment of the committee was proposed that it was not in order, because it was a change of what had already been done by the Committee of the Whole, still, as the committee did do it, and reports that amendment here, it strikes me that that is the question pending now, and that what was done in the committee is an amendment to the text.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. The question of order in that particular was raised in the Committee of the Whole, and the amendment that was adopted by the Committee of the Whole and is now before the House was admitted as being in order; and when the point of order was raised it was not allowed by the Chair.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the Chair allow me to make a statement in regard to that? The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, in making report to the House, does not designate any particular amendments, but simply states that he is instructed to report the bill back with sundry amendments; and that is the whole of the report that is made. The Clerk has kept a record of the amendments and the Clerk reports the two amendments, one of which, the first adopted, fixing the date at which the wool schedule takes effect immediately, and he reports a subsequent amendment that it takes effect on the 2d day of August next. Now, it seems to me that the condition is this, that the House would now vote on the date last adopted, and if that is not agreed to, that the House shall then vote upon the other amendment; and if it is agreed to that disposes of the matter.

We have, therefore, the choice by these amendments of mak-

ing the date the 2d of August or immediately upon the passage of this bill; and put in either shape it will permit the House to decide between those days, as the committee decided between them. The House can decide on August 2 now, and if it fails to do that the other amendment can be voted on to go into effect immediately after the passage of the bill. It is the duty of the Chairman to report all amendments which are agreed to, which has been done by the Clerk as his representative.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that every amendment which has been agreed to by the committee must be reported from the committee to the House, and that it is in the power of any member of the House to have a separate vote on any amendments so reported. In the case before the House, it seems that there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and agreed to, which fixes a given time for the tariff on the woolen schedule to go into effect, and subsequently that amendment was amended so as to strike out that part of it which fixed the time and fixed another time. Now, it seems that the two reports from the Committee of the Whole on the question of the time when the bill should go into operation are inconsistent one with the other. One report is that it shall immediately take effect, and the other is that it shall take effect at another time, so that it seems to the Chair that perhaps the best solution of the question would be for the House to vote upon what is called the last amendment, the amendment to amend the first amendment, that fixes the time. If that should be agreed to by the House, that would dispose of the question; if it should not, then the other amendment could be voted upon.

Mr. McMILLIN. A parliamentary inquiry. I do not know whether it makes any practical difference, but if the Committee of the Whole had before it concluded its labors adopted an amendment so as to strike out a part of the text and kept it in another form, would the two reports of the Committee of the Whole to the House bring before the House that part which the committee has stricken out?

The SPEAKER. The trouble that the Chair finds arises from the fact that it has never been the custom or the rule that the Committee of the Whole should reconsider its action, therefore, its action takes the form of a subsequent amendment to the first amendment which accomplishes the same purpose as reconsideration, and yet gives effect and force to the change of mind in the committee on the question. Now, it seems to the Chair if the House should vote upon the amendment as amended that it would enable the House to pass upon the question fixing the time as amended, and if that should fail then it could vote upon the other amendment. [Cries of "Right!"]

Mr. McMILLIN. I was going to ask that the report made last to the committee be considered as the text, and the other as an amendment pending to that. That will bring the question up directly; but that can only be done by consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. The trouble with the last proposition is that you will be voting into the bill an incomplete amendment, because the three words are left out of the original text.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment which was subsequently agreed to, as it will read as an amendment to the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 90, paragraph 686, amend the proviso by striking out all after the word "take," and insert the words "after August 2, 1894;" so as to read: "Provided, That this paragraph shall take effect on and after August 2, 1894."

The SPEAKER. Now, it seems to me that the three words which were in the first amendment are necessary to the second—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. And they are preserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. But the House has not yet acted on them.

The SPEAKER. The Committee of the Whole has acted on them, but the House has not acted upon the recommendation as to those three words, and the Chair thinks the only way—

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me the suggestion of the Chair indicates the appropriate way of disposing of this question.

The SPEAKER. The three words embraced in the amendment known as the Johnson amendment have not been agreed to except by the committee, by the same vote by which the committee agreed to put wool on the free list. If the House should now vote upon the second amendment, it would never pass upon those three words which were adopted in connection with the first amendment. Therefore it would seem to be necessary to vote first on the first amendment, in order to get at those words.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would inquire whether the phrase "so that the proviso would read" do not include those three words?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment reported from the committee—the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio—and the vote will be taken on that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 683 by adding at the end of the paragraph the words "provided that this paragraph shall take effect immediately upon the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to this amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me that if this amendment should be rejected, and then the other amendment should be rejected, the words "to effect" would be entirely out, and could not be presented to the House except in a new motion. Now, as a matter of fact, the first motion having been adopted that the provision take effect immediately, and a motion having subsequently been received to strike out all after the words "to take effect" and substitute other words, and that having been adopted by the committee, the amendment as it should be reported to the House is simply that it shall take effect on the 2d day of August. It seems to me that is all there is before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Maine that the House can accomplish the same result that the committee accomplished in the same way; that is, agree to the amendment just read, offered by the gentleman from Ohio, which places wool immediately upon the free list, and subsequently agree to the next amendment, which strikes out all of that except the language "to take effect."

Mr. DINGLEY. But suppose the House should disagree to the first amendment, what would then be the situation?

The SPEAKER. That would leave the matter in rather an awkward position. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Why should we not vote first on the amendment which amends the Johnson amendment, and then vote on the amendment as amended? That would avoid all difficulty.

The SPEAKER. The only trouble is that the Johnson amendment contains three words which the committee desired to retain in the subsequent amendment. Now, the only vote in committee which adopted those three words is the same vote which adopted the provision to put wool immediately on the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think the Chair understood my suggestion. It was that we vote first on the amendment which amends the Johnson amendment and fixes the date at August 2, and then, if that carries, vote on the Johnson amendment as amended. If the first proposition should fail, then we would vote on the Johnson amendment pure and simple. Thus we would escape the effect of the blunder made by the committee.

Mr. WALKER. Allow me to call attention to another point. The original idea of the office of Speaker is that he shall execute the will of the House; and whenever we get into a muddle of this kind, I submit it is the duty of the Speaker to execute the will of the House in its common-sense interpretation. In pursuance of that old-fashioned rule, it seems to me the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] should prevail.

The SPEAKER. The Chair still thinks the situation is such that he can only submit the question on the amendment as reported from the committee.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If the Johnson amendment be adopted, and then the amendment subsequently adopted by the committee should be adopted as an amendment to that, it will leave in the three words which have been referred to?

The SPEAKER. It will. The question is upon the amendment which the Clerk has just read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In paragraph 686, page 90, amend by striking out all after the words "take effect" and insert the words "on or after August 2, 1894."

The question being put on agreeing to the amendment,

The SPEAKER said: The ayes seem to have it.

Several Members called for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 205, noes 47.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I call for the ayes and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered, only five members voting in favor thereof.

So the amendment was adopted.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend paragraph 295, page 51, by striking out in line 4 the words "July first," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "December second," so as to read: "The reduction of the rates of duty herein provided for manufactures of wool shall take effect December 2, 1894."

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to this amendment.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 196, noes 42.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Yeas and nays. [Cries of "Oh, no!"]

The yeas and nays were refused, only seven members seconding the demand.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, paragraph 567, line 24, strike out after the words "crude or refined" the following words:

"Provided, That if any petroleum is imported, the product of any country which imposes a duty on petroleum exported from the United States, then there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon such imported petroleum the rates of duty existing prior to the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER. The question is upon this amendment.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 170, noes 44.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. The next amendment is the internal-revenue amendment, and unless the reading be demanded it will be dispensed with.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reading will be dispensed with. The question is on agreeing to the amendment known as the internal-revenue amendment.

Mr. COCKRAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this vote be confined to the income-tax proposition.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order pending this vote. The Clerk can not hear responses unless the House is in order.

Mr. COCKRAN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCKRAN. The question being now put, does it involve the proposition for an income tax simply, or does it cover the whole internal-revenue amendment.

The SPEAKER. It will cover the whole internal-revenue amendment.

Mr. COCKRAN. Is it in order to ask a separate vote on the income-tax proposition?

Mr. HATCH. The whole amendment is reported from the Committee of the Whole as a single amendment and is not divisible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] to the fact that it has been decided, on appeal, that a motion for a division of the question on an amendment reported as a single amendment from the Committee of the Whole is not in order. The Digest refers to the Journal of the first session of the Twenty-eighth Congress, the first session of the Twenty-ninth Congress, the first session of the Thirtieth Congress, and the second session of the Thirty-seventh Congress. It seems to have been frequently decided by the House; so that the question would not be divisible at this stage. The Chair hopes the House will be in order, so that the Clerk may hear distinctly the responses of members. Gentlemen will please resume their seats, so that there may be no error in this vote. The Clerk will now call the roll.

The question was taken on the internal-revenue amendment; and there were—yeas 182, nays 48, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—182.

Abbott,	Blanchard,	Bynum,	Cooper, Tex.
Alderson,	Bland,	Cabaniss,	Cox,
Alexander,	Boatner,	Caminetti,	Crain,
Allen,	Boen,	Cannon, Cal.	Crawford,
Arnold,	Bower, N. C.	Capehart,	Culbertson,
Bailey,	Bowers, Cal.	Caruth,	Davis,
Baker, Kans.	Branch,	Catchings,	De Armond,
Baldwin,	Breckinridge, Ark.	Clark, Mo.	Denson,
Bankhead,	Breckinridge, Ky.	Clarke, Ala.	Dinsmore,
Barnes,	Bretz,	Cobb, Ala.	Dockery,
Barwig,	Brickner,	Cobb, Mo.	Donovan,
Bell, Colo.	Brookshire,	Cockrell,	Durborow,
Bell, Tex.	Brown,	Coffeen,	Edmunds,
Berry,	Bryan,	Conn,	Ellis, Ky.
Black, Ga.	Bunn,	Cooper, Fla.	Enloe,
Black, Ill.	Burnes,	Cooper, Ind.	Epes,

Erman, Flithan, Fletcher, Forman, Fyan, Geary, Goldzier, Goodnight, Gorman, Grady, Gresham, Griffin, Hall, Minn. Hall, Mo. Hammond, Hare, Harris, Hartman, Hatch, Hayes, Head, Henderson, N. C. Holman, Hooker, Miss. Houk, Ohio Hudson, Hunter, Hutcheson, Ikirt, Johnson, Ohio	Jones, Kem, Kilgore, Kribbs, Kyle, Latimer, Lawson, Layton, Lester, Lisle, Livingston, Lynch, Maddox, Maguire, Mallory, Marsh, Marshall, Martin, Ind. McCreary, Ky. McCulloch, McDaunoid, McDearmon, McEttrick, McGann, McKeighan, McLaurin, McMillin, McNagny, McRae,	Meredith, Money, Montgomery, Morgan, Moses, Neill, Oates, Outhwaite, Paschal, Patterson, Paynter, Pearson, Pence, Pendleton, Tex. Pendleton, W. Va. Pickler, Pigott, Richards, Ohio Richardson, Mich. Richardson, Tenn. Ritchie, Robbins, Robertson, La. Russell, Ga. Sayers, Shell, Sibley, Simpson, Snodgrass, Somers,	Springer, Stallings, Stockdale, Stone, Ky. Strait, Swanson, Sweet, Talbert, S. C. Tarsney, Tate, Taylor, Ind. Terry, Tucker, Turner, Turpin, Tyler, Washington, Weadock, Wells, Wheeler, Ala. White, Whiting, Williams, Ill. Williams, Miss. Wilson, W. Va. Wise, Woodard, The Speaker.
---	--	---	--

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays, and 36 members voted in the affirmative.

Mr. COCKRAN. Count the other side.

The SPEAKER (having counted). Thirty-six gentlemen have arisen to second the demand for the yeas and nays and 227 gentlemen have arisen in opposition. Not one-fifth having seconded the demand, the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on the motion to recommit with the instructions recited in the resolution.

The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COCKRAN and Mr. BLANCHARD asked for a division. The House divided; and there were—ayes 103, yeas 177. So the motion to recommit was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass? The question being taken, the Speaker declared that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 140, not voting 8; as follows:

NAYS—48.

Bartlett, Beltzhoover, Brawley, Cadmus, Campbell, Causey, Clancy, Cockran, Compton, Coombs, Cornish, Covert,	Cummings, Davey, De Forest, Dunn, Dunphy, English, Everett, Fielder, Geissenhainer, Haines, Harter, Hendrix,	Lapham, Lockwood, Magner, McAleer, McCall, McKaig, Meyer, Mutchler, O'Neil, Page, Powers, Price,	Rayner, Reilly, Rusk, Ryan, Schermerhorn, Scranton, Sickles, Sperry, Stevens, Talbot, Md. Warner, Wolverton.
---	---	---	---

NOT VOTING—122.

Adams, Ky. Adams, Pa. Aitken, Aldrich, Apsley, Avery, Babeock, Baker, N. H. Bartholdt, Belden, Bingham, Blair, Boutelle, Brattan, Broderick, Brosius, Bundy, Burrows, Caldwell, Cannon, Ill. Chickering, Childs, Cogswell, Cooper, Wis. Cousins, Curtis, Kans. Curtis, N. Y. Dalzell, Daniels, Dingley, Dolliver,	Doolittle, Draper, Ellis, Oregon Funk, Funston, Gardner, Gear, Gillet, N. Y. Gillett, Mass. Graham, Grosvenor, Grout, Hager, Hainer, Harmer, Haugen, Heiner, Henderson, Ill. Henderson, Iowa Hepburn, Hermann, Hicks, Hilborn, Hines, Hitt, Hooker, N. Y. Hopkins, Ill. Hopkins, Pa. Houk, Tenn. Hulick, Hull,	Johnson, Ind. Johnson, N. Dak. Joy, Kiefer, Lacey, Lefever, Linton, Loud, Loudenslager, Lucas, Mahon, Marvin, N. Y. McCleary, Minn. McDowell, Melkjohn, Mercer, Milliken, Moon, Morse, Murray, Newlands, Northway, Payne, Perkins, Phillips, Post, Randall, Ray, Reed, Reyburn, Robinson, Pa.	Russell, Conn. Settle, Shaw, Sherman, Sipe, Smith, Stephenson, Stone, C. W. Storer, Strong, Tawney, Taylor, Tenn. Thomas, Tracey, Updegraff, Van Voorhis, N. Y. Van Voorhis, Ohio Wadsworth, Walker, Wanger, Waugh, Wever, Wheeler, Ill. Wilson, Ohio Wilson, Wash. Woomer, Wright, Mass. Wright, Penn.
---	--	---	--

Mr. BRETZ and Mr. COCKRAN asked for a recapitulation of the vote.

The names of the members voting were recapitulated by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 182 and the yeas are 48. The yeas have it and the amendment is agreed to. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted, and also to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. COVERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and demand the previous question upon it.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the pending bill be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report it back with such amendments as will provide, by duties levied on imports, for such additional revenue as may be necessary for the support of the Government economically administered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. COVERT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

YEAS—204.

Abbott, Alderson, Alexander, Allen, Arnold, Bailey, Baker, Kans. Baldwin, Bankhead, Barnes, Barwig, Bell, Colo. Bell, Tex. Beltzhoover, Berry, Black, Ga. Black, Ill. Blanchard, Bland, Boatner, Boen, Bower, N. C. Branch, Brawley, Breckinridge, Ark. Breckinridge, Ky. Bretz, Brickner, Brookshire, Brown, Bryan, Bunn, Burnes, Bynum, Cabaniss, Caminetti, Cannon, Cal. Capehart, Caruth, Catchings, Causey, Clancy, Clark, Mo. Clarke, Ala. Cobb, Ala. Cobb, Mo. Cockran, Cockrell, Coffee, Compton, Conn.	Coombs, Cooper, Fla. Cooper, Ind. Cooper, Tex. Cornish, Cox, Crain, Crawford, Culberson, Davis, De Armond, De Forest, Denson, Dinsmore, Dockery, Donovan, Dunn, Dunphy, Durborow, Edmunds, Ellis, Ky. English, Enloe, Epes, Erdman, Everett, Fielder, Fithian, Forman, Fyan, Geissenhainer, Goldzier, Goodnight, Gorman, Grady, Gresham, Griffin, Hall, Minn. Hall, Mo. Hammond, Hare, Harris, Harter, Hatch, Hayes, Head, Henderson, N. C. Hines, Holman, Hooker, Miss. Houk, Ohio	Hudson, Hunter, Hutcheson, Ikirt, Johnson, Ohio Jones, Kem, Kilgore, Kribbs, Kyle, Lane, Lapham, Latimer, Lawson, Layton, Lester, Lisle, Livingston, Lockwood, Lynch, Maddox, Maguire, Mallory, Marshall, Martin, Ind. McAleer, McCreary, Ky. McCulloch, McDaunoid, McDearmon, McEttrick, McGann, McKaig, McKeighan, McLaurin, McMillin, McNagny, Meredith, Money, Montgomery, Morgan, Moses, Mutchler, Neill, Oates, O'Neil, Outhwaite, Paschal, Patterson,	Paynter, Pearson, Pence, Pendleton, Tex. Pendleton, W. Va. Pigott, Rayner, Reilly, Richards, Ohio Richardson, Mich. Richardson, Tenn. Ritchie, Robbins, Rusk, Russell, Ga. Ryan, Sayers, Shell, Simpson, Snodgrass, Somers, Springer, Stallings, Stockdale, Stone, Ky. Strait, Swanson, Talbert, S. C. Talbot, Md. Tarsney, Tate, Taylor, Ind. Terry, Tracey, Tucker, Turner, Turpin, Tyler, Warner, Washington, Weadock, Wells, Wheeler, Ala. Whiting, Williams, Ill. Williams, Miss. Wilson, W. Va. Wise, Wolverton, Woodard, The Speaker.
---	---	--	--

NAYS—140.

Adams, Ky. Adams, Pa. Aitken, Aldrich, Apsley, Avery, Babeock, Baker, N. H. Bartholdt, Belden, Bingham, Blair, Boutelle, Bowers, Cal. Broderick, Brosius, Bundy, Burrows, Cadmus, Caldwell, Campbell, Cannon, Ill. Chickering, Childs, Cogswell, Cooper, Wis. Cousins, Covert, Cummings,	Curtis, Kans. Curtis, N. Y. Dalzell, Daniels, Davey, Dingley, Dolliver, Doolittle, Draper, Ellis, Oregon Fletcher, Funk, Funston, Gardner, Gear, Geary, Gillet, N. Y. Gillett, Mass. Grosvenor, Grout, Hager, Hainer, Haines, Harmer, Hartman, Haugen, Heiner, Henderson, Ill. Henderson, Iowa Hendrix,	Hepburn, Hermann, Hicks, Hilborn, Hitt, Hooker, N. Y. Hopkins, Ill. Hulick, Hull, Johnson, Ind. Johnson, N. Dak. Joy, Kiefer, Lacey, Lefever, Linton, Loud, Loudenslager, Lucas, Mahon, Marsh, Marvin, N. Y. McCall, McCleary, Minn. McDowell, Melkjohn, Mercer, Meyer, Moon, Morse,	Murray, Newlands, Northway, Page, Payne, Perkins, Phillips, Pickler, Post, Powers, Price, Randall, Ray, Reed, Reyburn, Robertson, La. Robinson, Pa. Russell, Conn. Schermerhorn, Scranton, Settle, Shaw, Sherman, Sibley, Sickles, Smith, Sperry, Stephenson, Stone, C. W. Stone, W. A.
--	--	---	--

Storer,	Updegraff,	Wanger,	Wilson, Ohio
Strong,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.	Waugh,	Wilson, Wash.
Tawney,	Van Voorhis, Ohio	Wever,	Woomer,
Taylor, Tenn.	Wadsworth,	Wheeler, Ill.	Wright, Mass.
Thomas,	Walker,	White,	Wright, Pa.

NOT VOTING—8.

Brattan,	Hopkins, Pa.	Milliken,	Stevens,
Graham,	Houk, Tenn.	Sipe,	Sweet.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to lay before the House an application of Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania for leave of absence on account of sickness, so that it will show on this roll. There was no objection, and leave was granted.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in that connection that Mr. HOPKINS came here with a physician attending him and was unable to remain. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SWEET] was taken suddenly ill and compelled to leave the Hall. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. HOUK] is detained at his home on account of serious illness in his family. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. MILLIKEN] is detained at home by serious illness, and is paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIPE]. If he were present he would vote against the Wilson bill.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 204, the nays 140. The yeas have it, and the bill is passed.

[Great cheering and applause on the Democratic side.]

On motion of Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a privileged question. I call up the resolution of privilege—

The SPEAKER. A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 12 o'clock m. to-morrow.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Naval Affairs: A bill (H. R. 2638) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser. (Report No. 344.)

By Mr. McNAGNY, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 770) for the relief of William M. Dunkee, administrator. (Report No. 345.)

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 5561) for the relief of Henrietta Bauers, Madison Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CABANISS: A bill (H. R. 5562) for the relief of Thomas G. Verdine, of Upson County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5563) for the relief of Pinkney Persons, of Monroe County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5564) granting a pension to Margaret Wolverton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5565) granting a pension to Joseph R. Brooks, father, by adoption, of Henry M. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5566) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Pruitt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 5567) for the relief of the estate of Greenwood Rushing, late of Shelby County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5568) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any statutory bar, of the claims of H. E. Collins & Co., and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: A bill (H. R. 5569) for the relief of Patrick Foley, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of employés of Dean Linseed Oil Mill, at Port Richmond, Richmond County, N. Y., against Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAIR: Protest of 279 of the employés of E. G. & E. Wallace, shoe manufacturers, of the city of Rochester, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill because they believe that, if passed, it will impoverish the country, lessen employment, reduce wages and earnings, decrease the purchasing power of the people, and greatly injure the lumbering, farming, and manufacturing interests of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas: Resolutions of the Knights of Labor of Huntington, Ark., protesting against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Remonstrance of 3,000 citizens of Jefferson County, N. Y., without regard to party, against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition from Kaw Valley Camp, Modern Woodmen of America, Manhattan, Kans., in favor of the admission of college and fraternal journals into the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FIELDER: Petition for the admission of publications of the fraternal society and college journals into the mails as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of cigar manufacturers of Minneapolis, Minn., asking that an increased tax be placed upon cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of 73 Republicans and 22 Democrats—farmers, mechanics, and laboring men of Letart Township, Meigs County, Ohio, against the so-called Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of employés of the Howe Scale Works, of Rutland, Vt., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Protest of the Democratic central committee of the Indian Territory, against including the Indian Territory in the proposed State of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 49 residents of Almond, N. Y., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 84 residents of Kennedy, N. Y., for laws to protect dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 34 residents of Stockton, N. Y., in behalf of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of C. L. Maxwell and 99 other citizens, of Xenia, Green County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of O. B. Cain and 100 other citizens, of Hamilton Township, Warren County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Richard Jefferson, I. F. Orr, and 110 other citizens, of Xenia, Ohio, against the reduction of the duty on binding twine and cordage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of citizens and lumbermen of Olive Hill, Carter County, and of citizens of Willard, Carter County, against the passage of the Wilson bill reducing the duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition and protest of citizens of Morehead, Rowan County, and of Grayson, Carter County, Ky., against reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Four petitions of numerous citizens of Georgia, urging the passage of the bill now pending in Congress for the punishment of train-wrecking—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of Washington Oil Company, protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition to admit publications of fraternal and benevolent societies to the mail as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest of Waterbury (Conn.) Board of Trade, against an income tax, unanimously adopted by the board—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of James W. Cramer and 19 others, of Dolgeville, Herkimer County, N. Y., for the passage

of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. T. Martin and 24 others, of Vernon, N. Y., for the passage of the Hill bill relating to oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John J. Schmidt and 150 other citizens of Utica, N. Y., against the increase of revenue tax on cigars, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petition for passage of House bill permitting fraternal papers equal rights through United States mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STORER: Petition of the Charles C. Jacobs Cordage Company, suggesting certain changes in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the trustees of the Cincinnati Museum Association, in favor of free art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Mr. George A. Root and 5 others, citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the employés of the Newport Rolling Mills Company, by Edward Bowen, chairman of the committee, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Max Worcher & Son, protesting against the reduction of the tariff on surgical instruments—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the employés of David Reeves, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the proposed change in the tariff on gold leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the excentric Association of Engineers of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Hamilton County (Ohio) League of Builders' Associations, by Fred Bader, president, against the passage of the income-tax bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of I. Gradel, secretary of the Lithographers' Union, of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of P. R. Mitchell Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the change of the duty on curled hair—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of 101 voters of Columbia, Hamilton County, Ohio, of all political parties, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of dealers and jobbers of playing cards, of New Orleans, La., against a tax on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Ault & Wiborg, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against reducing duty on printing ink—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of A. L. Andrews and 42 other employés of the Globe Iron Roofing and Corrugating Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Freeman Perfume Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York: Telegram from G. C. Buell & Co., of Rochester, N. Y., urging the defeat of the free refined sugar feature of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of four prominent wholesale grocery firms of Zanesville, Ohio, protesting against any change in the tariff or bounty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition to admit to the mail as second-class matter all publications of fraternal and benevolent societies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of W. B. Doarnan and 34 others, citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fries & Schule and 68 other business firms and citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Petition of Steele, Hopkins & Meredith, of Springfield, Ohio, against free-sugar feature of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON, of Washington: Petition of 14 citizens of Centralia, Wash., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 6 citizens of Snohomish, Wash., for a uniform rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 5 citizens of Seattle, Wash., for a uniform

rate of 35 cents on all unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Port Townsend, in protest to the placing of lumber on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 200 citizens of Clallam County, Wash., for the improvement of the Quillayute River and harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging Congress to make provision for submitting an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by the vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 2, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

GUNBOAT CASTINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy stating, in response to a resolution of January 31, 1894, the reasons why the New York Navy-yard has been selected as the place for the work of lengthening the gunboat Castine, instead of the navy-yard at Portsmouth, N. H.; which, on motion of Mr. HALE, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition from the Royal Society of Good Fellows, of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of more favorable postal rates for the fraternity and beneficiary press of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Prof. Herman Kower and 38 other members of the faculty of the University of California; of Prof. Frederic Gardner, jr., and 13 other members of the United States Department of Agriculture; of G. Stanley Hall, president, and 31 other members of the faculty of Clark University, Georgia; of L. A. Morrison and George Dimmock, citizens of New Hampshire; of C. A. Adams, jr., and 14 other members of the faculty of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; of George T. Winston, president, and 8 other members of the faculty of the University of North Carolina; of Prof. A. S. Packard and 8 other members of the faculty of Brown University, Providence, R. I., and of Prof. John A. Ryder and 6 other members of the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, praying for the removal of all duties upon scientific and philosophical apparatus whose chief use is for instruction or research; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Good Templars, of Vermont, praying for the appointment of a national commission of inquiry to investigate the alcoholic liquor traffic; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Bee-keepers' Association of Vermont, remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on honey; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of L. F. Abbott and 11 other woolen manufacturers, of Bennington, Vt., remonstrating against placing wool on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAVIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lanesboro, Montgomery, and Springfield, of Lodge No. 57, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Delavan, and of Council No. 1206, Royal Arcanum, of Itasca, all in the State of Minnesota, in the interest of fraternal society and college journals, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill, proposing to amend the postal laws; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against placing iron ore and undressed lumber on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of H. J. Bishner and other citizens of Wells, Minn., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Socialist Labor party, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the governmental control of the tele-