By Mr. MORSE: Petition by Business Men's Association of Gloucester, Mass., praying for the immediate completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge, Cape Ann., Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of 1,309 citizens of Taunton, Mass., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: Remonstrance of 195 employés of Holden, Leonard & Co., manufacturers of fine wool dress fabrics, of Bennington, Vt., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RITCHIE: Petition of members of Toledo (Ohio) Medical Association, favoring passage of bill to establish bureau of public health—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Harris Toy Company, Toledo, Ohio, and employés, protesting against passage of Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging the defeat of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gainey, Brown & Co., Charles Cordier, and others, of Scranton, Pa., against reduction of tariff on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. D. Clark, P. A. Grebe, and others, of Scranton, Pa., against reduction of duty on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Association No. 1 of Lithographers' International Association, New York, asking that specific duties be made on lithographic goods in lieu of ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of overseers and operatives, 492 in number, in the Grosvenor Dale Company Mills, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of A. L. Rockwell, E. M. Brown, C. F. Rockwell, P. B. Foster, and 21 other citizens of Trowbridge, Allegan County, Mich., asking for the defeat of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UPDEGRAFF: Petition of A. J. Marchant and 21 other honorably discharged Union soldiers, for the enactment of a just and equitable service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Alex. McElroy, and 219 other honorably discharged Union soldiers, for the enactment of laws against the suspensions of pension except after proof of fraud and notice to pensioner, and compelling the restoration of pensioners otherwise suspended—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Herman Ihm and 38 others, farmers and dealers in barley, against any reduction of existing duty, and against an advalorem rate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 261 workers in the card clothing industry in the Third Congressional district of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill as ruinous to that industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of Slater Woolen Company, Webster, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Letter in claim of William Nix to accompany House bill 5383—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, letter for an increase of pension to John Oliver, to accompany House bill 5382—to the Committte on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio: Petition of J. K. Funderbury and 28 others of Clark County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. C. Miller and 12 others, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 23, 1894.*

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4292) to amend section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments at Washington, with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

UNITED STATES CONVICTS IN UTAH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, a statement prepared by the First Comptroller of the Treasury, stating the amount due to the United States from the Territory of Utah on account of costs and expenses of prosecutions for offenses against laws of the Territorial Legislature of Utah required to be paid by the treasury of that Territory under the act of June 23, 1874; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TURPIE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Anderson and Gas City, Ind., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on green and flint glass bottles; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 54, of Evansville, Ind., remonstrating against any change in the duty on cigars; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Rhoda Talkington, of Forest, Ind., praying for the reissuance of her pension as the widow of John C. Parr, late Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Amelia M. Grobe, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE. I present the memorial of Alexander H. Dick and 196 other employés of the Smith and Dove Manufacturing Company of Andover, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill. The memorial is in the form of a resolution passed at a meeting of the operatives of the company, and is accompanied by a statement that owing to the fact that there has been so little work there many have left the town and, therefore, the signatures are not so numerous as they otherwise would have been. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Charles V. Thronig, president, and 10 other members of the faculty of Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the removal of all duties on scientific and philosophical apparatus whose chief use is for instruction or research; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER. I present a concurrent resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, at its regular session of 1893, favoring the passage by Congress of Senate bill 1136, having for its object the Governmental control of the telegraph service of the United States. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oregon, praying that Chapter 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be so amended as to extend to the city of Astoria in that State all the privileges of said chapter that have been granted from time to time to other cities falling within its provisions; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oregon, praying that a well-equipped quarantine station be established at some suitable point on the Columbia River; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of Mrs. Mary B. Hulings, of Rockville, Md., praying Congress to recognize her as the widow of Thomas M. Hulings, late major Forty-ninth Pennsylvania Volunteers, and to place her name on the pension roll as such; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WASHBURN presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Duluth, Minn., indorsing resolutions adopted by the Duluth (Minn.) Stock Exchange, favoring the retention of the existing tariff on iron ore; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented petitions of employés of the Foxcroft (Me.) Woolen Mills, and the North Berwick (Me.) Woolen Mills, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of miners of lead ore in Northwestern Missouri and Southeastern Kansas, remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Portland (Me.) Typographical Union, No. 66, praying for the Governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. POWER presented the petition of John Fogarty and 237 other citizens of Butte, Mont., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1133, for the establishment of a Government telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Frank Lee, of Big Timber, Mont., praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Typographical Union, No. 66, of Portland, Me., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HILL presented petitions of East Clay Grange, No. 469, of New York, and of Michael Bowes and sundry other citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the traffic in oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the employés of the Globe Woolen Company, of Utica, N. Y., remonstrating against a change in the duty on wool and woolen goods; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry farmers of Suffolk County, N. Y., praying for the retention of the existing specific duty of 25 cents per bushel on potatoes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the employés of the Ausable Horse Nail Company, of Keeseville, N. Y., remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on horseshoe nails to 25 per cent ad valorem; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of Geo. W. Marshall and sundry other farmers of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRICE presented petitions of John Wollam Command, No. 20, Union Veteran Union, Department of Ohio, and of George A. Taylor Command, No. 8, Union Veteran Union, Departments of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, praying for a solution of the pension question; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of 73 citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, soldiers of the late war, and of 15 citizens of Franklin County, Ohio, soldiers of the late war, praying for a thorough investigation of the present administration of the Pension Bureau, orders of suspension, and subsequent orders which claim to modify, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Central Labor Union, of Cleveland; of Federal Labor Union, No. 5335, of Cincinnati; of Typographical Union No. 199, of Zanesville; of Typographical Union, No. 3, of Cincinnati; of the State Trades and Labor Assembly; of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 173; the Trades and Labor Council, and Mayflower Assembly, No. 469, Knights of Labor, of Zanesville, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Assembly, No. 7954, Knights of Labor, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, and for the imposition of an income tax on all incomes exceeding $4,000; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 228 employés of Landesman, Hirschheimer & Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that the Wilson tariff bill be so amended that the present duty be retained on ladies' and misses' cloaks; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 73 citizens of Lloyd, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 174 citizens of Newark, Ohio, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on glass bottles; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Newark Machine Company, of Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against the admission of Canadian machines while the products of this country are practically barred from Canada by their duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Franklin Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the further issue of bonds of the United States Government for any cause or reason whatever; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the P. R. Mitchell Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the retention of the present duty on curled hair used for mattresses, bedding, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Lodge No. 4, Shipmasters' Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the retention of the present duty on iron ore; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 64 citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, inasmuch as it provides for a radical reduction of the duty on the manufacture of wool, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of 101 cigar manufacturers and dealers in leaf tobacco, of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against a reduction of the import duty on manufactured cigars, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Marysville, Chillicothe, Cleveland, Reading, Dayton, Hamilton, Portage County, Cuyahoga Falls, Ironton, Middletown, Delaware, and Fremont, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

POLICY REGARDING HAWAII.

Mr. TURPIE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a resolution favorably, with a recommendation for its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That from the facts and papers laid before the Senate it is unwise and inexpedient, under existing conditions, to consider at this time any project of annexation of the Hawaiian territory to the United States; that the Provisional Government therein having been duly recognized, the highest international interests require that it shall pursue its own line of policy. Foreign intervention in the political affairs of these islands will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the Government of the United States.

Mr. TURPIE. I am directed by the committee to state that this resolution comprises the unanimous opinion of the committee save the dissent of the honorable Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] to the first clause. I am directed also by the committee to state that the resolution has no relation to the special investigation now pending before the committee. That is a separate matter. I am directed further by the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANDERSON. I object.

Mr. MORRILL. Let the resolution be read again.

Mr. TELLER. Has the resolution been printed?

Mr. HOAR. It is just reported.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution has not been printed, the Chair is informed.

Mr. TELLER. I object to the present consideration of the resolution. I want to see it in print. There need be no haste in the matter.

Mr. MORRILL. Let the resolution be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will again be read, and the Chair will recognize the objection of the Senator from Colorado.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. MILLS. Whenever the resolution comes up for consideration I shall ask for a division of the question.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Texas is not heard on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. MILLS. I concur with the Senator from Colorado in objecting to the present consideration of the resolution in order that we may have it printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado objects to the present consideration of the resolution. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. MILLS. Let it be printed.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say that I think the resolution ought to be printed that we may have an opportunity to see it in print. It will, no doubt, bring on some discussion. It can not be passed in a minute.

Mr. TURPIE. I notice that the honorable Senator from Colorado directs his remarks to me. He thinks that it is an unreasonable request to ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution. It is no personal request of mine. I was plain in my statement that the Committee on Foreign Relations requested me to ask of the Senate the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TELLER. I was not finding any fault with the Senator from Indiana. I understood him to say that the committee had instructed him to make the request. I was taking the privilege that every Senator has to object to a resolution of this kind when it first comes from a committee.

Mr. WASHBURN. Is any further order necessary for the printing?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that under the rule the resolution will be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 564) for the relief of W. Jasper Blackburn, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; which was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1414) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia," to report it favorably with amendments. I am also instructed by the committee to ask the Senate to place the bill on its passage at this time. It relates to a local matter here in regard to the jurisdiction of the police court. The report of the committee is unanimous.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon requests the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it be read in full.

Mr. BUTLER. The morning business has not been concluded?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is not concluded.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I will state to the Senator from South Carolina, if he will allow me, that I have just reported this bill from the Judiciary Committee with the recommendation of the committee that I should ask for its present consideration. It is a matter of some importance; the committee is unanimous in favor of the bill; and I think it will lead to no discussion.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall have to object to its consideration until after the conclusion of the morning business.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Then I ask that the bill be laid over temporarily, and I shall call it up later in the morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over for the present.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1111) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to grant a permit to build on lot 43, square 358, in the city of Washington, D. C., submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1482) to relieve John Holbrook from the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1483) to correct the military record of Elisha B. Bassett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 1484) granting a pension to W. E. Anderson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1485) granting a pension to John C. Secrest; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WASHBURN introduced a bill (S. 1486) to restore a pension to Harriet M. Knowlton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1487) granting a pension to Frederick Andros; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1488) for the relief of J. M. Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1489) to fix the pay, allowances, pensions, retirement, and rank of the veterinarians of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 1490) to pension Mollie Crandall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 53) providing for the appointment of a commission to the Antwerp International Exposition; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PALMER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the printing of the proceedings of the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition by the Public Printer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

DUTIES ON SUGARS, ETC.

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

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the Senate, if, in his opinion, it is not incompatible with the public interest, any correspondence exchanged between the Government of the United States and the Governments of Colombia, Venezuela, and Haiti, in reference to the proclamations issued by the President on the 15th of March, 1892, levying import duties on sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the produce of those countries brought to the United States, in compliance of section 3 of the act approved October 1, 1890, commonly known as the McKinley law.

CONTRACTS FOR DEPARTMENTAL SUPPLIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4292) to amend section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments at Washington.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was to strike out all after the word "board" in line 22 of the Senate amendment down to and including the word "Department" in line 25, and to insert in lieu thereof:

consisting of one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury and Interior Departments and one of the Assistant Postmasters-General, who shall be designated by the heads of said Departments and the Postmaster-General, respectively.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the amendment to the amendment be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAW.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, submitted yesterday by Mr. LODGE, as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Civil Service Commission is hereby instructed to report with as little delay as possible to the Senate the number and character of the cases which it has considered since March 4, 1889, or which it has now under consideration, in which it is alleged that the civil-service law, or regulations, or orders thereunder approved by the President, have been violated by the head of any one of the Executive Departments, or bureaus thereof, or by any officer of the United States whose appointment is subject to the confirmation of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that, in line 5, he change the word "or," because as the resolution stands it gives to the Civil Service Commission authority to report "the number and the character of the cases which it has considered since March 4, 1889, or which it has now under consideration." I apprehend the Senator wants both classes, and not only one of them.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest that the word "or" should be stricken out and the word "and" inserted, so as to read: "and which it has now under consideration."

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; that is right. I will modify the resolution in that way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

APPEALS FROM DISTRICT POLICE COURT.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If the morning business is over, I ask consent of the Senate for the consideration of the bill (S. 1414) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia," which was laid aside temporarily a few moments ago.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ALLEN. Unless an explanation is made of the bill, I do not know but that I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Does the Senator desire to object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLEN. Possibly a short explanation will obviate my objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If the Senator and the Senate will hear me, I think I can satisfactorily explain the bill in about two minutes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. When the act was passed providing for the court of appeals in this District, under the existing law at that time a writ of error lay from criminal proceedings in the police court to the supreme court of the District. In enacting the law providing for the establishment of a court of appeals for the District of Columbia, by some carelessness the right of appeal was not preserved; in other words, the provision for an appeal to the supreme court of the District was repealed, and there was no provision for an appeal on a writ of error to the court of appeals.

Mr. HOAR. The provision was merely for an appeal to the District supreme court.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Does this bill take away or limit the right of appeal?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It gives the right of writ of error.

Mr. ALLEN. Does it enlarge the right?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It does not; it simply strikes out the words "supreme court of the District of Columbia," as the language of the law stood, and inserts "court of appeals of the District of Columbia." It does not enlarge the right; it does not lessen it; but simply extends the provision so that a writ of error will lie to the court of appeals instead of to the District supreme court.

Mr. ALLEN. Is the right of trial by jury preserved?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes, in certain cases the right of trial by jury is granted.

Mr. ALLEN. If the bill does not interfere with the right of appeal or take it away I shall not object to its consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It does not. It does not change the law as it stood prior to the enactment of the act establishing the court of appeals.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I shall not make any objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 15, after the word "judge," to insert:

Within such time as may be prescribed by rules and regulations which shall be made by the court of appeals of the District of Columbia for the transaction of business to be brought before it under this act, and for the time and method of the entry of the appeal and for giving notice of writs of error thereto from the police court of the District of Columbia,

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 24, after the word "require," to strike out the period, and insert a comma, and also to insert:

Which record shall be filed in said court of appeals within such time as may be prescribed by the court of appeals as hereinbefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. CALL. I ask that the bill may be read, as it now stands.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to define the jurisdiction of the police court of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1891, be, and the same hereby is, so amended as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That in all cases tried before said court the judgment of the court shall be final, except as hereinafter provided. If, upon the trial of any such cause, an exception be taken by or on behalf of any defendant to any ruling or instruction of the court upon matter of law, the same shall be reduced to writing and stated in a bill of exceptions, with so much of the evidence as may be material to the question or questions raised, which said bill of exceptions shall be settled and signed by the judge within such time as may be prescribed by rules and regulations which shall be made by the court of appeals of the District of Columbia for the transaction of business to be brought before it under this act, and for the time and method of the entry of the appeal, and for giving notice of writs of error thereto from the police court of the District of Columbia; and if, upon presentation to any justice of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia of a verified petition setting forth the matter or matters so excepted to, such justice shall be of opinion that the same ought to be reviewed, he may allow a writ of error in the cause, which shall issue out of the said court of appeals, addressed to the judge of the police court, who shall forthwith send up the information filed in the cause and a transcript of the record therein, certified under the seal of said court, to said court of appeals for review and such action as the law may require, which record shall be filed in said court of appeals within such time as may be prescribed by the court of appeals as hereinbefore provided. Any defendant desiring the benefit of the provisions of this section shall give notice in open court of his intention to apply for a writ of error upon such exceptions, and thereupon proceedings therein shall be stayed for ten days; *Provided*, That the defendant shall then and there enter into recognizance with sufficient surety, to be approved by the judge of the police court, conditioned that in the event of a denial of his application for a writ of error he will, within five days next after the expiration of said ten days, appear in said police court and abide by and perform its judgment, and that in the event of the granting of such writ of error he will appear in said court of appeals of the District of Columbia and prosecute the writ of error and abide by and perform its judgment in the premises. Upon failure of any defendant to enter into the recognizance provided for in this section the sentence of the police court shall stand and be executed pending proceedings upon his application for a writ of error and until the final disposition thereof by the said court of appeals.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the bill ought not to pass. It relates to a class of people of small means and to a character of offenses that are committed by such people. It relates to a proceeding where an information by a single person is filed and the judgment of one other person is taken, and there the proceeding ends, unless a broad avenue shall be opened for appeal to a higher court. It requires, for the suspension of the judgment of one person, over a large number of very poor people who are unable to obtain security, a recognizance and security to be entered that they will prosecute the appeal. A very large portion of the people of this country are now destitute of money, property, or friends who have either, and this bill submits to the judgment of two men the deprival of the personal liberty of a large number of the people of the community. For the reasons I have given, I think the right of appeal and the reversal of error in trials and convictions in this class of cases should not be accompanied by restrictions which place it beyond the reach of the greater number of the people who are affected by it. I am therefore opposed to the bill for the reasons I have given.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President, just one word in reply to the Senator from Florida. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. The bill simply provides for writs of error from the police court of the District of Columbia, as such writs have heretofore existed for years. The right of a writ of error was cut off, as I said, when the bill providing for the establishment of the court of appeals was passed. The pending bill simply puts it back, but gives the right of a writ of error to the court of appeals, instead of the supreme court. The Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous in the opinion that the bill ought to pass.

Mr. HUNTON. Will the Senator from Oregon allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Certainly.

Mr. HUNTON. Do I understand the Senator to say that there is a writ of error now from the police court to the supreme court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. There is none. It was cut off when the bill providing for the establishment of the court of appeals was passed. Prior to that time there was a writ of error from the police court to the supreme court.

Mr. HUNTON. Then I desire to ask the Senator why in the bill under consideration the supreme court of the District of Columbia has been skipped? I understand the courts of the District of Columbia consist of a police court as the lowest court, the supreme court of the District of Columbia as the next highest, and the court of appeals as the highest local court.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Yes, that is the case.

Mr. HUNTON. It seems to me that an appeal from the police court ought to be first to the supreme court of the District of Columbia. I should like to know the reasons why, in the opinion of the committee, the intermediate court was skipped in the right of appeal.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I will state to the Senator from Virginia that the matter was fully discussed in the committee, and it was the opinion of the committee unanimously that to provide for an appeal to the supreme court and then perhaps for another appeal to the court of appeals would be imposing on parties some restrictions that ought not to be imposed, just as the Senator from Florida says; and in the judgment of the committee it was thought to be unnecessary.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator from Oregon will pardon me, I will state that it would require a retrial of the facts in all cases, where perhaps neither party wanted but a hearing of law.

Mr. HUNTON. I understand the court of appeals is now overburdened; that its docket is increasing enormously every week, and it seems to me that it would be better to limit appeals from the police court to the supreme court of the District.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That is simply a matter of judgment. It may be the opinion of the Senator from Virginia: but it was the opinion of all the members of the Judiciary Committee that it would be better under all the circumstances to have the writ of error issued out of the court of appeals.

Mr. HUNTON. But the Senator from Oregon will admit that it is most unusual in giving writs of error or appeals to skip one court in the way up. An appeal generally goes from the lower court to the next highest and then to the highest.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The bill does not skip a court that is confined exclusively to deciding questions of law; but the appeal goes to the court of appeals, which is a court to pass upon the law.

Mr. HOAR. If my honorable friend will pardon me for a suggestion, I will state that the bill does in regard to this jurisdiction exactly what is done in regard to the Supreme Court of the United States. On a full vote of the Senate, although I did not approve of it in that case, and I do not now, writs of error were given from the district courts to the Supreme Court of the United States in many criminal cases.

Mr. CALL. The observations which I made directed to the bill did not relate to the right of appeal as restored or the writ of error, if it be so; but they do relate to the objection that where the defendant is forcibly brought before the court and tried and sentenced, and error is pronounced by a judge of another court as existing in the record, he should be required to give security for the prosecution of the writ of error. It is the duty of the Government which has brought the defendant before a court of its own creation, if error is ascertained in the proceedings, to suspend the execution of the sentence.

The objection I make to the bill is that it embraces a large class of people who are unable to prosecute appeals and writs of

of error, and affects their personal liberty and their personal rights. It embraces a large class of people who are too poor to avail themselves of the benefits and privileges of the law, to whom the privilege ought to be secured by the Government where error is pronounced by the judge of a superior court to exist in the record of the trial.

The Government owes an obligation and duty to the people to protect them in their right to personal liberty against harsh and oppressive laws. And surely it is a harsh and oppressive law to deny a person a right of appeal, a writ of error, or an inquiry into the unlawfulness of his imprisonment because he is poor and unable to give security for the prosecution of appeal or writ of error.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from Florida whether he would permit criminals after they have been condemned in a court to go free without giving any recognizance while the alleged error is being tried in the superior court?

Mr. CALL. That is the very fault of the bill; that it assumes a person to be a criminal when the judge of another court has pronounced that he is not a criminal by the record of his trial——

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. It is in the discretion of Congress whether the right of writ of error shall be given at all in this matter. In a great many municipalities the right of writ of error is not given at all from the decisions of municipal courts. So far from this being a bill that oppresses persons who may be tried and convicted in the municipal court, the police court of the District, it extends to them a privilege not usually given. The Senator from Florida is all wrong as to the effect of the bill.

Mr. CALL. I admit the proposition of the Senator from Oregon that it is extending and restoring a privilege to them, but it is subjecting it to conditions which make it inoperative and oppressive to them. As to the fact that Congress has discretion, certainly Congress has discretion. I suppose it might pronounce capital execution against a man because he was a vagrant and had no employment. I do not know, unless it comes within the provision of cruel or unusual punishment, what limitation there is upon the power. But it is the question of expediency, of the justice and the rightfulness of having a man convicted upon an information, deprived of his personal liberty by the sentence and judgment and opinion of one man, and then, when the judge of another and higher court has pronounced that there was error in the record and the trial, that the man, a poor man, unable to prosecute an appeal, should be required to give a recognizance and security.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from Florida another question?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. As I understand, the objection of the Senator from Florida is to the provision in the bill that where a party applies to the court of appeals for a writ of error he must give bonds conditioned that he will appear in that court and prosecute the appeal, and conditioned further that in the event the judgment of the police court is affirmed he will appear in the police court and abide by the original judgment. I understand the Senator from Florida to object that a man should be compelled to give a bond that he will do that thing. What would the Senator have him do? Would he have him committed to prison until the matter is determined or would he permit him to go scot-free and thus escape the original judgment?

Mr. CALL. The Senator from Oregon is very able and very astute in answering objections which are not made.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. What, then, is the objection of the Senator from Florida to this bill, if I have misunderstood him?

Mr. CALL. If the Senator will listen a little while I will tell him. First I will tell him what it is not. It is not to the recognizance requiring the appearance of the convicted man in the court at any proper time to abide the judgment, but the objection is to the provision that requires him to give security for the prosecution of the appeal or the writ of error, because it relates to a class of people who can not give the security and who are therefore deprived of the benefit of the provision—people who are too poor to employ counsel, too poor to get security that they will prosecute the appeal; and in such a case and in relation to all this class of offenses where error is pronounced by a superior judge it is the duty of the Government to prosecute the case, and not allow an unlawful imprisonment of a citizen under an erroneous judgment and sentence to be made because the person convicted is too poor to assert his rights.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. But, if the Senator from Florida will allow me, his argument kills itself. The Senator from Florida must admit that if the right of writ of error is given at all then a certain length of time must elapse between the time the writ issues out of the court of appeals and the time when it can be heard in that court on the return from the superior court.

Mr. CALL. Unquestionably.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Now, the Senator says he does not object to the party being compelled to give bond to appear and abide the judgment of the court after the appeal is over, but what he does object to is that he should be compelled to give bond that he will prosecute his appeal. It is just as broad as it is long. You must give time. You must give the party time; you must give time for the matter to be determined in the superior court. If you give the right of appeal and do that, you can permit the criminal already convicted to go free. You do not want to commit him to prison. Therefore you give him the privilege of giving bond. If he can give the bond, all right; if he can not give the bond, then he must abide by the decision of the court below.

Mr. CALL. The objection, I again state, is not that the party shall be required to give his recognizance, but that he should be required to give security for the prosecution of the appeal or the writ of error.

I insist, in reference to this class of offenses, minor offenses which affect the personal liberty of the people, persons unable to give bonds and security for the prosecution of the appeal or the writ of error ought not to be required to do it. Their recognizance is sufficient, unless it be an aggravated case, where the penalty is greater than it is usually in the administration of police justice. The objection is, that this is an inoperative right of appeal, because it relates to a class of people who can not give security for the prosecution of the appeal.

When the judge of a superior court has pronounced the opinion and judgment that there is upon the face of the record error, that ought to be sufficient to allow the man to go upon his recognizance for any minor offense, and the right of the citizen to his personal liberty should be determined by the superior court without any prosecution of the writ of error by the citizen and without any restriction or limitation of security of any kind.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to say one word, as I am somewhat responsible for the original error which the bill is intended to correct, having had charge of the court of appeals bill. The old system in the District of Columbia provided for no appeal on the facts from the police court in petty criminal cases which were tried there, but it provided for a writ of error which went to the supreme court, and was heard by the supreme court in banc as a court of law. Now, that being the existing law, we provided in the last Congress for the court of appeals, which became the supreme law court of the District of Columbia, as the supreme court in banc had been before. We abolished the full-bench jurisdiction of the supreme court, leaving it purely a *nisi prius* and equity court, and provided for writs of error from that court to raise a question of law to the court of appeals. But we omitted, in making that provision, to take care of the old writs of error from the police court. We abolished the jurisdiction of the supreme court. So we left this class of criminals without any remedy whatever to revise the erroneous rulings of a single judge sitting in the police court.

This bill is purely to cure that, and provides that the old writ of error which formerly was heard by the supreme court in banc, but which now has no jurisdiction in banc, shall be revived, but that it shall go to the court of appeals. That is all that the bill does.

Now, the Senator from Florida says you ought not to put upon a criminal in a small criminal case such as is heard in the police court the obligation of recognizing or giving bond to appear in the upper court and prosecute his appeal. But that is what he does now as long as he is in court until he is sentenced. If he is arrested by an officer and brought into that court he has to give bail or recognize with surety, or in some other way secure his appearance from day to day, else he is imprisoned while he awaits trial and while his trial is going on. Therefore this bill merely provides what every criminal, I suppose, in every State in the Union has to do. If he is arrested he has to secure his appearance, that he will not run away; and that he must continue to do when he is exercising this further privilege of a writ of error; and that is all.

Now, it is true that the court might in its discretion, and frequently would discharge on his own recognizance, a well-known and respectable person who is charged with some petty offense; but if he is a man whom the court would ever discharge on his own recognizance he certainly would not have any difficulty if it were necessary to get surety.

So this measure is merely picking up a dropped stitch in our own legislation; and whether the view of my friend from Florida be right or wrong it ought not to be directed at this particular bill. If there ought to be a system under which criminals until finally sentenced, shall be allowed to be at large without security, it ought to be made general and not be applied to this particular, exceptional case.

Mr. CALL. I acquiesce in all that has been said by the Senator from Massachusetts, except that the objection in this case

is not yet met. An information is filed by one person against a poor man unable to give security. A trial is had before another and a judgment is pronounced. A third judge of a higher court pronounces that trial to be erroneous. The bill requires that the person thus convicted without a trial by jury, sentenced to be deprived of his liberty for a week or a month or a longer period, within the extent of the jurisdiction of the court, the trial and conviction pronounced to be erroneous by a superior court, shall be required to give security for the prosecution of that appeal, or it shall fail and the person stand convicted, not because he is guilty, but because he is poor.

Now I insist, Mr. President, that in my judgment in a jurisdiction which affects the personal liberty of a very large part, perhaps a great majority, of the people of the district, when error is found in the decision of the court by a judge of a superior court, security ought not to be required by the absolute positive terms of law for the prosecution of that appeal or writ of error. And that is all. The bill might easily have provided in that respect that the person should be required to give his recognizance and security for his appearance if need be, or, which would be better, leave it to the discretion of the judge to require or not require it.

It might have been so amended that the error should be heard by the court awarding the writ, and the person discharged if the conviction should be held erroneous, without the prosecution of the writ of error or the appeal by the convicted person.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I ask for a vote, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is upon concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were concurred in.

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

ISSUE AND SALE OF BONDS.

Mr. STEWART. In accordance with the notice I gave yesterday, I call up the resolution of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEFFER] proposing to declare it as the opinion of the Senate that the Secretary of the Treasury has no lawful authority for issuing and selling bonds, as he proposes to do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Nevada will proceed upon the resolution.

SOLVENCY OF THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the gigantic syndicate which controls the finances of the world is situated in London. The inner circle or executive committee of that colossal combination surrounds the Bank of England and largely controls its financial operations.

The destruction of enterprise and the wreck of securities by bankruptcy was anticipated by the syndicate from the beginning. They fully realized that none but the richest could survive the destruction of one-half of the metallic money of the world. They knew that the army in the open field of enterprise must perish, and, as the war of the parasites against production progressed, the success of their scheme required the acquisition and the sure investment or concealment of gold, the only money of final payment which they had not marked for destruction.

Twenty years was a short time in which to select and secure bonds and other securities in which to invest their great fortunes, safe from the carnage and ruin which the destruction of enterprise must produce.

At the mixed assembly of dupes and manipulators in Brussels in the autumn of 1892, Baron Rothschild, the representative of the inner ring of gold monopoly, asked for further time. He proposed to postpone the final collapse by the temporary use of $25,000,000 of silver per annum by Europe and a continuance of silver purchases by the United States under the Sherman law, until the investments of the gold combination could be more firmly secured and all doubtful obligations unloaded on the public at large.

He warned his associates in language which the initiated well understood, that if this was not done there was danger ahead, and that they must take care of themselves without regard to the safety of associates who lacked the caution to retain what avarice had acquired.

The evidence that the faithful took warning in time is shown in the alarm and distrust which rumor creates with regard to the solvency of great institutions.

The hope still exists that the confidence reposed in the great Anglo-Saxon bank may not be misplaced, and that the managers of the syndicate will not find it necessary to save themselves from the impending storm by unloading doubtful securities on the Bank of England, and that the smoke which now envelopes it is no indication of fire beneath.

It could hardly have been anticipated that the enslavement of labor and the destruction of small fortunes, which the gold standard was intended to accomplish, would affect the bulwarks of avarice and gain; and when the storm of distress was raging at its highest, and the Barings were thrown into the deep, the hope was indulged that they were a sufficient Jonah to save those in the ship.

But the storm is increasing, with the breakers in sight, and the rumor that the compass has gone by the rail, and that the rudder has sprung, has filled thousands on board the Great Eastern of finance with dismay and fear of the coming collapse.

But sound finance, for those who have gold within environments so strong as to defy all attack, will soon be secured. The masses will then be invited to admire the wisdom of the dealers in gold, who never indulge in the folly of work or the rashness of enterprise, but gather the wrecked fortunes their intrigues destroy.

The enjoyment of wealth obtained by extortion is only insured by cunning and fraud. The parasites are blind to the examples which history affords of the power of the people to destroy when nothing is left but despair.

The arrogance of the syndicate in compelling Secretary Carlisle to ignore the existence of the legislative department shows how oblivious unrestrained power may become to the consequences of revolutionary proceedings.

The failure of the radical element of the gold combination to heed the advice of Rothschild, which was to continue the use of silver temporarily, until the accumulations of the syndicate could be more safely invested, created an immediate necessity for United States bonds to substitute for the bonds and other money futures which the knowledge of the inevitable panic which Rothschild foretold made necessary to unload on the uninitiated.

When the syndicate radicals suspended coinage in India, and convened Congress in extra session for the destruction of silver, only the initiated comprehended the scope and bearing of the scheme proposed. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] on the 18th day of October, 1893, during the debate on the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, made known the designs of the gold combination in the following significant language:

> There are one or two questions more important than the one I have been discussing, one of which is the necessity of strengthening the gold reserve in our Treasury. We have outstanding $800,000,000 in notes or certificates, and but $86,000,000 of gold to redeem them. Think of that for a moment! Senators say they will not increase this reserve, they will not issue bonds to buy it; that the people do not like the idea of increasing the public debt.

The Senator assumed that the $800,000,000 of Treasury notes and silver certificates were all to be redeemed in gold, and ignored the law which had provided for the redemption of over $330,000,000 of silver certificates by a like amount of silver coin in the vaults of the Treasury, and over $150,000,000 of the Treasury notes by silver bullion purchased with such notes, which the law required to be coined for their redemption.

But the decree had gone forth and the knowledge had been communicated to the initiated that, the law to the contrary notwithstanding, all the silver in the Treasury was to be converted into credit money and redeemed in gold alone.

It was the knowledge of the plan of the gold combination that enabled the Senator to declare that there was $800,000,000 of paper to be redeemed, and only $86,000,000 gold for its redemption. He knew the power of the syndicate to annul the statutes of Congress through executive administration.

At this time Secretary Carlisle was not fully informed; he ignorantly supposed that the silver bullion in the Treasury might be coined and used as money, and gave orders to the mints to prepare for such coinage. But before undertaking to administer the affairs of the Treasury Department without specific instructions he visited the bankers of New York. In the following quotation the Financier of November, 1893, shows where the Secretary received his final instructions:

> One good result of Secretary Carlisle's recent visit to New York was the understanding then arrived at, between him and the bankers, that he would abandon the idea of attempting to increase the coinage of silver dollars in order to secure some profits on seigniorage.

The President in his message, and the Secretary in his report, advised Congress to authorize the issuance of bonds to buy gold to take the place of the repudiated silver in the Treasury, make up the deficiency which the destruction of enterprise had created, and supply safe money futures for the inner ring of the gold combination.

The Administration was again "astonished by the opposition in the Senate to such prompt action as would relieve the present unfortunate situation." A contumacious Congress was ignored, and the established policy of the Treasury Department to create law and carry out the decrees of the gold combination was continued. A circular for more bonds was issued on the 17th of January, 1894. The Secretary of the Treasury advertised for bids for $50,000,000 of 5 per cent bonds to be paid for in United States gold coin, referring as authority for such offer to the resumption act of January 14, 1875. He did not inform the public

that there was not any authority in that act to purchase gold coin and exclude silver coin. The act authorizes the sale of bonds to buy coin (not gold coin) for a certain specific purpose which was "to the extent necessary" to redeem Treasury notes outstanding on the 1st day of January, 1879. No other authority to borrow money and increase the national debt exists in the laws of Congress.

Ninety-five million five hundred thousand dollars in coin was purchased by the sale of bonds, under the authority of the resumption act, to redeem Treasury notes outstanding on the 1st of January, 1879. About twenty-five or thirty millions of the gold so purchased has been used for other purposes.

There is about $70,000,000 of gold coin in the Treasury subject to the redemption of Treasury notes, commonly called greenbacks, which is amply sufficient, and more than is necessary to be kept in the Treasury for that purpose. The people prefer the greenbacks to gold, and seldom present them for redemption. Congress has made ample provision for the redemption of the silver certificates in silver coin now in the Treasury, dollar for dollar, and also for the redemption of the Treasury notes issued under the act of 1890, by declaring "that the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act, as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for."

The pretext that a sale of bonds is necessary to obtain coin to redeem greenbacks is a flimsy sham. There are two distinct and well-defined objects in view in the issuance of these bonds. One of these objects is to supply the deficiency of the Treasury without utilizing the silver which is crowding the vaults, or the issuance of more legal-tender money, drawing no interest, to supply such deficiency. The other and paramount object is to afford safe investment for the money, which, from interest, or the sale of doubtful securities, has accumulated in the hands of the gold combination.

The disregard of the limitation of the power of the Secretary, to the sale of bonds to buy coin to redeem the greenbacks outstanding January 1, 1879, is usurpation of unlimited power by the Secretary of the Treasury, to increase the national debt. There is not even an apology for such usurpation while there is $70,000,000 gold in the Treasury, applicable to the redemption of United States notes, and which is a greater amount than is required for that purpose. The statutes having been ignored, the system is automatic. For example: Mr. Rothschild goes to the Treasury with ten millions in Government paper, no matter what kind, because, according to Treasury-made law everything is redeemable in gold; he deposits his paper and demands an order for gold, indorses the order and hands it back in full payment for $10,000,000 worth of bonds, which he puts in his pocket and goes home. This process can be repeated until all the outstanding paper is worn out by handling, and requires to be reissued to perpetuate the operation.

The plethora in the Treasury, after supplying the deficiency which this automatic system would create, could be relieved by liberal appropriations. The necessity for maintaining the credit of the Government by incurring more debt is easily created by maintaining the gold standard, falling prices, and hard times, and providing by legislation for ample deficiencies.

The inability of the legislative department to resist the overshadowing power of the executive has simplified the process by which the gold syndicate of London expect to establish Egyptian financial rule in the United States. Egypt, on 5,000,000 acres of land under cultivation pays, $25,000,000 for interest on public debt and $27,000,000 for current expenses, which is more than $10 per acre per annum, beside feeding, as they are fed, and clothing, as they are clothed, 6,000,000 of people.

How large an income, upon a like basis, may the gold syndicate reasonably estimate from the people of the United States, when the grinding process of contraction and the heartless rule of the gold kings shall have perfected the work in America, as they have in Egypt, Austria, and Italy?

The submission of the down-trodden masses of Europe, overawed by military power, and the acquiescence in this country, through ignorance of the cunning and insidious methods employed by the gold trust, has inspired the rashness which is now boldly defying 70,000,000 of people and demanding of them an unconditional surrender of the rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution, and a full assignment of all power and authority to an Administration which knows no law but the power of money, and respects no rights but the claims of capital.

The bonds to be issued depend for their payment upon the permanent supremacy of the executive over the legislative branch, and the continuance in undisputed sway of the gold oligarchy of money-changers, which has ruled in the Treasury Department for the last twenty years.

The faith of the syndicate investing in such bonds may seem warranted by the experience of the past; but the dangers encountered and the sacrifices made on American soil for justice, equality, and law are notice sufficient to deprive them of equity, and confine them to strict law when the principle of *caveat emptor* is applied.

THE SCIENCE OF MONEY.—I. MONEY.

Civilization is created by making common to all what is known or produced by each. There are two inventions of man which are essential to civilization, namely, language and money. Neither is useful in isolation while there is but one individual to learn or to produce.

Spoken and written language makes acquired knowledge accessible to all. Money commands services and all the products of labor, and makes the efforts of the whole human race contribute to the wants of each member of society. Equally with language, it is an essential factor of civilization, without which man would soon descend to the lowest condition of barbarism.

I am not aware that even a single tribe of men has been discovered which did not possess some kind of money. The efforts of barbarians to create money, which would enable them to enjoy the fruits of each other's labor, are very instructive. Cowrie shells to this day answer all the purposes of local currency among certain African tribes; wampum, made from shells, fully possessed the money function among the American Indians; cattle were used as currency in ancient Greece; the money of Iceland in former times was codfish, and our Anglo-Saxon ancestors used slaves as money.

With the advance of civilization these various devices are abandoned, either on account of their inconvenience or because they are too abundant. The more civilized nations have used gold and silver from earliest history. The reasons why their use has been so long continued may be found in their indestructibility and limited quantity. Throughout history the almost universal use of the precious metals as money has educated the world to the idea that the precious metals possess some intrinsic quality which makes them money, and to overlook the fact that their money function was given to them by man and not by nature. They do not consider the fact that if, in the beginning, there had been discovered some other material more easily obtained, more conveniently transportable, equally indestructible, and limited in quantity, gold and silver might have remained commodities without any detriment to civilization.

It must be borne in mind that, at the time the precious metals were first used as money, and for a long time afterward, the arts of making, engraving, and printing paper were unknown, and also that the means of limiting the quantity of money by law were very imperfect, on account of the frail and unstable character of government. Every civilized government of modern times has given numerous practical illustrations of the possibility of producing paper money possessing durability, more convenient in use, and more cheaply transportable than either gold or silver.

No fixed system or rule for limiting quantity by law has yet been established. This is the important question to be determined before the limitation which nature placed on the quantity of gold and silver can be abandoned. Before discussing the importance of limitation of the quantity of money, I will consider the function which money performs.

II. THE FUNCTIONS OF MONEY.

Money is a medium of exchange, an expression of price, and a measure of deferred payments. In the early stages of civilization the function of facilitating the exchange of the property of one man for the property of another, and designating the price of property exchanged, were the most important uses of money. But, at the present time, the measurement of time contracts, so as to do equity between debtor and creditor, is the paramount consideration.

When, by custom, agreement, or law, a common representative of things useful has been selected, such common representative may be exchanged for any property; because, by such custom, agreement or law, it is made representative of all property. The representative of all property may, or may not, be composed of material useful in itself, without regard to the function of representing other useful things; but it can not be money, unless it is made an order for all things for sale, by some law, custom or understanding, which the people observe, either voluntarily or by force of sovereign authority. It must be an unquestioned order or warrant of attorney, in the hands of its owner, for everything offered for sale and for the discharge of all obligations payable in money.

The power conferred by this warrant of attorney, in modern times, is called legal tender; because the law requires creditors to receive it in payment for debts. The use of the precious metals as money, and the use, at the same time, of stamped paper of no appreciable value, have led to much confusion. The fact that the precious metals have uses other than those inci-

dent to the representative value conferred by the money function, tends to complicate the subject, and leads many to suppose that it is the material in these metals, and not the money function, which makes them valuable as money.

Neither gold nor silver can be used as a commodity, and at the same time in its representative character, as an order for all things for sale and a legal tender for the payment of debts. Anything which is clothed with the money function of a dollar will pay a debt amounting to a dollar, and buy a dollar's worth of property—no more and no less—no matter of what material it may be made. It is the money function which makes it a dollar, not the paper, the gold, or the silver. If there were no law, custom or understanding by which the money function could be conferred upon anything but gold and silver, and gold and silver only could be converted into money without loss or charge, the amount of gold required to make a dollar would be worth a dollar, and the amount of silver necessary to make a dollar would also be worth a dollar. And if the money function could only be conferred upon a certain kind of yellow paper, and another certain kind of white paper, and all such paper, both the yellow and the white, could be converted into money without loss or charge, the amount of yellow paper required to make a dollar would be worth a dollar, and the amount of white paper required to make the same amount of money would also be worth a dollar; but the value of each dollar in commodities would depend on the number of such dollars.

Rude nature never has, and there is no probability that she ever will, yield from the mines too much of either gold or silver, or both, for use as money; consequently it has always been, and still is, safe and expedient to confer the money function upon all the precious metals, offered for that purpose, by coining them into money.

III. THE AUTOMATIC THEORY.

This limitation of nature is called the automatic theory of money. From time immemorial, previous to 1873, with few exceptions, the great commercial nations have furnished their people with full legal-tender money by coining all the gold and silver deposited at their mints for that purpose. But the case is very different where paper or any other material, which may be obtained in unlimited quantities, is endowed with the money function. While the precious metals were both used, a law providing how much of each should be required for a dollar, or other unit of money, and with a provision for the unlimited coinage of both, was all that was required. But where paper or other material of unlimited quantity is used, the law must not only provide how paper shall be converted into money, but must also determine what quantity of money shall be created from paper. In the former case nature determines the quantity of money; in the latter the quantity must be determined by law. In other words, in using paper in the place of gold and silver, the law of man must be substituted for the law of nature.

The automatic theory, of limiting the volume of coin, by the quantity of the precious metals, is not a perfect system. When the mines are productive, coin is more plentiful than when the output is diminished from exhaustion of the mines or other causes. In every age of the world, when there has been an abundance of coin there has been prosperity as well; and, when there has been a scarcity of coin there has been adversity. Thus the automatic theory works well when the precious metals are abundant, and badly when they are scarce. It is not a scientific system, because such a system would furnish an adequate supply of money at all times, without regard to the accidents of mining.

For fourteen hundred years previous to the commencement of the sixteenth century it worked badly, because very little gold or silver was produced. For three hundred years previous to 1810 the automatic system worked well, because during that period mines were reasonably productive. Between 1810 and 1850, on account of the Spanish-American wars, which nearly destroyed mining, the system produced ruinous contraction and hard times. From 1850 to 1873 there was a copious yield of the precious metals, and the progress of civilization was marvelous. In 1873 the automatic system was abandoned, and a scheme was inaugurated to regulate the volume of the standard money of the world by gold alone.

The undertaking has not been fully accomplished, but, in its approach to consummation, it has produced disaster. It was the most radical financial revolution ever undertaken in the history of the world, and one which, if finally consummated, must end in ruin. If the automatic theory had not been abandoned in 1873, the prosperity of the preceding twenty-three years would have continued, because the output of the two metals would have maintained a reasonable supply of money. The restoration of the automatic system, by the remonetization of silver, would secure future prosperity indefinitely, if the discovery and development of gold and silver mines should furnish an adequate production of the precious metals.

If modern civilization is to be maintained, the automatic system must be restored, or a more scientific system devised and established in its stead. Education and habit of thought favor the automatic system, which, as we have seen, consists in the use of both gold and silver, without discrimination against either. The abandonment of the automatic system has forced the inquiry as to what necessary functions gold and silver perform as money which might not as well be performed by some other substance.

IV. VOLUME OF MONEY GAUGED BY GENERAL PRICES.

Since the arts of making, engraving, and printing paper have been invented a material has been produced having every essential quality of gold and silver, for use as money, except limitation of quantity. Paper is sufficiently durable, cheaper as to cost of transportation, and more convenient than coin, except for small change. The only question remaining is, can any sure and safe rule be ascertained and established by law for the limitation of quantity.

General prices furnish a rule or gauge by which to determine whether the supply of money is sufficient or otherwise. The volume of money in circulation, and all the property for sale, are reciprocally a supply and demand as to each other. If the average price of commodities is stable, the proper volume of money is in circulation. All authorities agree that stability in general prices is the end and aim of monetary science. Any increase or diminution in the supply of money produces a corresponding rise or fall in general prices. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, when there was only about $150,000,000 of coin in circulation in all Europe, general prices reached the lowest level in history. A hundred years after the discovery of gold and silver in Mexico and South America the volume of metallic money was more than quadrupled, and prices greatly advanced. Between the years 1810 and 1850 the cutting off of the supply of the precious metals, due to the Spanish-American wars, largely reduced the supply of money, as compared with property for sale, and prices fell over 50 per cent. The new supply of gold from California and Australia advanced prices, between 1850 and 1873, from 18 to 25 per cent. Since 1873 the reduction of the supply of standard money, by the demonetization of silver, has produced a fall in general prices amounting to fully 50 per cent.

These practical examples are in harmony with the law of supply and demand. A supply of money, in excess of the legitimate demand of business, is not desirable, because it disturbs the equity of time contracts, and enables the debtor to discharge his obligations in money less valuable than the money in circulation at the time the contract was made.

V. EXPANSION AND CONTRACTION.

A constantly increasing volume of money is necessary to supply the increased demand arising from the growth of population and business. A decreasing volume of money, as compared with the demand, is disastrous. It compels the debtor to pay in dearer money than he undertook to pay when he entered into the contract. It discourages enterprise, because property produced or acquired by the investment of money declines in price, and thus the probability of profit upon any venture is diminished. When money is advancing in value or, what is the same thing, is increasing in purchasing power, the human instinct of gain induces investments in money. Such investments are made by exchanging property for money, with a purpose to hoard it, or for bonds and other credits, which are investments in money futures. Investments of this character do not create wealth, but absorb wealth already produced.

When prices are rising the same instinct leads to the acquisition of property. Property is acquired by purchase and by production which results from the employment of labor. The employment of labor in production is the source of all wealth and prosperity. Speculators of every description, including dealers in money, in the language of Wall street, "go long" on those things, whether property or money, which are rising in price or value, and "go short" on those things which they believe to be on the decline. Since the demonetization of silver, money has been appreciating in value, and the competition to acquire reliable money futures has been so great as to induce people to accept very low interest, in view of the prospect of an increase in the purchasing power of money invested. The decline of prices has been so serious as to induce prudent men to go short on property, by declining to engage in new enterprises, and by converting their property into money futures. Enforced idleness, produced by the enhancement of the value of gold or, what is the same thing, the fall of prices, has withdrawn the progressive and the ambitious from productive undertakings, and has led them to seek wealth by investment in money futures.

An infinite variety of causes affect progress and prosperity. Wars, pestilence, famine, and bad government are common afflictions of the human race. But, in the absence of a known and great calamity, contraction of the circulating medium is the only instrument of universal misery. No form of civilization or government has been able to withstand its blighting influence or to survive its long continuance. The unlimited use of gold and silver under present conditions would rescue the country from pending disaster, and, if the mines should continue productive, would secure a prosperous future. If, ignoring well-known facts, such as that the quantity of gold coin in existence is constantly being reduced through abrasion and loss and that there is not any reasonable prospect of a future production of gold more than sufficient to supply the arts, the money powers shall continue to resist the restoration of the automatic system and to insist that the volume of money of ultimate payment shall be reduced to the narrow basis of existing gold, an effort must be made to secure a more scientific money system, which would dispense with the use of the precious metals altogether.

VI. RELIEF OR ECONOMIC REVOLUTION.

A paper money, representative of all property for sale, clothed with unlimited legal-tender quality, redeemable in debts and taxes, and of a proper volume, would be an ideal money. If such paper money were established, and the Secretary of the Treasury were required to pay it out in lieu of all other money now in the Treasury, or hereafter to be received; if he were further required to destroy all other paper money of whatever description, in or to be in the Treasury; and to sell as bullion all gold and silver in or to be paid into the Treasury, and to replace it all with the newly established paper money, the volume of circulation in the country would thereby be neither increased nor diminished; but it would consist of a single circulating medium, which, to the exclusion of all other money, would be clothed with the money function and legal-tender power.

Does anybody doubt that the only money which would pay debts and taxes, in the richest country in the world, would be the best money? Every resident, and every foreigner, desiring to buy property, pay debts or taxes in this country, would be compelled to have it. Would not such a demand be sufficient? If it be contended that the present supply of money is adequate, it can not be maintained that it will continue to be so. The growth of population and business constantly increases the demand for money; and the supply must also be increased to prevent contraction. The percentage of increase of population is known, and a like per cent of money could be added, by covering into the Treasury a further amount of representative paper money, in lieu of taxes, and the paying out of the same for current expenses.

The increase of business might require a greater percentage of increase in the volume of money than the growth of the population would indicate. In that case it would be necessary to resort to that certain and reliable gauge of the volume of money, which is found in the general range of prices. Competent and reliable statisticians might be employed to investigate prices, and ascertain whether general prices were rising or falling. If rising, the amount of money covered into the Treasury, from time to time, might be diminished, and, if falling, an increased supply must be found until stability in general prices should be restored and maintained. It is the volume of money which regulates general prices, and, by the rise and fall of general prices, any excess or deficiency in the volume of money in circulation is shown.

The reason why general prices, and the volume of money, respond and correspond to each other, is because the money in circulation, and all the property for sale, are reciprocally the supply and demand for each other. The confusion which exists with regard to the relation between money and prices, arises from a comparison of isolated articles or commodities, with money. The demand for money is equal to the demand for all other things; because it is the universal order for property; but the demand for each kind of property is limited. Its value, as compared with other property, and its price in money, depend upon the supply and demand of the particular kind of property. The fluctuations, in price or value, of every description of property, in obedience to the law of supply and demand, have no effect upon the aggregate value of all property offered for sale; for that value is dependent, solely, upon the total supply of money.

VII. SCIENTIFIC REFORM OR DESTRUCTION.

Whatever credit devices may be invented, whether Government or bank currency, redeemable in gold, or private checks, bills of exchange or other promises to pay, the volume of the circulating medium must ultimately depend upon the volume of money clothed with every money function. Money redeemable in other money is simply a form of credit. Credit is limited by the means of payment or redemption. Since prehistoric times and up to the year 1873, the fabric of credit, including currency redeemable in coin, rested on both gold and silver. That part of the foundation which consisted of silver has been removed, and the silver coin, which formed at least one-half of the base, has been converted into credit money, to be redeemed in gold. In round numbers, the gold coin, silver coin, and paper money of the world, are about equal to each other. The pyramid was firm and substantial while gold and silver were the base and constituted two-thirds of the fabric, and while paper, the apex, represented only about one-third. It now stands: gold coin, one-third, for the apex; and silver and paper, two-thirds, for the base; but the pyramid is reversed, with the apex at the bottom.

The load of credit resting on gold must be greatly reduced to correspond with the gold standard, and that is the process now going on, which has produced the current financial "squeeze," and to which the authors of the ruin point as an "object lesson."

The hope of relief by increasing debts, or issuing more currency redeemable in gold, is vain. The inflation of prices, by issuing paper redeemable in gold, without gold for redemption, must end in panic and collapse. It would be like attempting a permanent cure of delirium tremens by an increased indulgence in strong drink. The grasp of gold contraction can only be temporarily relieved by credit devices, as a patient is sometimes revived, when suffering from the effects of alcoholism, by a cocktail in the morning, only to be sunk to a still lower depth of depression by the inevitable reaction later in the day. Banks are the storm centers of panics. The squeeze of 1893, to force the gold standard, pumped the wind out of $4,500,000,000 of bank credits, based on $500,000,000 of reserves. But the "object lesson" has not silenced the demand of the gold trust for more credit and less money.

The alternative of scientific money, of material other than gold and silver, or the restoration of the automatic theory, is presented to the creditor class. The revolution which they have inaugurated to destroy the automatic theory must either be arrested by the restoration of silver or by the invention and establishment of a better system.

The preliminary effects of the gold-standard contraction have paralyzed enterprise and destroyed the prospect of future credits. It is now destroying existing obligations, and, when its deadly work shall have been fully accomplished, all bonded debts will have been liquidated by repudiation and bankruptcy. If blind greed is to be the only guide of the money powers in the future, as it has been in the past, the horrors of universal ruin and the disorganization of society may be realized before the work of reconstruction can be begun. The hope still exists that there is sufficient intelligence in the masses to direct their dormant energies in a mighty effort to break the chains of contraction, with which fraud and avarice have bound the limbs of enterprise. If this hope can be realized, the civilization of the nineteenth century will escape the abyss of degradation and want in which all preceding civilizations have perished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). If there be no objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance. The Chair hears none.

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. GRAY. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the regular order of business, the bill known as the elections bill, though the time for the consideration of the unfinished business has not yet quite arrived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business at this hour. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, the powers which the framers of the Constitution of the United States conferred upon Congress constitute its most forceful possibilities. I use the term possibilities because they must be put into action by Congress in order to effect the purposes of their creation. If allowed to remain dormant they never would accomplish the purposes for which they were created; nor could this Republic ever have become the great nation it now is. There could have been but little effective governmental movement without legislation by Congress.

The supreme character of the Republic was well and forcefully provided for in that provision of the Constitution which declares that:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under

the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

But to give this provision of the Constitution its full force, legislation by Congress was necessary. Without this the Government of the United States would have been, and would have remained, a negative quantity. To avoid such a contingency the Constitution provides that Senators and Representatives "shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution." It is true that this provision applies not only to Senators and Representatives in Congress, but also to "the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States;" and this clause will justify the suggestion that if the Legislatures and the executive and judicial officers of all the States had observed their oaths of office, the war of the rebellion would not have occurred. This they did not do, and the result was a prolonged and most unjustifiable defiance of and resistance to the authority of the nation.

For years it lasted, and imposed upon the people all of the horrors which war induces. The panorama of death, physical disabilities, public and private indebtedness which the years of that war presents is one which will ever arrest the attention and invite the study of the people of this country. The present generation and those which shall follow it will ever find most helpful and enduring lessons depicted thereon, suggestive and illustrative of the duties of the people of this Republic. The trials, griefs, disabilities, deaths, burdens, deprivations, and sacrifices which come upon our people as depicted on this historic panorama seem almost too great to have been successfully borne in view of the complication of circumstances then existent and ever attendant upon our people all through the years of the war of the rebellion. But the loyal people of the Republic were equal to the burden imposed on them. They were true to their trust and triumphed.

Mr. President, it was not alone with the features and elements of the case which I have enumerated that the loyal citizens of the nation dealt. They gave considerate, thoughtful, conservative, and conscientious attention to all of the possibilities of the case which pressed upon them. The result was several amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Human slavery, and the demands of the States supporting it, was the cause of the war of the rebellion. The loyal elements of our population resolved that slavery should be abolished. This action was taken by the adoption of the amendment which declares that—

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The adoption of this amendment put an end to the hateful presence which had induced the war of the rebellion, and it will here be observed that the people resolved that the power of Congress to make the abolition of slavery effective should not be subject to the frequent uncertainties of judicial action, and therefore clothed it with full power to enforce the abolition of slavery by appropriate legislation.

No one has disputed the effectiveness of this amendment of the Constitution. Slavery departed from the United States What remained in its place? A mass of citizens, recognized as such by the Constitution, but inadequately protected by its terms. These were members of the colored race. Most of them had been slaves. The loyal sentiment appreciated these circumstances and placed another amendment in the Constitution, which I will hereafter quote and comment upon, and by force of which no citizen can be excluded by any State from the ballot box "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Mr. President, it would be well for this Republic if every man entitled to exercise the right of voting would do his full duty toward keeping the way to the ballot box open to every citizen entitled to cast his vote therein. That is the Constitution and the law of the nation, and whoever interposes obstacles to the enjoyment and right exercise of this power to vote when thus conferred violates his highest duty as a citizen. There is not a member of this body possessed of a more sacred right to go to the ballot-box and deposit his vote than belongs to the humblest voter in the State which he here in part represents. It would be much better for our common country if every citizen should observe this rule and aid in its enforcement. Far better would it be for our common interests if a united effort were put in resolute exercise for the defense of the purity of the ballot box than by inaction to allow its sacred character to be assailed by practices now by far too common. A pure ballot box will be more effective in maintaining right methods in legislation and in the administration of the affairs of this Republic than any other factor known to our system of government.

In order to be possessed of this forceful factor we must not only prevent all persons from casting ballots into said box who are not entitled by the Constitution and laws so to do, but we must also keep the way to the box open and unobstructed to all citizens who are lawfully entitled to exercise the right of suffrage. In addition to this, it is the duty of the Government to so provide by appropriate legislation as to assure correct returns of the ballots cast in accordance with the provisions of the laws relating thereto. When these ends are accomplished this nation will be blessed with pure elections and correct returns of the results thereof. Every patriotic citizen, whether in official station or in the walks of private life, should resolutely work for the effecting of these ends.

Mr. President, the provisions of the laws of the United States which it is the purpose of the bill now under consideration to repeal were all enacted with the sole purpose of assuring to every citizen entitled to cast a ballot the opportunity to exercise the right, and to have his judgment properly reported in the returns of the election. Was this a wrong purpose? What citizen of the United States whose thoughts, opinions, and acts consistently work together for the promotion of the best interests of the Republic would for a moment entertain the purpose of giving an affirmative answer to this question? No citizen whose patriotism rises above selfish and party considerations and purposes will give such an answer. There is nothing in the laws which it is the purpose of the bill now under consideration to repeal which can suggest to any such citizen a sufficient reason for changing his position in this respect. It will be an unfortunate happening for the true interests and stability of the institutions of this Republic should these conditions be reversed.

Mr. President, it may be well to call attention to some of the sections of the Revised Statutes which it is the purpose of this bill to repeal, and this I will do.

Section 2004 reads as follows, viz:

All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State or Territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivision, shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all such elections, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State, Territory, or by or under its authority to the contrary notwithstanding.

From what source did Congress derive the power to enact this law? From the Constitution of the United States, in which is embodied in Article XV the sections which read as follows, viz:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment was proclaimed, in due form, a part of the Constitution March 30, 1870, having been ratified by the Legislatures of twenty-nine of the thirty-seven States. In the list of States which joined in the ratification of said amendment we find North Carolina, West Virginia, Louisiana, South Carolina, Arkansas, Florida, Virginia, Missouri, Mississippi, Texas, and Georgia, and this shows that no small part of the great and good work done in the matter of the amendment of the Constitution for the more perfect protection of the rights of citizens of the United States in the exercise and enjoyment of the sacred right of voting was supplied by States where slavery was formerly dominant.

It will be much to their credit now if the members of this body now representing them should, by their vote on the pending bill, announce their purpose of aiding in the enforcement of this provision of the Constitution by appropriate legislation. This would be evidence of continued good faith. Certainly it can not be successfully claimed that the section of the Revised Statutes which I have quoted is not appropriate legislation for the enforcement of the fifteenth article of the Constitution. Good faith and our obligations to constitutional duty demand that it shall retain its place in our laws, and that it shall be obeyed by all of the States.

Mr. President, in order to discharge the duties resting on us as members of the legislative department of the Government, we must go further than I have indicated. We must preserve the sections of the Revised Statutes relating to Federal elections by defeating the passage of the bill now before us. I shall not appropriate such an amount of time as would be required to refer to all of the provisions of law which would disappear from our statutes by the passage of this bill. Brief notice of a few sections will serve my purpose and explain my views of the general subject.

Section 2005 reads as follows viz:

When, under the authority of the constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of any Territory, any act is required to be done as a prerequisite or qualification for voting, and by such constitution or laws persons or officers are charged with the duty of furnishing to citizens an opportunity to perform such prerequisite, or to become qualified to vote, every such person and officer shall give to all citizens of the United States the same and equal opportunity to perform such prerequisite and to become qualified to vote.

Will any member of this body question the justice, propriety, and fairness of this section of the Revised Statutes? It is one of the sections embraced in the repealing provision of the bill we are now considering, and it would be interesting to listen to some Senator who might venture to invent and express a reason for its repeal. I doubt that any Senator will make the venture. It would be impossible for the most astute member of the committee which reported this bill to perform such a task. The entire scope of the section is a mere command that any officer or person charged by law with an obligation to perform a duty shall obey his oath of office.

If he shall fail to do so then he should be dealt with therefor, and section 2006 makes provision for such contingency, and is couched in the following words:

Every person or officer charged with the duty specified in the preceding section, who refuses or knowingly omits to give full effect to that section, shall forfeit the sum of $500 to the party aggrieved by such refusal or omission, to be recovered by an action in the case, with costs, and such allowance for counsel fees as the court may deem just.

Who will venture to question the propriety and justice of this section? Why should not a citizen entitled to vote be given a remedy, such as is here provided, against a person or public officer who by reason of his own neglect or refusal to perform his defined duty inflicts the injury and wrong upon him? Will some one undertake the task of presenting an answer to this question?

The remedy provided for in the section last quoted is of a personal character against the officer or other person charged with the performance of a public duty, and thereby deprives the citizen of his right to vote. But Congress did not fail to take care of the public interest in such cases when it enacted the laws we are now considering. The public has a definite interest in protecting the citizen in the exercise of the right of suffrage. The purpose of the law is to afford opportunity to all citizens entitled to give voice in respect of our public affairs to do so. Hence provision is made in section 2007 of the Revised Statutes for the more perfect protection of the public interests in cases wherein public officers or other persons may have failed or refused to perform their duties. The section named reads as follows, viz:

Whenever under the authority of the constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of any Territory, any act is required to be done by a citizen as a prerequisite to qualify or entitle him to vote, the offer of such citizen to perform the act required to be done shall, if it fail to be carried into execution by reason of the wrongful act or omission of the person or officer charged with the duty of receiving or permitting such performance, or offer to perform, or acting thereon, be deemed and held as a performance in law of such act; and the person so offering and failing to vote, and being otherwise qualified, shall be entitled to vote in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had in fact performed such act.

Mr. President, these citations are sufficient for my present purpose. They show that the object and intent which induced the enactment of the provisions of law which it is the purpose of the bill now under consideration to repeal was solely to protect the citizen entitled to vote at the elections to which they refer to cast his ballot, and assure to the public interests involved therein correct returns of the results arrived at. All the provisions of law relating to the appointment of deputy marshals, supervisors of elections, jurisdiction of the courts in respect of elections are but instrumentalities for the accomplishment of the great object and purpose of the legislation, as I have already stated. If we want pure elections and undefiled returns thereof we will not assure the country of either by the passage of this bill. Nor can we find any excuse for doing it in the often-repeated assertion of the supporters of this measure that the legislation which they now seek to repeal is violative of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

If there is any truth in this contention, why do they not go into the courts of the United States and seek their remedy there? I presume that the most effective answer they can make to this inquiry is that they have been there and that the Supreme Court of the United States, after very thorough presentation of the constitutional question in all of its aspects and features, differed from them and held that the provisions of the statutes complained of were not violative of the Constitution, but in entire harmony with it.

In the case of *Ex parte* Siebold, 10 Otto, 371, the Supreme Court of the United States definitely passed upon every question of constitutional construction involved in the enactment by Congress of the several provisions of the laws now in force, and which it is the purpose of the bill we are now considering to repeal. In treating in general of the power of Congress to enacs laws for the regulation of elections the court expressed its views in language as follows, viz:

The clause of the Constitution under which the power of Congress, as well as that of the State Legislatures, to regulate the election of Senators and Representatives arises, is as follows: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators."

It seems to us that the natural sense of these words is the contrary of that assumed by the counsel of the petitioners. After first authorizing the States to prescribe the regulations it is added: "The Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations." "Make or alter." What is the plain meaning of these words? If not under the prepossession of some abstract theory of the relations between the State and National Governments, we should not have any difficulty in understanding them.

There is no declaration that the regulations shall be made either wholly by the State Legislatures or wholly by Congress. If Congress does not interfere, of course they may be wholly by the State; but if it chooses to interfere there is nothing in the words to prevent its doing so, either wholly or partially. On the contrary, their necessary implication is that it may do either. It may either make the regulations or it may alter them. If it only alters, leaving, as manifest convenience requires, the general organization of the polls to the State, there results a necessary coöperation of the two governments in regulating the subject. But no repugnance in the system of regulations can arise thence, for the power of Congress over the subject is paramount. It may be exercised as and when Congress sees fit to exercise it. When exercised, the action of Congress, so far as it extends and conflicts with the regulations of the State, necessarily supersedes them. This is implied in the power to "make or alter."

The Supreme Court, in the same opinion from which the foregoing quotation is made, and in further illustration of the reasonableness and accuracy of the position stated, expressed itself in language as follows, viz:

Suppose the constitution of a State should say "the first Legislature elected under this constitution may by law regulate the election of members of the two Houses; but any subsequent Legislature may make or alter such regulations," could not a subsequent Legislature modify the regulations made by the first Legislature without making an entirely new act? Would it be obliged to go over the whole subject anew? Manifestly not; it could alter or modify, add or subtract in its discretion. The greater power of making wholly new regulations would include the lesser of only altering or modifying the old. The new law, if contrary or repugnant to the old, would so far, and so far only, take its place. If consistent with it, both would stand.

The objection, so often repeated, that such an application of Congressional regulations to those previously made by a State would produce a clashing of jurisdictions and a conflict of rules, loses sight of the fact that the regulations made by Congress are paramount to those made by the State Legislature; and if they conflict therewith, the latter, so far as the conflict extends, ceases to be operative. No clashing can possibly arise. There is not the slightest difficulty in a harmonious combination into one system of the regulations made by the two sovereignties, any more than there is in the case of prior and subsequent enactments of the same Legislature.

Mr. President, whoever may read with care and study with patriotic purpose the opinion of the Supreme Court to which I have referred and from which I have quoted, can not fail to discover that it answers all of the arguments presented in this body in support of the demand made for the repeal of the Federal election laws as contained in the sections of the Revised Statutes mentioned in the bill which we are now considering. I apply this remark to all that has been or may be said concerning the sections which provide for the appointment of deputy marshals, supervisors of elections, and all other instrumentalities provided for the enforcement of those provisions of law which it is the purpose of this bill to repeal. The court in its opinion states definitely its judgment on this feature of the case in language too clear to be misunderstood, and from which I make the following quotation, viz:

It must also be remembered that we are dealing with the question of power, not of the expediency of any regulations which Congress has made. That is not within the pale of our jurisdiction. In the exercise of the power, however, we are bound to presume that Congress has done so in a judicious manner; that it has endeavored to guard as far as possible against any unnecessary interference with State laws and regulations, with the duties of State officers, or with local prejudices. It could not act at all so as to accomplish any beneficial object in preventing frauds and violence and securing the faithful performance of duty at the elections without providing for the presence of officers and agents to carry its regulations into effect. It is also difficult to see how it could attain these objects without imposing proper sanctions and penalties against offenders.

And now I quote from the concluding portion of the opinion of the court, as follows, viz:

In our judgment Congress had the power to vest the appointment of the supervisors in question in the circuit courts.

The true doctrine, as we conceive, is this: That whilst the States are really sovereign as to all matters which have not been granted to the jurisdiction and control of the United States, the Constitution and constitutional laws of the latter are, as we have already said, the supreme law of the land; and, when they conflict with the laws of the States, they are of paramount authority and obligation. This is the fundamental principle on which the authority of the Constitution is based, and unless it be conceded in practice as well as theory the fabric of our institutions, as contemplated by its founders, can not stand. The questions involved have respect not more to the autonomy and existence of the States, than to the continued existence of the United States as a Government to which every American citizen may look for security and protection in every part of the land.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court has been firm, consistent, and practical in its treatment of the constitutional questions embraced within the field of governmental problems with which we are now dealing. It has been true to the nation as organized under the Constitution and which has carried this Republic so grandly forward in the lines of development and progress. It has been faithful to the States by holding them to the performance of their constitutional duties as factors in the formation of the political result, the union of the States. It has been true to the citizens by its support and enforcement of laws enacted by Congress for protection of their rights, as defined in the letter and by the spirit of the Constitution established for the security of all. Its decisions have approved and affirmed every feature of

the provisions of the several sections of the Revised Statutes, the repeal of which is the purpose of the bill we are now considering. It has held these provisions of our national law not only necessary to the protection of the purity of our elections, but also for the perpetuity of the Republic itself.

In *ex parte* Yarbrough, United States Reports, volume 110, page 557, the court expressed its opinion on one feature of the case in language as follows, viz:

That a government whose essential character is republican, whose executive head and legislative body are both elective, whose most numerous and powerful branch of the legislature is elected by the people directly, has no power by appropriate laws to secure this election from the influence of violence, of corruption, and of fraud, is a proposition so startling as to arrest attention and demand the gravest consideration.

If this Government is anything more than a mere aggregation of delegated agents of other States and governments, each of which is superior to the General Government, it must have the power to protect the elections on which its existence depends from violence and corruption.

If it has not this power it is left helpless before the two great enemies of all republics, open violence and insidious corruption.

Further on in the opinion thus quoted from, the court propounds the following forceful questions relative to the power of Congress, viz:

Will it be denied that it is in the power of that body to provide laws for the proper conduct of those elections? To provide, if necessary, the officers who shall conduct them and make return of the result? And especially to provide, in an election held under its own authority, for security of life and limb to the voter while in the exercise of this function? Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes from personal violence or intimidation, and the election itself from corruption and fraud?

* * * * * * *

These questions answer themselves; and it is only because the Congress of the United States, through long habit and long years of forbearance, has in deference and respect to the States refrained from the exercise of these powers that they are now doubted.

But when, in pursuance of a new demand for action, that body, as it did in the cases just enumerated, finds it necessary to make additional laws for the free, the pure, and the safe exercise of this right of voting, they stand upon the same ground and are to be upheld for the same reasons.

It is said that the parties assaulted in these cases are not officers of the United States, and their protection in exercising the right to vote by Congress does not stand on the same ground.

But the distinction is not well taken. The power in either case arises out of the circumstance that the function in which the party is engaged or the right which he is about to exercise is dependent on the laws of the United States.

In both cases it is the duty of that Government to see that he may exercise this right freely, and to protect him from violence while so doing, or on account of so doing. This duty does not arise solely from the interest of the party concerned, but from the necessity of the Government itself, that its service shall be free from the adverse influence of force and fraud practiced on its agents, and that the votes by which its members of Congress and its President are elected shall be the free votes of the electors, and the officers thus chosen the uncorrupted choice of those who have the right to take part in that choice.

Mr. President, the Supreme Court in the case cited gave most thorough and patriotic consideration to all of the phases presented by it, and by its judgment affirmed the constitutionality of the acts of Congress which will disappear from the nation's laws in the event of the passage of the bill now being considered by this body. If Congress shall abandon its constitutional duty to maintain laws for the protection of our citizens in the exercise of their right to vote and to assure purity in the returns of the results of the elections, then, indeed, may we realize the force of the suggestion embodied in the last paragraph of the opinion of the court, from which I have been quoting.

That paragraph is couched in the following language:

If the Government of the United States has within its constitutional domain no authority to provide against these evils, if the very sources of power may be poisoned by corruption or controlled by violence and outrage, without legal restraint, then, indeed, is the country in danger; and its best powers, its highest purposes, the hopes which it inspires, and the love which enshrines it, are at the mercy of the combinations of those who respect no right but brute force on the one hand and unprincipled corruptionists on the other.

Mr. President, the passage of the bill now before the Senate would be, in effect, a declaration by Congress that the laws now in force for the regulation of Federal elections are unconstitutional. It is upon this ground that the Democratic party plants itself in its efforts and movements for the repeal of the present existing laws. Hence the present contention over the subject may, without deviation from the lines of truth, be entitled The Democratic Party *vs.* The Constitution and the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, by virtue of the judicial functions and powers with which it is clothed by the Constitution, is authorized to pass upon any law which Congress may enact, in respect of its constitutionality, whenever a case presenting that issue reaches the court for adjudication. As I have already stated and demonstrated by quotations from the opinions of the Supreme Court, that tribunal has affirmed the constitutionality of the present Federal election laws. It has affirmed the necessity for the existence of such laws for the proper protection of the highest and most sacred interests of our citizens who respect and obey the laws of the nation and of the Republic itself. The Democratic party takes issue with the court and proposes to repeal all national laws now in force without any declared or even intimated purpose to enact any regulations in their stead, notwithstanding the danger to the nation and its most sacred interests as presented in the concluding paragraph in the opinion in *ex parte* Yarbrough, which I have heretofore quoted.

The facts presented in the views of the minority of the Committee of Privileges and Elections in respect of the action of the Democratic party relative to elections in States dominated by that political organization, furnish no ground upon which to base hope for improvement in the future. In all of the cases and instances given in the views of the minority, none can be found which give promise of equality in the exercise of the ballot and of truthful returns of the results of the actual voting done. Cunningly devised constitutional and statutory schemes have been adopted to assure Democratic partisan domination in the election proceedings of the States, regardless of actual political views of each citizen entitled to vote.

Let me cite the case of the State of Mississippi as an example of the cunningly devised schemes adopted to assure the domination of the Democratic party in that Commonwealth. The lieutenant governor and secretary of state appoint the commissioners of elections for each county, and the latter appoint the inspectors of elections. This conflicts with much that has been said here in opposition to the Federal election laws, because, as it is alleged, they remove the appointment of the deputy marshals and inspectors of election from the localities in which the elections are held. This is exactly what this Mississippi plan does, but it also tends to assure continued Democratic partisan domination in the politics of the State. The first fact is used here as an argument in favor of the passage of the bill now under consideration, while at the same time the result which flows from it commends it to the favor and support of the same minds because of the belief that it will aid their political organization in carrying local elections.

But, Mr. President, this is not all there is of the Mississippi plan for assuring Democratic partisan control of the government and affairs of the State. It is bad enough, but it was deemed necessary in order to give full effect to the most reprehensible part of the scheme. The part to which I now refer is found in section 244 of article 12 of the constitution of the State, which reads as follows, viz:

On and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1892, every elector shall, in addition to the foregoing qualifications, be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof. A new registration shall be made before the next ensuing election after January 1, A. D. 1892.

Now, let us keep in mind that the constitution of the State is so framed as to secure Democratic election officers throughout the State, in all of the counties thereof. The day of election arrives, and the election officers are in their places with purpose to do their full partisan work. A voter approaches the polls with intent to vote a Republican or Populist ballot. The election officer says to him: "Can you read?" The voter replies, "No; the school system of the State in my childhood afforded me no chance to go to school, and I can not read." "Very well," replies the Democratic election officer, "I will read to you a section of the constitution of the State and see if you understand it." The section is read, and doubtless it is one of the most difficult in the instrument for the comprehension of the average voter. When read, the question is put to him, "Do you understand what I have read?" The voter replies, "Yes, I understand that, for I was in the court-house yesterday and I heard the judge give a decision on that very section," and then he proceeds to relate what the judge declared to be its proper construction. The election officer replies, "That will not do, you do not understand the section at all, but I will give you another chance to get your vote in. I will read another section to you and see if you can give me a reasonable interpretation thereof." He reads the section, and the anxious voter gives his interpretation of it. It may be entirely reasonable, but if the officer should admit it, then he must accept the tendered ballot and place it in the box. But that is not what he is there for, and tells the uneasy voter, "Your interpretation is not a reasonable one, and you can not vote." This ends the interview, and the citizen leaves the polling place a disfranchised man, not because he was not possessed of sufficient comprehension to comply with at least one of the constitutional conditions, but for the reason that he did not propose to vote the ticket of the party to which the election officer belonged.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WILSON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator whether he discovered, in examining the constitution and laws of Mississippi, any escape whatever for the voter from the decision of the inspectors of elections that the voter's interpretation of the most abstruse clause in the constitution of Mississippi is not a reasonable one?

Mr. WILSON. Not any.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is not the judgment of those inspectors absolute?

Mr. WILSON. It is paramount.

Mr. CHANDLER. So that if they want a man to vote they say that his interpretation is reasonable and they let him vote, and if they do not want him to vote, they say that his interpretation is unreasonable and exclude him from voting.

Mr. WILSON. That is the system as embodied in the constitution of Mississippi.

Mr. CHANDLER. And there is no escape for the voter from the imperative judgment of those inspectors?

Mr. WILSON. I have not discovered any except that which the protection of the Federal election laws would give where the voter might get a remedy in Federal elections.

Mr. CHANDLER. After the election.

Mr. WILSON. After the election; but he can not vote. I may venture here to remark that it is not unreasonable to believe that the election officer did just what he was appointed to do; that is what he was there for; his authority was paramount; he could exclude from the ballot box the vote of an intelligent Republican, no matter whether white or colored, on the ground that he did not give a reasonable interpretation of some section of the constitution of the State presented to him as a test, when in fact his interpretation was far more reasonable than any that the ignorant election officer could give. No wonder that Mississippi is the closely sealed box of Democratic domination which her present constitution was framed to create and perpetuate.

Much has been said by those who favor the repeal of the Federal election laws in laudation of the doctrine of home rule and local self-government. Concerning this feature of the case the minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in the views presented by it to the Senate, presents this paragraph for our consideration, viz:

> But this idea is utterly set at naught in some of the Southern States. Instead of trusting the people of the localities, the laws have been carefully drawn to keep the control of elections away from the residents of the town or precinct where the voting is done, and to furnish the means of securing from each locality such results as are desired to a central power in the State, sometimes to one individual alone—the governor.

The cases and illustrations presented by the minority amply sustain this statement, and that the cry in favor of home rule which we have heard of often here has no home in the States referred to. Central power is the rule there, and the partisan Democracy which it serves wants nothing to interfere with its paramount domination. It will tolerate criminal interference with a voter's rights if he dissents from the views and purposes of the central power. It has a vivid recollection of that unpatriotic exclamation so often used by it in the years of the past, "Anything to beat Grant," and has merely changed the form of expressing itself to "anything to beat the Republican party."

It would close the ballot boxes in the States referred to against the votes of Republican voters, while in New York City, where Tammany is paramount, it will throw wide open the ballot boxes for the reception of unauthorized and criminal ballots of thousands of applicants who have no right to vote. Hence the persistent cry, "Repeal the Federal election laws."

Mr. President, if we yield to this demand we will not perform an act which will tend to promote the best interests of this Republic. Far better will it be if we all join in determined effort to so formulate our laws as to purify all of our election methods, and to secure to every citizen who is lawfully entitled to vote, the opportunity so to do, and to effectually guard the ballot box against invasion by any and all persons who are not entitled to vote. A free and pure ballot and a fair and just count is a rule which, if put into actual and permanent practice, will assure to our nation a future of progress, permanent prosperity, and unexampled glory. Purity in national elections will assure a like result in the conduct of the affairs of Government.

Let us not undo what has been accomplished, for no good result will come to our common country by such a reversal of the progress we have made. There is more in this work than the supposed or temporary interest of any party organization. Corrupt elections will not confer permanent success on any political party which may win a victory by such instrumentalities.

Mr. President, whatever may be the result of the vote on this bill, it will receive no support from me. The probability is that the bill will pass this body and become a law, as it has already passed the House of Representatives. The Democratic party has command of majorities in both branches of Congress. If that party shall take upon itself the responsibility which now confronts it, and repeal the only laws now on our statute books for the protection of the purity of national elections, the time will come, and it will not be long delayed, when it will be relegated to a minority position in the Congress of the United States, and the people will rejoice.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, there are several reasons why I should like to make some remarks this afternoon upon the resolution offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], which is upon the table. I expected to have had an opportunity to do so this morning during the morning hour. I ask whether the Senator will allow me to take the floor for that purpose?

Mr. CHANDLER. I dislike to interpose an objection to the Senator's remarks, but I will make a proposition of a broader nature to the Senator from Delaware, who I see is in charge of the pending bill.

I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that the bill be allowed to go over until the first Monday in December next. In the absence of any recommendation from the President of the United States that this bill should be passed, I am led to infer that the President would be very willing to have the election laws remain upon the statute books to be tested at another Congressional election. I am not aware of any recommendation of the President that this bill should be passed; and therefore I suggest to the Senator, if there be no objection, that unanimous consent be granted that the bill go over until the first Monday in December next, and that the Senator from Illinois be allowed to proceed with his remarks at the present time.

Mr. GRAY. I am very loath to wound the tender relations which exist between the Senator from New Hampshire and the President of the United States; but, notwithstanding that, I have a duty to perform, and, without regarding those relations which compel the Senator to subordinate his own views to what are the supposed views of the Executive, I must still insist upon the pending bill being considered at this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. With the consent of the Senator from Delaware I yield, if he does not object, to the Senator from Illinois only for this afternoon.

Mr. GRAY. I can not control the Senator from New Hampshire in yielding his time to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. I shall not occupy the whole afternoon, probably not over three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] may now be taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the pending order be temporarily laid aside in order to take up the resolution to which he has referred. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. Not displacing the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Temporarily, without displacing the unfinished business in any way. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

The Senate proceeded to consider the following resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 3d instant:

> *Resolved*, That in the opinion of the Senate, pending the investigation ordered by resolution of December 21, directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to inquire into our relations with Hawaii, there should be no interference on the part of this Government, by moral influence or physical force, for the restoration of Liliuokalani or the maintenance of the Provisional Government in the Hawaiian Islands, and that our naval forces should be used in said islands only for the protection of the lives and property of American citizens.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, the Hawaiian constitution of 1864, as granted by King Kamehameha V, continued in force from that year until 1887, when the oppression and the corruption which attended the reign of his successor, King Kalakaua, produced such a state of public feeling that a popular demonstration, a public mass meeting, was held in the city of Honolulu, on June 30, 1887, to inaugurate peacefully a change in the constitution. The demonstration was so great, and the evident determination of the people so apparent, that King Kalakaua immediately in writing consented to agree to the wishes of the people, saying:

> Any guarantees which may be reasonably required of us under the constitution and laws of our Kingdom will be at once conceded.

The result was that a new constitution was constructed, containing new and necessary restrictions of the royal prerogatives, and new guaranties of the reserved privileges and rights of the people and of the Legislature. This constitution was the one in force until January, 1893, when Kalakaua's successor, Queen Liliuokalani, by her act of revolution and practical abdication, withdrew the same and announced, that of her own motion and regardless of the wishes of the Legislature and people, she should proclaim a new one. She proposed to revoke all the conditions and guaranties of the constitution of 1887, and to proclaim another which should practically make herself the absolute monarch of the Kingdom, subject to no control by the legislative power. She declared that she would no longer continue

subject to the wholesome restraint upon the royal will which the constitution had established, and which had been mutually approved by the King and people, thus violating the oath she had taken in its support upon her coronation as Queen.

The constitution of 1887 was, in the main, modeled after that of the United States, in so far as it seemed possible to adopt a republican constitution to a monarchical government.

It differed from the previous constitution in this: That it was not simply a grant from the King to the people, but a supreme ordinance in the creation of which the King joins with and fully recognizes the authority of the people. The preamble of this constitution concludes in the following language:

> Now, therefore, I, Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands, in my capacity as sovereign of this Kingdom, and as the representative of the people, hereunto by them duly authorized and empowered, do annul and abrogate the constitution promulgated by Kamahameha the Fifth, on the 20th day of August, A. D. 1864, and do proclaim and promulgate this constitution.

Thus, it will be seen, that for either estate, whether crown or people, to attempt without full acquiescence by the other, to withdraw, revoke, abandon, or abolish this most solemnly adopted supreme constitution, would be a clear act of revolution, treasonable in its character, equivalent at the very least to abdication.

By the act of Queen Liliuokalani, in publicly announcing that she should abrogate the constitution and issue one of her own and by taking the necessary steps to complete the royal revolution, she became simply Mrs. Dominis, having stripped herself of all regal authority. The people took her at her word, and in the most usual, decent and proper way, proceeded to organize a temporary government of the people and by the people. Had the people attempted by revolution to dethrone her by armed power, cast her into prison, banished or executed her, where would have been the power of the United States to interfere in the matter? In Brazil to-day armed revolution exists, which if it be successful will overturn governments and possibly imprison or execute leaders. Where is the prerogative of the United States to interfere, any further than has already been done for the protection of American interests?

The constitution of 1887, upon comparison with that of 1864, shows that the principal amendments adopted were such as should more fully recognize the individual rights of citizens and people, and more definitely restrict the sovereign from interfering with the representative and lawmaking power.

Notwithstanding all the care exercised in the preparation of this constitution to prevent royal interference with or control of the lawmaking power, the late Queen, during her reign, through her cabinet and privy council, began by corruption and intimidation to exert an influence upon individual members of the Legislature to legalize a subsidized traffic in opium, to establish the Louisiana lottery, and press other measures, for the passage of which money was paid to the royal favorites. The situation was becoming unbearable and the people were again becoming restless under the encroachments of the Crown. When, as stated, in January last, the Queen, by the withdrawal of the constitution under which her monarchical authority alone could exist, practically abdicated the throne and became a revolutionist, this was an arbitrary and unlawful act upon her part; an assumption of a new and imperial power which recognized no right existing by virtue of the constitution, in any of her subjects, to participation in legislation or other function, except as might be graciously permitted by Her Majesty. In other words, she assumed the right and power to change a constitutional monarchy having its limited prerogatives, which guaranteed to the people certain rights of representation, into an absolute monarchy, subject alone to her own sweet will.

The act was as much a crime, and as certainly a revolution, in so far as it affected the people, as was the *coup d'état* of Napoleon in declaring himself Dictator or Emperor of France. It was in effect a crime, and as really an abdication of all right to the throne as would be the act of an American President who should, on some fine morning, renounce his constitutional allegiance and create a revolution by declaring himself the dictator paramount of the United States.

She had by the withdrawal and attempted practical revocation of that constitution, which was the written limitation of her power and authority and the established guaranty of the people's privileges, become a public enemy, and was guilty of treason to the country whose throne she had disgraced. The moment her declared purpose was manifest, the people, in their own right, took upon themselves the sovereignty, and peacefully but manfully organized a provisional or temporary government.

Abundant testimony has been furnished upon every hand, in controversion of the assumed theory of the President and the Secretary of State, and the reported declaration of Minister Willis, that the revolution was primarily incited and fostered by United States Minister Stevens and by Capt. Wiltse, who was in command of the Boston. That theory has been so completely disproven, not only by the great chain of circumstantial and corroborative evidence, but by direct and conclusive testimony, which proof has been accepted by the mass of the American people as ample and sufficient, that it would be an imposition upon the patience of the Senate, as well as upon the public, to present it again on this occasion.

The assumption, which we have so often heard, that the act of Minister Stevens in recognizing the Provisional Government, was an act of unjustifiable interference and intimidation, in the face of which the Queen was compelled, as by force, to retire, is untrue. It has been, by the most undeniable testimony, established, that every request of Minister Stevens, and every order of Capt. Wiltse made under such request, was within the limit of their duty. I most emphatically deny that there is any truth whatever, or substantial semblance of truth, in the assertions of invasion by the forces of the United States. But suppose the American forces had committed the act so alleged, what difference would that make as regards President Cleveland's act in attempting to recrown Mrs. Dominis? Mr. Cleveland found there an established government. You may call it what you will, but it was still a government, in possession and in operation. I believe it was both a government *de facto* and a government *de jure*. It was an actual, existing government. Mr. Cleveland knew this, for he accredited his special detective commissioner to its chief executive.

The American, German, English, Portuguese, Japanese, and other Governments recognized it as a government, and there was no shadow of rebellion against it or other foreign protest against even its annexation to the United States. The world at large acknowledged it, and the United States, above all other nations, were foreclosed from questioning its legitimacy. Waiving all this, where has the President of the United States found precedent or authority for the most singular action which we have seen?

Passing by some of the intermediate steps taken by the United States Government, such as the withdrawal of the pending treaty from this Senate; the sending of a special commissioner as a detective, to act as a spy upon a foreign Government, without the advice and consent of the Senate, then in session, and other equally ridiculous blunders of Falstaffian diplomacy, we have found a government in Hawaii recognized by the world in full control of affairs. There was, it is true, an American flag flying in Honolulu, to give earnest of the will of the United States that American interests and American citizens should be protected, and that the new Government should be allowed peacefully to conduct its administration pending the treaty negotiations with the United States.

Acting under instructions, this American spy performed his duty by frequent secret reports to the Secretary of State, as to what he found and as to what he did, which included the singular incident of pulling down the American flag.

On another occasion, in earlier history, a distinguished citizen of New York State, in his capacity as a member of the Cabinet of President Buchanan, issued an order something as follows: "If any man pull down the American flag, shoot him on the spot." At a later day, by the order, if I mistake not, of Gen. Butler, at New Orleans, one man was hanged for the same act for which another now receives the thanks of the Executive of the United States.

Another event in Revolutionary history has certain parallel lines to the story of the President's detective in Hawaii. Something over a hundred years ago a British officer of undoubted character and reputation was selected as the special commissioner of his Government to act the part which would complete the betrayal of West Point and other American forts into the hands of the British. Maj. Andre, the distinguished spy, was apprehended and paid the ponalty with his life.

Whatever may be said of desecrating our flag in Honolulu, that was only a humiliation to Americans and a self-inflicted disgrace to this Administration. But the stealing of an American spy into Hawaii, with credentials to the head of the recognized Government addressed "My great and good friend," for the simple and secret purpose of plotting and negotiating with Mrs. Dominis, then an enemy of that Government, and secretly and stealthily endeavoring to arrange for her reënthronement upon the ruins of the temporary or Provisional Government, was not that such an offensive act, that the Provisional Government would have been fully justified under the rules of war in declaring him to be a public enemy and treated accordingly? In the United States treason consists in levying war against the Government, or in adhering to its enemies, giving them aid and comfort. What was Blount in his relation to Hawaii? Neither more nor less than a public enemy. Personally I am very glad to see the ex-paramount here in Washington, walking safely about the Capitol; but I must confess that there would have

been a good deal of grim justice in the act if the Hawaiian Government had caused his trial either by the civil authorities or by court-marshal at Honolulu, as would have been done in any other government.

Just look at it! Purporting to be an ambassador and accredited to a recognized government, his secret instructions, not even made known to this Senate, if obeyed by him, put him in the attitude, in fact and effect, of the most despicable of offenders against international proprieties. True, his offense was that of his superiors merely, but the punishment is meted to the agent who is caught in the act. Maj. Andre suffered death; Commissioner Blount receives compensation from the United States, but the world condemns both him and his employers.

The people of the United States, of all shades of party faith, have discussed with bated breath almost, the series of events in our diplomatic service, initiated since March 7 last, and have seriously questioned the mental equilibrium of an Executive and Cabinet who could, either by accident or design, have stumbled into such unprecedented and incomprehensible errors.

It has never been charged seriously that President Cleveland was especially gifted as a diplomatist, or that the study of international law had been made a specialty in his academic curriculum. Consequently he has never been held immediately at fault for minor informalities in the direction of our foreign affairs. It has always been assumed that the Secretary of State is the immediate director of such subjects, and that in all important matters the approval of the President is either expressed or implied. But in the Hawaiian affair, the history of nine months of successive blunders is so full of the tragic, the ridiculous, and the farcical, and the responsibility has become so diffuse and generally uncertain, that the country has reached the conclusion that President, premier, and Cabinet, with all their new-fangled paramounts and mysterious cipher dispatches, are the mere tin-clad actors in a stupendous comedy of errors.

What a spectacle has been presented to the world! The future historian will not be able to comprehend the motives or understand and analyze the mental processes by which an American Executive could come to initiate such a policy. That chapter of American history which details the events of the year 1893 will consist either of undisguised condemnation or humiliating apology. Heretofore the diplomatic history of the United States, with trivial exceptions, has been a bright and glorious record, and its precedents have become standards of international procedure. Until now liberty, justice, and honor have been the legends inscribed upon each diplomatic act bearing the approval of American Presidents and Secretaries of State. No citizen of this country has ever before been called to hide his head when challenged upon the theater of the world, and forced to acknowledge the disgrace and shame of the Republic.

Our people have once again been taught how dear have become our institutions and how glorious the intensity of our citizenship. We have been menaced by foreign foes, and have maintained our integrity. We have had fearful and dreadful domestic warfare, and have emerged with honor. We have changed what was before but an almost imaginary bond of national cohesion into a union of States, each and all proud of the united structure. No citizen knows the shadow of a fear when the United States are threatened from abroad, nor again quickens his pulse when internal troubles frown upon our future.

But where is the man whose cheek has not blushed with bitter shame, as day by day he has been forced to read the humiliating story of our blundering Hawaiian policy? Where is the living man whose very heart has not swelled with indignation as he has witnessed the perpetration of inexcusable and unprecedented outrages upon a weak and struggling people. Outrages which, unjust and criminal as they were towards that little band, were a thousand times more disgraceful and criminal against our own American citizenship. The shield and panoply of honor, which has shone like a star over the pathway of American glory, has been blackened and tarnished, while our entire people are doing the penance of humiliation and shame.

But the God of nations has not permitted the unholy effort to succeed. Our coat of arms will forever bear the bar sinister, but the heroes of republican Hawaii will have the just reward of their steadfastness, and do high credit to their American blood and birth.

Mr. President, I was gratified to-day when the honorable Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] reported a resolution regarding the policy to be pursued towards Hawaii. Although I do not know that I agree fully with it, yet it shows that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate has recognized the Hawaiian affair as at an end and is proposing at last to take some action that will place Hawaii in proper relations with the United States.

The effort to destroy them and their cause is dead, but the epitaph of those who made that effort is already written upon a more enduring monument than marble.

The ridiculous mantle of secrecy which had hidden for months the actions of the Executive has been removed, and the patchwork policy is fully revealed. How now appears that sham and shoddy management, which according to the public press—I do not know whether it is true or not—marshaled the subordinate employés of the State Department *en masse* in the halls of the State building, and administered to the charwomen, messengers, laborers, and clerks a monstrous oath, that they would never, never reveal to the outside world a single word or thing pertaining to the Hawaiian correspondence? Was the usual constitutional oath of office which every one had taken of so little value that Secretary Gresham could make the obligation stronger by a new-fangled, unlawful, and wholly nugatory imposition? Was all this necessary to impress the beautiful Queen with the entire sincerity of an American prime minister? Or was he fearful that the touching supplication sent to her on tinted paper, and indorsed, "By the politeness of Mr. Willis," urging her not to cut off the head of his "great and good friend," might finally reach the American people? It is barely possible that he quoted the verse found in the story of the "Knight of the Sorrowful Figure," which was sung under the window of the Princess Antonomasia, as follows:

> The tyrant fair, whose beauty sent
> The throbbing mischief to my heart,
> The more my anguish to augment
> Forbids me to reveal the smart.

But, by the persistence of the representatives of the people in Congress, the electric light of public scrutiny has been turned upon a scene which until now was only occasionally brought into view. And what a scene! Personal hates and dislikes; partisan prejudices; charges of unfaithful conduct against an honest minister; offers to restore a fallen monarchy upon the ruins of a crushed republic; disavowals of American manhood; treachery and unfair dealings; all these things piled up, each upon the other, give the lie to an honorable record of more than a hundred years of our national life.

What answer to these things do we hear from those who timidly and with soft step and whispering voice essay a weak defense for the Administration which has two or three years longer in which to dispense its patronage? Up to this hour, the only attempted answer of defense has been, "Charge it to Stevens," or "What about Stevens?" When Secretary Gresham revels in cipher dispatches which take him days to translate, and Senators and press and public grow weary of waiting and wondering why he does not take the United States into his confidence, some piping cuckoo settles the whole matter by saying, "Well, Stevens is to blame."

Minister Stevens can well afford to rest in quiet and peace, without reply to these petty attacks upon him. Whatever may be his personal peculiarities, he stands before the people of the United States as an honest and honorable public servant, competent in his profession, straightforward in his methods, and whose official record upon this matter is in every way a hundred fold more creditable than that which seeks to strike a blow at Benjamin Harrison over the shoulders of John L. Stevens.

There is still another word to be said upon the present situation of this anomalous and singular history. This Administration, pledged to reform everything in sight, from the tariff on peanuts to the pension of the wounded soldier, started upon the first week of its accession to power to reinstate a monarchy. Think of it! To reinstate a monarchy before taking hold of the great questions which it had been pledged to carry out in its national platform!

Ignoring a Senate then in session, and assuming a pompous dictatorship and supreme control hitherto without precedent and wholly without excuse, the President set himself in hot haste upon the task of carrying out the Chicago platform by offering to make Mrs. Dominis once more the Queen of the Cannibal Islands. After various sorts of negotiation he told Mrs. Dominis, through Messenger Willis, "Now, if I do this thing, you must be a good queen. You must not get me into trouble by cutting off the heads of 'my great and good friend,' Mr. Dole, and the rest."

The dusky madam stamped her foot and swore she would kill every mother's son of them and confiscate all their property besides. Imagine Messenger Willis, with tears in his eyes, begging the angry woman not to throw away this chance to become queen again.

But I will pause. Senators, the characterization of these ridiculous proceedings, initiated by the executive officers of a civilized government, republican government, in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, in language which would do the subject justice would be an unnecessary humiliation to this Senate and the country.

It is bad enough to have to think of your chosen ideal as a counterpart of the great knight errant of Spanish chivalry, riding over the world on a miserable old Rosinante to right the wrongs of suffering princesses, with his chosen Squire Sancho—

Gresham—upon the faithful Dapple, following beside him and begging to know how soon he was to be made governor of an island.

But the march of events continues steadily on. The effort to discredit the clear and honest policy of a previous Administration has passed into the bundle labeled Vindictive Blunders. Everything which has been attempted to be done in that regard has come to naught, but the President has finally gathered up the scattered shreds and patches in disgust, has brought them over to the Capitol, relegating the whole subject to Congress.

I have received from a distinguished gentleman of the Pacific coast, formerly a Representative in Congress, the following sketch, from his personal knowledge and experience, which I deem of sufficient current value to incorporate it in my remarks, with the statement that while I do not adopt it in full, it presents the views of a careful observer, with good judgment, and that it is entitled to careful consideration:

The Hawaiian monarchy had dwindled almost into utter insignificance; like the last flickering of a candle, it was about to go out. Never strong enough to be an independent power, except by the common consent of all other powers, it had reached a point at which a mere handful of men were ample to overthrow it.

While the natives are, as they have for a long time been, fading out numerically, there are said to be unmistakable signs of relapsing toward barbarism. Meanwhile the islands are rapidly becoming Mongolianized, the only check to which will be annexation to the United States.

The monarchy, as it existed up to the time of the present Provisional Government, was at no time, even in its palmiest days, strong enough to protect anything—not even its own interests, much less those of Americans or others. As a strategic point commercially, to say nothing of war, the value of the Hawaiian Islands is beyond computation.

There is no nation that would not seize and hold Hawaii if it had the conceded right and opportunity now offered to us. Jealousies among European powers prevent annexation by any one of them. This condition of things may not last always. We will surely forfeit our right by long neglect of our opportunity—delay is dangerous.

The Isthmus routes are to be opened, that is certain, and when completed will be the most conspicuous and commercially valuable points on the world's greatest highway around the globe. Most important must they ever be to the commerce of our country in both the great oceans whose shores bound the American continent. The nation that annexes Hawaii will dominate said Isthmus and highway and become legitimate heir to commercial supremacy beyond that of any country at the present time.

The Isthmus routes under American domination become an indissoluble bond of interest to our whole country.

Annexation is what we want; no protectorate will fully answer.

Fortunately no nation has made, or can make, any serious opposition to the acquisition of these islands by the United States.

To talk about righting a wrong is idle; there has been no wrong to right.

The monarchy, if restored, will simply be a corrupt convenience for bad and dangerous purposes. Among such may be mentioned that the monarchy itself could not for any considerable time endure, but while it lived it would plunge itself into debts and obligations.

For our country this is a moment that may decide our destiny. Russia is strong geographically, because she has but one frontier to defend—the southern. The Arctic regions defend the northern. The Arctic Ocean should and will in due time constitute our northern boundary, sure as fate, if we acquire Hawaii. With Hawaii the dominion will surely come; without Hawaii, never.

That I do not believe.

It is preposterous to suppose the long coterminous boundary of 4,000 miles, to be defended by guns, forts, armies, custom-houses, and all the paraphernalia of government and jurisdiction at vast expense, can be permitted indefinitely to remain and separate Americans—for Canadians are Americans as we are—having a common language.

The annexation of Hawaii will give us the needed prestige peaceably and inevitably to result, as I believe, in shaping our own supremacy commercially, territorially, and destiny as a leading power and as a blessing to all nations.

Mr. President, the economic questions involved in the determination of the governmental status of Hawaii are of vast importance to the United States. Important as they are or may be, however, I would not justify the interference of this Government for purposes of warlike conquest or forcible annexation, upon any belief of their importance to us. It never was, and it should never be, the policy or purpose of this Republic to seize upon weak governments or minor principalities, because we want them and can take them, no matter how important to our commerce or necessary to our welfare. If we need a resting place upon the Pacific Ocean, we are not forced to steal it. If we find it needful to our trade, that our ships should enjoy the privileges of an American port among those islands, we can negotiate for its purchase or its use. But we are not forced to outrage decency and propriety.

In the case of Hawaii and the islands of that group, the substantial, intelligent, and enlighted population, those upon whom their future must rest, were ready and anxious to tender themselves and their interests to our care not merely for protection, but for mutual association and welfare. This country had for fifty years so maintained during every succeeding Administration this actually described and outlined policy, that their incorporation into our system was so certain as to be only a matter of time and negotiation. All countries had tacitly conceded the propriety of a close relationship between the United States and the Hawaiian people, which was certain to result at some day in the absorption of the latter by the former. Nearly every Secretary of State for half a century had in dignified state papers discussed the exact conditions which national propriety and international propriety had wisely indicated. Never, however, until 1893 had a harsh and untoward act been done by an American Executive which should actually force away from us a people who desired our friendship or a land which needed our assistance.

Of course, I do not speak in a personal sense in condemning the course of action taken by our Government, but I do maintain and believe that in so far as an Executive may, in the premises and under the conditions, commit an illegal act, an offense against his country, the President and his advisers have done that thing. No other President of any party during our history of nearly a hundred and twenty years has ever put this people in an attitude which subjects them to popular derision and which has made us a laughing stock before an enlightened world. The Administration of James Buchanan has sadly taken its place in our history as one of timidity and weakness in its dealing with our internal affairs, but its foreign policy in the conduct of the relations of the United States with other countries was a bright record of genius, intellect, and good sense, as compared with that of the Administration of to-day. The one bore the impress of ability, looked after the interests of our people, selected men of known intelligence, experience, and skill for the places of honor and responsibility abroad and at home, and sought to produce an American citizenship which was worth the enjoying. The other seems to try its worst to destroy our trade, our commerce, our valued interests, our American ensign, our national pride, and our love of country and its institutions.

In concluding my remarks, I beg to quote entire a recent editorial article from the Washington Post, which I think most eloquently words the sentiment of the American people and truthfully illustrates a most shameful episode of our national history.

CLOSING A DARK INCIDENT.

The Hawaiian incident is closed. It is only necessary to examine the documents, reports, etc., which make up the history of that lamentable episode in order to realize that the public sentiment of the country will not for an instant tolerate a reopening of it. This is a case where the lifting of the curtain involves its immediate and permanent fall. We have at last had a clear and comprehensive glance. We want no more.

Fortunately, no real harm has been done. The men who had in charge the civilization and the liberties of Hawaii were imbued with the spirit that has animated pioneers and liberators ever since the dawn of human progress and emancipation. Neither by cajolery nor intimidation, by stratagem nor bold assault could they be turned one single hair's breadth from their high and holy purpose. Beset by secret machinations, threatened by mysterious perils, approached by the smiler with the knife beneath his cloak, facing an open foe with murder in his heart and harboring a hidden foe with treachery in his—beleaguered by every enemy that could assail the cradle of a new-born republic, these heroes held their ground with nerves of steel and souls that knew no fear. Where a false step might have plunged them into the abyss, they marched straight and true. Where the smallest sign of faltering might have brought the avalanche, they turned their faces to the sunlight. They have triumphed. They have proved their title to the noble heritage of freedom. They have passed through the valley and the slough, and to-day they stand upon the mountain top with the white wonder of the dawn upon their brows.

The spectacle which we discover in the reports of Mr. Willis will not be lost upon the country. The revelation of a savage and revengeful queen, ridiculous in everything except her bloodthirsty rancor; the revelation of that tawdry monarch planning the destruction of the leaders and reveling in the foretaste of the shambles is enough to make the American people shudder. Unconsciously she vindicated the revolution which dethroned her and put to shame the policy of restoration when she declared her barbarous aspiration. The thought of peace, of order, of reconciliation; the idea of ushering in an era of enlightened progress, never once occurred to her. The only perspective that unfolded itself in that hour of her hope was thronged with the scaffold and the ax. The only path her fancy trod led to the ghastly portals of a hecatomb.

As we say, the black shadow has passed. Never again will any administration of this free Government address itself to the task of rehabilitating that savage and murderous régime. Never again will the American people listen with toleration to any scheme which has for its object the exaltation of barbarity and assassination of human freedom. The cloud has passed, condensed in folly and spread by mistaken zeal, it has been dissipated by courage, devotion, and Christian manhood. Let it blow seaward and be lost!

Mr. President, as supplemental to my remarks, I desire to present here a statistical and descriptive statement regarding the Hawaiian Islands, and a narative of the events before, during, and after the revolution of January, 1893, which has been carefully prepared at my request by Dr. N. B. Delamater, of Chicago, who spent nearly a year in Hawaii. Dr. Delamater was an accurate observer, from an unofficial standpoint, and has given an intelligent and truthful history of the matters which came under his notice. I ask that it may be inserted as a part of my remarks without taking the time of the Senate to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the request of the Senator from Illinois will be granted.

The statement referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, *December 13, 1893.*

DEAR SIR: I take pleasure in replying to yours of 9th instant, and furnishing you the following regarding the Hawaiian Islands:

POPULATION.

Natives and half-castes:	
Oahu Island	14,754
Hawaii Island	11,349
Molokai and Lanai Islands	2,633
Maui Island	8,110
Kaui and Niihau Islands	3,776
Tota	40,622

POPULATION—continued.

Hawaiian born of foreign parents:	
Oahu	2,792
Hawaii	2,292
Molokai and Lanai	14
Maui	1,312
Kaui and Niihau	1,085
Total	7,495
Foreign born, all nations:	
Oahu	13,648
Hawaii	13,113
Molokai and Lanai	179
Maui	7,935
Kaui and Niihau	6,998
Total	41,873
Total population of the islands	89,990
By nationalities:	
Natives (that is, full-bloods)	34,436
Half-castes (that is, part Hawaiian)	6,186
Hawaiian, born of foreign parents	7,495
Americans	1,928
British	1,344
Germans	1,034
French	70
Portuguese	8,602
Norwegians	227
Chinese (in 1884 was 17,939)	15,301
Japanese	12,360
Polynesians	588
All others	419
Total by nationality	89,990
Hawaiians of foreign parents:	
Portuguese	4,117
American, about	900
British	300
Other white races	417
Chinese and Japanese	1,701
Others	60

Population by age classification.

Class.	Under 6 years.	6 to 30.	30 to 45.
Natives	4,275	15,294	16,351
Half-castes	1,568	3,603	948
Hawaiian, foreign, both parents	4,918	1,250	143
Americans	71	704	662
British	14	432	515
German	16	422	392
Portuguese	255	4,730	2,426
Chinese	71	6,043	6,919
Japanese	15	7,147	5,073

Occupations, by nations.

Nativity.	Laborers.	Farmers.	Fishers.	Mariners.	Teamsters.	Mechanics.	Planters.	Merchants and traders.	Clerks.	Professional and teachers.	Others.
Natives	2,253	3,279	668	332	237	763	53	132	59	185	907
Half-castes	116	113	25	14	32	230	14	32	79	51	178
Hawaiian, foreign parents	21	16	----	2	7	33	9	19	73	49	34
American	38	26	2	36	59	369	18	81	132	171	176
British	27	15	----	28	34	334	30	42	88	74	147
German	52	11	2	10	26	177	6	47	54	25	108
Portuguese	2,656	136	3	10	63	167	17	56	35	11	123
Chinese	8,827	1,500	133	----	74	564	42	777	164	18	1,066
Japanese	10,969	36	3	2	4	42	----	27	20	23	129

Social statistics.

Nativity.	Married.	Single.	Attend school.	Read and write English.	Own real estate.	Registered voters.
Native	14,382	19,994	5,302	24,067	3,271	8,777
Half-caste	1,423	4,763	1,758	3,834	395	777
Hawaiian-born, both parents foreign	376	7,119	1,094	1,291	105	146
American	852	1,076	121	1,724	177	637
British	626	718	63	1,205	169	505
German	488	546	118	915	57	382
Portuguese	4,898	3,701	1,270	2,426	234	2,031
Chinese	2,928	12,373	71	2,022	226	------
Japanese	5,065	7,295	33	307	4	------

Leaving out Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese there are within school age 9,991, of which 85.05 per cent are attending school. How will this compare with our own country?

Hawaiians take education readily, and are being well trained. English is the language of the country, and taught in all but about 5 per cent of the schools of the country.

Taxpayers, by nationality.

	Number.	Amount.
Americans:		
Individuals	1,330	$46,585.01
Firms	34	24,480.39
Corporations	33	68,932.90
Total	----------	139,998.30
Hawaiians and of Hawaiian birth*		
Individuals	13,593	110,369.26
Firms	52	5,614.36
Corporations	31	19,432.43
Total	----------	135,416.05
British:		
Individuals;	635	43,314.33
Firms	20	11,843.42
Corporations	9	12,257.14
Total	----------	67,414.89
Chinese:		
Individuals	16,262	395,500.11
Firms	317	13,869.44
Corporations	8	509.01
Total	----------	109,878.56
Japanese:		
Individuals	5,916	29,327.70
Firms	1	8.25
Corporations	----------	----------
Total	----------	29,335.95
Germans:		
Individuals	518	10,534.37
Firms	12	6,640.86
Corporations	8	8,573.71
Total	----------	25,748.94
Portuguese:		
Individuals	3,198	22,298.58
Firms	15	753.21
Corporations	3	264.70
Total	----------	23,316.49
All other nations:		
Individuals	450	6,098.03
Firms	4	550.09
Corporations	----------	----------
Total	----------	6,648.12

*Those of Hawaiian birth are almost entirely of American parentage.

Public debt, March 31, 1890.

Bonded debt	$1,734,000.00
Postal savings bank deposits	974,000.00
	2,881,000.00
Less loan fund cash balance	281,497.06
Net indebtedness	2,599,502.94

Actual cash value of Government property at same date.

Cash	$491,152.00
Public lands	2,186,950.00
Government buildings	928,257.00
Bridges	101,510.00
Wharves and landings	167,580.00
Light-houses	20,475.00
Water works	796,800.00
Property of various departments	104,851.00
Total value	5,797,576.00
(Add to this crown lands.)	

Exports for 1890.

Articles.	Quantity.	Value.
Sugar ..... pounds	259,798,462	$12,159,585.01
Rice ..... do	10,579,000	545,239.53
Bananas ..... bunches	97,204	176,364.00
Hides ..... pieces	28,196	70,949.00
Wool ..... pounds	374,724	35,396.00
Coffee ..... do	85,593	14,737.00
Molasses ..... gallons	74,926	7,603.00
Goat skins ..... pieces	8,661	3,181.00
Tallow ..... pounds	33,876	1,140.00
Other products	----------	10,000.00
Total	----------	13,239,194.54
Supplies furnished naval vessels, 1890		$52,000.00
Supplies furnished merchant vessels		87,900.00
Foreign goods exported		119,525.00
		259,425.00
Add exports		13,239,194.00
Total		13,498,619.00

Value of imports, 1890.

From United States	$5,259,154.36
From Great Britain	1,104,022.12
From China and Japan	277,607.04
From Germany	148,288.00
From Australia and New Zealand	142,554.00
From British Columbia	13,560.00
From France	7,703.00
From Pacific islands	3,414.00
By whale ships	5,897.00
Total	6,962,201.00

Of the exports, there was to the United States $13,021,907.

Total value of foreign trade, 1890.

United States	$18,332,631
Great Britain	1,104,022
Germany	1148,228
Australia and New Zealand	260,664
China and Japan	90,142
All others	69,281
Total	20,05,030

Capital stock and ownership of sugar plantations.

Forty corporations, total capital	$28,466,990
American owners	22,459,610
British	4,443,130
German	834,600
Native	266,250
Other nations	299,100
	28,292,600
In addition twenty-seven plantations and mills not incorporated, capital	5,055,000
American	2,276,000
British	1,605,000
German	1,174,000
	5,055,000

Number of vessels and tonnage, 1890.

Nationality.	Entered.		Cleared.	
	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage
American	227	150,676	224	153,038
British	18	22,303	16	22,912
Hawaiian	34	42,229	35	43,641
German	8	6,110	9	7,070
All others	8	8,802	9	9,980

There are vast possibilities waiting capital. The coffee industry can be increased more than a hundredfold; the rice, banana, cocoanut vastly increased. Pineapples will in a few years be a large export. They can be raised there with comparatively small capital, and quick and large returns of a very superior quality. Sugar lands enough yet wild to supply all comers for many years to come.

There is a very small fraction of the available lands under cultivation. Heretofore everything has gone to sugar on account of the enormous profits in it, the average per acre being from 5 to 10 tons.

This country is destined to be a very rich one.

Now, as to the revolution.

During the legislative session preceding the same, there was a constant conflict between the Queen and Legislature as to the cabinet.

The Legislature was composed of twenty-four representatives, elected by citizens who could read and write, and who had an income of $250; twenty-four nobles, elected by those with incomes of $600—these are annual incomes; and four cabinet ministers, appointed by the reigning monarch, subject to dismissal by vote of want of confidence by the Legislature.

There was finally a cabinet appointed of leading men, nonpoliticians mainly, and the individuals composing it represented several millions of property.

Shortly after this every one seemed easy. The lottery bill had apparently dropped out of sight, the opium bill had been defeated, the United States steamship Boston went away for a week's practice, Minister Stevens going upon her; several members of the Legislature went home. The last week of that session a vote of want of confidence was passed by purchase and bribery, a new cabinet of very shady character was appointed, the lottery and opium bills were then revived and passed by open purchase. There was no apparent attempt at concealment of the purchase of members of the Legislature. On a Saturday morning following the Queen prorogued the Legislature on notice from that body. She appeared in person in state and with her retinue. I was present. Her speech was one of peace and of the ordinary kind. Her guards, about seventy-five in number, marched over to the palace yard.

Right across the street, drawn up in line, a native society, according to prearrangement, immediately appeared and presented to the Queen a new constitution, demanding its immediate promulgation. She at once called on her cabinet to sign it. Part of them refused, and went down town and notified the prominent and leading citizens. Up to this time the plan of those who are now the Provisional Government was to get control through constitutional measures and the ballot, by compeling the Queen to recognize the right of a majority of the Legislature to name the cabinet ministers. That is, that the Queen should call on a member of the majority to form a cabinet, whom she would appoint. The outlines of the new constitution, it is claimed, were such as to give the reigning monarch absolute power.

Excitement ran very high. Threats were freely made against anyone interfering with her plans, both by herself and her adherents. The leading men and members of previously opposite parties at once united, and felt that life and property demanded immediate action, instead of ordinary political methods. The Boston, with Minister Stevens, came into port about this time in total ignorance of what had occurred. Up to this time I had not called on Mr. Stevens and did not know him by sight. Excitement ran high Saturday afternoon and evening and Sunday. Steps were immediately taken to organize a volunteer military force for protection of property, and to my certain knowledge a very respectable force, composed of leading and prominent men—merchants, capitalists, planters, lawyers, professional men of all kinds, and others—was organized before Monday. A signal was decided on that would call them together very quickly should any emergency arise. The leaders as yet had no plan, and did not know what to look for.

On Monday afternoon two large mass meetings were held, one by the present Provisional Government people, and the other by the royalists. I was at the royalists' meeting. Excitement was at high tension. Rumors of intention and threats of burning houses and stores were rife. I heard many royalists say they desired Mr. Stevens to land troops from the Boston to save property. I also heard a number of quite prominent royalists say they had asked Mr. Stevens to land troops to save property and prevent bloodshed. At 5 this Monday afternoon the troops were landed. Many of the radical hotheads were not in favor of landing the troops, feeling that they could overthrow the Queen, and realizing that if they were landed it would prevent a fight.

I talked with a number of the leaders, and also with several very intimate friends, who were very near and supposed to be in the confidence of the leaders, among them being Dr. F. R. Day, the attending family physician of Chief Justice Judd, Vice-President Damson, Mr. W. R. Cassel, and five or six other members of the committee of safety, and who attended Mr. Thurston on the voyage, in company with the other commissioners, coming to present their case to the United States. Not one of the persons seemed to know what Minister Stevens would do. They all claimed that they could get no expression from him as to what course he would pursue in case of revolution, further than that he would protect the lives and property of noncombatant American citizens.

It seemed to be the general understanding that he would raise the American flag at some large and convenient place, declare it American territory, and proclaim that all desiring protection should go there.

When the troops were landed the marines were stationed at the American legation and at the office of the consul-general. The sailor companies were marched down past the palace and Government building, and it was the intention to quarter them some considerable distance away, and, as I understand it, they were camped the first night. The next day an empty building near the Government building and palace was secured, and they were quartered there. All Monday evening excitement was intense, and a large portion of the inhabitants kept watch all night for fear of fires, etc.

The next morning, Tuesday, I learned that at sone time during the day a signal would be given which would call the volunteers together at a building (really an open shed) near the palace, and that the committee of safety would take possession and declare monarchy at an end. I did not learn the time, and I am very sure the consul-general, Mr. Severance, did not get any information more than I did. I am also morally certain that no help was expected from the United States forces, and that they expected to fight a battle and win, before Mr. Stevens would interfere. I know the general impression was that Mr. Stevens and Capt. Wiltse would not interfere until they had positively placed themselves in position, and that they failed to get any encouragement from him, even as to interference, any further than that he would protect all noncombatant American citizens who should apply to him and go to a place designated by him.

Of course I do not know as to absolute facts. I do not know that Mr. Stevens did not say he would, but I do know that the general impression among the prominent citizens was as stated above. And that the Dr. Day mentioned in a previous part of this letter, and who was a student of mine, afterwards my clinical assistant in my college work, and later my assistant in private practice, as close as he was to the Provisional Government leaders, had the same impression.

That afternoon, Tuesday, I was driving in a buggy and came near what is known as the old armory, on Beretania street, I saw all at once men coming at full speed in all sorts of conveyances and on foot, in full run toward the armory. Every one carrying a gun, I concluded the signal had been given. I learned later that a wagon had started from a large wholesale hardware store down town loaded with ammunition to come to the armory, and that the Queen's police had stopped it, and being shot at by the driver, had run away. There were three policemen and all ran. This was within a block of the police station, and the citizens had taken this shot as a signal and gathered at once. Inside of fifteen minutes there were in the neighborhood of two hundred citizens—clerks, lawyers, doctors, merchants, and capitalists—each with a rifle and a double belt of cartridges around them, formed in line and ready for action. At the same time the Provisional Government, as represented by its committee, took occasion to reach the Government building, each from his own office and by the shortest route.

When there, it is true, without any Provisional troops in sight, but knowing them to be so stationed as to be able to intercept the Queen's guards should they undertake resistance, and knowing that force to be more than double the entire forces of the Queen, and knowing them to be composed of men of standing and ability, they did, without the immediate presence of the troops, read the proclamation. I was there before it was entirely finished, and about the time they had finished reading the Provisional troops in two companies marched into the grounds, having met with no offer of resistance. They were immediately placed on guard duty and quartered in the Government building. The Queen's officers at once gave up possession. A communication was then sent to the Queen, and a demand made on her to abdicate, an offer of protection, and assurances of pecuniary assistance if she submitted to the new order of things. After some parley this she did.

Of course I was not present at any of the interviews but had information which to me was satisfactory that a demand was being made for the surrender of the palace, police station, and armory. I was at the police station and saw that the Provisional Government had placed it with a small force of the Queen's defenders in a state of siege, with ample force to capture it and a fixed determination to do so, and an hour later I was there again and found it in possession of the new government. I then learned that Minister Stevens, after the Provisional Government had shown him that they were in actual possession of the government building and all public offices and the police station, and had the Queen's guards cooped in their own armory, recognized it as the *de facto* government, and immediately a number of the representatives of other governments did the same. England and two or three others did not till the next day.

Now, of course Minister Stevens might have recognized it a half hour earlier than I know anything about. I was not a participant, and had no claim to inside information, but I was doing all I could to learn everything that was going on, and as the harmony of action and information seemed general I felt that I had correct information as to the time and sequence of events. Of this I am sure, the Provisional Government would have succeeded if United States forces had been a thousand miles away. They had, from my own personal observation, a force more than double that of the Queen, and composed of such men as meant business. Among the privates who went on guard duty there was represented several million dollars.

As to Mr. Blount, a commission of some kind was expected, and preparations made to give him a reception, which was to be nonpartisan. That is, both sides would take part. Of course, there was no certainty as to time of his arrival, no cable being connected with the islands. The vessel came and a committee having representatives of both sides went out to meet it. A large concourse of citizens of all classes turned out. A native society of

women decorated with garlands of flowers; two bands, etc., were at the dock and waited hours after the vessel had anchored. Both sides were ready for a general nonpartisan and enthusiastic reception. Finally, word came that Mr. Blount declined the reception of any honors. He was landed and quartered himself at the Hawaiian Hotel, the most prominent hotel there. He was domiciled in one of the cottages and remained there during his stay in Honolulu.

It was perhaps an unfortunate circumstance that this placed him in the midst of the most marked royalistic influences, but it can not be claimed, so far as I know, that he knew of this. He persistently declined to accept any hospitality from persons of either side so long as he was "special commissioner." This feature of his conduct was very marked, and while I have no fault to find with it, was carried, it seemed to me, to the extent of at least appearing like posing.

He was soon known as the "silent man," as an "interrogation point," and various other appellations, because of his treatment of those with whom he came in contact. No one seemed able to get the slightest expression from him as to his opinion on the subject. He seemed ready to ask questions without limit, of those who called, and to listen in absolute silence to answers, and of course had his stenographer take all conversations. His wife was at once made much of, especially by the prominent American women. One little instance of his full consistency as to accepting hospitality: Mrs. Day had entertained Mrs. Blount in the way of private picnics, a lunch party, horseback rides, etc. One evening about dusk, Dr. and Mrs. Day drove to the Blount cottage in a two-seated surrey, to ask Mrs. Blount to take a little ride. Mr. Blount was on the sidewalk by the side of the carriage when Mrs. Blount got in and Dr. Day asked him to go. He declined on the ground he could not accept any hospitality from any one.

As an evidence of his courtesy, he received a dispatch from Washington directing him to appear before the United States consul-general and take the oath of office as minister. The same dispatch had a clause stating that a successor to Mr. Severance would soon be sent on. Mr. Blount had received a good many favors from Mr. Severance. This part of the dispatch he folded under and concealed from Mr. Severance, when he appeared with the dispatch as a credential. And three days later, of his own motion, gave this to a royalist paper officially for publication. His reason, as stated by himself, being that he was friendly to Mr. Severance and could not bear to tell him personally.

Within a week from his arrival the royalists started the report that the Queen was to be restored, and several distinct days were set. My opinion at the time was that they started them without any foundation. They claimed to have assurances from Mr. Blount. I did not at the time believe he had given the slightest encouragement. I am sure the Provisional people felt the same way at this time, basing their belief on the utter impossibility of getting anything out of him on their part. The flag came down. Although Mr. Blount was at the house of Minister Stevens on the afternoon preceding, and after he had issued his order to the naval commander, he did not, I am certain, mention the matter to Minister Stevens, who first heard of it from Mr. Waterhouse, of the Provisionals, late in the evening.

Up to this time I did not know Minister Stevens by sight. About this time a friend urged me to pay him a formal visit as the representative of my country, etc. I did so on his regular reception day, remained about ten minutes in general conversation, making no allusion to public affairs. I called on him once later. These are the only times I met him in the ten months I was there, and at neither time had any talk with him about affairs.

A few days after my first call on Mr. Stevens I made a formal call on Mr. Blount as a representative of the President and presented my card, which gave my profession and my American residence. The call lasted not to exceed five minutes. No conversation on Hawaiian affairs was had, except he asked me what I thought would be the effect of lowering the flag and removing the troops. I said I thought it would prove that the Provisional Government was able to take care of themselves. I remained as long as it seemed there was occasion. I left with him my Honolulu address and telephone number, and remarked that if I could be of any service, would be pleased. My wife and Mrs. Blount met a good many times socially. My wife called on Mrs. Blount. This is the only time I met Mr. Blount.

Within a week after his arrival the people began to wonder that he was not calling on the leading and prominent men. When he was made minister these same men, who belong to the class who rush forward and force service or information unasked, but who had called formerly and offered to be at his service whenever desired, were still wondering. Those men, like Chief Justice Judd, who was not an active partisan (in fact, many of the prominent men were uncertain whether he was not favorable to the Queen), found that information on vital points was not asked for.

I formed and expressed the idea that the object was to make it appear that the Provisionals were able to care for themselves. This was quite strongly combatted by many who began to feel that Mr. Blount was opposed to the Provisionals and favoring the Queen. And finally, before coming away I was compelled to admit that Mr. Blount's conduct was certainly very singular; that he was not conducting his intercourse just as I would expect a gentleman to do, and that his treatment of Mr. Stevens seemed very ungentlemanly, to say the least. Mr. Stevens and I never mentioned his name in either of our conversations.

For a long time there was no American flag at his headquarters, and inasmuch as the stars and stripes were floating everywhere else in Honolulu, this became a subject of marked comment. Finally the wife of one of the naval officers bantered him pretty strongly on the subject, and offered to and did present him with a flag which was draped on his front porch. Later Mr. Blount issued, by publication in the press of the city, a proclamation defining the protection he was authorized to give American citizens. The last clause of this proclamation relating to the loss of all claim on the American minister for property, or family, as well as personal protection, by those who took active part in internal affairs of the country, while probably good law, seemed to me unwise, unnecessary, and not at all diplomatic. Its effect was to cause a great deal of uncertainty as to whether he was not contemplating at that moment, as the Royalists positively and confidently asserted, the immediate restoration of the Queen.

In fact, Mr. Blount's course was such that, justly or unjustly, the royalists were encouraged and the Provisionals were discouraged.

Whether the royalists received from him information as to what was the final intention, I do not know; but they guessed exceedingly well, for in April, May, and June I heard from the lips of royalists there the most positive declarations that they knew that President Cleveland would do certain things. Those things the President has since done.

As to the sentiment of the nation, Hawaiians of Hawaiian parents, the Queen is certainly not popular. There is, I believe, a much stronger feeling in favor of Princess Kaiulani. I talked with a large number of them who were decidedly in favor of annexation also.

The royalist party there is not made up of or led by natives, but largely by English residents. The motive seems fairly clear. Mr. Davis has had complete control over Kaiulani and her education. The near approach of her reign would give him large advantages in a financial way. He would probably be in fact, if not in name, prime minister. He would have the placing of Government loans (probably) and the inside track in many contracts, etc. Then, socially, his family and that of Mr. Walker, his partner, who are the leaders of the English society, would be very close to the court social world. Mr. Cleghorn, the father of Kaiulani, is Scotch. A son of Mr. Wodehouse, the English minister, is married to a half-sister of Kaiulani. When the native women undertook to have a large mass meeting and present to Mr. Blount a petition, they split on the question whether it should be Lilioukalani or Kaiulani.

Now, dear sir, I have answered your questions, I fear, too fully. I have endeavored to be candid and just and correct in my statements. If it is of service I shall feel repaid for the time occupied. I have not gone into the press with any statement, as I am not fond of notoriety.

Respectfully,

N. B. DELAMATER.

Hon. SHELBY M. CULLOM, *United States Senator.*

REPEAL OF ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. GRAY. The unfinished business was temporarily laid aside, and as the Senator from Illinois has concluded his remarks, I suppose the unfinished business is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2331) to repeal all statutes relating to supervisors of elections and special deputy marshals, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment submitted by Mr. CHANDLER.

Mr. CHANDLER. I obtained the floor to submit some remarks apropos of the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] made a few days ago who is not now in his seat, and, therefore, I will yield to a motion, if made by any Senator, to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Missouri will be here in a moment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

Mr. VEST entered the Chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] on Thursday last addressed the Senate in favor of the passage of the pending repeal bill, and undertook to draw a picture of the prostrate and terrified condition of the people of St. Louis, especially the Democracy of that city, at the November election in 1876. I do not know whether the Senator from Missouri assumed that the whole of the Southern States were terrified in like manner.

That election, Senators will remember, was one the ultimate result of which, after much tribulation, was the inauguration of Rutherford B. Hayes as President of the United States. At that election the Republican party, whose candidate was Mr. Hayes, carried only three Southern States, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Florida; and there are not wanting incredulous and prejudiced Democrats who have been heard to insist that even those States were not lawfully carried for Hayes and Wheeler. But they were counted for Hayes and Wheeler; and by the process of the Electoral Commission, a member, perhaps members, of which I see upon this floor, President Hayes was finally declared lawfully elected, and he was inaugurated.

But at that notable election of 1876 there were only these three Southern States which were Republican. There were also chosen 106 members of Congress by the sixteen Southern States, and of those 106 members from those States, terrified as a part of them were, as the Senator from Missouri says terrified by United States marshals, the Republicans succeeded in electing only 17, leaving 89 Democratic members elected. Three Southern States were carried for the Republican party and 13 for the Democracy; 17 Republican Representatives and 89 Democratic Representatives were elected; and from that time to this, from the terrified South, notwithstanding the existence upon the statute book of national election laws, there has been no electoral vote cast for a Republican candidate for the Presidency, and the Republican party at the last general election was reduced to the paltry number of 7 Republican Representatives.

A table of the result 1876 is as follows:

Southern States.	Representatives.	Democrats.	Republicans.
Alabama	8	8	0
Arkansas	4	4	0
Delaware	1	1	0
Florida	2	0	2
Georgia	9	9	0
Kentucky	10	10	0
Louisiana	6	2	4
Maryland	6	6	0
Mississippi	6	6	0
Missouri	13	9	4
North Carolina	8	7	1
South Carolina	5	2	3
Tennessee	10	8	2
Texas	6	6	0
Virginia	9	8	1
West Virginia	3	3	0
Totals	106	89	17

Yet in the face of that result the Senator from Missouri, almost with tears in his eyes, certainly with plaintiveness in his voice, in an unusual manner for him, pleaded for the sympathy of the Senate and the sympathy of the country on account of the terror which had seized the community of St. Louis in 1876 because of the existence upon the statute book of these obnoxious and atrocious national election laws, and because of the presence at the polls in three Congressional districts in that city of marshals of the United States appointed in pursuance of those national election laws.

For the purpose of proving his sad case the Senator from Missouri introduced the election contest of Frost against Metcalfe, where Mr. R. Graham Frost, who had been the Democratic candidate, contested the election of Mr. Lyne S. Metcalfe, and the Senator proceeded to read, as the foundation for his appeal to our sympathy in behalf of the terrified community which he represents, the testimony of one W. D. W. Bernard. I desire the particular attention of the Senate to that testimony, which the Senator cited at length. In order that I may not be understood as misrepresenting him, I quote his exact words. He said:

R. Graham Frost was defeated by a Republican named Metcalfe on the return, though he was elected at the polls.

In order not to misunderstand the Senator, I quote his exact language; an averment of the Senator from Missouri that Frost was elected at the polls.

The Senator then quotes from the testimony of Mr. Bernard, who, he says, was the confidential friend of Gen. Grant, and who in some sort seems to have usurped the function of the United States marshal at St. Louis, who was Mr. H. W. Leffingwell. Mr. Bernard appeared before a commissioner in 1878, two years after the election, to testify as to his acts and proceedings. The Senator says that Mr. Bernard testified that he disfranchised 5,700 voters; that he took the registration list and struck off 5,700 names, and that various arrests were made by the marshals, appointed not by Mr. Leffingwell, in fact, but by Mr. Bernard. So, the Senator says, terror seized the whole community.

Later in his speech the Senator undertakes to cite a great outrage committed by Mr. Bernard, who was invested, he says, by President Grant or by Mr. Attorney-General Taft, the representative of the President and of the Administration, with special authority for the purpose of enforcing the national election laws on this occasion in St. Louis, which I suppose the Senator would have us infer was one of the transactions which produced the terror which he says pervaded the city of St. Louis at this election.

I ask the special attention of the Senate to the Senator's narration of this alleged outrage. Here was a canvassing board in peaceful session in the city of St. Louis; a Democratic canvassing board. What they were engaged in doing as a matter of fact will appear shortly.

But here they were, the Senator says, honestly, patiently, and peacefully engaged in counting in Mr. Frost. When Mr. Bernard appeared, the Senator says, he was "booted and spurred and armed, with an armed deputy marshal at his heels." I call the Senator's attention to his exact language, and I want to know whether he adheres to that language. The word "armed," the Senator will notice, is uttered twice:

Bernard booted and spurred and armed—

That is himself armed with an armed deputy marshal. "Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just"; and Bernard was not only himself armed with a deputy marshal, but the deputy marshal was also armed.

Here, Mr. President, according to the picture drawn for us by the Senator from Missouri, was the whole pharaphernalia of war arrayed against this peaceful canvassing board headed by Mr. Garesche. They invaded the room of this canvassing board for the purpose of committing a great outrage upon the board. But I have looked in vain through the testimony which the Senator has cited for any evidence that Mr. Bernard was either booted or spurred or armed. It may be that he was armed, but certainly neither the boots nor the spurs appear in the testimony. Therefore I am obliged to conclude that the Senator's imagination invested Mr. Bernard with all these accouterments of horrid warfare with which he, in the name of Gen. Grant's Administration, advanced upon Mr. Garesche and his two associates for the purpose of committing the terrific outrage which the Senator proceeded to depict, and to which I now call the attention of the Senate, using the Senator's own speech. I beg that Senators will not be too much disturbed in their sensibilities as they anticipate the outrage which this booted and spurred and doubly-armed Bernard was advancing to commit upon this canvassing board. Bernard said:

"I understand you are about to count precinct No. 71." Mr. Garesche, the county clerk, said, "What right have you in here, sir? This is a State board." And he ordered him out of the office. Bernard said, "I am under Federal authority, and if you dare to count the vote in that precinct I will put every one of you in jail before night." He swears that he did so and Garesche then again told him that he must leave the office—

Now mark the sequel—

and a personal difficulty was averted by pushing Bernard out of the door.

There is the end of the atrocious proceeding of Mr. Bernard in interfering with Mr. Garesche and his canvassing board, booted and spurred and armed, with an armed deputy marshal. He marches in, and Garesche tells him he must get out and a personal difficulty is only averted by "pushing Bernard out of the door."

That is a sample of the outrages which were committed by Mr. Bernard and his deputy marshals at this time, when, according to the Senator, he was terrifying the whole community of St. Louis, and wrongfully taking for the Republican party three out of the seventeen of the Republican members of Congress, which in 1876 the Republicans elected, leaving ninety-nine for the terrified Democracy to elect.

Mr. President, this Mr. Bernard, whom the Senator has brought in here as a witness in this debate to the atrocity of the Federal election laws, so that by reason of his conduct and the conduct of men like him we must make haste to wipe these election laws off the statute book, was a person to whose testimony, given under the circumstances, the slightest heed should not be given by any careful or intelligent or candid person. Anyone who will read the whole testimony will see that he was a mere braggart, a pretender, a blow-hard, a man who it seems was a hanger-on of Gen. Grant. I think the Senator said he himself knew him well; so that he was an acquaintance of the Senator's. He had managed to get appointed a bank examiner by claiming some sort of relationship with Gen. Grant and by coming to Washington and crowding himself into that office; but the Senator will notice that these transactions were in 1876, and that Bernard testified in 1878; and by inquiry this morning, in order to ascertain the history of this remarkable personage who bulldozed the whole city of St. Louis, I found that he made no report as bank examiner after 1876.

So it is fair to conclude that when he testified in 1878 he had been turned out of his office, and I assume that such will turn out to be the fact that under President Hayes' Administration he was turned out. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri when he speaks again in behalf of this witness will kindly tell us whether or not this man Bernard had been removed from his office or had given up his office a year or two before he testified in the contest of Frost against Metcalfe, and will inform us whether it was not the mere spleen and ill will and the braggadocia of this man Bernard which controlled the whole of his absolutely absurd and ridiculous testimony.

Mr. President, it is difficult to believe that Mr. Bernard even imagined that he had been doing all that he said he had done; that he really had faith in a single one of his boastful statements, and I certainly do not find that he anywhere tells the story narrated by the Senator about his being pushed out of the door in order to prevent war or bloodshed at that time in the city of St. Louis. This man was a conceited, coarse, and vulgar person, and I candidly submit to the Senator that he ought to apologize to the Senate for bringing his testimony into this Chamber.

On page 329 of Mr. Bernard's testimony is a statement how he converted from Democracy to Republicanism a very prominent Democrat in the Ninth ward, known as the "King of Kerry," Pat Cullinane. The narative is obscene and vulgar, not fit to be read in this presence, and it ought not to have polluted any public document, and no Senator will read it without utterly condemning, in my judgment, the Senator from Missouri for contributing this man's chatter to the discussion of a grave and serious and important subject. So much for Mr. Bernard.

But while bringing his witness here, the Senator from Missouri has committed himself to the proposition that Mr. Frost was elected and that Mr. Metcalfe wrongfully held his seat in Congress. If I had wanted to find a Democratic outrage to bring to the Senate as a reason for maintaining upon the statute book the national election laws, I could not have found one so appropriate as this case of Frost against Metcalfe. I take occasion to thank the Senator for teaching me concerning it.

I propose to detain the Senate a few moments by reciting its history. When the election was finished in St. Louis, the returns showed that Mr. Metcalfe was elected by 25 majority. I quote from Mr. Metcalfe's statement, on page 14 of the document submitted to the House of Representatives, being the complaint, with which is printed the testimony taken before proper officers on the contest of the election. The returns showed that there were 8,097 votes for Metcalfe and 8,072 votes for Frost, making 25 majority for Metcalfe.

That was the result upon the face of the returns, and all St. Louis knew it, and the Senator from Missouri was there at the time and must have heard of it. Then began one of those proceedings which are so well known to the Democratic party, and

in such practices as I am about to disclose to the Senate the Democratic party knows no North, no South, no East, no West. The Democrats conceived, as Democrats are very apt to conceive, that a Republican who is elected by only 25 majority is as good as defeated if they have the canvassing power; and so the canvassers of the vote in one of the precincts, No. 57, as Mr. Metcalfe says, proceeded to surreptitiously and corruptly change the returns.

The actual vote given for Mr. Frost in precinct No. 57 was 272. Some Democrat changed the 7 to a 9 by writing a half circle or three-quarters of a circle upon the top of the 7 and returned for Mr. Frost 292 votes instead of 272, which, as Senators will see, reduced Mr. Metcalfe's majority from 25 to 5, and by a subsequent change, to which I shall shortly advert, Mr. Metcalfe was deprived of 6 more votes, electing Mr. Frost by 1 vote, which was the ground of contest in the case of Frost and Metcalfe.

This writing into returns a half or three-quarter circle on the top of a 7 for the purpose of increasing the vote of a Democratic candidate is a Democratic trick of widespread use. In 1884, just before the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who is not now in his seat, was reëlected to the Senate, a forgery was committed in ward 4 A, Cincinnati. The forgery was a change of 709 for the Democratic candidate to 909 by this same Democratic device. It is the simplest thing in the world.

The Democratic operators who do these things would argue with great gravity that there is not much harm in merely writing with a pen a half circle or a three-quarter circle. Possibly the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] may argue that this was a little thing. He must so argue if he stands to his assertion that Mr. Frost was elected. But it is a very large thing when you write your half or three-quarter circle on top of a 7 and make it into a 9, and then by that very simple and, as our Democratic friends would have it, harmless act steal a State Legislature and a United States Senator, which is exactly what was undertaken in Cincinnati. This harmless little change in 1884, in ward 4 A, Cincinnati, writing a half or three-quarter circle on top of 709 and making it 909, elected four Democratic State senators and nine representatives from Hamilton County. It nearly changed the complexion of the State Legislature, a Legislature which was to elect the successor of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and left it with only 2 or 3 majority.

This one little harmless memorandum, such as the constituents of my friend from Missouri were engaged in making in 1876, when made in Cincinnati in 1884, changed four State senators and nine representatives and reduced the Republican majority down to two or three in a Legislature which was to choose the successor to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN].

With the notorious practice which exists in Ohio of electing Democratic United States Senators by corruption there is no man in this Senate who will pretend to say that after the four State senators and nine representatives had been stolen in Ohio it was safe for the Republicans to go into a Senatorial election when on joint ballot there would have been but two or three Republican majority.

That wrong was righted by the Legislature of Ohio before they went into the Senatorial election, and the Senator from Ohio was reëlected to give his valuable counsels and his sound votes to the cause of good Government in this body.

I want to make the facts as to the Ohio forgery specific, because perhaps the Senator from Missouri will undertake to defend these Democrats of Ohio as he is bound to defend those Democrats of Missouri. That forgery was committed by John Tosney. The return as forged was counted by Dan Dalton, county clerk. John Tosney was convicted and sent to the Ohio penitentiary; and thus the intended result of the crime of the changing of a 7 into a 9 in Ohio was averted and the crime punished.

Mr. President, I can not refrain, now that I am on the subject of Democratic methods of election frauds, from alluding to one that is frequently practiced by Democratic counters, and which like writing a half circle on a 7, they consider a very venial offense and something which it is really utterly unreasonable for Republicans to complain of, and which they say above all things we ought not to have United States supervisors to look at and to record and to preserve the evidence of to use in future proceedings. That method is the harmless one, when the Republican candidate gets more votes than the Democratic candidate, in making the return simply to give the Republican candidate the Democratic vote, and the Democratic candidate the Republican vote. It is conceived by the Democrats who are engaged in this business that this is not a great swindle.

There is no changing either of names or figures. The figures are correct and the names are correct. It is only a slight change merely of location, and why should the Republicans of Missouri, or the Republicans of Ohio, or the Republicans of New York, complain when the figures are reproduced by the canvassing officers exactly as the ballots were counted, and they have simply written the Democratic vote against the Republican candidate and the Republican vote against the Democratic candidate?

I saw the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] in his seat a few minutes ago. I had hoped he would remain in his place. It is with great pain——

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the Chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is with great pain that I notice the lack of interest taken in the discussion of this question by those Senators who seem determined, against right and reason, to repeal the election laws. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. My object in rising is to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if I am to understand, as I do understand from his argument, that the authorities of the forty-four States of this Union can not be trusted to supervise and direct and control the election of the Representatives and Senators who are to represent them here? Is that the point?

Mr. CHANDLER. My present argument is not quite so broad. I am showing three instances in detail of Democratic false counting in three different States.

Mr. HARRIS. Individual cases that the Senator charges as such; but I beg again to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if the authorities of sovereign States, in the selection of the Representatives and Senators who shall represent them in the two Houses of Congress, are to be discredited, and overseers, known as Federal officials, I do not care by what name, are to boss and control their action?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will bear in mind that they do not control them. They only look on, and if frauds like these are committed they make a record of them.

Mr. HARRIS. Your Federal officials do a great deal more than look on.

Mr. CHANDLER. They do not interfere with the State election officers.

Mr. HARRIS. Upon the contrary they do, largely.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Tennessee tell us how they do it?

Mr. HARRIS. But no matter about that.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is a very important matter.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg to state to the Senator from New Hampshire that my point goes a little further than that inquiry. I utterly deny that there is any authority, Federal or otherwise, that can interfere with the officers of a State in regulating the selection of their own Representatives and their own Senators. The States are a little older than the Federal Government. They created it, with absolute power to control their——

Mr. HOAR. Thirty-one of the States are not older than the Federal Government.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not hear the wise suggestion of my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. If my friend will yield to me for a moment I will say, without claiming any extraordinary wisdom for my suggestion, that I think when a Senator asserts on the floor, after talking about forty-four States, that they are older than the Federal Government, the observation that thirty-one of them are not is a little wiser than the observation he makes.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is certainly right; there were not forty-four States originally. But there were thirteen, and thirteen consented to the delegation of certain powers, and those powers regulate the powers delegated to the Federal Government, and every State that has come into the Union since has come in under those regulations, and is entitled to as much right as any one of the original States. I say it is impertinent—I do not know that I can command a stronger word that I would be at liberty to use, but if there is a stronger word that I could use I would apply it to the effort of the Federal Government in undertaking to boss a State in the selection of its own Representatives and its own Senators. I do not know that I shall call it an infamy, but I think it is.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am very glad we have succeeded in arousing the Senator from Tennessee to take part in this discussion. I have never felt that there was anything which the Senator did not know about the Government and its Constitution. I have learned many things from the Senator in my pleasant association with him that have shown me his great wisdom. I am glad he has come to participate in the debate. But I regret to notice that the Senator from Tennessee is not aware of all the clauses in the United States Constitution.

Mr. HARRIS. I am exceedingly glad to have the suggestion.

Mr. CHANDLER. I knew that the Senator from his earliest youth had been a diligent student of the Constitution of the United States, and yet he deems it important to rise and inter-

rupt me in my argument, and to do it with an entire forgetfulness or ignorance on his part of the clause in the Constitution of the United States, which says that the Congress may make regulations for the election of Representatives in Congress. How can it be that the Senator, with his full knowledge and his long life of study of the Constitution of the United States, has entirely forgotten or chooses now to absolutely ignore that clause in the Constitution?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Tennessee has not forgotten, nor has he ignored the clause that the Senator from New Hampshire refers to; but if the Senator from New Hampshire with absolutely impartial judgment, not partisan——

Mr. CHANDLER. I profess to be impartial, certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Of which I fear he is incapable——

Mr. CHANDLER. I certainly profess to be impartial.

Mr. HARRIS. If he can assume a judicially impartial attitude and weigh the provision of the Constitution to which he refers, it means no more nor less than this: If a State shall ignore and refuse to send Senators and Representatives to the Congress, then, and only then, the power is intended to be given to Congress to interfere and to provide the ways and means of furnishing Senators and Members, so as to perpetuate the Government.

Mr. CHANDLER. I regret that when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] this afternoon was making a very able and carefully prepared argument to show the constitutionality of the election laws, to show that there is no basis whatever for the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee, that the Congress has the right to make laws regulating the election of Representatives in Congress only when the State refuses or neglects to do it, there were upon the other side of the Chamber not more than two Senators listening to his argument. The Senator from Iowa had a right to expect, when he prepared to speak to this precise point, having a hope—possibly a belief—that he would succeed in inducing some of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber to consent to allow the election laws to remain a little while longer upon the statute book, that they would listen to his argument; but not more than two Senators upon the other side listened to him.

Now, I commend to the Senator from Tennessee that argument, and I hope he will read it in the RECORD to-morrow, and that he will forever put out of his mind the constitutional doubt whether the powers of the Congress to pass a national election law for the control of the election of Representatives can be exerted before the State has refused to provide its own laws for the election of such Representatives. There is neither in the language of the Constitution nor in any one of the Supreme Court decisions the slightest foundation for any opinion or notion of that sort.

Mr. President, before I had the honor of being diverted by the Senator from Tennessee I was speaking of the methods of Democratic frauds, and I had stated the St. Louis fraud, where, by the simple process of writing a half circle on top of a 7, a Democratic Representative was to be counted in in the place of a Republican Representative who had received a majority of the votes at the polls. I had also stated the Ohio fraud, where the same thing was done, and I had further come to another method whereby Democratic election officers make a simple transposition of the vote cast for the Republican candidate, when it happens to be larger than the vote given for the Democratic candidate, and put it against the name of the Democratic candidate and give the Republican candidate the smaller number. I was about to illustrate this tendency of the Democratic mind, this theory of Democratic counting, by referring to a case in the State of New York, which entered into the process by which in 1892 the State senate of New York was stolen from the Republican party and taken possession of by the Democratic party.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] was then in the Chamber. He is not here now. But I shall have occasion at some later period in the debate to call his attention more fully to the facts in connection with the New York senate steal. I now only state specifically that in the second election district, in the town of Fishkill, for State senator the Republican candidate, Deane, received 131 votes, and Osborne, who was the Democratic candidate, received 117 votes. When it was discovered, after the election in November, 1891, that there was a Democratic assembly but that the senate of the State was Republican by 18 to 14, it was announced to the world by a distinguished Democrat of that State, not now a thousand miles from this Chamber, that when the final result should be made known it would appear that the State senate as well as the assembly was Democratic. The process of making good that prediction was carried forward by causing a return to be made from the second election district in the town of Fishkill of 117 votes for Deane, the Republican candidate, and 131 votes for Osborne, the Democratic candidate; and that crime, with other frauds, entered into the steal of the State senate, by which the Republican State of New York was given a Legislature Democratic in both branches.

There has been a great deal said within the last few years about the wrong that has been perpetrated in the State of New York by having a Republican Legislature in a State where there is a Democratic popular majority. I take occasion now to call the attention of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber to the fact that there was at the last election in the State of New York not only a Republican Legislature chosen, but there was a Republican majority on the popular vote of 24,000 upon all the State ticket except the judge, and a majority of over 100,000 for the Republican candidate for judge.

The people of that State are fast making headway in the work of overcoming the Democratic tricks by which, when Mr. Deane gets 131 votes, being a Republican, and Mr. Osborne, 117, being a Democrat, the Democratic counters make a transposition and kindly give to Mr. Osborne the 131 votes and to Mr. Deane only the 117 votes, thereby contributing to the larceny of a State senate and to the enactment of atrocious partisan legislation, which it will be the function of the present Republican Legislature of New York to undo, and which action I trust the present Democratic governor of that State will have the good sense and the patriotism to approve.

But, Mr. President, I am forgetting the case of Frost and Metcalfe. After the 7 had been changed into a 9, and 20 votes thus taken away from Mr. Metcalfe, he still remained elected by 5. It became necessary that the larceny should be completed by an additional fraud, and thereupon the partisans of Mr. Frost induced the judges and clerks of election precinct No. 64 to go, on the morning of the 9th day of November, to the clerk of the county court and make an amended return.

This amended return of precinct 64 gave 8 additional votes to Mr. Frost and 2 additional votes to Mr. Metcalfe, the balance in Mr. Frost's favor being 6, and, as will be seen very readily by Senators, the 6 wiped out the 5 remaining majority for Metcalfe and elected Mr. Frost by 1 plurality.

Now, the remaining history of the case, Frost and Metcalfe, is exceedingly interesting. Mr. Metcalfe went to court. He commenced legal proceedings. He first went to the St. Louis circuit court.

Mr. GRAY. Would it disturb the Senator at this point to interrupt his speech for to-day for an executive session?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am willing to be interrupted for a much longer time than one executive session if the Senator so desires.

Mr. GRAY. I will not trespass upon the Senator's good nature by asking for a longer time than until to-morrow.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will yield to the Senator from Delaware.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 23, 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 and approved.

FORTIFICATION BILL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the Major-General of the Army, submitting an amendment to the fortification bill, making available for general purposes the unexpended balances; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

METROPOLITAN RAILROAD COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a detailed statement of the receipts and disbursements of the Metropolitan Railroad Company for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered printed.

NEW YORK BRIDGE BILL.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I move the reference of the bill (H. R. 3289), the New York bridge bill, together with the veto message of the President, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MOORE AND WOODSON.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the Committee on Claims discharged from the further consideration of Senate resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause the settlement of accounts of special agents Moore and Woodson under the treaty of 1854 with the Delaware Indians, etc.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the resolution, and the Chair will submit the request.

Mr. HUDSON. I desire to explain to the Chair——

The SPEAKER. This must be done without debate.

Mr. HUDSON. The Committee on Indian Affairs has precisely the same bill introduced in the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cause settlement of the accounts of special agents Moore and Woodson under the treaty of 1854 with the Delaware Indians, etc.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, is not this in the nature of a claim, and under the rule goes to the Committee on Claims?

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HUDSON. The original bill was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DINGLEY. If it is in the nature of a claim it ought to go to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DOCKERY. The title indicates clearly that it is a claim.

Mr. HUDSON. It does not appropriate any money.

Mr. DINGLEY. I take the statement of the gentleman that it is not a claim.

Mr. HUDSON. The original bill was referred by the Speaker, of his own motion, to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of this resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE HON. WILLIAM LILLY.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Saturday, February 17, 1894, beginning at 2 o'clock p. m., be set apart for paying a tribute to the memory of the Hon. William Lilly, late a member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

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

EMPLOYÉS IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. BARWIG, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, reported back adversely the resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury for information as to the number of employés in the Treasury Department, not under the classified service, assigned to South Carolina, etc.; which was laid on the table.

The call of committees was concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution (H. Res. 112) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to grant to the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of the District of Columbia the privileges of the Library; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message from the Senate also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4292) "to amend section 3709 of the Revised Statutes relating to contracts for supplies in the Departments at Washington."

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of committees for reports. Under the order the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen have been speaking to me about the fact that the order of yesterday was not finished. Does not the order previously made in the House for consideration of the schedule affecting coal take precedence of the unfinished business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know, but thinks the committee ought to finish what they were considering.

Mr. OATES. The order on which the sugar schedule was considered yesterday was made in committee. The order for the consideration of coal and iron ore was made in the House.

The SPEAKER. The agreement in the House is expressed in the RECORD. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next when the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the pending bill, three hours be devoted to debate of that portion of the bill relating to the duty on coal, that then a vote be taken, and that after that three hours be devoted to discussing the duty on iron ore.

The SPEAKER. That was the agreement made in the House a day or two ago.

Mr. DINGLEY. What was the inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The inquiry of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] was whether this morning, when the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, the committee should complete the question on which they were engaged at the rising of the committee yesterday, or whether, under the order of the House, they would be required to take up another schedule.

Mr. DINGLEY. When the committee rose there was under consideration an amendment to which an amendment had been adopted, and in that situation, without having taken final action, the adjournment was had. That is the pending question.

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair that that question would be properly disposed of this morning before the other was taken up.

Mr. DINGLEY. I take that for granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Does the Chair take into consideration that we were also working on the sugar question under a special order? There was a special order setting aside so many hours yesterday for the consideration of the sugar schedule, and the question is which order takes precedence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that what the gentleman from Ohio calls a special order was merely an agreement that so many hours' debate should be devoted to these particular items and that at a given time the vote should be had. As to the sugar schedule, it was agreed that there should be three hours for debate, which was afterwards, as the Chair understands, enlarged to four hours in the House, and the committee were voting on that proposition when they rose yesterday. Then, pending that agreement, the House made another order or agreement that to-day three hours should be devoted to debate of the iron and coal schedule. The Chair would not think, unless some suggestion were made that does not now occur to him, that that would prevent the committee from disposing of the matter which was under consideration yesterday.

Mr. OATES. That course would certainly have the effect of making an agreement made in Committee of the Whole displace an order made by the House.

The SPEAKER. It certainly was not contemplated to displace the sugar schedule by the iron and coal schedule when the order was made.

Mr. OATES. It may not have been contemplated, but still that would be the effect, to displace an order of the House in order to complete an agreement made in Committee of the Whole. It seems to me that the committee might recur to the sugar schedule after disposing of the order of the day.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, had not the order in relation to the sugar question been exhausted? Had we not voted on all the amendments contemplated by the order, and were not the amendments which were pending when the committee rose other amendments not contemplated by the order?

The committee had voted on all the amendments which were pending when the discussion closed, and these were subsequent amendments coming up under the ordinary rules of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. The gentleman is mistaken. The two amendments that the committee were voting upon at the adjournment had been proposed before the debate closed.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think not. I think it is the gentleman from Ohio who is mistaken.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the order setting apart to-day for the consideration of the duty upon coal was an order made by the House. The agreement as to the sugar schedule was one made in Committee of the Whole, and it seems to me that the committee this morning should go on with the order which the House made for it, and that at the conclusion of that business the matter pending in the committee would properly come up.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the inquiry made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] is quite pertinent, it seems to me, if the point should be made that the House has ordered the coal schedule to be considered this morning. It occurs to me that that order would take precedence over an agreement or order made in the committee. All I desire is

not to have to settle the matter after I shall have taken the chair in Committee of the Whole, so I hope the House will settle that question of priority beforehand. If I were in the chair and the question were raised as to which order, there being two special orders, should have precedence, I should be compelled to decide that the order of the House should have priority over a mere agreement in committee; but I trust that the House will settle the question now before we go into committee.

Mr. REED. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the interest of good faith no such conclusion as that should be reached——

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is wholly immaterial to me which way the question is decided.

Mr. REED (continuing). Because the time for debate on the sugar schedule was extended with the express understanding that we were to finish that subject. The idea of having that matter, over which we spent so much time, thrown over in this way is very unsatisfactory, and it seems to me that the intimation of the Chair is entirely correct. We were in the midst of a vote deciding a question when the time arrived at which the House had ordered an adjournment. When the hour for adjournment arrives in the midst of a roll call, the roll call has to be finished before the House can adjourn. We were right in the midst of a vote on this question, and to hold that we should stop now between two amendments and turn to something else would seem to me to be a very absurd conclusion. I think the intimation of the Chair is entirely correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. OATES. It seems to me there is no difficulty about this matter at all. The agreement in Committee of the Whole not having been completely executed it is simply suspended by order of the House; and when that order shall have been carried out the committee will naturally recur to the unfinished paragraph that it was engaged on when the order of the House began to operate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have read the agreement made in Committee of the Whole as to sugar.

The Clerk read as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that on Monday next, immediately after the committee shall begin its session for the purpose of considering the pending bill, three hours shall be given to the consideration of the sugar schedule in the bill, at the expiration of which time the vote shall be taken upon the pending amendments thereto, if there be any. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the order subsequently made as to iron and coal.

The Clerk read as follows:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next when the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the pending bill, three hours be devoted to debate of that portion of the bill relating to the duty on coal, that then a vote be taken, and that after that three hours be devoted to discussing the duty on iron ore.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent that the order be modified so as to permit the Committee of the Whole to conclude the consideration of the sugar schedule as soon as the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole this morning.

Mr. OATES. And cut off a part of our time; to which I object.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. My proposition is simply to postpone the time for the consideration of coal and iron, not to interfere with the full time granted for the consideration of those schedules.

The SPEAKER. The order made as to coal and iron permits the matter to extend beyond one day. There is an express provision——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It allows six hours; it does not say that the consideration of those subjects shall be concluded to-day.

Mr. OATES. But it says that the six hours shall begin the first thing to-day.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. What objection is there to putting off the consideration of coal and iron for thirty or forty minutes? You will get the same length of time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the whole agreement as to iron and coal. There is an express provision that if the matter be not concluded to-day, the vote shall be taken to-morrow.

Mr. DINGLEY. Upon this question I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the following language of the Digest:

Where two special orders are made for the same time, the one first made takes precedence. The other, according to the practice, if made for that day and from day to day, will come up as soon as the one first made is disposed of.

That seems to settle this question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the order of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understood the Chair to say, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], that the whole of the debate and the votes included in the propositions of the gentleman from West Virginia would be closed on Tuesday afternoon. Now, if we give three hours to the discussion of each of these subjects, that will make six hours, and the proceedings may overrun the length of the daily session. I suggest, therefore, that the proposition be modified so as to leave the vote to be taken on Wednesday if necessary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the agreement will be made.

The SPEAKER. Whilst there may be some question as to the language of these orders, the Chair thinks there is no question as to the intent of the House that the disposition of the sugar matter should be followed by the consideration of the iron ore and coal schedule.

Mr. BLAND. I understand the order to be that after we have voted on the sugar schedule the other order shall take effect. Now we have not concluded voting.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks—of course if the House holds differently it can so determine—that it is competent for the Committee of the Whole to dispose of the sugar schedule and then take up the subject of iron ore and coal.

Mr. OATES. If it is understood by the House that when the sugar question has been disposed of, the order for the consideration of coal and iron shall be entered upon and the full time agreed upon given, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. That is the order which was made. The House will now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE. May I ask what is the decision of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The decision of the Chair is that it is competent for the Committee of the Whole to dispose of the sugar question before it enters upon the consideration of iron ore and coal.

Mr. PRICE. That is the decision of the Chair?

The SPEAKER. It is.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. It relates to the parliamentary status of the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to address himself to that.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] offered yesterday an amendment to strike out all of paragraph 181 and insert a paragraph imposing duty upon raw sugar and also increasing the duties on refined sugars, whereupon the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] proposed an amendment in the nature of a substitute, proposing in lieu of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, to strike out paragraph 181, including lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 38, and to strike out in paragraph 641 (that is a part of the free list) the words "not above No. 16, Dutch standard in color," the effect of which would be to put refined sugar on the free list.

Now, my parliamentary inquiry is whether the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] should not have been treated as a substitute, so that the proposition now before the House would be upon the substitute of the gentleman from New York, placing refined sugar upon the free list and striking out the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, which places raw sugar on the dutiable list. If that is the parliamentary status, there now remains before the Committee of the Whole nothing but the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to first state the position that the Chair holds in the matter, and then he will hear any gentleman who desires to be heard upon it.

Mr. REED. Perhaps the Chair had better hear the argument before he makes a decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not intend to decide the question, but simply to state the position, and then let gentlemen address themselves to the position, not intending to decide it in advance.

Mr. REED. That is what I wanted to guard against. I think the matter is pretty plain.

The CHAIRMAN. It is immaterial with the Chair. The Chair has no pride of opinion, but desires if possible to carry out the wishes of the committee as far as he can, as the organ of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DINGLEY. The point I desire to call attention to——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will therefore hear the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. DINGLEY. As to the nature of the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], it was offered as a substitute, and could be treated as nothing else but a substitute. It

proposed to submit another proposition for the proposition offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON]. It could not be treated as an addition to that, because it was a proposition entirely inconsistent and the reverse of that. The gentleman said he proposed to strike out paragraph 181 of the bill as reported, and to insert something else. It made his motion, in parliamentary effect, a motion to substitute—to amend by way of a substitute—and in that case, the substitute having been adopted, is now the only proposition before the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair requests all gentlemen to take their seats. The Chair can not hear the argument, and gentlemen can not hear the argument as long as they remain standing upon the floor engaged in conversation. It is certainly important for all gentlemen to understand the parliamentary status.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I offered an amendment to paragraph 181, which was to strike out that paragraph and insert a proposition putting a tariff upon sugar.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] offered an amendment to that amendment, and that amendment was recognized by the Chair as an amendment to my amendment, and was so voted upon by the committee. Now, sir, I hold, from my familiarity with the scope of the amendment which I introduced and the amendment which the gentleman from New York introduced, that the two are not inconsistent—that, in effect, the amendment to my amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and voted upon by the House, puts melado, concentrated melado, and molasses on the free list.

Mr. DINGLEY. And puts——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. And it puts all refined sugars on the free list.

Mr. DINGLEY. Refined sugars.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. It places refined sugar upon the free list; so that the two extremes, the lower grades of sugar and the higher grades of sugar, are put on the free list, and the intermediate grades of sugar have a tariff on them, according to the terms of the amendment which I offered.

Mr. DINGLEY. The suggestion I want to make is this: That the amendment offered by my friend from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] put a duty of $1\frac{5}{8}$ per cent upon refined sugar. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] as a substitute put refined sugars upon the free list.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I claim that the amendment of the gentleman simply amended my proposition by putting refined sugar on the free list.

Mr. DINGLEY. It could not be treated as an amendment. It was treated as a substitute.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. It was offered and treated by the committee as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs gentlemen in front of the Chair to please resume their seats.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized.

Mr. DINGLEY. One moment; if the gentleman will pardon me to add a single remark. The effect of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was not only to put refined sugar on the free list, but all sugars on the free list, so that they are two entirely distinct and contrary propositions.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I think I can make this plain to the Chair and to the committee, if I can get the attention of the committee for one moment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] in the remarks which he submitted in regard to the amendment which he proposed subsequently, used certain language to which I desire to call the attention of the committee:

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk and ask the Clerk to read an amendment, the object of which is to strike out from our tariff schedules the remnant of protection which the pending bill proposes to leave for the benefit of the sugar trust in the city of New York.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out paragraph 181, including lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 28; and strike out from paragraph 641 the words "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color," in line 9 and 10, on page 86.

That was the whole of his amendment. He proposed to insert nothing. Mr. WARNER continued to explain:

Mr. WARNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, the first reason why I ask for the adoption of this amendment is that by taking off the duty proposed—one-quarter of a cent per pound—upon refined sugar, you will take off that duty which weighs most universally upon every one in this country, and by so doing will give the most prompt relief and the relief which will be most appreciated of any that can be afforded in any line of tariff reduction.

At that point the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] asked the following question:

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Does the gentleman's amendment propose to make these sugars free?

Mr. WARNER. Absolutely free. The duty of one-quarter of 1 cent, I say, is not a revenue duty. The sugar trust will control then, just as it does now, the supply of refined sugar for this country.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I would like to know upon what this discussion is going on. It does not seem to be addressed to the point of order.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is addressed to the point of order. The object of this explanation is to show the meaning of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York——

Mr. CULBERSON. What is the point of order?

Mr. SPRINGER. The question of order is as to whether the amendment agreed to——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say it is impossible for him to hear the gentleman from Illinois when he turns his back to the Chair. If this is on the point of order, the Chair would very much like to hear it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will state what the point of order is.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will suspend until order is restored so that we can hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has requested gentlemen to resume their seats and cease conversation. The gentleman will suspend until all gentlemen resume their seats. The Chair can not compel gentlemen to cease conversation. He can only request them to do so.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the question of order is as to whether the amendment upon which the committee is now called to vote, namely, the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], is amended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], which simply strikes out section 181 and those other sections of the law in regard to refined sugar, or whether this was an addition to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Louisiana.

I hold that the amendment now before the committee is the text of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], namely, to strike out paragraph 181, including lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 28, and to strike out from paragraph 641 the words "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color," in lines 9 and 10, on page 86. That is the amendment, because it is the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] as amended. The gentleman from Louisiana moves to strike out paragraph 181 and insert the following:

All sugars shall pay a duty upon their polariscopic tests as follows, namely: All sugars testing by the polariscope not above 75° shall pay a duty of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay three one-hundredths of a cent per pound additional, and all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall pay an additional duty of five-twentieths of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That all sugars when exported from or the product of any country, when and so long as such country pays or shall hereafter pay directly or indirectly a bounty on sugar, shall pay in addition to the rates hereinbefore provided a duty equal to the bounty so paid by such country.

The proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] was to strike out and insert—to strike out paragraph 181 and insert what I have read. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] in moving his amendment simply sent it forward as an amendment, assuming that the Chair and the committee would treat it as an amendment, in lieu of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, to take its place——

Mr. HOLMAN. As a substitute?

Mr. SPRINGER. As a substitute; an amendment in the nature of a substitute, because the provisions of one amendment are utterly inconsistent with the provisions of the other.

Mr. COOMBS. All through?

Mr. SPRINGER. All through. One was to strike out and insert—to strike out all that was stricken out by this, and more.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, upon that point does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] insist that it is not competent for the committee to adopt two inconsistent propositions?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is competent for the committee, of course, to adopt two inconsistent propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. And not for the Chair.

Mr. SPRINGER. And not for the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the point the Chair wants to get before the committee very clearly.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Chair is not required to prevent the committee from doing an inconsistent thing. But I am of the opinion in this respect that the inconsistency is covered by the amendment itself, and now that we have simply stricken out all this provision, it must stand in lieu of the motion to strike out and insert. That was the understanding of the committee when it was voting upon the amendment. When we were voting upon this, as I understood, we were voting to take off the quarter of a cent a pound on refined sugar. That is all we were voting for at that time, and that proposition was to take the place of the cent a pound on raw sugar proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the ascending increase of duties provided for in this amendment.

Mr. REED. That is, it was intended as a substitute, understood that it was a substitute, and ought to be regarded as a substitute.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understood it to be a substitute. I think that every member of the House so understood it, and by that means we were voting against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, and putting in its place the one propos d by the gentleman from New York. We all understood, or at least I did, when we had voted on that substitute we had removed every obstacle in the way, and the committee had declared in the vote that the committee gave through tellers its desire to remove the half a cent pound duty.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman is right about that, and all the members of the committee so understood it, there would be no difficulty. But this is a question of fact, and members differ very widely as to the facts. The gentleman from Louisiana, who offered the original amendment, says he did not so understand and does not now understand it to be that way. It seems to be a difference of opinion among members.

Mr. SPRINGER. It seems to me that if there was misapprehension as to what members were voting on in the committee, the committee ought to be permitted to vote understandingly on the proposition, because we have been induced to vote for a proposition that we did not desire, while the Chair would be bound, and gentlemen have been put in the position of having voted for what they did not want. We ought to be permitted to retrace our steps and see if the expression of the committee is to make it a substitute for the proposition pending or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon that point the Chair desires to state, in response to the gentleman, that the Chair will not interpose any objection, but of course a motion to reconsider can not be entertained in committee. However, by unanimous consent, the committee could practically reconsider the vote, and it could be presented to them in such a way as they desire to vote upon it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then I ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Louisiana, and then if it passes we can take a vote upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The committee would first have to give unanimous consent to reconsider.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BLANCHARD. Some of the rest want to be heard also.

The CHAIRMAN. The request for unanimous consent will be considered as pending. The gentleman from Illinois makes a request for unanimous consent, which will be considered as pending, and while it is pending the Chair will hear any gentleman who desires to submit any reflections or remarks upon it.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I desire to address myself for a moment to the request of the gentleman from Illinois. It seems there is an easier and better way out of it than that. Now, I hold it is the duty of the presiding officer to so rule as to avoid any incongruity or evident absurdity. It is an absurdity to say that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] does not come in as a substitute for the pending amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. It is not possible that the members of this House undertook to put refined sugar on the free list and raw sugar upon the dutiable list.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will point out to the Chair any rule——

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Let me complete my sentence. This is the point I desire to make. The Chair can rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York should act as a substitute, and make that his ruling, and then the gentleman from Louisiana could appeal from that and we could get an expression of the will of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon what ground could the Chair make that ruling?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Because it is inconsistent.

Mr. REED. I would like to explain on what ground the Chair could make that ruling.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. REED. The presiding officer of an assembly is the organ of that body. It is his business, if he can do it consistently with the rules of the body and parliamentary law, to effectuate the wish of the assembly. Here is a case where an amendment was pending. Another gentleman offered another amendment, which from its very nature and character was a substitute for the amendment offered by the first gentleman. No matter what language he used in describing it, it is practically clear, from what has been stated by my colleague, that it was a substitute. There is no other sensible way of construing it. There is no other method of giving force to its language. I venture to say, with the exception of six gentlemen, there is not a man in this House who did not fully understand it as a substitute.

Is it to be defeated because the gentleman in presenting it called it an amendment instead of a substitute? Now, every substitute is an amendment; and the gentleman in describing it as an amendment was entirely right; only he failed to be specific. You can judge something of the preposterousness of a ruling by the preposterousness of the conclusion to which it is liable to lead; it is what is called *reductio ad absurdam*. Now, if this is only an amendment to the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], even then the way we are going to come out is this: We are to be presented, not with the alternative between the Robertson amendment and the Warner amendment, but between a proposition which nobody wants—a proposition to tax raw sugars and free refined, and a duty on the refined, which the committee has already, in effect, already voted down. Now, a duty on raw and free refined would deprive us of both revenue and manufacture, and the committee do not want it.

Mr. COOMBS. I understand that to be the object of the amendment.

Mr. REED. How can we be forced to such a conclusion for the mere technical reason that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] did not call his amendment a substitute? It was a substitute, was treated by the House as a substitute, should be treated by the committee as a substitute, and should be treated by the Chair, its representative, in the same manner.

Now, if anybody claims—for it is desirable above all things that we should be entirely fair about such measures and have an honest expression of the sentiment of the committee—if anybody claims that he misunderstood that, that he did not know what he was voting for, that he did not comprehend it as a substitute, the way to correct that is perfectly clear. The committee can permit the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] to be voted upon as a substitute for this, and then we shall arrive at the result of carrying out the intention of the House. I am speaking, not as having anything to do with the decision of the House or any sympathy one way or the other with regard to it; I am simply speaking of it as a question of right proceeding.

Mr. DINGLEY. If my colleague will permit a suggestion, I find on examining the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] that the language of it shows that it was a substitute. It does not propose to strike out any part of the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, but it says strike out paragraph 181. That language fixes it as a substitute.

Mr. REED. Yes, the very language of the amendment classifies it as a substitute. It does not refer to the language of the so-called Robertson amendment, but refers to the language of the original bill; therefore it could never have been anything but a substitute and the Chair can not construe it as anything but a substitute.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Chairman, there are many members on this floor who do not at all agree with the gentleman from Maine as to the understanding of the Committee of the Whole when they took the vote which is now under discussion. It will not be denied by anyone that the parliamentary situation was this: My colleague, Mr. ROBERTSON, offered an amendment to paragraph 181, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment, and his amendment was considered all through the afternoon as an amendment to the amendment of my colleague. At that time there was no suggestion from the gentleman from Maine or anyone else that it was to be considered as a substitute and not as an amendment. That was the time for that point to have been made.

But every member on this floor sat silent and did not make the point. They permitted the Chair to consider it an amendment to an amendment, and it is down in the RECORD and Journal as plain as it can be in that position. But, further, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], with all of his parliamentary knowledge and skill, will hardly contend that two substitutes can be pending to a proposition at the same time. Yet that is the position in which his contention would place this matter. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that he permitted the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] to offer an amendment to the amendment of my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], and then submitted to the committee a proposition for unanimous consent for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] to offer a substitute for both propositions.

That unanimous consent was given, whereupon the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] was recognized to offer a substitute. He did offer it, and the Chair submitted his substitute to the Committee of the Whole, and it was voted down. Now, if the amendment of the gentleman from New York was a substitute and not an amendment to the amendment of my colleague [Mr. ROBERTSON], why did not the gentleman from Maine, or some other gentleman, rise and make the point of order when

the gentleman from Kentucky offered his substitute that it was not in order because one substitute was already pending?

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] did at that time make the point that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was not an amendment to his proposition. And I would like to inquire just here how a proposition can amend that to which it does not refer?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rose and addressed the Chair and made a statement to the House before the vote was taken that I desired to inform members that the amendment of the gentleman from New York was to some extent inconsistent with my proposition, and having been notified of this when they were casting that vote, they are to be held as voting deliberately with a knowledge of the situation. I made those statements out of order; I was not recognized by the Chair, and my point, of course, was not put to the House, but the House was informed of the situation by the language which I used, and it voted when it did vote on the amendment of the gentleman from New York as an amendment to the amendment which I had offered.

Mr. BLANCHARD. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, and I do not think any parliamentarian on this floor will dispute the proposition, that if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was, as is now contended, an amendment in the nature of a substitute, a further substitute, to wit, the one offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] would not have been in order.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLANCHARD. In one moment. The fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Warner amendment was considered as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana was the only condition upon which the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky could have been received.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman insists that a second substitute could not be entertained. Was not unanimous consent asked of this committee to entertain the substitute of the gentleman from Kentucky, and could not the committee give unanimous consent to consider two substitutes if it chose?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The question of the gentleman from Ohio is a little far-fetched. It is a little piece of ingenuity on his part to steer around a difficult question. The gentleman from Ohio knows, and every gentleman upon this floor knows, that unanimous consent was not asked for the gentleman from Kentucky to offer his substitute because another substitute was pending.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It does not make any difference what reason he gave for it.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I do not yield for a further interruption by the gentleman. I yielded for his question. Unanimous consent was asked because there was a misunderstanding between the Chair on one part and myself and other gentlemen on the other part, not because it was necessary to ask unanimous consent on account of one substitute being already pending, and from a parliamentary standpoint another could not be offered except by unanimous consent, but because of the misunderstanding between the Chair and certain gentlemen on this floor as to their right to offer a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and the amendment of Mr. WARNER to that amendment. So that the gentleman can not get around the difficulty in that way.

The situation, Mr. Chairman, as disclosed in the RECORD all through is that the Chair treated the amendment of the gentleman from New York as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and the Chair can not now entertain any other position with reference to that amendment that will not be inconsistent with yesterday's proceedings as they appear in the RECORD. The Committee of the Whole had the right to adopt the amendment of Mr. WARNER to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and it did so; and then the question recurs parliamentarily upon the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York. There can be no escape from this position without a proceeding entirely inconsistent—a proceeding which will not tally with the proceedings of yesterday as disclosed in the Journal and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will.

Mr. REED. The gentleman said a moment ago, I believe, that two substitutes can not be pending at the same time?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Two substitutes of an entirely different nature to the same proposition.

Mr. REED. What is to hinder it, if no point of order is made?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman in this way: If the amendment of the gentleman from New York was an amendment in the nature of a substitute instead of an outright amendment to an amendment, why did not the gentleman from Maine make the point at that time?

Mr. REED. I was not here.

Mr. BLANCHARD. He did not make it, yet he comes in this morning and says that this was not an amendment to an amendment, but an amendment in the nature of a substitute, when it was not offered in any such way.

Mr. REED. Does the gentleman from Louisiana consider that an answer?

Mr. BLANCHARD. The gentleman from Maine can take it as he pleases.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman from Louisiana allow me a question?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will.

Mr. KILGORE. Would it not be competent for the gentleman from New York to call his amendment a substitute, *nunc pro tunc?* [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANCHARD. After the amendment of the gentleman from New York is adopted as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, it is a little too late to make any change in the parliamentary status by doing anything *nunc pro tunc.*

Mr. STOCKDALE. There is one point I would like the gentleman to explain——

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. One parliamentary inquiry, that of the gentleman from Louisiana, is pending.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I yield for a moment to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE].

Mr. STOCKDALE. If it be true that the Warner amendment does not refer in language or otherwise to the Robertson amendment, but is an amendment to the bill and was so voted on, and the Robertson amendment was not voted on, is not the Robertson amendment now pending to be voted on; and would not that vote clear up the whole proposition?

Mr. BLANCHARD. I will state to my friend from Mississippi that, without objection from anyone, the gentleman from New York offered an amendment, no matter in what language, no matter in what way it may have been presented; it was offered as an amendment. It was treated by the Chairman, without objection from the gentleman from New York or any other gentleman, as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. As such alone it was submitted to this House; as such alone it was voted upon by this House; as such alone it was adopted by the House. That is the situation.

Now, the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana has been amended by the action of the House in adopting the Warner amendment to the Robertson amendment; and there is no way for the Committee of the Whole now to proceed, if we are going farther in the disposition of the propositions submitted yesterday, except to submit to the House the question on the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York. What effect the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, as amended by the proposition of the gentleman from New York, will have, is a matter that cuts no figure in the parliamentary question now presented. A vote on the Robertson amendment, as amended by the Warner amendment, is now the only parliamentary move that can be made. The only other way to reach the matter would be to reconsider the vote by which the Warner amendment was adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that the RECORD discloses the exact situation with reference to this amendment. I insist that we proceed in a parliamentary way; that the Chair do not now recede from its ruling yesterday, viz, that this was an amendment to an amendment; that the Chair be consistent with the proceedings had yesterday, and declare that the vote is now to be taken on the amendment of my colleague from Louisiana as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEARD. It is perfectly obvious to all that there was a serious misunderstanding prevailing in the House at the time this vote was taken. I now ask, Mr. Chairman, is it not competent for the Committee of the Whole to declare what its purpose was, and to give effect to it in the following manner: When the Chair makes a ruling upon this point, is it not competent for the committee to except to the ruling, whatever it may be, and take an appeal from the decision of the Chair, and test it in that way, as a vote of the committee would declare what its purpose was?

The CHAIRMAN. When the Chair decides, the decision of the Chai will be subject to appeal.

Mr. HEARD. Then I say it occurs to me that the committee

can, by that method, have an opportunity for declaring whether or not the Chair properly interprets the intent of the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If a member offers a proposition to the committee or to the House the parliamentary condition of that paper and its relation to pending questions does not depend upon the statement made by the gentleman who offers it, but upon the substance of the paper and its relation to the questions that are then pending.

Now, the question pending was the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] to strike out the entire clause of section 181 and substitute therefor his proposition. The paper offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was a proposition to strike out section 181, and section 641 of the free list, and to insert——

Mr. SPRINGER. To insert nothing.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. To insert nothing, but simply to strike out. Now, there was not possibly any mode by which the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] could be written before, in the middle of, or at the end of the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON]. There is no way by which that proposition can be prefixed, annexed, or inserted into the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Now, the common principle of the law is that all amendments to a statute are to be considered as if they had been originally written into the text, and the entire text, the original text, and the amended text, are to be read as if they were one text.

Now, it is absolutely impossible to do that with these two propositions; and the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] that his proposition is an amendment to the amendment does not change the substance of it, and when the committee adopted it, it necessarily adopted it as a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Now, when I came to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, it was a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], because it included within its scope all sugars, raw and refined, and all materials out of which sugars could be made—malado, molasses, drainings, drippings, and everything else—and therefore it was in substance a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER]; and when the House voted that down they voted the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] into the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], in the sense that they adopted it in lieu of that. It left the parliamentary condition in this situation, that the substitute of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was the only pending question; that and that alone was pending.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. It had not been carried?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It had not been carried.

The CHAIRMAN. What, then, would become of the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. It had been destroyed by having had the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] placed in lieu of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Because the House so voted.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it because it was inconsistent with it?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Not only because it was inconsistent with it, but because it was necessarily in the very teeth of it, a substitute. Now, it is not inconsistent, if the Chair please, in the ordinary sense of inconsistency, because there may be two propositions which are not in their whole absolutely consistent, but yet which can have in some way an agreement; but this is absolutely destructive of the other.

Mr. COOMBS. Will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] answer a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I do not know whether I will or not. I will if I can.

Mr. COOMBS. Suppose it had been the intention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] to simply remove the duty on refined sugar and impose a duty on raw sugar, so as to make it impossible for refined sugar to be made in this country, it would be inconsistent as a matter of policy, but would it not be possible from a parliamentary standpoint?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But if the gentleman will reread the proposition offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] and the proposition offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], he will find that that does not occur, because the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] puts all sugar on the free list. The proposition of the gentleman from New York does that, and the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] puts all sugars on the taxable list—all except maple sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky give the Chair his attention? The Chair agrees substantially with the gentleman on his line of reasoning until he comes to the point of saying that the Chair must hold that this amendment of the gentleman from New York was a substitute, and the Chair would ask the gentleman how he could so hold? Now, the Chair wants to get the mind of the gentleman to the point that is in the mind of the Chair.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If the Chair will allow me to interpolate, I would say that if I can convince the Chair that it ought to hold so and so, I know there is no court before which I have practiced that could not find a way how to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The difficulty that exists with the Chair, and the Chair simply desires to call the attention of the gentleman to the difficulty that is presented, is this: On yesterday afternoon the Chair treated the amendment of the gentleman from New York as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. These two gentlemen will remember that the Chair suggested that they should introduce their amendments, one as an original proposition and the other as an amendment to it, and then that the matter would be open for a substitute, if any gentleman desired to offer it; the object being to get as many propositions before the committee as could be admitted under the rule, and not to shut out anyone from offering amendments.

Now, if it be true that the propositions are utterly inconsistent with each other, which the gentleman from Louisiana does not concede, but, admitting it, it would not make them unparliamentary, and would not make it necessary for the Chair to rule either one of them out of order. Now, the only effect of the argument of the gentleman from Kentucky would be to make the Chair rule the amendment of the gentleman from New York out of order, because it is a substitute, or because it is inconsistent with the original proposition. That the Chair does not think he could do——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If the Chair will allow me to go one step back——

The CHAIRMAN (continuing): Under this rule, which provides that if an amendment be proposed inconsistent with the amendment, or with one already agreed to, it is a fit ground for its rejection by the House, but it is not within the cognizance of the Speaker to suppress it as if it were against order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. But that is not the point here, the point being on an amendment pending. That rule is where an amendment that has been adopted is inconsistent it is not for the Chair to decide its inconsistency. This is a question where two propositions are pending, and it is for the Chair to decide when he looks at them whether it is an amendment or a substitute. Therefore I ask the Chairman to draw the distinction I am trying to draw. Where a proposition is pending, and a gentleman offers another proposition, is it not the duty of the Chair to decide whether the second proposition is an amendment or a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. Right now; the Chair decided yesterday evening that the amendment of the gentleman from New York was an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and no gentleman objected and no gentleman protested. The Chair submitted the question in that form, the committee voted upon and adopted it as an amendment to the amendment. Now, as the gentleman's argument, the Chair asks——

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, let me read to the gentleman from Kentucky, to see whether any other construction can be given to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and see the shape that you are in. Will the Chair pardon me for reading it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not concluded his statement, but will yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If I have the floor, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think this will strengthen the position of the gentleman from Kentucky. It simply presents this fact. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have only to read the propositions as they stand in order to demonstrate very clearly that the gentleman from Kentucky is correct.

Now, let me call attention to the two propositions. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] moved to strike out paragraph 181, and insert the following: "All sugars shall pay a duty upon their polariscopic test, as follows," giving the amount of each kind, "provided that all sugars from countries that pay export duties shall pay," and so on. That being pending before the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] proposed in writing—no matter what he said this is

his written amendment—the following: "Strike out paragraph 181, including lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 28; and strike out from paragraph 641 the words, 'not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color,' in lines 9 and 10, on page 86."

Now, how would this amendment read on the construction that has been contended for here that the proposition of the gentleman from New York was merely intended as an addition to the original amendment? Why, it would be the most absurd proposition ever heard of.

Mr. BLANCHARD. How was it received by the Chair?

Mr. DINGLEY. No matter how it was received. The very language of the gentleman from New York itself contains a conclusive demonstration that it is a substitute, and the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], with the amendment of the gentleman from New York added to it, would be not only incongruous but an absurdity. In order to make this perfectly clear I will read the two together. Let us suppose that the contention of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] that the amendment of the gentleman from New York was simply an amendment to be added to that of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], let us see what we would have before us to vote upon. I read first the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON]:

Strike out all of paragraph 181, and insert the following:

"All sugars shall pay a duty upon their polariscope test as follows: namely: All sugars testing by the polariscope not above 75° shall pay a duty of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay three one-hundredths of a cent per pound additional, and all sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard in color shall pay an additional duty of five-twentieths of 1 cent per pound.

"*Provided*, That all sugars when exported from, or the product of, any country when and so long as such country pays or shall hereafter pay directly or indirectly a bounty on sugar, shall pay in addition to the rates herein provided for a duty equal to the bounty so paid by such country."

Now, add to that the proposition of the gentleman from New York:

Strike out paragraph 181, including lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 28; and strike out from paragraph 641 the words, "not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color," in lines 9 and 10, on page 86.

What kind of an amendment have you there on the construction that has been contended for? It is obvious, as contended by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], that the last part of this which I have read is a distinct proposition, a substitute, and that it can not be added to the original proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but it seemed to me that having asked and obtained unanimous consent yesterday to offer my proposition I ought to express the opinion that this was a substitute. If the Chair desires to change the decision which he made yesterday afternoon, it seems to me there is no difficulty, because the matter is still pending; no error has been committed by the Chair, if he thinks he has fallen into an error, that can not be remedied, because the matter has not yet passed beyond the power of the Chair.

Now, I want to say with great frankness that since the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has proved that I was correct, I am not so certain about it. [Laughter.] I am not so certain that there is not a possible construction which I desire to suggest, and to which I shall be glad to have the attention of the gentleman from Maine. The gentleman was kind enough to read the two amendments together so as to show that I was correct, but I desire to submit to him now, and to the committee, whether it is not possible that the effect of the one, a substitute, is to strike out two clauses from the bill and, if the Robertson amendment should be adopted, to insert, in lieu of those two clauses, that amendment; so that the proposition of the gentleman from New York would simply clear the way for the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana by making a hiatus in the body of the bill into which it could be inserted.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Will the gentleman from Kentucky permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I will yield for a question.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky to state that his amendment, or rather substitute, which was voted down yesterday——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. To my great regret. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANCHARD. I understood the gentleman to say that it was more in the nature of a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Now, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to his own language used yesterday in presenting it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I meant as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, and——

Mr. BLANCHARD. But you stated awhile ago that your substitute was more in the nature of a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from New York. Now, your own language yesterday was vastly different.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. If I stated that, I did not say what I intended; but I think the gentleman misunderstood me. What I meant to say was that the proposition I offered was a substitute to take the place of whatever was before the committee.

Mr. BLANCHARD. That was the statement you made yesterday. You said:

Mr. Chairman, I now offer that as a substitute for all pending amendments and for paragraph 181.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. That is exactly what I meant. I expressed yesterday, as I have expressed this morning, the idea that my proposition was intended to be a substitute for the text of the bill and for whatever was pending before the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the impression which gentlemen have made on this committee as to the inconsistency of the amendment of the gentleman from New York with my amendment does not state the condition as it exists. My amendment was a proposition to strike out and insert. It applied to paragraph 181. The part of the amendment of the gentleman from New York which applied to paragraph 181 was only a motion to strike out the words which put a duty on refined sugar. That part of his amendment, I say, was simply a motion to strike out, while mine was a motion to strike out and insert. Therefore, in so far as the first part of his amendment is concerned, it has identically the same effect as mine in striking out certain words in paragraph 181, but it does not go as far as mine. Mine moves to strike out, and to insert in place of the words stricken out a proposition for a duty upon sugar. The two propositions, therefore, are not at all inconsistent. The other part of the amendment of the gentleman from New York refers to a portion of the bill which is not covered by my amendment, and is a specific amendment to a part of the bill which my amendment does not apply to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I wish to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if it is not a fact that his amendment was not read at the desk when he first offered it? Was there not some delay?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I do not remember as to that, but I think it was read at the time. It was offered and read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. You delayed it somewhat, did you not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisania. No, sir; not at all. It was offered and read, and I spoke to it immediately after it was read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Does your amendment deal with paragraph 641 at all?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. The effect of your amendment is, at one place to put a duty on sugar and at another place to put sugar on the free list.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. No, sir, it is not. My amendment should have and would have been followed by another amendment to another portion of the bill. The amendment of the gentleman from New York was offered to two separate and distinct parts of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. It would leave sugar on the free list in one place and in another place would put a duty on sugar.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Not at all. The language would have to be transposed. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have stated the exact situation as it was yesterday, and I hold that there is no inconsistency between the two propositions. The committee voted an amendment to my amendment on yesterday which puts a duty upon sugar, and the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] simply strikes out the words which, upon the adoption of my amendment, will be replaced by others to be inserted by a direct motion.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has seen the amendments to any measure in the House in a more tangled condition than these are in has had a long experience here. [Laughter.] The amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana applies to paragraph 181. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], whether substitute or amendment, applies to both paragraph 181 and paragraph 641; and I desire now to make a parliamentary inquiry, because the object here is to get out of this tangle, and it has been ruled that we can not reconsider in Committee of the Whole.

Under the order that has been adopted by the committee, would it be in order, Mr. Chairman, if all the amendments now

pending to paragraph 181 are voted down, to offer such amendments as members desire to have acted upon to paragraph 641? The only way that I see out of the tangle is to vote down the amendments as amendments to this paragraph, and then apply them to paragraph 641, and profit by the experience of the past and not tie ourselves in such a hard knot again.

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee, the Chair would state that he has always understood the rule to be that when a proposition is pending and a vote ordered to be taken at a specified time in the future upon that proposition and pending amendments only four amendments can be offered; an amendment to the proposition, an amendment to that amendment, then a substitute, which the rule says may be once amended, making four propositions in all. But the Chair understands that they must be pending at the hour specified for the vote.

Now, there were no other amendments pending at the time specified when the vote was about to be taken; and the Chair does not think new amendments could be entertained.

Mr. McMILLIN. The Chair thinks they could not be entertained?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. DINGLEY. One moment——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think that that ruling——

Mr. McMILLIN. Permit me to proceed a moment.

Mr. DINGLEY. Right at that point I want to call the gentleman's attention——

Mr. McMILLIN. In one moment I will give way to the gentleman, but I do not want to be diverted now from the point I was about to make.

Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to withdraw the amendments in their present shape, as applied to section 181, and let the same amendments that were pending be offered hereafter to section 641?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done by unanimous consent. The gentleman is aware that when a vote has been taken on adopting an amendment, it can not be withdrawn without unanimous consent. Before a proposition is voted on, it can be withdrawn in the House; but as the Chair now remembers the rule, after an amendment is offered in Committee of the Whole it can not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent, even though it has not been voted upon.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not know whether it would be agreeable to gentlemen who have offered these amendments to take the course I suggest, but it is the only course I see out of the present difficulty. I trust I may be pardoned for relating an historical event which illustrates our present condition.

A negro who was employed as a general roustabout at a railroad station, saw a large dog brought in to be expressed to some distant point. After a time the dog broke out of his crate, lost his tag, and was "rollicking" around generally through the depot. Then the African, knowing he had been brought there to be expressed, grabbed a handful of the hide of the animal's neck and dragged the canine unwillingly up to the express office.

He said, "Mr. Expressman, I want to 'spress this dog." "Well," said the expressman, "where do you want to send him to?" The negro replied, "Well, I don't know; he's a dog, and he don't know; and he's eat his tag, and nobody knows." [Laughter.] If we don't watch we will lose our tag.

Now, if we do not get out of our present difficulty in the way I suggest, we will have trouble in doing so at an early moment I fear. I do not feel at liberty to ask gentlemen to withdraw these amendments and apply them to the subsequent section; but if the Committee of the Whole would give consent to that, under the ruling of the Chair, it might be done by unanimous consent, and we could then vote on these two propositions as we see fit, and ultimately strike out the present paragraph if we wish.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think a solution of this question can be reached in a way to satisfy all parties, and with that view I wish to make a suggestion to the Chair and to the committee. The point of order which I have made is that the amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York is and was in the nature of a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and displaced it, and that the question now before the Committee of the Whole is upon the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York; that the sole text before us is the text of his amendment. Having made that point of order, I ask the Chair, as the question arose out of a misunderstanding in the committee, to submit the point of order to the committee, so that the committee can decide what our understanding was. If this can be done there will be no embarrassment to the Chair, and the present difficulty can be solved. If the Chair thinks he has power to submit this question without unanimous consent——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that any question of order may be submitted to the committee if the Chair desires to do so. If the Chair should hold that the amendment of the gentleman from New York is to be treated as a substitute, of course the ruling of the Chair on that point could be appealed from; and the Committee of the Whole would be called upon to decide whether the opinion of the Chair should be sustained as the judgment of the committee. But the gentlemen of the committee might have hesitancy in voting upon that question; and the Chair is perfectly willing, without ruling upon the point, to submit to the committee whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York shall be treated as a substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. There has been so much debate on this subject since last night that I think the exact situation has been lost sight of. When the Chair was about to state the question that "the vote now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York," I raised a question of order, which was that the amendment of the gentleman from New York was in the nature of a substitute and that the adoption of that substitute had really defeated the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. That was the point made last night. Now, I ask the Chair either to decide that point of order, or, in accordance with the suggestion just made, to submit it to the House. We are willing on our side that either course shall be taken.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I think that this mistake is not the fault specially either of the Chair or of the gentleman from New York; and at any rate there is a very easy way out of the difficulty. Of course the mistake of the gentleman from New York was in offering his amendment as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. The amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana was to strike out section 181 and insert certain matter. The amendment of the gentleman from New York was to strike out section 181 and part of section 641. Strictly speaking, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York was not an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. It was simply an amendment to the original text. The motion of the gentleman from New York being simply a motion to strike out, and the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana being a motion to strike out and insert, the question under the rules ought to have been put first upon the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. The rule on this subject is clear and specific. It is found in clause 7 of Rule XVI:

7. A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible, but a motion to strike out being lost shall neither preclude amendment nor motion to strike out and insert; and no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Now, turning to the Manual we find that it is settled under the decisions of the House that—

If it is proposed to amend by striking out a paragraph, the friends of the paragraph are first to make it as perfect as they can, by amendments, before the question is put for striking it out.

Now, I think the mistake of the Chair was not one for which the Chair is the least to blame, because in the great confusion on the floor it was impossible for the Chair to tell exactly what the amendments of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] and of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] were, or what relation one had to the other.

I think the only mistake the Chair made was in putting the motion upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York first as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. The motion should have been put upon the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] simply to strike out and insert, and afterwards on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] to strike out. And I think that mistake having been made, the Chair can correct it by putting the other motion first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to say that he did not make any mistake. The Chair gave the gentleman from Louisiana the floor to offer the amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] obtained the floor and offered his amendment as an amendment to it, and the Chair submitted it in that form and no point of order was made.

Mr. BYNUM. The Chair is correct in that; but nevertheless one is simply a motion to strike out and insert, and the other is a motion to strike out, and the motion to strike out and insert always takes precedence of a motion to strike out; and while the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] confused the Chair by offering his proposition as an amendment to the amendment, it was nevertheless simply a motion to strike out; and certainly the committee had a right to vote upon the motion to strike out and insert before voting on the motion simply to strike out.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I first want to call the attention of the Chair to a point which is, I do not doubt, absolutely well known to the Chair and to every other gentleman present, but which seems for the moment to have been lost sight of, and that is that in a parliamentary sense there is no such thing as a substitute. The only question is as to whether an amendment is an amendment not in the nature of a substitute, or an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and whether it is such or not depends not on the intent of any gentleman, but upon its substance and effect.

I wish also to suggest that this morning is a bad time to be discussing any mere question as to accuracy of language, for, as has been suggested to me, the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MEIKLEJOHN], offered yesterday, was really a substitute, although it was put as an amendment; and on page 1247 of the RECORD I find that the Clerk at the desk, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], our Chairman, each used the word "amendment" when referring to a substitute.

When the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] was pending, after he had explained that it was in the nature of a substitute, the Clerk records that—

The amendment was read.

When the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] referred to it, immediately afterwards, he referred to it not as a substitute, but as an amendment; and when the Chair, near the bottom of the page, undertook to explain the parliamentary situation, he stated that there were four amendments pending to paragraph 181, two of which were substitutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will understand that all substitutes are amendments, while all amendments are not substitutes.

Mr. WARNER. "The gentleman" is not criticising the Chair. The gentleman thinks the Chair was correct. The gentleman is simply calling attention to the fact that the mere fact of referring to a substitute as an amendment is not, in parliamentary practice, determinative of it as an amendment as distinguished from a substitute.

In the next place, the gentleman from New York, as the RECORD shows, did not propose any amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON]. The proposition of the gentleman from New York related to two sections of the bill, sections 181 and 641, only one of which was referred to even by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], and therefore the amendment in its nature was as much of an amendment to section 641, and thereby entitled to an independent standing, as was the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] entitled to its position as an amendment to section 181. And what is more, Mr. Chairman, in presenting the amendment, this is the language that was used:

I send to the desk and ask the Clerk to read an amendment, the object of which is to strike out, etc.

In other words, it thereupon became a pending amendment; whether in order or not makes no difference, since the point of order was not then raised. It was an amendment relating to section 641 as well as to section 181, and therefore was entitled to an independent standing; and the mere fact that the Chair in putting it described it simply as an amendment, which it was, and did not further designate it, as he had no occasion to do, makes no possible difference in the parliamentary status.

But, sir, the question has passed from one as to whether the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York (myself) was in order when it was proposed, or whether the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] should have been put first or second.

The action of the committee has transmuted the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] into an order from the Committee of the Whole House, and the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], if it has the standing of an amendment, must conform to the order of the committee as expressed by its adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York (myself).

The two amendments, briefly described, are as follows:

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] moved that section 181 be stricken out, and that a complicated schedule of duties be imposed upon sugar.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] proposed his amendment, not as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], but as an amendment standing upon its own basis, proposing that section 181 be stricken out and that all sugars be put upon the free list, and he so declared to the House; and when the House adopted the amendment, the direction taking out section 181 and putting all sugars upon the free list left absolutely nothing of any amendment providing for duties which might have been theretofore proposed to that section and subject to the action of the House thus taken. The proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] is therefore destroyed by the order of the House, which order—the action of the House—absolutely brushes aside all rules of procedure, which are of no effect when confronted with the fact that the House has actually acted. Such is the case here. The House has ordered that the proposal of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] be amended in accord with the proposal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], and on comparison it is evident that not a shred of the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana remains. The result is that the amendment of the gentleman from New York is substituted for that proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana, a status which must be recognized.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, I ask that this question of order be submitted to the committee.

Mr. HEARD. Since the whole difficulty arises from the question as to what was the understanding and intent of the committee, it occurs to me that the intimation by the Chair of a disposition to submit the question to the committtee to decide whether the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] was to be treated as an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], or as a substitute therefor, should be accepted, and that such action on the part of the Chair will enable the committee to give effect to its purpose and will relieve the situation of all difficulty; and I hope the Chair may be given an opportunity of thus submitting the question to the House and letting the House pass upon it.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point and to take final action.

The parliamentary situation is certainly not without very great difficulties; but, at the same time, the Chair thinks the road is clear to a satisfactory conclusion. The status is this: When paragraph 181 was reached the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] to offer an amendment to it.

He then recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER] to offer an amendment to that amendment. He had conferred with each of these two gentlemen, and they had been informed of the intention of the Chair to so recognize them. The Chair, as a fact, had read the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], but he had not read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON] when he offered it. The Chair held that only those two amendments were pending when the period arrived to vote upon that paragraph.

But subsequently the committee, by unanimous consent, considered the proposed substitute of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE]. That was voted down. The Chair then stated that the question was upon the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], the amendment to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER].

Now, there was no exception to any of these proceedings. The Chair stated it distinctly, as the RECORD shows here, that it was submitted as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON]. It was voted upon in that way. Tellers were ordered, and it was carried. Now, at that stage the gentleman from Ohio made a point of order.

The gentleman stated, if the Chair remembers correctly, that the amendment just adopted to the amendment was inconsistent, etc., to the original amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana. The fact that it was inconsistent would make no difference in the opinion of the Chair, as a parliamentary question; it might as a legislative question; and if the committee saw fit to vote both amendments in and make them a part of the same proposition, it was in the power of the committee to do so. Whether wise or unwise it was for them to determine. Now, that being the status, the contention arose yesterday evening, and in the confusion it was not determined when the committee rose. Now, the Chair this morning is asked to hold that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WARNER], being wholly inconsistent, as it is claimed, with the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON], must be considered as a substitute; and it is insisted on both sides of the House that gentlemen understood that it was offered as a substitute, and that they voted upon it with that understanding.

If the Chair holds that the amendment of the gentleman from New York is a substitute, and as a substitute displaces the original amendment, the decision can be appealed from and the committee would have to decide the matter. If the Chair held that it was not a substitute but an amendment to the amendment of the gentlemen from Louisiana, that decision could be

appealed from and in any event the committee might have to settle the question. Therefore, in order that the committee may settle it, without having to pass upon the action of the Chair, or be biased in any way by the decision of the Chair of the question, the Chair, as an original proposition, will submit the question to the committee.

The question then, the point of order being made that the amendment of the gentleman from New York is a substitute, and was voted upon as a substitute and should be treated as a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, the Chair will submit to the committee in this way: Shall the amendment of the gentleman from New York be treated as a substitute or an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. I would like to inquire what would be the effect upon this House of a vote?

The CHAIRMAN. If the contentions of gentlemen on both sides are correct, that they understood the amendment was a substitute and voted intelligently that way, and decided that it was a substitute, it would be so adopted by the committee's vote, and then the paragraph 181 would be submitted to the House as amended by the substitute. If, on the other hand, the committee votes down that proposition on a point of order and decides that they did not understand that it was a substitute, then the Chair would submit the question to the committee upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Has not the committee voted upon that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to go into that now. The Chair will submit the other question. The question is, Shall the amendment of the gentleman from New York be considered as a substitute?

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes seem to have it; the ayes have it, and the amendment will be considered as a substitute; and the question now is on paragraph 181 as amended by the substitute or amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Can we debate that question?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not open for debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. In stating the question, the Chair ignores the proposition that paragraph 641 is included in the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not undertake to say what was in the proposition.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let the paragraph be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the paragraph and the amendment agreed to as a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Paragraph 181: All sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard in color, shall pay a duty of five-twentieths of a cent per pound.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, let the Clerk read also the paragraph on the free list as it stands in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has first read the paragraph 181. The Clerk will now read the substitute of the gentleman from New York, and will also read the lines which are stricken out by the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out paragraph 181, including lines 11, 12, and 13, on page 28, and strike out from paragraph 641, on page 86, the words:

"Not above number sixteen, Dutch standard in color," in lines number 10 and 11, on page 86.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now upon agreeing to this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Let us have the original proposition read, to which that may be a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That has been voted down, and the substitute has been adopted.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is nothing now before the committee except this text.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all. The question is now upon this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, is the effect of the adoption of this amendment to put all sugar on the free list?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question which the gentleman must answer for himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANCHARD. And debate is not in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. That is an important question.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order. The question is on the paragraph as amended.

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

Mr. PRICE. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 161, noes 38.

Mr. PRICE, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. BLANCHARD asked for tellers.

Tellers were refused; only 19 members voting in favor thereof.

COAL.

The CHAIRMAN. There are no other amendments to the sugar schedule, and the committee will now take up the schedule known as the coal schedule. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] is recognized.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out of the free list "coal, etc.", and on page 55, immediately after line 9, paragraph 316 of the bill, insert: "Coal, bituminous, and shale, 40 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel (18.17); coal, slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 20 cents per pound of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers this as an amendment to the coal schedule. The Clerk will first read the text of the bill on coal.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I understand that the order is that we are to devote three hours to the coal schedule and then take up iron. Would it be in order, under the head of ores, to offer an amendment relative to lead?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not decide that question in that general form, but if the gentleman will prepare an amendment and offer it at the proper time the Chair will pass upon it.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The reason I ask the question is, that in my community we are very much interested in this question, and we have had no opportunity to offer any amendments to the ore schedule. If we can have unanimous consent to have an hour upon that branch of the bill I would like to have it understood at this time.

Mr. OATES. There has been no agreement about time, and that would rest with the Chair. I understand the gentleman from Washington to make some proposition about time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes a parliamentary inquiry as to whether an amendment would be in order in reference to lead.

Mr. OATES. The noise was so great that I could not hear the gentleman distinctly.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the ore schedules are now up?

The CHAIRMAN. Only coal.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. But I understand that iron follows.

The CHAIRMAN. But they will be considered separately.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Well, I want to follow the iron with lead, and I would like to have an hour or thirty minutes or such time as the committee may think proper to present that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman that he prepare his amendment and perhaps he can offer it under the iron schedule. Only the coal schedule is now before the committee.

The Clerk will read paragraph 439 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

439. Coal, anthracite, bituminous, and shale, and coal slack or culm.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment of Mr. OATES was again read as above.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama by striking out "40 cents" and inserting "50 cents," in line 1 of the amendment.

Mr. MCKAIG. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer as a substitute for that amendment the one I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend House bill 4864 by inserting, on page 55, after paragraph 316, line 9, the following words:

"Coal, bituminous and shale, 75 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 30 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel."

And by striking out, on page 71, paragraph (free list) 439, containing the following words:

"439. Coal, anthracite, bituminous, and shale, and coal slack or culm."

Mr. HITT. As an amendment to the substitute I offer the provision which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of paragraph 439:

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps it would be well to settle now the question of order, so that if this amendment should be ruled out another amendment might be offered, and that when the time arrives for voting there might be four pending amendments. The Chair wants to give, so far as he can, the fullest latitude for voting upon amendments.

Mr. PAYNE. Would it be in order for me to offer an amendment restoring the duty on coke, which of course is a species of manufactured coal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not. There are now four amendments pending, an amendment, an amendment to the amendment, a substitute, and an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. PAYNE. Coke comes in a different paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment would not be in order for a further reason, because coke is not included in the agreement made for the consideration of coal and iron at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. This is manufactured coal.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair might recognize the gentleman later to offer the amendment, but not now.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ALDERSON. I have an amendment which I want to have considered as pending, and I will call it up in the event that the amendments levying a duty on coal are voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman, in presenting this amendment now, simply states that he desires to offer it if the opportunity be given him.

Mr. ALDERSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not considered as pending, however.

Mr. ALDERSON. I desire to save all rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 71, amend paragraph 440, by adding at the end thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That any of the articles mentioned in paragraphs 439 and 440, inclusive, when imported from any country which lays a duty upon the importation into such country of such articles or any of them, shall be subject to the duties existing at the time of the passage of this act."

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry in reference to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT]. I understand it is offered as an amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. SPRINGER. That substitute provides, as I understand, that the duty fixed by existing law, 75 cents a ton, shall be continued. Now, would not the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] stand or fall with the substitute; in other words, if the substitute should be voted down, would not the amendment of my colleague fall?

The CHAIRMAN. It would unquestionably fall with the substitute if the substitute should be voted down.

The Chair will hear the gentleman from West Virginia upon the point of order raised by him upon the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] to the substitute.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. This Committee of the Whole is now in session under an order of the House made by unanimous consent on Saturday last. The proposition as then stated to the House by the Speaker and adopted, is as follows:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next when the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the pending bill three hours be devoted to debate of that portion of the bill relating to the duty on coal, that then a vote be taken, and that after that three hours be devoted to discussing the duty on iron ore.

Now, sir, the House is in Committee of the Whole to debate the tariff upon coal, and at the close of the debate to vote on all amendments which can properly be offered under the rules to this part of the bill. There have been an amendment, an amendment to the amendment, and a substitute; and the gentleman from Illinois now proposes an amendment to the substitute. I submit that this amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is not germane. It does not relate to the coal tariff. It is a proposition for general reciprocity under all the revenue schedules of this bill——

A MEMBER. Retaliation.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Or, as my friend here more properly describes it, it is a proposition for retaliation, and for retaliating upon our own people for the follies of other people. But I care not what the merits of the proposition may be, the point I raise against it is that it is not germane to this part of the tariff bill which by order of the House the Committee of the Whole is about to consider.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, this Committee of the Whole is now considering the question of imposing a duty upon coal or admitting it free of duty; and it is directly cognate to that question to determine all the conditions of the admission of coal into the United States. There is a duty of 60 cents a ton levied upon coal sent out of the United States into an adjoining country. Another part of this very free list, framed by the honorable gentleman from West Virginia who has made this point of order, contains this very provision to protect petroleum and also to protect salt, and the words of my amendment are borrowed from his own proposed legislation and covers coal, the subject under consideration. It is true that other things than coal could be considered as included in this amendment; but it touches directly upon the coal interest, the duty on coal and upon the importation of coal, and secures for the coal interest and labor engaged in mining it in the United States privileges and advantages such as have been secured in another part of this very free list for the oil of the Standard Oil Company and for salt. Could it be more germane?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Now, the Chair will give the gentlemen of the minority an opportunity to offer any amendment that they desire to offer, if they desire to offer any, to the substitute. One more amendment is in order.

Mr. HITT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will offer the amendment with the change of language—

Any article on the free list.

The CHAIRMAN. That is making the amendment broader, is it not, than the gentleman had it before?

Mr. HITT. No, it did not contain those words.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please state the language that he desires to use?

Mr. HITT (reading):

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proposed amendment, and the Chair will hear gentlemen on that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of paragraph 439:

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

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know whether any arrangement has been made for the control of the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman to make no point of order against this amendment?

Mr. BURROWS. I make a point of order against it, that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] to make a point of order.

Mr. BURROWS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on that.

Mr. BURROWS. It is not necessary, I suppose, to be heard upon it. It is not germane to the question under consideration.

The question under consideration relates to coal. It is well settled that all amendments on a subject different from the one under consideration, are not germane. If the Chair held that the other was not germane, certainly this is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this amendment is probably more obnoxious to the rule than the other, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The Chair will state that he will give gentlemen of the minority an opportunity to offer a further amendment, if they desire.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand there is an amendment now pending which subititutes the existing law for the proposition to put coal on the free list?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that to be the fact—the substitute of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG].

Mr. PAYNE. We are satisfied with that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. As I understand, there is no obstruction at this time that will prevent any gentleman of the minority from offering an amendment applying specially to coal?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not decide that until the emergency arises. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] has the floor. The Chair wishes to submit to the committee the question of the division of the time. If there is any desire to have the time divided between the sides, the Chair will be very glad to have that arrangement made. If not, the Chair will undertake to divide the time equally between the two sides; that is, for and against the amendment. The Chair hearing no suggestion, will undertake to control the time, and recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES].

Mr. OATES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG].

Mr. RAYNER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to control the time?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole will control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will understand that if the Chair controls the time, he can only yield five minutes at any one time to any gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Before the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG] begins, I would like to inquire if the three hours begin to run from this time?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the three hours begin to run from the time the debate begins. The Chair will so hold.

[Mr. MCKAIG addressed the committee. His remarks will appear hereafter.]

Mr. RAYNER was recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] be allowed ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] be allowed to speak for ten minutes?

Mr. OATES. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to have the time divided as equally as possible.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any part in this debate. I have upon several occasions in this House given my views on the subject of the tariff, and I do not find it necessary now to tread the beaten path, either for the enlightenment of the public or to make manifest my own position. I arise for one purpose, and for one purpose alone. I desire to enter a Democratic protest and demurrer against any Democrat standing upon this floor and demanding protective duties for the district that he represents. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The attempt by this amendment is to retain the duty, or a part of the duty, upon coal. Now, coal is the principal product of my own State that is affected by this bill, and I can not be silent and permit my own position upon this subject to continue in any doubt either upon this floor or among my constituency at home. I am opposed to keeping the duty upon coal. With great deference to those who differ from me, and without in the slightest degree impugning their motives, I challenge the right of any Democrat to stand upon this floor and vote for free trade in everybody else's district and then vote for protection in his own. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKAIG. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. RAYNER. I will submit to an interruption in a moment; but I did not refer particularly to my colleague.

Mr. MCKAIG. I wanted to ask you about your own district.

Mr. RAYNER. The coal interests of my State, Mr. Chairman, are largely centered in the city that I represent, and the strongest appeals have come to me that can come to any one to attempt to amend this bill so as to keep the duty on coal; but I have respectfully declined the proposition.

I am not a Democrat on everything else and a Republican on coal. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If raw materials are to be put upon the free list, I want them put in the very places where I can stand in the thick of the contest and bear the brunt of battle with my colleagues on this floor. [Applause.] I have followed the members of this committee far beyond the outposts, and I shall never desert them now when the poisoned shafts are flying from the very citadel of protection. [Applause.]

Now, a few words about coal. Why, sir, to-day, if you take Great Britain and Germany out of the list, the output of coal from the United States is greater than the output of all the other countries on earth combined. It is not only greater than the output of all other countries, with the exception of Germany and Great Britain, but it is almost twice as large.

What is the next fact that we find? We find that we are exporting coal to-day to almost every corner of the globe. A few years ago our exports of coal to Mexico amounted to a few thousand tons. To-day our exports of coal to Mexico amount to 100,000 tons and over. A few years ago our exports to Canada amounted to 100,000 tons. To-day our exports to Canada amount to over a million tons, and I believe the day will come when we will control almost the Canadian market west of Montreal. Let me call attention to one point in connection with this matter. We send coal to Canada, we pay the freight, the transportation on it, and also the Canadian duty, and yet we undersell the Canadian coal-producers in their own markets, at their own doors.

Mr. MCKAIG. Only west of Quebec.

Mr. RAYNER. That does not make any difference. One-half of all the coal exported by the United States last year went to Canada. I repeat, we pay the freight and transportation to Canada, we pay the Canadian duty, which is almost as high as the American—ours being 75 cents and the Canadian 60 cents—and yet we undersell the Canadians in their own markets. And, although we are able to do that, we are told that we can not compete with Canadian coal in our own market: That is protection logic.

Mr. ALDERSON. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Canadian coal and anthracite coal are very different articles.

Mr. RAYNER. I am talking about bituminous coal. I will yield in a moment. Mr. Chairman, I will admit, in answer to the gentleman from West Virginia and in answer to the question that I suppose the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG] intended to ask me——

Mr. KCKAIG. Let me ask the question first, will you?

Mr. RAYNER. I think I know your question. I will admit that free coal will come in for the purpose of use on the New England coast.

Mr. MCKAIG. That is not the question I intended to ask.

Mr. RAYNER. But I want to call your attention to the fact that when you get beyond the coast and into the interior, Nova Scotia free coal can not compete with American coal; and I want to call attention to another fact: That to-day American coal in the city of Boston costs more than Canadian coal costs there. The Canadian coal comes in cheaper, according to a circular which a very estimable gentleman of my State has just issued, a gentleman in favor of the duty on coal. I refer to Henry G. Davis, president of the West Virginia Central Railroad Company. We undersell Canadian coal in the Boston market, although the Canadian coal comes in cheaper.

But I want to call attention to another fact. What are you going to do about the Pacific States? Look for a moment at the gross injustice in connection with this question. The Pacific States get no coal at all from the Eastern mines. If I am wrong about that I will permit my friend from West Virginia [Mr. ALDERSON] or my colleague from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG] to correct me. I say the Pacific States get no coal at all from Maryland or West Virginia.

Mr. ALDERSON. Certainly not; they get their coal from British Columbia.

Mr. RAYNER. That is admitted; that is just what I say; they get their coal from British Columbia and Australia; and they get some—very little, however—from the State of the gentleman who is standing up over there [Mr. WILSON of Washington]. The whole coal product of the gentleman's State did not amount to over a million of tons last year.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. We have over a million acres of coal.

Mr. RAYNER. Then you do not produce more than a ton an acre.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The gentleman does not know that in reference to my State. He may be thoroughly informed in regard to Nova Scotia coal; but in regard to the coal question as affecting the Pacific coast he does not know it.

Mr. RAYNER. I decline to yield further, as I have only a few minutes.

The Coal Trade Journal shows that the output of the gentleman's State last year was only a million tons; and if there are a million acres of coal there, then they mined only a ton to an acre.

But what I was about to say was this: That outside of the gentleman's State the Pacific States get their coal entirely from British Columbia and Australia; and upon it they must pay a duty of 75 cents a ton. How does that help the Eastern mines? What benefit do the people of Maryland or the people of West Virginia or Virginia or Pennsylvania, or any other Eastern State, derive from compelling the Pacific States to pay a duty of 75 cents a ton on their coal? There was sent to the Congress which passed the McKinley bill a petition from every manufacturer on the Pacific coast, asking Congress to give them free coal.

I wish to make only one other point on this question. What is the profit on coal to-day? I have heard talk here about reducing the wages of the miner. That is a proposition which has been unmasked long ago by the intelligence of the American people. What is the profit on coal to-day?

I wish I had time to read from the circular of that estimable gentleman, Mr. Davis, to whom I have already referred, the president of the West Virginia Central Railroad. It would tell you that the output of American coal is 150,000,000 tons a year; and the profit on this coal averages 20 cents a ton. That means $30,000,000 annually to the owners of the mines. And America is exporting coal to every corner of the globe, expanding its markets year by year, so that within the last four years we have had an increase in bituminous coal alone of 40,000,000 tons, an average of 10,000,000 tons a year.

Now, while I admit frankly that free Nova Scotia coal will come to the New England coast cheaper than the coal of West

Virginia or of my State can get there, I will not admit that Nova Scotia coal can compete with our coal in the interior; and I will not admit that that coal is of as good quality as our coal. I will not admit that we have any right to injure the Pacific States, which derive no benefit from the Eastern mines, by compelling them to pay 75 cents duty on every ton of coal they use.

So much on the question of coal. Now, I utterly deny that it comes within our province as Democratic representatives to stand here and demand protection for the industries of our respective districts——

Mr. McKAIG. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Not just now; I will do so before I finish. If such a course is justifiable, then there is an end of all Democracy and tariff reform. If we are tariff reformers for everybody else's district except our own there will be no revenue reform at all; and we may as well resolve ourselves into a mercenary mob, ready to retreat whenever our interests are involved, instead of presenting an unbroken front upon the solemn pledges that we made to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If I am here to defend the provisions of the McKinley act so far as Maryland is concerned, then I differ in no respect from a Republican representative who defends that law so far as the interests of Pennsylvania or any other State are concerned.

I ought to cross the line and take my place with him or resign the trust that has been reposed in me by the confidence and suffrages of my party. If the protected industries of our districts threaten us with defeat unless we accede to their demands, is it better to make terms with them and purchase a continuance of our places, or is it the proper course to scorn the proposal and go down if need be with the pledges of our platform, and the traditions and principles of our party. I come from a manufacturing center. By this bill duties have been reduced all along the line throughout the district that I represent. I have been appealed to in every case where changes have been made upon the schedules to endeavor to amend this bill so as to keep the duty on.

These appeals have come to me in the strongest way from the most influential sources. I had but one reply substantially to make to them, and that is that I was not sent here for any such purpose; that upon this measure I represent my party and my country, and not the protected industries of my district; and that if the district desires a continuance of the oppressive rates of the McKinley bill it must send a protectionist to Congress; and that whatever may be the consequences to myself I shall follow my convictions and not beat a cowardly retreat when the call to arms summons us for action. There are two classes of persons who can no longer be deceived upon this matter—the farmers of this country who at every country store and farmyard, at every country court and crossroad are arraigning this system that has impoverished and bankrupted them; and the laborers of the country, nineteen-twentieths of whom are not employed in the protected industries at all, who can no longer be intimidated and driven to the polls like cattle to the shambles, and who realize the fact that they earn every dollar of wages they receive, because as a rule they work longer and harder and better than any mechanic in the world. We know that in this fight the protected industries are against us, with all the influence they wield and with all the enormous wealth that they possess. It is a fight of the oppressors against their victims, of monopoly against the consumer, and in this contest I am with the consumer.

Twice he has made the fight and twice against apparently terrific odds he won. He has no money to corrupt the suffrage with, but he has certain rights that Providence has given him, which it lies not even in the power of monopoly to deprive him of. I do not believe that you can buy the freemen of America. Their ballots are not for sale. Whatever benefits the consumer will ultimately benefit the business interests of the country. Every change in the tariff necessarily creates temporary uneasiness. That can not be avoided.

I believe, however, that there is an era of great prosperity in front of this bill; that with free raw materials untaxed with one exception by any other country, we will be able to hold our own in foreign and domestic markets; that the time has come when we can compete with other goods in the cities and emporiums of the world; and, more than this, I believe the time has come when protected capital must make concessions to the middle classes and the poor; when 60,000,000 of people must demand equality under the laws; when we must have commercial intercourse with the trading nations of the earth, and when the highways of the ocean must be opened for the commerce of mankind, as God intended that they should be. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, I am always happy when I find a point of agreement with my adversary. I agree with my distinguished and eloquent friend [Mr. RAYNER], who has just taken his seat, that a man can not consistently vote for free trade in all districts save his own, and for that one district vote in favor of protection. My distinguished friend from Maryland thinks he can more consistently advocate spreading the blight of free trade with equal prodigality upon all sections of the country.

I think his principle is correct, and conformably to it I advocate extending the benefits of protection with equal prodigality to all sections of our country, stimulating the exertions of labor and enterprise everywhere in all parts of the land. I do not believe in the prayer that invokes blessings upon "me and my wife, my son and his wife, us four and no more." [Applause on the Republican side.] I invoke the blessings of protection upon all industries that need them in all sections of this Union.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the removal of the duty on coal by this measure, it seems to me that the observation of the gentleman from Missouri the other day, that a tariff reformer is a free trader in the shell, acquires a profound significance.

Mr. Chairman, incubation has progressed more rapidly within the last few months than in any equal period of our country's history. Either the eggs are sounder, or the hens have been more diligent and self-sacrificing in their maternal labors; for the tariff-reform roosters—and I do not use that term as a disparaging epithet, but simply to preserve the simile—are to-day rushing in headlong where for an hundred years their angels feared to tread. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent in part a State which produces more that 90,000,000 tons of coal per annum, about one-half of which is bituminous. A reduction of 1 cent a ton on this coal means a loss to miners and producers of nearly $450,000. If testimony can demonstrate anything, it has been made so clear that the wayfaring man, though of medium faculty only, can not err therein that we can not compete with Nova Scotia coal in the seaboard markets. If the Canada coal producers can ship to us over a million tons of coal a year under a duty of 75 cents a ton, can anyone foresee the number of millions of tons she will empty in our markets after that duty is removed. But every ton she sends us displaces a ton of our own and lessens our production that much. Thus we not only lose $750,000 of revenue (an article in urgent demand at this time), but we surrender our own markets to Canadian producers to whatever extent they are able to occupy them by reason of their superior facilities.

It is a misconception that supposes that consumers will profit by this surrender to any considerable extent, unless upon the hypothesis that wages of miners are to be cut down. It does not seem possible to reduce the cost of transportation below present rates, but on the contrary, they must rise in the same ratio at which the amount shipped diminishes. The returns of capital invested in the coal industry have not been shown to be unreasonable, and wages will not bear reduction. The present scale of rates, profits, and wages are made possible by the extent of the production. Relinquish a portion of our consumption to foreign producers and our fixed capital in that business will suffer, because a diminishing market will curtail profits or raise the price of coal to consumers or cut wages, and either alternative is a compromising and degrading one and ought to be spurned by every patriotic American citizen with the scorn it deserves.

Pennsylvania sent her capital and her enterprising sons to West Virginia to develop her exhaustless fields of coal on the assumption that our tariff policy as far as coal was concerned was fixed by the unbroken practice of a hundred years. Now after their capital is invested and their industry in operation you cut off the protection which invited them to carry their capital thither and made it possible for them to establish the industry there. Is that fair treatment of the industries of your country? I hope you will take pause before consummating this assault upon American interests. Some of my constituents have been led by the established policy of the Government to invest their capital in a Virginia industry. When this blow falls it strikes them, and therefore I interpose this feeble appeal for mercy to a stricken home industry. I can not do more. You alone on the other side of this Chamber can honor that appeal. I can only solicit in behalf of my constituents; you have the power to yield to that solicitation and save an industry. Some of you I know would be glad to do so, but I fear too many of you sustain to the present the relation which the Duke of Wellington sustained to the Peel administration, when he said to the prime minister:

> If you think the exigencies of your administration require it, I unhesitatingly recommend the measure, for my only object in public life is to support your administration of the government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to refer to another instance illustrating the cruelty of this measure. In the town of Columbia, in the district which I have the honor to represent, there is a lace factory, established since the enactment of the present tariff law. It is operated by two enterprising and

energetic Scotchmen, who removed tneir plant from Scotland to this country to secure improved facilities for the operation of their industry. There is in that factory an investment of $100,000, and three hundred operatives are employed. The same gentlemen are operating a factory in Darvel, Scotland, and have been associated with the lace industry in that country since its birth.

Possessing full and reliable data to enable them to make comparisons of cost of product here and abroad, they say that if the lace industry is to be retained in this country the present duty of 60 per cent must not be reduced. Any lower rate will open our market to Nottingham and Scotland. For some time past they have been placed in competition with their own factory in Darvel. New York importers, they say, have purchased goods from their firm in Scotland, paid 60 per cent duty and 5 per cent freight, and yet have been able to land these goods, exactly like their manufacture at Columbia, and sell them at a lower price than they can afford to sell from their Columbia factory.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the explanation of this? The cost of lace goods is made up principally of cotton and labor. In Scotland they pay 16 cents for cotton yarn and in Philadelphia 19cents. In Scotland the average weekly wages of lace-weavers is $5, in Columbia $15. This tells the story—and it is entirely clear in this as in many other cases that the removal or reduction of duties means the crippling if not the destruction of American industries.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] says:

> We do not take the duty off raw material to benefit manufacturers, but the consumers.

This argument proceeds upon the assumption that when the duty is off the production will continue the same—the same labor will be employed to the same extent—the only difference being that goods will be cheapened. This involves the vicious assumption that when one thing is changed everything else will remain the same; which is without warrant in human experience or correct principle. The fallacy indulged by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means finds illustration in the commodity of coal. If with the duty removed our own production would continue the same, our miners be employed to the same extent, and our capital earning the same profits, then the change would only involve a loss of revenue.

This sophism becomes apparent when it is considered that with the duty removed our markets are opened to the foreign product, that our consumption continues, not of our own, but of a foreign product, and that in the same ratio that the foreign article supersedes the domestic in our home market, the domestic production is curtailed; the employment of domestic labor diminished, and our own fixed capital invested in the coal business, impaired resulting in the transfer of labor and capital to other pursuits and the surrender of a portion of our domestic markets, which we are abundantly able to supply, to the product of foreign labor and foreign capital.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other matter. There are some kinds of arguments that ought not to be made in support of any cause. Indeed, scarcely any cause is strong enough in its merits not to be injured by arguments that are not addressed to human intelligence. I find an example of the kind of argument to which I refer in the speech of the honorable member from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] on last Saturday. I reproduce from the RECORD the following paragraph from that speech:

> During this period the conflicts between employers and employés increased until riots and bloodshed became so numerous as to excite but little interest except in the most extreme cases. During the years 1883, 1884, 1885, and 1886 we had 2,977 strikes in 17,271 establishments, embracing 1,039,011 employés. The number of strikes increased from 471, affecting 129,591 employés in 1881, to 1,411, affecting 499,489 employés in 1886. During the years 1882 to 1886, inclusive, lockouts occurred in 2,214 establishments, affecting 175,270 employés. The estimated wage loss to employés by reason of strikes and lockouts during these six years aggregated $59,972,440.
>
> Notwithstanding this frightful record of destruction and ruin, the advocates of protection were not yet satisfied.

This is a portion of his argument against the protective system. The strikes, riots, and bloodshed of which he gives so graphic a recital are charged against protection. By implication at least he asserts that these labor disturbances were caused by the economic system in vogue in the United States in unbroken continuity for so many years. He does not take the pains to show the connection between strikes and the protective system. He does not trouble himself to search out and disclose to the House the mode of operation by which this result is worked out. He contents himself with showing that these disturbances transpired coincidently with the prevalence of defensive duties and drives the inference with lash and spur by placing the two events in conjunction—that they are not merely fortuitous coincidences, but actually in some way or other, not explained, sustain the relation of cause and effect. Of course such an act of violence to candid and rational argumentation will always call down upon it the maledictions of the genius of logic; but that does not seem to be considered.

It were easy by this mode of reasoning to prove that the effect of Napoleon's wars was to promote the establishment of Sunday schools. That drinking saloons promoted the growth of schools and churches in the United States, for these things have all concurred in point of time. In the same manner I can prove that free trade caused the strikes which so frequently occurred in England in the last fifty years. And I could clinch the argument by showing that the strikes occurring in that country prior to 1843 were caused by protection.

The gentleman is aware that wages are higher in the United States than anywhere else in the world; that our working people are better fed, better clothed, better housed, and enjoy a larger share of comforts than in any other country, and his mode of reasoning would lead us to the lame and impotent conclusion that high wages and liberal comforts are conducive to strikes. Moreover, we can add, to strengthen the argument, that strikes have increased in frequency as wages have advanced and the purchasing power of a day's labor increased.

That these facts have coexisted in this country goes without saying; but that the benefits which have come to labor under our protective system have been the cause of our labor troubles can only be believed by those whose minds are like the pupils of their eyes, the more light you throw on them the more they contract. Of course, when my honorable friend applies his mind to this subject he will see that he was not arguing the question at all in the part of his speech to which I have directed attention. I do not think a member of this House ought to exercise his vocal organs at the same time he is giving his mind a respite from toil, and my friend from Indiana will agree with me when he thinks about it. The celebrated Dr. Bushnell said he had a valuable friend, who was honest, though talkative, and only believed what he said because his mind had not caught up with it.

Mr. Chairman, a glance at the history of labor troubles throughout the world will demonstrate that they are characteristic of all the higher civilizations—that they are not political in their origin or the peculiar product of any economic system.

In England they commenced as far back as Wat Tyler's rebellion, and have occurred at intervals ever since, both under protection and free-trade régimes. The great strike of the London tailors in 1834 under protection, and the equally notable disturbance known as the "Preston strike" of 1853, under free trade, arrested the attention of the world. Forty-nine cotton and other mills were closed, and before the strike ended 14,972 persons were added to the pauper list.

It was stated a few years ago that the common people of England were 30 per cent better fed, 40 per cent better clothed, 50 per cent better housed, and 250 per cent better educated than when Victoria was crowned. Still there were strikes. In 1867, 40,000 colliers; in 1873, 60,000 Welsh laborers; in 1875, 50,000 miners; in 1876, 80,000 Lancashire spinners; in 1877, nearly all the workmen in the shipbuilders' yards on the Clyde; in 1878, 120,000 cotton spinners; and in 1879, the Durham coal miners rose against what they called the exactions of capital and produced serious social disturbances. Still later—in 1890—1,028 strikes occurred in that free-trade country, and an army of 392,981 laborers rose against the barons of free trade. Still later—in 1892—40,000 cotton-mill hands struck, and the military power had to be called into requisition to quell the disturbance. In Germany, in the same year, there were forty-five strikes, affecting 45,800 persons, while in France there were thirty-one strikes, affecting 98,700 persons.

If there is one thing made clear by the history of these labor disturbances it is that, as a rule, they occur most frequently in countries in which labor is most intelligent and prosperous. Laborers who are really oppressed, living from hand to mouth, have no time to waste in strikes and no means to support them. But when wages yield a liberal support and improve conditions, with some leisure to read and think on the questions of the day, the working people become sensible to an increasing degree of the inequalities existing in our social system, and as their means increase, feel a growing desire to resent and resist what they believe to be an encroachment on their rights. So it came to pass that one of the latest and most disastrous strikes of recent times occurred at Homestead, Pa., where the strikers had been receiving the highest wages ever paid to workmen, and were better fed, clothed, and lodged than laborers in the same line of work anywhere else on earth.

Without enlarging upon this interesting inquiry further, I may say that there is a field of economic philosophy in connection with the labor problem which my honorable friend from Indiana, Mr. BYNUM, would find it profitable to explore, and after he has done so I hazard nothing in saying that he will cor-

rect his log book of logic, and never again undertake to ascribe our labor troubles to our protective system.

But, Mr. Chairman, the policy of this measure, more vicious if possible than the arguments used in its support, of reducing the revenues of this Government by the removal of duties must lead to the same disasters which have hitherto followed a similar policy. It will result in a diminished revenue and a diminishing prosperity. It has done so in the past, and will do so in the future. Like causes produce like effects, under identical conditions, the world over. No better illustration of this can be found than the instructive parallel existing between the situation of the country at this time and its situation under the last Democratic Administration before the war. I will submit in this connection the results of a glance into the state of finances and business at the latter period.

On June 30, 1857, the public debt was about $29,060,386, against which the Treasury held in its vaults $17,710,114. To set free the increasing balance and to relieve the business interests of the country which were then struggling to avert the revulsion which finally overtook them, the Secretary of the Treasury, Howell Cobb, purchased of the unmatured debt about $5,000,000, paying thereon a premium of about $700,000. This, however, failed to relieve the situation. The industries of the country were in distress, and the revenue fell off so rapidly that upon the opening of the Thirty-fifth Congress the Secretary was compelled to ask for a loan of $20,000,000. Congress promptly authorized the issue. The work of increasing the debt to meet the deficiency in the revenue went bravely on until under five different acts of Congress, from December 23, 1857, to March 2, 1861, inclusive, bonds and Treasury notes amounting to $143,591,250 had been issued, increasing the actual indebtedness of the Government well nigh $75,000,000, as appears from the subjoined statement.

Issued under act of—	
December 23, 1857, Treasury notes	$52,778,900
June 14, 1858, bonds	20,000,000
June 22, 1860, bonds	7,022,000
December 17, 1860, Treasury notes	10,010,900
February 8, 1861, bonds	18,415,000
March 2, 1861, Treasury notes	35,364,450
Total	143,591,250

The tariff act of 1857 supplementing the act of 1846 and reducing still more the duties on imported goods, went into operation July 1, 1857. Disasters to business and curtailment of revenue followed thick and fast. By March 3, 1859, the situation was so appalling that President Buchanan addressed a special message to Congress appealing in tones of touching pathos to preserve the credit of the country. The Treasury was bankrupt. The national credit was reduced to its lowest terms, and money had to be borrowed on any terms to defray the ordinary expenses of the Government. In his message the President said:

> Thus the country, which is full of resources, will be dishonored before the world, and the American people, who are a debt-paying people, will be disgraced by the omission on our part to do our duty.

After thirty-three years we again have a Democratic Administration. It has been in full and unfettered operation for less than ten months. The baleful shadow of tariff for revenue stalking before its substance has fallen like a mildew blight upon our country, paralyzing our industries and curtailing our revenues, and we again witness the mortifying spectacle of a Treasury sinking towards bankruptcy, and the Secretary advertising a loan of $50,000,000 to meet the current expenses of the Government. Thus does Democratic history repeat itself. I have taken the pains to set this instructive parallel before the Democratic members of the House that they may be helped to an understanding of the meaning of "the morass of imbecility and indecision in which they are sinking deeper and deeper every moment."

Mr. Chairman, I will append to my remarks a paper prepared by Hon. H. G. Davis, of West Virginia, containing valuable information on the subject of coal production and distribution.

APPENDIX.

MEMORANDUM RELATING TO DUTY ON COAL, PREPARED BY H. G. DAVIS, WEST VIRGINIA.

Anthracite coal has been on the free list for many years, and is the only coal in domestic use in New England, New York, and New Jersey, which section would furnish a market for foreign coals.

Bituminous coal in the East is used almost exclusively by gas, electric, railway, steamship, and steamboat companies, and by manufacturing establishments.

The duty on bituminous coal is 75 cents per ton, which is less than half the average per cent paid on dutiable articles under the present tariff.

No tariff act from the organization of the Government down to this Congress has put coal on the free list.

Between 1856 and 1866 there was a reciprocal treaty with Canada, which admitted, among other articles, coal into each country free of duty; other foreign coals paid a duty.

The tariff act of 1846, known as the "Walker" or low tariff, put coal at 30 per cent ad valorem. The duty has been as high as $2.80 per ton.

The average duty on coal from the first tariff in 1789 to the present law has been over $1 per ton. The per cent of duty on coal previous to 1860 was generally higher than that of the average dutiable article. The average per cent of dutiable articles under the present tariff is about 48; on coal 23. The per cent of duty on the present and proposed tariff on nearly everything used by the miner and operator, such as wearing apparel, blankets, carpets, furniture, picks, shovels, steel, and iron, is higher than the present duty on coal.

If the tariff on coal is to be reduced, there is no good reason why it should be reduced below the average reduction on all other dutiable articles.

The changes from time to time in the duty on bituminous coal is shown in the following compilation of the tariff laws, to wit:

Year.	Rate.	Duty per ton.
1789	2 cents per bushel, equals	$0.56
1790 to 1792	3 cents per bushel, equals	.84
1792 to 1794	4½ cents per bushel, equals	1.26
1794 to 1812	5 cents per bushel, equals	1.40
1812 to 1816	10 cents per bushel, equals	2.80
1816 to 1824	5 cents per bushel, equals	1.40
1824 to 1842	6 cents per bushel, equals	1.68
1842 to 1846		1.75
1846 to 1857	30 per cent ad valorem, equals	$0.65 to .75
1857 to 1861	24 per cent ad valorem, equals	.55 to .65
1861 to 1862		1.00
1862 to 1864		1.10
1864 to 1872		1.25
1872 to 1893		.75

As a matter of fact, from 1856 to 1866 no duty was collected by the United States on coal coming from Canada, as the reciprocity treaty with that country was in operation.

The official report of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, places the average value of bituminous coal for 1892 at $3.32 per ton. The duty of 75 cents per ton makes an ad valorem duty of 22½ per cent—not quite half the average rate on all dutiable articles.

From the beginning of the Government to the present time, no President, no Congress, no national platform of any political party, and none of the great statesmen of the past have favored free bituminous coal. Neither the Morrison or the Mills bill placed coal on the free list, but the Ways and Means Committee of the present Congress propose to overturn and reverse the long line of precedents and the uniform policy of the Government on this subject.

Great Britain, of all the foreign countries, is the only nation that will be benefited by free coal. Canada exacts a duty of 60 cents a short ton, or about 67 cents a long ton, on United States coal. Why should her coal come into the United States free? The removal of our duty will not increase a particle our trade with Canada.

The United States and Canada cover large areas of territory which are contiguous and separated for thousands of miles only by a land line or waterways. The proximity in some instances of our mines to Canada, particularly to the Province of Ontario, enables us, by a short haul, to reach their markets and send some of our coal into Canada, paying a duty of 67 cents, long ton; and from like circumstances some of their coal comes to the United States, paying 75 cents per ton. Remove our duty and let theirs remain and we will be at a great disadvantage. Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Alabama will lose much of their seaboard trade and gain nothing.

Mr. E. Gilpin, jr., inspector of Nova Scotia mines, reports in 1890:

"The two principal shipping ports are Pictou and Sydney. They are about the same distance from Boston, namely, 625 miles. The mines are all located in the immediate vicinity of harbors. The distance from the mines to the loading grounds for vessels is from one-half to 15 miles. Although the facilities for the shipment of coal from these ports are very imperfect, there would be no difficulty in quickly making them ample for all the coal that would be raised from the mines. Although the Spring Hill Colliery produces more coal than any other colliery in Nova Scotia, it has had no outlet by sea until recently. Such an outlet was talked of more than forty years ago. Railroad outlets on the Bay of Fundy, at Parrsboro, 33 miles from the mines, and at Pugwash, on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, have recently been completed. The coal from this mine has heretofore found its market in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the upper provinces.

"It is believed that there are no mining districts in the world so accessible to and within such easy reaching distance of navigable tidewaters as are the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and especially those of Cape Breton. There are safe harbors in abundance, and there would be no difficulty in providing shipping facilities to any required extent."

The following comparative statement shows the difference in the cost at Boston of United States and Canadian coals:

Analysis cost bituminous coal at Boston.

	United States.	Nova Scotia.
Royalty, mining and loading railroad cars at mines	$1.00	$1.00
United States, average railway transportation from mines to seaboard, 350 miles, at 4 mills per mile	1.40	
Nova Scotia, average railway transportation from mines to seaboard, 23 miles		.25
Water freight to Boston, average	.90	1.00
Present duty		.75
Cost at Boston, including duty	3.30	3.00
If coal is made free, deduct duty		.75
Cost of Nova Scotia coal at Boston, duty off		2.25

N. B.—Boston is selected simply as a common point in New England and as a large receiving port for coal.

The above shows that Nova Scotia coal can be sold at Boston with present duty at $3, which is 30 cents less than the cost of United States coal. But the difference in quality is in favor of the United States. If it is conceded that United States coal is 20 per cent better, add this to $2.25, the cost of Nova Scotia coal, and we have $2.70 as the value of Nova Scotia coal without the duty, as compared with $3.30, the cost of United States coal, or an advantage of 60 cents to the Nova Scotia coal. The net profit to the producer on United

States coal is between 10 and 20 cents a ton. Under the present tariff the landowners, miners, the operators, railways, American vessels and seamen are striving to retain the home market. Take away the 75 cents duty and they must lose much of their seacoast trade.

Of the soft coal consumed in New England it is estimated that about one-third of it is used in manfacturing, the greater portion being required by railroads, gas companies, electric railways, steam vessels, light plants, etc. Many of the factories are located on rivers. The removal of the duty, therefore, would benefit manufacturing interests but little, and in so small a proportion upon manufactured goods as to have little effect on the cost of production.

A large manufacturer in New England, using 30,000 tons of coal annually, writing on the subject, says:

"Massachusetts' census shows that the cost of the fuel employed in manufacturing is equal to 2 per cent of the total cost of all material used in the woolen manufacture, to 1.7 per cent of the total cost in worsted manufacture, to 3.2 per cent of the total cost in cotton manufacture, to 1½ per cent of the total cost in all industries."

Although this authority gives the average cost of fuel in all industries as 1½ per cent, in order to meet any suggestion that may be made that this is too low an estimate let us double it and call the cost of fuel 3 per cent. If the manufacturer saves the entire 75 cents per ton it would be less than one-fourth of 3 per cent, or about three-quarters of 1 per cent.

Canada, not including Nova Scotia, uses about 3,500,000 tons of bituminous coal annually, about two-fifths of which comes from the United States, on which we pay her a duty of over $800,000. The coal regions of the United States affected by the removal of the duty produce many times the amount consumed by Canada. In 1864-'65-'66, the three last years of reciprocity treaty with Canada, Nova Scotia sent to the United States about 1,188,000 tons of coal, or nearly 400,000 tons annually, which at that time was about one-fifth of the bituminous coal used on or near the Atlantic coast. If, by making coal free, they would be able to send the same proportion, their trade with this country would be about 1,500,000 tons annually, and to this extent would take work and money from our people. Would this be right, and would they not ask who is responsible, and remember, when voting again, the men and party who reduced their wages and gave part of their work to foreigners?

The following statistics of the area and production of coal in the several States will be found interesting in this connection:

Area of coal in the several States.

States.	Area in square miles.	Production, 1892.
BITUMINOUS.		*Tons.*
Alabama	8,600	5,250,000
Arkansas	17,000	450,000
California	----------	90,000
Colorado	----------	3,775,000
Dakota (North and South)	----------	150,000
Georgia	200	250,000
Illinois	36,800	14,000,000
Indiana	6,450	3,250,000
Indian Territory	----------	1,000,000
Iowa	18,000	3,750,000
Kansas	17,000	2,800,000
Kentucky	13,000	3,000,000
Maryland	550	3,058,350
Michigan	6,700	100,000
Missouri	26,887	3,250,000
Montana	----------	600,000
New Mexico	----------	800,000
Ohio	19,000	13,500,000
Oregon	----------	60,000
Pennsylvania	9,000	37,500,000
Tennessee	5,100	2,500,000
Texas	4,500	400,000
Utah	----------	370,000
Virginia	180	3,500,000
Washington	----------	1,200,000
West Virginia	16,000	6,500,000
Wyoming	----------	2,000,000
Total	----------	113,103,350
ANTHRACITE.		
Pennsylvania	470	41,893,316

The tariff bill, as reported, is especially damaging to the interests of West Virginia, whose leading articles of commerce are coal, ore, lumber, salt, and wool, all of which it is proposed to put on the free list. Two-thirds of the State is underlaid with coal, and its production constitutes her largest industry. Free coal would not benefit a single person or industry in the State. There are fully 10,000 employés engaged in the production and transportation of coal in the State of West Virginia, all of whom would be affected by placing coal on the free list, some being thrown out of work entirely, while the wages of the others would be reduced.

Foreign coal mines on both sides of the Atlantic are near the sea. In some of the Nova Scotia mines the coal is taken from under the sea. Our coal mines are inland, and from 250 to 400 miles from the ocean—to our great disadvantage. When coal mined in the United States reaches the seaboard or the point of consumption in New England, New York, or New Jersey from 90 to 95 per cent of its value represents labor.

It is generally believed that a number of gentlemen of Boston and New York, of great prominence in political and financial circles, have recently formed a company, expecting to reap large gains by free-coal legislation, and it is said that their influence is being used in favor of the proposed removal of the duty.

It is well known that foreign ships and seamen are paid less than those of the United States. If we are to successfully compete under the new conditions proposed our labor must be reduced, and we ought to have free ships. Under our present laws American coals must be carried between points in the United States in American vessels.

The census of 1890 gives about 75,000 people in the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Alabama employed in the production of bituminous coal, principally marketed in the East, where foreign coal competes. If the average is five persons to a family, we have 375,000 people in the five States depending upon this industry for a living.

Free coal is different from all other articles named in this regard: only a few interests on the seacoast are benefited, and many thousands of persons elsewhere are injured.

It requires about $500,000,000 annually to carry on the Government, a large portion of which must be obtained from customs dues. The present duty on coal brings a revenue of about $1,000,000 a year, as will appear from the table below. Notwithstanding the need of this revenue, the committee have reported a bill which they estimate will create a deficit of between sixty and seventy millions of dollars, and have placed coal on the free list. There is no good reason why coal should be exempted from its share of the expenses of the Government, and why should we give Canada the benefit of free coal while she continues to charge us 67 cents a (long) ton upon the coal sent her from the United States? The coal imported and the duty paid for the last three years are as follows:

Year.	Tons.	Value.	Duty.	Average value per ton.	Average ad valorem duty.
					Per cent.
1891	1,031,560	$3,558,932	$773,670	$3.45	21.73
1892	1,309,974	4,352,180	982,480	3.32	22.57
1893	1,102,231	3,614,202	826,673	3.27	22.93

This statement is taken from the official reports of the Treasury Department. The figures for 1892 are also found in a comparative statement issued in pamphlet form by the Ways and Means Committee, having upon its cover the names of its members and carrying with it the sanction of that body. The data given will be found on page 47 of that pamphlet.

This reference alone should be sufficient to show that the position taken by the chairman of the committee in his opening address upon the tariff bill, as to the value which should attach to coal in estimating the ad valorem duty, is ingenious and misleading. Mr. WILSON states that the cost of coal in his district is from 40 cents to 60 cents a ton, and argues from this that the duty of 75 cents is excessive. The authority of his own committee on this subject is found in the above statement of the duties collected for the year 1892, which gives the average value per ton of coal as $3.32, upon which valuation the duty of 75 cents is applied to get the ad valorem duty and not merely upon the bare cost of digging the coal. The amount per ton which he gives covers merely the wages of the miners. He takes no account of the cost of transferring to the railway cars, timbering the mine, maintaining the machinery and the numerous items of expense incidental to a mining plant, besides which there is royalty and interest to be considered on the capital invested.

But even if the chairman had brought these items into his cost of production, it would be manifestly unjust to stop at this stage of the coal's progress to a point where it would be useful. Surely it is not at the mouth of the mine where American coal has to compete with foreign coal, but at the seaboard and at the place of consumption. That which was worth but little in the ground and of small value at the mouth of the mine has been greatly enhanced by the labor of transportation when it has gone hundreds of miles by land and water to a point where it must come in competition with the coals of other countries. If the value of the coal ought to be estimated at the mine in finding the ad valorem duty, then the whole basis of the valuation of the dutiable list as prepared by the Government is wrong.

Mr. WILSON is also quoted as saying that the duty on coal is in the nature of a subsidy to the railroads. Such a statement is unjust and reflects injuriously upon an interest absolutely essential to the development of his State and country.

The average haul to tidewater from the coal fields of the two Virginias is 350 miles, while the average freight is 4 mills per ton per mile, which leaves little or no margin over cost.

It is only necessary to call attention to the fact that about one-fourth of the roads of the country are in the hands of receivers, while from not more than one-half of all the roads are the stockholders receiving any returns from the many millions they have invested in railways.

The Democrats announce themselves for "tariff for revenue;" then why not make coal a part of it? Coal should not be classed as raw material. In the mines it has very little value, from 5 cents to 20 cents a ton, depending upon its quality and locality. At Boston, which is a central point in New England for the delivery of coal from the two Virginias, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, it is worth $3.30 per ton, which shows fully 95 per cent of its value when it reaches the consumer is the labor of production and transportation. It is entirely consumed in using, while other articles, called by some as raw material, upon arriving at the factory are often in the first stage of manufacture; one is destroyed, while the other is being put into a permanent form of usefulness.

There is no demand from our people for free coal, and no person, corporation, or interest has asked for it.

H. G. DAVIS.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE] asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WISE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. CLARKE of Alabama withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[M. TUCKER withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. HUNTER obtained the floor.

Mr. HERMANN. I ask that the time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HUNTER] has been recognized. The Chair will remark that if the time of every speaker be extended, a number of gentlemen who desire to speak can not be accommodated.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important question, and it seems to me it ought to be considered in the light of revenue and that alone. As I understand, the purpose of this bill is to provide for equalizing taxation. We ought to be fair with each other about a question of this kind; and whilst we are seeking to carry out a system of taxation for the people of

the country certain articles may be subjected to taxation with some propriety. As the taxing power is limited by the terms of the Constitution, I think the line is distinctly drawn by that instrument, so that we can not here as legislators enact any law for the purpose of protection. If protection comes at all it must be under the eighth section of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that Congress shall have power to levy taxes, duties, and imposts for specific purposes; that is, to provide the necessary revenues to support this Government.

No construction has ever been placed upon the Constitution by which you can levy a tax to protect anybody or anybody's business. Avarice is the creation of protection. It is the outgrowth of a doctrine which seeks to plunder the masses of the people in order to confer special benefits and special privileges upon a small number of people. In order to sustain this doctrine and make it plausible, it is explained by many men in this House that labor will be benefited; that if we will step aside from the constitutional provision and adopt this scheme of protection, the laborer will receive the benefit by virtue of the enactment of such a law. Mr. Chairman, no man in this country has ever received one cent of additional pay because of a protective tariff.

The man has never been discovered who has received, as a laborer, one particle of these protective duties that have gone into the hands of the protected classes. It is a mere pretense, and the statement is made simply for the purpose of making the doctrine seem plausible to the masses of the people and cheating them out of their votes.

Go to Alabama to-day where they are digging ore, and you will find the laborer working there for 60 cents a day, with pick and shovel, throwing out the ore upon the dump. Go to Pittsburg, and there you will find men digging ore and receiving $1.10 per day. Go to Colorado and you will find laborers doing the same kind of work with the same muscle and the same skill, receiving for their labor $3 a day. If protection is for the benefit of the laboring man, why do not all these laborers doing the same class of work receive $3 a day? What is protection for? It is simply to be used in order to obtain votes in certain localites, and in certain other localities to exclude them, it may be.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman correct his statement about Alabama as to 60 cents a day? That is a great mistake.

Mr. HUNTER. I only take the reports which I find.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. They earn from $3 to $4 a day in the coal mines.

Mr. HUNTER. Where men are working by the day it is very different from where they are working by the ton under ground. The wages may be different in different localities, and I have no doubt that is true. Men are working for 60 cents a day in many localities, and for $2.50 in other localities, in the protected industries of this country; and I ask, if protection is for the benefit of labor, why do they not all get the highest price for their labor?

I wish to call the attention of the committee to the following statistics of the area and production of coal in the United States, which will be found interesting in this connection:

States.	Area in square miles.	Production, 1892.
BITUMINOUS.		*Tons.*
Alabama	8,600	5,250,000
Arkansas	17,000	450,000
California	----------	90,000
Colorado	----------	3,775,000
Dakota (North and South)	----------	150,000
Georgia	200	250,000
Illinois	36,800	14,000,000
Indiana	6,450	3,250,000
Indian Territory	----------	1,000,000
Iowa	18,000	3,750,000
Kansas	17,000	2,800,000
Kentucky	13,000	3,000,000
Maryland	550	3,058,350
Michigan	6,700	100,000
Missouri	26,887	3,250,000
Montana	----------	600,000
New Mexico	----------	800,000
Ohio	19,000	13,500,000
Oregon	----------	60,000
Pennsylvania	9,000	37,500,000
Tennessee	5,100	2,500,000
Texas	4,500	400,000
Utah	----------	370,000
Virginia	180	3,500,000
Washington	----------	1,200,000
West Virginia	16,000	6,500,000
Wyoming	----------	2,000,000
Total	----------	113,103,350
ANTHRACITE.		
Pennsylvania	470	41,893,316

You will observe that the Creator has been exceedingly kind to his children, storing away in the bowels of the earth fuel to meet the demands for all time. Now, to lay the heavy hand of protection upon an article of such prime necessity is inconsistent with the laws of God and the rights of the toiling people. Who makes this demand these protectionists in the galleries could answer best.

We have reached a point where coal is light, heat, and force, and should be free.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ALDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I heard my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Judge HARE, the other day tell of having, on a certain occasion, appeared before a board of education against a proposed change of schoolhouse site. The judge said he made a very eloquent and able argument on that occasion, as he always does. The board gave him their undivided attention, and he was satisfied that he was making a most excellent impression. After the judge had concluded his oration and retired, the board proceeded to consult, and after a little while one of the members came out to break to the judge the news of the result.

He took the judge aside and said to him, "Judge, look here: you made a very able speech to-day, an eloquent speech, a strong speech, and I think you were right about this matter, but the fact is this board of education was elected to move this schoolhouse, and, by George, we are going to move it!" [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party was elected to reform the tariff, and we will reform it. [Laughter and applause.]

And this, Mr. Chairman, is neither the time nor the occasion for Democrats to measure their respective Democracy. It is no time for bickering. I have great respect for the Democracy of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] who so ably and eloquently addressed us on this occasion. But with due deference to him I want to say that in my humble judgment, and in the opinion of a great many other people, I have been as good a Democrat on the silver question at least as he has been [laughter]; and I desire to call his attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that even in the great State of Maryland all the illustrious men do not agree upon the question of a tariff upon coal. I want to read to him the language uttered by the distinguished Senator and Democratic leader from Maryland, Senator GORMAN, in a speech delivered by him in the Senate on January 9, 1889, on this subject. Senator GORMAN on that occasion used this language:

> As I have before said, there never was a Democratic statesman, there never has been a President elected by the Democratic party, or a Secretary of the Treasury, or a committee of either branch of Congress that was controlled by Democrats, knowing that revenue must be raised from the tariff, who ever dreamed of putting coal upon the free list. My friend wishes to reverse all precedents. No, Mr. President, the Democratic party is not a free-trade party.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, it may not be out of place to quote from a speech delivered upon this floor on May 5, 1884, by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ALDERSON] give us the date of that speech of Senator GORMAN?

Mr. ALDERSON. It was on the Mills bill, on an amendment in the Senate to place coal on the free list, January 9, 1889.

Mr. REED. Quite recent!

Mr. ALDERSON. To show that the Republican statesmen have disagreed on this subject, I want to call attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that on March 3, 1871, Mr. Farnsworth, of Illinois, a Republican, called up the following resolution offered by himself:

> *Be it resolved, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this joint resolution no tax or duty shall be levied upon foreign coal.

Messrs. FRYE and HALE, now Republican Senators from the State of Maine, then members of the House, both voted in the affirmative, along with every Republican from New England, if I am correctly informed as to the politics of the gentlemen who voted on that occasion. Mr. Garfield was for free coal when in this House, as was Mr. Blaine, along with other distinguished Republicans.

But recurring to the speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, I want to say that it is not surprising that some Democrats in West Virginia who have been his students upon the tariff question do not now agree with him upon this question of free coal. In his speech delivered in this House on May 5, 1884, he said:

> Mr. Chairman, I have said enough to indicate my support of any wise scheme for the reduction of taxes. I voted for the consideration of this bill. I shall vote to-morrow against the motion to strike out the enacting clause. This does not imply an indorsement of the bill as it stands. It simply means a willingness to consider and support a bill with the general object professed by this one, "to reduce import duties and war taxes." If we do not strike out the enacting clause, but proceed to consider the bill by sections, it can be amended and perfected wherever this may be necessary. A vote in favor of that motion presented itself to my judgment as a vote to prevent all legislation at this session for the reduction of taxes and for the relief of the people and of our industries. The same vote that can strike out the enacting

clause can strike out everything after the enacting clause and substitute such a bill or such provisions as may be wiser and better.

As I have said, I favor a bill for the reduction of taxes. Where this bill departs from its general scheme of merely reducing taxes and seeks to enlarge the free list, it bears unevenly and, as I believe, unjustly upon some of the interests of my own State. To take any one great industry and transfer it suddenly to the free list is to hold it tributary to all the rest, while depriving it of any share in the common "protection." Whatever reduction is made should be made so gradually as not to wreck, to disturb, or to alarm any of our great industries, and this return to a peace tariff ought to be made by even progress and on a scale of justice to all. This bill would permit reciprocal free coal with Canada, a provision I think little apt to be carried out, and free coal from England. Coal is now free, so far as the foreign and coastwise trade is concerned, having otherwise a duty of 75 cents per ton, which is less than 20 per cent ad valorem, under a tariff whose general average is over 40 per cent. Should we proceed to the consideration of this bill by sections, I shall present to the committee such facts and figures as will bear fully upon this question, and I have every confidence—indeed, I may add, I have every assurance that can now be given—that this inequality and discrimination will be corrected, and the interests of my own State share only in the general fortune of all.

Mr. Chairman, when I remind this committee further that in every tariff bill which has been passed by a Democratic Congress, or any Democratic branch of any Congress, coal has been placed upon the dutiable list; when I remind the committee of the fact that five of the gentleman who have reported this Wilson bill placing coal upon the free list joined in reporting the Mills bill, retaining a duty of 75 cents per ton, it can not be denied—and I wish to call the attention of my friend, Mr. RAYNER, to this fact—that the Democrats in this House who now favor a revenue duty upon coal have very good Democratic precedence and very good Democratic company for the position which they assume.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that everybody can not be suited in a tariff bill. I will vote for this bill on its final passage if there is not one single amendment made to its provisions. I do not like all of its provisions. I do not like a bounty on sugar. I do not like the rebate provisions contained in section 22 of the Wilson bill and contained in 25 of the McKinley bill. But I shall vote for this measure, or any other measure, Mr. Chairman, which has in it a single shred of tariff reform. I do not like a bill, Mr. Chairman, which gives the interests of my people and section all the "reform" and New England all the "tariff." Why, the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] the other day used the following language as an argument:

"There is one section in this country which gets the lion's share, but it is not the south. [Applause.] For every dollar that the Southern States get out of this bill New England will get $5 out of this bill. [Applause.] One State, Massachusetts, will reap more benefit from the tariff left in this bill than all the Southern States combined. The State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania alone will reap more benefit than all the Southern States combined."

The South and West have had a superabundance of this kind of legislation, Mr. Chairman.

The voters of the United States, after full discussion and deliberation, by a majority of more than 800,000 in the Congressional elections of 1890, declared in favor of tariff reform. That verdict was reiterated in the elections of 1892 by the selection of a Democratic Executive and House of Representatives, and enough changes resulted in the Senate from that election to alter its political complexion, and to make both branches of the legislative department of the Government Democratic.

I believe every Democrat on this floor has an earnest desire and honest intention to carry out the expressed will of the people, and the differences which exist among us are such only as can and will be settled amicably among ourselves, and in the end the great object will be attained for which we have been commissioned by the people. The people have trusted us, Mr. Chairman, and let us trust ourselves.

The people demand action, and we should act without unnecessary delay. It is recognized on all sides that in arranging the tariff schedules it will be impossible to gratify the wishes of all people or of all sections, and should we not meet this question with a disposition to compromise differences and to make concessions? It is in this spirit that I will consume the short time allotted to me in the discussion of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the issue to be considered is not between the abstract doctrines of free trade and of protection, but is to be fought out between the Democratic demand for a tariff for revenue only and the Republican contention for a high protective tariff. Unfortunately for the taxpayers of the country, the expenses of this Government have grown so enormously, as the result of Republican extravagance and misrule, that we will not be able now to reduce the burdens of the people in so considerable an extent as is desirable and as their condition demands. We are driven to meet an annual expenditure of $500,000,000, in round numbers, of public funds.

It is our policy, and it is the object of this bill, to collect a portion of this immense sum from tariff taxation, and we are now to determine the particular subjects to be selected as those upon which the tariff shall be placed, to the end that revenue shall be collected to meet the demands of Government. Democrats disagree merely as to the subjects to be selected for taxation; but in the common purpose to relieve the people by means of tariff reform we all stand shoulder to shoulder, and will be united when we have settled among ourselves the differences which exist among us.

In some quarters, Mr. Chairman, an attempt has been made to measure the Democracy of members of this House by the claim that it was "an unpardonable sin" to propose any amendment to any clause of this bill, as originally drafted. In this statement I have no reference to any member of the Committee on Ways and Means, but if this rule should be adopted the majority of the committee would most certainly be entirely outside the pale of party, as the chairman has consumed two days in offering amendments to the original draft of the bill. I believe the lumber schedule has been twice changed from the original draft. We first had free lumber; next a tariff on finished lumber, and now we have a reciprocal tariff on lumber, on motion of the chairman of the committee.

If every man is to be read out of the party who has objection to some particular feature of the bill, we would not have a Democrat left in this body. I do not mean to criticise the chairman of the committee by this statement, but merely desire to call attention to the fact that this bill is like every other bill—open to amendment—and to impress it upon the House that it is unjust and unfair to charge that any gentleman is opposed to the general object of the bill simply because he offers to amend the measure. This bill will be the bill of every Democrat in the land when it becomes a law; we are all alike responsible for it, and are alike entitled to share in its preparation.

Mr. Chairman, we have determined to raise a portion of our revenues by means of a tariff tax, and we have promised to treat every section and interest fairly, as well as to reform the tariff.

I do not agree with gentlemen who say they will vote to cut down every rate of duty provided in this bill, and will vote against every proposition to pay some duty upon articles placed upon the free list in this measure; but I stand ready to support any amendment which will have the effect to treat every section and every interest fairly in the distribution of the benefits to result from the levying of a tariff for revenue, and in doing so simply carry out Democratic pledges and promises made to the people.

The Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means are able and intellectual gentlemen. They have given much time to the consideration of the great question of tariff reform, and with commendable zeal and energy have devoted their time and attention to the discharge of the onerous and delicate duties required of them in the preparation of the bill which they have reported; and when we measure the great variety of subjects covered by their inquiries, investigations, and actions; when we consider how stupendous was the task before them, we have not been surprised that they have corrected in many respects their bill as originally drafted, and their chairman has found it necessary to consume more than two days of the time allotted to the consideration of amendments to this bill in perfecting it by offering and securing the adoption of amendments to the text of their measure as orignally reported. We honor the committee for their honest and earnest efforts to perfect a measure which is to carry out the wishes of the people expressed by them at the polls twice in succession, and we feel sure the members of the committee have no sympathy with the idea that this particular measure is hedged about with some divine attributes, and that any Democrat who proposes to amend it in any particular is a traitor to his party.

I have not heard any gentleman speak of this measure who has claimed that it is perfect in every particular, or assert that he indorsed its every feature. This statement applies to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means as well as other gentlemen. So far as I am concerned, and as I have said before, I would vote for it if it had in it a single shred of tariff reform, and I will vote for the bill on its final passage if I am not able to secure an amendment to a single provision which it contains.

I confess there are some features of the bill which I would change if in my power to do so; but when I come finally to vote I must decide whether the measure is a better bill than the McKinley tariff law; and in my judgment there should not and will not be any hesitation about arriving at a proper conclusion upon that question and in favor of this bill, as I have. I would not place diamonds and other precious stones uncut upon the free list, as is done in the Wilson bill; but I find the same provision in the McKinley tariff bill. I would wipe out the rebate provision (section 22) of the Wilson bill; but I find the same provision in the McKinley law (section 25). I am opposed to that part of this bill which gives a bounty to the sugar-producers of this country; but I find the same undemocratic measure in the McKinley bill in an aggravated form.

Mr. Chairman, the great reduction made in the Wilson bill in

the duty upon clothing alone will go far to compensate those whom I represent for the losses they would sustain should every product they have go upon the free list, not excluding coal, of which I desire to speak more especially upon this occasion. But, Mr. Chairman, the benefits to result from cheaper clothing to the people will not be confined to my district, but like the dews of heaven will fall equally upon all; and in like manner all the benefits of every nature which shall come from the passage of this bill should be shared equally and fairly by every section and every interest of the country. I repeat it, the Democratic party has promised to treat every section and every interest fairly as well as to reform the tariff, and one of these pledges is as sacred and binding as the other and should be as faithfully kept and observed. Does this bill as originally drafted treat the people of my district and their products fairly? I think not; and while I admit that the bill is a far better measure than the McKinley tariff law, I must insist that it is not undemocratic in me to ask that my people have accorded to them justice in this Democratic measure for tariff reform.

"A tariff is a tax," and the levying of a tariff for revenue works naturally and incidentally protection upon any given article, and benefits those engaged in producing the commodity upon which the tax is fixed. There are some exceptions to this rule, growing out of circumstances surrounding and conditions existing and relating to a given article which do not exist with respect to products generally. A notable exception to this rule is wool, which has always commanded the highest price in this country when the duty upon it has been lowest. While all the people are given cheaper clothing when the duties upon woolens are reduced, yet the persons engaged in the manufacture of woolens have an especial and double benefit preserved for them by the tariff left upon their product in this bill; and in this peculiar benefit persons engaged in other industries have no share or portion.

If absolute free trade was feasible or practicable then we could not complain if our great product—coal—should share in the common lot; but so long as it is our policy to collect a portion of our revenues from tariff taxation, I deem it to be my duty to demand that those whom I represent shall share equally in the benefits as well as the burdens which shall come to the whole people under any and every system of taxation which may be inaugurated in this Government, and I should feel that I was recreant to the trust reposed in me if I did not with all the power, strength, and ability which I possess urge and insist that those whose servant I am should have justice accorded to them in this the law under which is to be collected taxes to meet the expenses of government.

Sir, millions of dollars have been expended in the district which I represent in constructing plants whereby coal can be produced, and in furnishing means of transportation of our product to market; thousands of honest and industrious laborers are engaged in digging out "our dusky diamonds" and transporting them to market, and thereby earning meager support for themselves, their wives, and children; thousands of farmers own land more valuable by reason of rich seams of coal underlying the surface, the farmers are dependent upon the mines to furnish a market for their products; the success of the business men is dependent upon the prosperity of the mining industries, and I view with alarm any attempted legislation which may bring injury to those great interests, and misery and want to so many thousands of my constituents. As I said before, we have been told by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] that the "little State of Rhode Island will receive more benefits under the woolen schedules in the Wilson bill than all the Southern States."

I would like to inquire by what token a whole section is to be discriminated against and in favor of New England? Why is it so? Why should it be so? In my judgment the capital invested in West Virginia is entitled to as much consideration as if it had been invested in Massachusetts. In my opinion the hardy, industrious and fearless miner who, in my district, digs his livelihood from the bowels of the earth, and the hardy, industrious, and fearless railroad employé is entitled to as much thought and care as the comfortably housed, comfortably clothed, comfortably fed, high-priced laborer in any hot house "infant industry" in Massachusetts or elsewhere; and I believe the farmers of my State are as much entitled to "a home market" as are the agriculturists around the smoke-stacks in New England, erected under a system of protective taxation which has on a much larger scale given "more of benefit to the little State of Rhode Island than to the whole South."

And the chairman of the committee [Mr. WILSON] has said that a tariff on coal was a subsidy to the railroads. It rather appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that free coal means a subsidy to New England manufacturers and the Dominion Coal Company, a corporation composed of capitalists of this country and Canada, who have secured control of a large area of coal lands in Nova Scotia, have had granted to them special and valuable privileges by the Dominion legislature, and who can with free coal and geographical and other advantages drive West Virginia coal out of the New England market; and for every ton of West Virginia coal which is supplanted by Nova Scotia coal a royalty of 12½ cents goes into the treasury of the English crown, under the charter of the Dominion Coal Company. Canada has a tariff upon coal.

The committee has been indeed considerate of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotians may bring their coal to us free under this bill, but we must pay them a tariff of 60 cents per short ton if we sell our coal to them. Lumber was originally placed on the free list by the committee, then a duty was placed upon dressed lumber, but on motion of the chairman the duty on lumber was made reciprocal. I had hoped that the committee would also propose to make the duty on coal reciprocal, but that has not been done. I will offer an amendment to that effect if we are not able to have the the duty reinstated.

I am no apologist or defender of railroads, but my information is that the rate for carrying coal from West Virginia to seaboard is about 3½ mills per ton per mile. It is claimed that freights can not be carried cheaper without loss to the railroads. But it is said that the railroads get the lion's share of profits on coal, and if the price on seaboard or in New England is cut down the rates will be reduced and the loss will fall upon the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, I think our everyday's experience teaches us that the railroads can take care of themselves. If they are to carry coal to seaboard at reduced rates they will recoup, in part at least, from the operator; the operator in turn from the miner, who to-day is receiving almost starvation wages. The railroad employé, now poorly paid, will come in for his share of the reduction, and, as is always the case, the laborer will bear the brunt and will suffer the most in the end. Not only this, Mr. Chairman, but if the railroads must cut down their rates on through freights they will compensate themselves by increasing local freight rates, with the result that the consumers along their lines will have to pay more for fuel; and the effect of free coal, I fear, will be to injure most the laborers employed in mining and transporting coal, will destroy the markets at the mines for farm products, and will increase the price of coal to home consumers who are not on the seacoast.

I am informed that coal has gone on the free list because the committee classes it as a "raw material." I do not care, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the abstract theories or hair-splitting ideas as to the point at which to draw the dividing line between "raw material" and "finished product;" but this we do know, that when coal is carried and laid down in market more than 90 per cent of its value is made up of labor, including transportation, and that there is scarcely a "finished product" in which such a large per centum of its value is made up of labor and transportation. If coal is a "raw material" now and should go on the free list, it was a "raw material" when the Mills bill was drafted and presented to the Fiftieth Congress by a Democratic committee headed by the great tariff reformer, ROGER Q. MILLS; yet a duty of 75 cents per ton was placed in that bill upon bituminous coal. As before stated, five of the democrats who reported the Wilson bill, including the present chairman, were members of the committee which reported the Mills bill and assisted in its passage through a Democratic House of Representatives. These gentlemen have the right to change their opinion upon the question at issue. I have the right not to change my opinion. I believe they were right then and are wrong now. I stand where they stood then. I occupy the position taken by every Democrat who has ever come to Congress from my State up to this time.

I am in favor now, as Mr. WILSON of West Virginia was in 1884, of "a bill for the reduction of taxes." In my judgment, as it was then his judgment, where a "bill departs from its general scheme of merely reducing taxes and seeks to enlarge the free list, it bears unevenly and, as I believe, unjustly, upon some of the interests of my own State." I believe now as he did then, that "to take any one great industry and transfer it suddenly to the free list is to hold it tributary to all the rest." And I insist that if in any bill my State and her interests are not fairly treated, that "this inequality and discrimination should be corrected and the interests of my own State share only in the fortune of all."

Every tariff bill which has ever passed a Democratic branch of any Congress has retained in it a duty on coal, and the individuals who to-day criticise as undemocratic the position that there should be a revenue duty laid upon coal are either ignorant of the record of the Democratic party on this question or for selfish or malicious ends misstate the facts.

The great Democratic leader, Senator GORMAN of Maryland,

in referring to this matter in a speech delivered by him in the Senate on January 9, 1889, used the following language, viz:

* * * Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] says truly that 90 per cent of the cost of coal from the mines to the furnace goes to labor. There are more than one hundred thousand men engaged in mining bituminous coal, and these hard-working men, who bring it from the bowels of the earth, get under the present tariff from 30 to 50 cents per ton, their wages not exceeding $600 per annum. The owners of the property, the men who have invested their hard earnings in this enterprise, do not realize more than 10 cents per ton. The transportation lines, the railroads and canals, carry these products from the mines east of the Alleghenies to tide-water, at less than one-half cent per ton per mile, so sharp is the competition, even with the duty at 75 cents. There is no monopoly; there can be no combine or trust in the bituminous coal trade. The deposit is too extensive and the competition too sharp to allow it. To open the door and admit foreign coals free of duty can only result in disaster to the owners of the mines and bring lower wages to the men employed in this great enterprise.

Mr. President, under the moderate duties that were levied by the first act ever passed for levying duties on foreign imports, the duty on bituminous coal was placed at 84 cents. It was increased to $1.25 by a Democratic Congress, and at no time from the date of the passage of the first act until now have the representatives of the Democratic party when in power ever proposed a lower duty than the present rate of 75 cents per ton.

From 1824 to 1843 the duty was $1.68 per ton; 1843 to 1846, $1.75 per ton; 1846, 30 per cent ad valorem; 1847 to 1861, 24 per cent ad valorem; 1862 to 1864, $1 per ton; 1865, $1.10 per ton; 1866 to 1872, $1.25 per ton; and since 1872, 75 cents per ton.

* * * * * * *

If the Democratic party, or any party, adopts the open and broad position of my friend from Missouri that, while you have to raise $300,000,000 to support your Government, you will so legislate as to leave open the doors and bring in Nova Scotia coal free, where the mines happen to be immediately upon the seaboard, and it can be transferred from the miners' cars to the vessel and brought in here by English tramp steamers and thus destroy this interest—the party that advocates such a proposition can not expect to maintain supremacy in these great coal-producing States bordering on the Atlantic.

As I have before said, there never was a Democratic statesman, there never has been a President elected by the Democratic party, or a Secretary of the Treasury, or a committee of either branch of Congress that was controlled by Democrats, knowing that revenue must be raised from the tariff, who ever dreamed of putting coal upon the free list. My friend wishes to reverse all precedents.

Senator FAULKNER, of my own State, who is one of the ablest and most ardent of the Democratic Senators, in a speech on this subject delivered January 9, 1889, said:

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, I feel a deep interest in the action which the Senate may take upon the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], as my State is so largely interested in the development of the coal industry, especially of bituminous coal. If we have any we have very little anthracite coal in the State of West Virginia, but I am satisfied that there is no area of country in the United States that surpasses West Virgin a in its deposits of bituminous coal, the coal area of that State covering 16,000 square miles in a total area of 24,645 square miles embraced within her limits.

I would not oppose the amendment simply because I represent a State which is so deeply interested in the development of the coal-mining interest, but I feel confident that in opposing it I am sustained by the declaration of principles of the national Democratic party and the action of its representatives in forming the Mills bill.

Mr. President, in that platform of principles the Democratic party announced to the people of this country that the reduction of revenue, which was an imperative necessity, should be made "in a spirit of fairness to all interests." That declaration was accepted by the people of the country as a leading and cardinal principle that should govern in the framing of the details of a bill for the reduction of the revenue.

With confidence in the good faith and honest purpose of that party the people decreed the overthrow of the Republican party by the election of a Democratic President and House of Representatives.

Coal was on the dutiable list at $1.25 a ton. Subsequently and in the process of reduction of the rates of duty upon the various protected articles the duty on coal was reduced from $1.25 to 75 cents per ton; but even then, as the Senator from Missouri has stated, drawbacks were allowed in favor of all steam vessels in the coasting trade, and therefore protection was only afforded to coal of American production as against foreign coal that was brought to the seaboard for the purposes of being utilized in the manufacture of articles in cities on the seaboard. That was the only protection practically given to coal under the provisions of the revenue laws.

In accordance with the principles of revenue reduction announced in the platform of 1884, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House formulated a bill at the last session which was substantially indorsed by the national Democratic convention of last year, and on which the canvass was made before the people of my State. Every representative of that party maintained that the provisions of the Mills bill fairly and honestly gave expression to the policy of the party as announced in its platform, to wit, that the reductions therein made were prompted and controlled by "a spirit of fairness to all interests."

Congress having reduced the duty on coal 50 cents a ton the framers of the House bill recognized the fact that a further reduction of duty upon that article would be a violation of that declaration that reductions would be made "in a spirit of fairness to all interests," refused to interfere with the duty then existing on coal, leaving it at 75 cents on a ton.

I therefore claim, Mr. President, that in opposing the amendment of the Senator from Missouri I am standing on firm, solid, Democratic doctrine.

Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Missouri whether he is not asking this side of the Senate to do that which is unjust and unfair in this respect? Who will be benefited, I will ask the Senator, by the abolition of this duty upon coal? Would any man in the interior who purchases a ton of coal be benefited one dollar by this reduction? No, sir; not one cent. The benefit, if his amendment should be adopted, would be received by whom? By the manufacturers on the seaboard, who would have the privilege of purchasing foreign coal, which could then compete with the coal from the interior, by purchasing it from vessels which brought it to the shores of this continent as ballast, or under very low freights, but the consumer of the interior would not be benefited one dollar or one cent by reduction in the price, and why? Simply because when you come to compete with American coal, and have to transport the foreign article which is landed upon our shores at the seaboard into the interior, the cost of transportation would cause the price to stand as it stands to-day; and the consumer, except upon the seaboard, would pay exactly the same price, because coal at the mine is now selling at a low price. Therefore there can be no benefit resulting to any one but the manufacturing interests on the seaboard in the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

* * * * * * *

I was proceeding to state that there is an additional reason why those gentlemen should not do it in all fairness and in all justice to the great coal interests of the interior of the country. They are highly protected on all articles which they are manufacturing, and if there are any persons who can fairly pay tribute, if this is to be considered a tribute, those who are receiving 42 per cent protection on the articles which they manufacture should not complain (and I am glad to say they do not) to a reasonable duty of 24 per cent to foster and develop so important an interest as this—an interest which employs a large number of laborers and digs from the bowels of the earth over a hundred millions of tons annually.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, from the examination I have made of Mr. Jarrett's testimony, to which the Senator from Missouri refers, as he will be if he examines it carefully, for I have had occasion to refer to that evidence—I repeat, I am satisfied Mr. Jarrett in his testimony is alluding to the miners of the anthracite region and not to the miners of the bituminous fields. There is, relatively speaking, a small section of the coal region of Pennsylvania which is bituminous, it being that section which is known as the Connellsville region, and which extends on into West Virginia. There will be developed within the next year in the State of West Virginia a coke interest that will be equal if not superior in quality and output to the Connellsville coal interest, which now has a reputation for fineness and quality superior to all others.

Only a few days ago, to my personal knowledge, 60,000 acres of the most magnificent coal land that can be found in this country was arranged by the owners of it to be sold to a syndicate of gentlemen who are going to develop it. Throughout that portion of the State of West Virginia running from Fairmont, in Marion County, down toward Clarksburg, in the interior of the State, great progress in the development of this important interest is being made.

In the southwestern part of the State, I can state to the Senate, as an evidence of the wonderful coal deposit found there and the progress of this industry in West Virginia, that since the 1st of last April in one district of one county the population has increased 3,000, and to-day for 10 miles, where a year ago there were only a few habitations and a scattered population, there are now 10 miles of coke ovens as close together as they can be built, and I am informed that in the excavation of a tunnel for a road to transport that product to market the cost of the excavation was paid for from the coal that was excavated.

I desire only to add a few words. I think it is a recognized fact by all those dealing with this subject that 90 per cent of the cost of coal is in labor. I claim, therefore, that under the principles of the party to which I have the honor to belong, that in the reduction of the tariff duties in accordance with the views of that party we should treat all interests with fairness, and that as the duty on this industry has been reduced to an amount far greater than any other protected interest since the inauguration of these high tariffs, it is unfair and unjust to ask us now, when it would result in increasing the profits of a few highly protected manufacturing industries on the seaboard, that coal should be placed on the free list. Especially is this so when those affected by it are not asking for this reduction. I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, and allow bituminous coal to remain at 75 cents a ton, as it is under the present law.

Senator Kenna of West Virginia entertained the same views. I have never heard the Democracy of either of these gentlemen questioned.

Coal "raw material" indeed! In this connection I call attention to the following schedules in the bill under consideration, viz:

Marble and stone, and manufactures of:

101. Marble of all kinds in block, rough or squared only, 40 cents per cubic foot.

103. Manufactures of marble, onyx, or alabaster not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

104. Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and other building or monumental stone, except marble, not specially provided for in this act, hewn, dressed, or polished, 20 per cent ad valorem.

In all frankness it appears to me that if coal is "raw material," marble, freestone, granite, sandstone, and limestone are "raw materials" also, and that the committee has not been consistent in carrying out its "raw material" ideas.

If a tariff on coal was right when the Mills bill was passed, it is right now. Indeed, the reasons why there should be a tariff on coal for purpose of revenue are tenfold stronger now than when that measure passed the House of Representatives. There has been no change of condition to justify a change of policy from a Democratic tariff-for-revenue standpoint. The expenses of Government and pension appropriations have increased enormously since the Fiftieth Congress. We are now confronted with a deficit of $50,000,000 or more in the Treasury, and we are in the act of passing a tariff measure which will fall short $60,000,000 or more of producing sufficient revenues. About $1,000,000 came into the Treasury last year from the tariff on coal, and if there was ever a time when we could poorly spare that $1,000,000 that time is upon us.

Mr. Chairman, under the Wilson bill every article, almost without exception, which our people purchase and consume has retained upon it a duty of from 35 to 45 per cent. The present rate of duty upon coal is and the tariff retained in the Mills bill was less than 23 per cent, according to the statistics furnished by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means. The tariff on coal is 75 cents per ton. If coal sells in market at $3, then the tariff is 25 per cent. The dinner bucket, the hat, the coat, the breeches, the shirt, and the shoes of the miner, and the tacks in his shoes, the lamp which he uses in the mines, the pick with which he digs the coal, the shovel with which he throws it into the car, the nails which hold the car together, the wheels of the car, the car tracks are to be taxed under this

bill, and yet the product of the miner's labor—coal—is to go on the free list. I put it to any logical mind and fair man whether this is just; whether this is right; whether this is equitable; whether this is Democratic? And yet gentlemen are accused of selfishness, and their Democracy is impugned when they insist that a revenue duty shall be retained upon bituminous coal.

I have heard it said that the duty on coal does not and to retain it will not benefit the producers of coal. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this proposition answers itself. We are certain that it will not hurt us, and if it can not benefit us it will not injure any other person or persons. If it neither hurts nor helps anyone why disturb the present condition? We know that a great many of our intelligent people believe that it will injure us to make coal free, and I see no good to be accomplished by experimenting in this matter or in any other. The majority of the committee have certainly intended to attain some object by their action in the premises. From statistics before me it appears that West Virginia produced in 1892 the immense amount of 9,738,755 short tons of coal, spot value $7,852,114, and the district which I represent produced 6,757,772 tons of this coal, and sent to the seaboard in 1892 the immense quantity of 2,912,109 tons of bituminous coal; 2,500,983 tons of this coal went to New England and Northern points.

This wonderful showing explains why my people, and myself feel so much interest in the subject under discussion. If an apology was needed for my position and contention upon this question it is found in the injury which may come to my people if present conditions are not preserved as regards the coal interests.

It is argued that the manufacturers should have cheaper fuel because they have their tariff reduced. It is not possible to give them cheaper fuel without reducing in the hands of the producer the price of coal; and to do so would only benefit such consumers as are approximately on the seaboard. In this connection I would like to ask wherein the manufacturer has his profits reduced and wherein does he surrender anything to tariff reform, if what he loses because of tariff reduction is made up to him from cheaper fuel? Does any man suppose that the New England manufacturers do not understand their own interests or know their own business when they ask for free coal, as they have done for many years past? Does any man believe that the New England Representatives who have voted for free coal in the past have misrepresented the interests of their constituents?

As bearing upon this question I desire to quote from the prospectus of the Dominion Coal Company, Limited. I have the prospectus before me, and it says:

Should the United States duty of 75 cents per ton be removed, it seems evident that this company will find a large market on the New England seaboard, for which its position at tide water would enable it to compete on advantageous terms.

It is estimated that it could put coal free on board vessel at Louisburg for about $1 a ton, probably cheaper than coal is shipped at any port in the world.

If the corporators of the Dominion Coal Company had not believed they were investing at a point where they would derive more profits, why did they not invest their money in the United States?

I have but recently read a three-column article in the New York World upon this subject, in which the great benefits to result to the New England manufacturers from free coal are strongly set forth, and it is claimed that these benefits are to come principally from importations of coal by the same Dominion Coal Company, when coal is made free; and the corporation is complimented for its shrewdness and astuteness in employing two prominent and influential lawyers to lobby through the Dominion Legislature the measure giving them special privileges. I quote from the article to which I have referred, viz:

BOSTON, *January 3.*

The prospect of the removal of the tariff on bituminous coal is regarded with great favor in the Eastern States. The possibilities of cheaper fuel for manufacturing purposes, whereby one of the principal handicaps on New England industry will be removed, seems now to be nearer realization than at any period since the reciprocity treaty with Canada was withdrawn in 1864.

The island of Cape Breton contains the best coal fields. The island, rude, desolate, and sparsely populated, is a vast bed of mineral wealth. The principal mining company is the General Mining Association, the original assignees of the Duke of York. It is in North Sydney; its seam of coal averages 5 feet in thickness, and the workings extend under the harbor seaward for 2 miles. This coal is considered to be worth about $1 more a ton than any other grade. The capital stock last year was given at $1,100,000, with a reserve fund of $125,000. The net profits were quoted at $50,000 per annum. Members of the Cunard family and Sir Charles Tupper were among the owners.

The eyes of farseeing Bostonians have been turned in the direction of the Nova Scotia coal fields for many years. New England manufacturers, long in business, were acquainted with the fuel from Pictou and Sydney. Under the old reciprocity treaty, between 1854 and 1864, much of the fuel brought into Boston came from the maritime province.

EXCELLENT GAS COAL.

The Boton gas works were fed on Pictou coal, as were those of Providence, Salem, Portland, and other cities. The trade developed until the coal imported was 460,000 tons a year. In 1865 the Canadas consumed 170,000 tons of their own coal. In 1892, 1,700,000 tons. The effect of the imposition of a duty of 75 cents a ton by the United States was to blight one of the largest sources of Boston's maritime interests.

The value of fuel is, of course, influenced by its availability. The proximity of the Nova Scotia mines to Boston by a deep-water route renders them of prime importance. Buyers will seek the cheapest market, and the existing demand in Eastern New England for cheaper fuel is loud at the present time because of the knowledge of the teeming seams of Cape Breton.

FOOD SUPPLIES ARE CHEAP.

The small income of the employés is equalized by the low price of necessaries of life. Potatoes at 15 cents a bushel help out the working classes in Nova Scotia to an astonishing degree, and beef, pork, and cereals are cheaper than in the States. * * *

THE GREAT AMERICAN SYNDICATE.

The purpose of the Whitney syndicate is to open markets that will create a demand for Cape Breton coal that their resources warrant. The main idea was to aggregate in one centrally controlled organization with abundant capital the best mining properties in Cape Breton. * * *

The work of organization was immense, and the manner in which the scheme was lobbied through the legislature of the province was extremely skillful and diplomatic. The work was conducted with extreme secrecy. The active agents were two clever Canadian lawyers—John White and B. F. Pearson.

John White was engaged because he is an adroit wire-puller and held confidential acquaintance with the leaders of the Dominion Government at Ottawa. * * *

The financial end of the syndicate is Kidder, Peabody & Co., of Boston, who hold $4,000,000 bonds. It is not known how these securities have been disposed.

The harbor of Louisburg is an open one, and, with an iceboat, the syndicate expect to ship coal all winter. The water is deep enough to float steamships of any practicable size. The coal mining is not the entire business. A railway from Sidney to Louisburg is to be built and the operation of the existing railways on the island are among the undertakings.

There has been a bitter opposition in the Dominion to the coal deal. Patriotic and economic objections have been urged, but the Canadian Pacific ring, which is interested in the scheme, has overcome all obstacles.

Up to October 1, the output of the mines controlled by the syndicate was 500,000 tons ahead of any previous yearly record. All the mines are doing well, and the lot of the workman is cheerful.

If it is true coal can be placed free on board vessel at Louisburg, Nova Scotia, for about $1 per ton, as claimed in the prospectus of the Dominion Coal Company, or even at $1.50 per ton, common sense teaches every man that inland coal from West Virginia or elsewhere can not compete in New England markets with Nova Scotia coal. When coal is on board vessel at Louisburg it is then as close to New England as West Virginia coal is after it has been hauled 400 miles by rail to seaboard, and the ocean freight charges are as high from Newport News and Lamberts Point, where West Virginia coal reaches seaboard, to Boston, or higher than they are from Louisburg to Boston. Does anyone for an instant suppose that coal can be mined and transported 400 miles by rail for $1 or even $1.50 per ton?

My information is, and it comes from reliable sources, that the actual cost of mining coal and loading it on the cars in West Virginia is from 80 to 90 cents per ton, including royalty, and the freight charges to seaboard amount to about $1.30 per ton, so that when West Virginia coal reaches seaboard it stands actual cost at about $2.20 per ton. This is actual cost and does not embrace any interest on money invested or profits. If coal can be placed free on board vessels at Louisburg at $1 per ton, as claimed, then the Nova Scotia producer has an advantage of $1.20 per ton at seaboard, if coal is free, and this advantage continues and exists when the coal reaches the New England market.

The following statement upon the subject has been furnished to me by a reliable gentleman, who is in a position to know what he is talking about. I can not vouch for the correctness of the figures, but they come from a reliable source:

Cost of producing a ton of New River steam coal from mines on the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad in Fayette County, W. Va., and delivering the same to Northern or New England markets.

Miner for digging	$0.40
For entry State, etc	.075
Hauling in mines	.080
Tracks	.020
Dumping and handling	.035
Ventilation	.010
Repairs	.025
Props and ties	.020
Extras	.020
Boss	.010
Surveying, clerical, etc	.015
Merchandise supplies	.015
Rolls, faults, squeezers, etc	.025
Water	.010
	.76
Royalty	.10
Total	.86

The above is the average cost—taking each item as ascertained from several mines. In some cases the figures may be reduced by fortunate conditions in the mines, but the above is a fair average.

The operator is paid 87½ cents per ton for his coal on board cars, and would have 1½ cents per ton profit.

Add to price paid for coal, viz	$0.875
Freight rates to seaboard, about 400 miles	1.31
Loading vessels, insurance, etc	.16
Average ocean rates to Boston, etc	.90
Making cost of coal alongside in Boston per ton	3.245
Add expenses of selling, etc	.075
Making a total of	3.32

It might sometimes run as low as $3.20 or up to $3.50.

Cost of Nova Scotia coal, free on board, Louisburg	$1.00
Ocean rates to Boston	.90
Add insurance and other expenses	.25
Total	2.15
So that, with free coal, Nova Scotia coal in Boston would have an advantage per ton of	$1.17
Scotch coal was sold in Montreal in the summer of 1893, per ton, at	$3.05
After paying duty to Canada of	.67
Leaving for coal, vessel charges, etc	2.38

It would seem that if the above statement is even approximately correct the operator has but a narrow margin of profit, and it is evident that any reduction in the price of coal in market would seriously injure the coal industry. How, then, is it possible, with free coal, for the West Virginia product to compete in New England with the Nova Scotia product? It is claimed that the West Virginia coal is superior in quality. That may be true, but it is the concensus of opinion among gentlemen who have given this subject consideration that the advantage in favor of Nova Scotia with free coal, which would be about $1.20 per ton, vastly exceeds the difference in favor of the quality of our coal.

Mr. Chairman, we are as much entitled to the New England market for our coal as they are entitled to our market for their products, and yet this bill will not only give to the manufacturer free coal at our expense and require us to purchase his product, or foreign products, with a duty laid upon the same of 35 to 45 per cent, but under section 22 (section 25 McKinley bill) the manufacturer is permitted practically to import his material free of duty, so far as his exportations of finished products are concerned. Section 22 refunds to the manufacturer 99 per cent of the duty which he pays upon any imported material, if he exports the finished product. In other words, he is invited by this section to purchase his materials abroad; he is paid a premium to sell his goods to foreigners cheaper than to home consumers, and we are taxed sufficiently upon what we buy and consume to justify him in doing so.

For the year ending August, 1893, 1,141,286 tons of coal were imported into this country. I do not see how any thinking man can claim that if so much coal could be imported and pay duty, that the importations would not largely increase if the duty was removed, whereby foreign coal to that extent would supplant the American product. It is said that we export coal. Such is the fact, and I take it that there is not a single American product that is not exported to some extent. My information is that the exportations of coal in almost every instance can be accounted for, by reason of the fact that in foreign ports the fuel on board vessels which come from this country, and called "bunker coal," is estimated as an exportation by us. In other cases empty vessels carry coal as ballast to foreign ports which they visit for cargoes. In some instances, and especially does this apply to Canada, we are able to export our coal across the lakes to Canada because of the remote distance from their own mines and seaboard of such points, and because of our closeness to such points and cheapness and nearness of transportation. Any man who looks at the map can tell why we export coal to Canada and can not in New England compete with free coal from Nova Scotia.

Thus it appears that the New England manufacturers are the people who will profit from free coal; that it is Democratic and just and fair to levy a revenue duty on coal, and that serious results may come to thousands of laboring men and farmers, and to a great industry in my State and in other sections if the unbroken record of my party is now changed upon the question at issue.

Mr. Chairman, the short time allotted to me will prohibit me from further discussing this question.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I make no argument in favor of protection. I simply ask that my people and their interests be treated fairly in the levying of a tariff for revenue. I am flatfootedly opposed to the Republican idea of protection. I stand on the Democratic platform of a tariff for revenue only, and have never failed in convention, caucus, or elsewhere to cheerfully accept the action of my party.

In conclusion I desire to say that while I recognize the fact that a tariff bill is passed for and will apply to a whole country, yet in my opinion my first duty is to reflect the wishes and the interests of those who have elected me, having in mind at all times the general welfare of the whole people of our common country. Nor do I consider that in taking this position I am narrow-minded or influenced by selfish considerations. Rather would I conclude that my course was unjustified and improper, narrow and selfish, should I submit without protest to the passage of a measure which, in the language of the distinguished chairman of the committee, "bears unevenly, and as I believe, unjustly upon some of the interests of my own State," and if I did not demand that my people, my section, and their interests, and every other people, section and interest, should receive fair treatment at the hands of this Congress. This I ask: nothing more; nothing less.

I can not forbear stating further that the Democrats who have behind them the unbroken record of the Democratic party in favor of a revenue tariff on coal are not justly open to censure for their position upon this question, and that those of us who stand where the Democratic party has always stood upon this question, and where five democratic members of the present committee stood when the Mills bill was reported to this House, have most excellent Democratic company in the position we have assumed upon this question.

I desire again to refer to the fact that Messrs. HALE and FRYE, now Republican Senators from Maine, when members of this House, on March 13, 1871, and upon an yea-and-nay vote, along with every Republican from New England, voted for the passage of a resolution to place coal on the free list, Mr. Hereford of West Virginia voting no; and Mr. FRYE was sent to West Virginia in the campaign of 1892 to teach our people lessons upon the tariff question. It also appears from the RECORD that Messrs. Blaine, Garfield, Wheeler, Foster, CULLOM, Dawes, John A. Logan, and other good Republicans, when in Congress favored placing coal on the free list.

The minority of the present Committee on Ways and Means have seen proper to assail the Wilson bill because coal is placed on the free list. We all know there is a division on the Democratic side upon this isolated question, and the Republicans of this House have the opportunity to demonstrate whether the minority of the committee expressed upon this subject the views of the minority of the House. In other words, with a division on the Democratic side, they have the power to reinstate the duty on coal. The result will show whether the framers of the minority report were candid in the expressions contained in their report concerning West Virginia and her coal interests. If the Republicans in this House insist upon a duty on coal in the minority report and fail "to practice what they preach," as they have done on many former occasions, the country should know it. "We shall see what we shall see."

The Republicans can not escape responsibility for the action here and now taken. I do not intend that they shall remain silent, or vote against a tariff on coal, and thereby defeat the motion to restore the duty on coal, and be in position to dodge or escape responsibility in future; and with this object in view I have called attention to the division in our own ranks upon this question, and to the condition of affairs here and now existing. The Republicans will not be permitted by their silence or votes here to prevent the adoption of an amendment to place coal on the dutiable list, and be in condition to go to West Virginia, or elsewhere, in future and claim before the people that the Republican party in good faith favored a tariff on coal.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, the section under consideration involves an article of prime necessity in all the affairs of life, including all forms of manufacture and commerce. We had before the Committee on Ways and Means when the McKinley bill was being framed a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, himself a protectionist, a Pennsylvanian, a man of very considerable research and ability, and who is now, I believe, a candidate for election to Congress. I refer to ex-Speaker Grow, from the State of Pennsylvania.

I will detain the House long enough to state some of the conclusions which he reached in connection with the coal question. Remember that he is from a State that is intensely interested if protection is in danger.

Mr. DALZELL. Would not my friend give the date of that hearing?

Mr. MCMILLIN. That was in the hearings on the McKinley bill in 1889 and 1890. Here is what occurred:

Mr. MCKENNA. Do I understand you that we mine coal cheaper in the United States than in Canada?

Mr. GROW. In Western Pennsylvania and Ohio we do, if you count all the expense of the mine.

Mr. MCKENNA. Why, then, do we want a duty on it?

Mr. GROW. On account of transportation.

Mr. MCKENNA. Is the cost of production in the United States cheaper?

Mr. GROW. The points I have mentioned mine cheaper than in Nova Scotia, and the coal at the mouth of the mine sells for less than it sells for in

Nova Scotia. The distance from the mine to the market adds to the selling price for both.

Mr. MCKENNA. That is not an inducement to put a tariff on their coal, because they have the longer distance to go.

Then again, in the same hearings, the chairman of the committee asked him a question, and this colloquy ensued:

The CHAIRMAN. How would it affect coal?

Mr. GROW. If there was no duty on coal between Canada and the United States, I think the Nova Scotia region would supply Canadian territory east of Montreal and most of the State of Maine and perhaps some in Boston; and Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana would supply all the territory west of Montreal to the Rocky Mountains. We should supply 10 miles of territory to their 1.

Mr. MCMILLIN. You say we should take 10 miles of their territory to 1 of ours?

Mr. GROW. I think so, as far as the supply from Nova Scotia region is concerned.

Mr. FLOWER. How is it with British Columbia mines?

Mr. GROW. They have large producing mines. How they compare with the Seattle mines I do not know; but a duty of about half the present duty, if reciprocal, would, I think, be no injury to the soft-coal industry of the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, from the investigation I have been able to give the question I think that the effect directly would be just as has been stated by Mr. Grow, to give to the mines of the United States western and central Canada, a much larger territory than they get from us. I believe they would probably get a small portion of the New England market by reason of the cost of transportation. We must remember that there is a good portion of that market it is impossible for them to get from us.

All the anthracite production must be forever subject to our market exclusively. They cannot get the market for the fine coal that is used on vessels and for the most valuable machinery. They would not get any of that higher grade of coal which is used in manufactures, but they would get a portion of our extreme Eastern markets by reason of the cost of transportation. On the other hand, we would take from them a much larger portion of their market.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. I ask for two more minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Now, this proposition for free coal is not a new one in this House, as seems to be the opinion of some of its friends. It is true it was not included in the Mills bill; but there was a proposition for free coal introduced into Congress on March 13, 1871, by a Representative from Illinois [Mr. Farnsworth], that I have no doubt my friend in front of me [Mr. LANE] knows. It came to a vote and, as reported on page 82 of the Congressional Globe, we find that it was not a partisan vote, but was a vote upon the question, not on the lines of politics.

Mr. ALDERSON. Both sides divided.

Mr. MCMILLIN. That is true. A very large majority, I think nineteen-twentieths, of the Democrats voted for it then. I will mention only a few of the distinguished Republicans who voted for it, among whom were Mr. Bingham, Mr. Dawes, Mr. Charles Foster, of Ohio; Mr. FRYE, of Maine; Mr. Garfield, Mr. Hare, and Mr. Wheeler—the same who was afterwards Vice-President.

Mr. Jeremiah Wilson voted for it; Mr. Shellabarger voted for it; that distinguished Indianian who has gone to the Senate and is performing such important functions as a legislator there, having spent so many years of honorable service in this House, Mr. VOORHEES, voted for it; James B. Beck voted for it; John T. Harris voted for it; Mr. Pendleton of Ohio voted for it, and it passed by a vote of 130 yeas to 57 nays.

I believe, sir, this action proposed by the committee will broaden our markets, not restrict them; will benefit our miners, not injure them. We are now competing successfully with other countries for the Cuban market. Is it possible that we can compete with the foreigner successfully on foreign soil, but can not at home? I would not injure our domestic manufacturer, our laborers, or my country. I would not knowingly take any step against my country's weal. But I believe that by extending our markets we bless our people.

We ship more coal to Canada than they ship here. I could give the figures, but I would trespass on the time of other members, while the committee has already extended my time—a courtesy for which I am grateful and which I will not ask to have repeated now.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LACEY Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the tariff question, which has occupied the political arena for so many years, is greatly simplified at the present time.

A generation has grown up since the question was settled by the necessities arising from the war, and in recent discussions we have been compelled to appeal to history and to the recollections of old men as to the workings of the policy now proposed by the party in power. In 1861 the Democracy went out of power and with a short exception have happily remained out ever since.

No one seriously justifies the rebellion now. We need discuss these issues no longer. Necessity alone compelled the adoption of the so-called war tariff. Necessity forced the retention of that tariff for many years, during which our industries took on new life. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] lays at the door of this tariff as its chiefest evil the fact that during these years of prosperity some men have accumulated more than their share of the country's wealth. When all are busy and earning money some will surely get more than their just proportion out of the general prosperity. No such complaint exists just now. Capitalist and laborer alike are engaged in the struggle to keep their heads above water.

But it was dire necessity alone which impelled the country to adopt the strong protective tariffs of the last thirty years. Nations, like men, are "born great, achieve greatness, or have greatness thrust upon them." This nation was not born great; it achieved much, but a considerable part of its industrial greatness has been thrust upon it by the necessities of its Treasury. The Congress that passed the Morrill tariff, builded better than it knew.

The war debt had to be paid. Eight billions of dollars were expended in the war.

The readiest form of raising the necessary funds to repair the losses of war was by a tariff, and strange as it may seem to free traders, the more we planted of new industries the more we prospered. With vast supplies of iron ore it needed the tariff to protect this industry and set it up against the Old World. With coal and clay at home the pottery industry rose under protection. All industries alike showed the benefit of protection and foreigners sending in their surplus to our markets took from their profits a part, if not all of the tax which they paid into the Treasury. The Democracy out of power and place sought to regain their lost ground and the agitation of the tariff question was begun.

Mr. Cleveland's first Administration was wrecked by the anticipation of free trade as foreshadowed in the Mills bill. His present Administration is being buried alive under the Wilson bill. In 1887, when the people were all prospering, the laborers were made jealous and uneasy with the constant charge that capitalists were getting more than their just share of the profits of production.

Mr. Cleveland exhumed the old theories of Calhoun's school of politics and set labor at war against its own products. But he had a Republican Senate to hold him in check until the American people in the campaign of 1888 condemned his fallacies at the polls.

A tariff for revenue only was taken up as the cardinal principle of Democratic faith and the campaigns of 1890 and 1892 were carried on upon an issue of calamity. In times of plenty a mock calamity was paraded before the country and voters were told, with endless iteration, that times were hard indeed. Even the great physical demonstration of the country's trade in 1892 was in vain. With an export exceeding $1,000,000,000, the largest in the country's history, the cry of business depression and hard times was believed. The riot at Homestead was used with deadly effect and workmen were led to believe that the laws which had created Homestead and a thousand more of busy creative centers ought to be repealed.

It was no doubt true and always has been that employers seek to make all the gain that they can. It is but human nature that such a condition should lead to some friction. But it took some actual experience to prove as patent a fact as that when any industry is stricken down by law the workmen employed must suffer too. In 1888, again in 1890, and later in 1892, Republican speakers were compelled to defend protection to the very men whose daily bread depended on the maintenance of our tariff laws. The opposite policy had not been tried for so long that a new generation had no knowledge of the workings of the proposed system except by information from the men of 1840 and 1857. It is easy to convince a prosperous man that his good fortune is not equal to his deserts. A political party gets little credit for the good it does, but the evil that it does is not soon forgiven.

The evil accomplished by the Democracy was becoming ancient history and was forgotton and forgiven. The good results of Republican legislation were obscured by a cloud of defamation and false statements, and the party of protection was swept from power. Let us now take a glance at the condition of the country when the Democracy came into power last March. The gifted gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] furnished last August a sketch of the situation that I will quote, as it is from a Democratic standpoint.

Mr. COCKRAN said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir, when the gavel of the presiding officer descended upon the desk of this House on the 4th of March last and members of Congress returned to their homes they found the country blessed with universal prosperity. Everywhere the fires of content blazed upon the hearthstone; the

light of hope illumined every household; yet in a period when everything that ought to produce prosperity was ours, the skies over our heads became somber, the dark cloud of a panic settled down over the length and breadth of the land, wrapping in its sinister folds countless thousands of American citizens, threatening to send the gaunt specter of starvation stalking over American highways, menacing the cottages that shelter American labor.

When we seek the source of the dangers that are now impending over us we can find nothing in the character of providential interposition to prevent our continued march towards prosperity. Our bursting granaries show that Providence has smiled upon us in seed time and in harvest; yet in every section of the country mills are closing, industry is suspended, the public mind is disturbed with apprehensions that during the coming winter our highways will be thronged not with tramps who shirk work, but with industrious laboring men, vainly seeking a market for their labor. There is reason to fear that self-respecting men and women who have been active forces in the production of our national wealth may be forced to taste the bitter and humiliating bread of charity.

The newspapers of all parties faithfully recorded the situation of the country's business. This was a happy country that we turned over to Mr. Cleveland last March. After the great Roman army of Varus was destroyed by Arminius, Augustus awoke from his startled sleep night after night and sobbed, "Oh, Varus, give me back my legions!"

And the people of America with one accord cry out, "Oh, Democracy, give us back our prosperity!"

In the language of Bill Nye, the Democratic party is experiencing a "stagnation of satisfaction and general revival of sadness in the realms of traffic."

Mr. Cleveland describes the situation in language no less strong than that of Mr. COCKRAN. In his message last August he said:

With plenteous crops, with abundant promise of remunerative production and manufacture, with unusual invitation to safe investment, and with satisfactory assurance to business enterprise, suddenly financial distrust and fear have sprung up on every side.

He blamed it all on silver, and promised us better things when silver purchases should cease. Republican votes repealed the silver-purchase law and took from him the last shelter behind which he could make defense. Realizing, as the Republicans did, that that law was being misused in buying silver indirectly with gold, and that it had ceased to furnish additional currency to the country, as had been its original purpose, Republican votes were cast in favor of the repeal of silver purchases. Republicans then claimed that the trouble lay deeper than the silver law; that it was the threat against protection that lay at the foundation of all our woes. They proved their charges by setting aside the silver law, and the country was then enabled to see the tariff issue, unobscured by any false and misleading statements.

But we are told that the present condition of the country is not due to the threat of the passage of a Wilson bill, or in any manner due to Democratic control. Mr. Cleveland's former four years of control are pointed out as evidence that his Administration may well be prosperous. But let us not forget that the Mills bill was an idle threat. It only showed what the Democratic party might do if it had the power, but the Senate stood as a bulwark of safety.

Mr. Cleveland gave us four years of Democratic rule under Republican laws. This country is governed by law and not by men, and about the only difference between Mr. Cleveland's first Administration and that of his predecessor was that the offices were held by Democrats instead of Republicans. You had to lick your stamps then in front of a Democratic postmaster. Now you feel like licking the whole Administration, postmasters included.

There was grim irony in Minister Van Alen's letter to Mr. Cleveland, resigning his Italian ambassadorship, when he told the President that he entertained—

An earnest hope for the continuance of the success which has marked your second Administration.

Mr. Cleveland, in 1884, was elected on a tariff platform, very moderate indeed in its declarations. In 1892 he was elected on a platform which denounced all protection as unconstitutional.

It is true that from 1884 to 1889, while Mr. Cleveland administered Republican laws, protection continued unbroken, and prosperity prevailed.

The situation reminds me of the young priest who preached his first sermon on the miracle of the loaves and fishes. In his confusion he told his hearers that a congregation of five persons were fed on 5,000 loaves and a few fishes. After the service he asked one of his Irish parishioners what he thought of the miracle, and his hearer informed him that he could do that himself. On understanding the nature of his mistake he concluded to preach the same sermon the next Sunday and make the correction; and he told the corrected story of how wonderfully 5,000 persons were fed on the five loaves and a few fishes. Seeing his critic of last Sunday in the congregation he said, "Pat, you could not do that, could you?" Patrick replied, "Yis, I could." "How would you do it?" said the young clergyman. "I would feed them on what we had left over from last Sunday," was the reply. And so Mr. Cleveland, for the four years of his first Administration, used the laws that were left over. But that would not work this time, for it was evident that the laws of the Republican party would not be left over—that they were to be surely repealed.

When, in February 20, 1893, Mr. ROACH was elected Senator in North Dakota, it then became certain for the first time that the Senate would be Democratic; a change of laws became then assured, and a cold chill crept up the backs of the body politic. From that day to this no assurance of relief has come from any source.

The inaugural address gave notice that the industries of this country were to be assailed. The President, with that obstinacy so characteristic of his nature, refused to see that which is obvious to all except those who are unwilling to see.

Instead of recognizing the real cause of our troubles he has sought to divert the attention to the silver law, and when its prompt repeal showed that he had treated the disease in the wrong place he persists in his error with all the dogged obstinacy of his nature. With an obstinacy shocking alike to friend and foe, he has closed his eyes to the destitution which his policy has wrought, and closed his ears to the cry of the unemployed and persisted in demanding of a subservient Congress the repeal of the laws which have brought wealth and prosperity in their train.

We are assured that if we send enough money abroad for goods it will make money plenty at home and in the treasury, and that if we employ enough hands in Europe to make our goods for us, the men who have manufactured these goods in America before will enjoy prosperity. Just how the increase of imports and the purchase from foreigners of what we have been buying at home will restore prosperity may be evident to the confirmed free trader, or the astute bookman, but it looks like too simple a thing to deceive American workmen. If this new order of things will bring prosperity, why is it that business men so ready to turn an honest penny do not buy or invest on the theory of a good time coming? If free coal is to help the United States, why is it that gentlemen so near the President and so confident of his judgment do not invest in enterprises in the United States instead of buying Nova Scotia coal fields? Why do not our industrial people in anticipation of the new tariff bill? Why is so much good looked on with so much apprehension?

Mr. Chairman, it was thought when Samuel J. Randall died that the last of the Randall Democrats was gone. I am glad to see so many recruits from the Democratic side of this Chamber to-day recording themselves in favor of protection. [Laughter.] If they are in favor of protection in their own districts and of the industries of their own neighbors that are to be affected by the tariff law, there is no reason why, as American citizens and American Representatives, they should not reach out the same protecting hand to the other districts in other parts of the United States and join the Republican party. [Laughter and applause.]

The coal schedule which we have up for consideration to-day is simply an entering wedge into the Democratic ranks. The coal-miners of this country are a large body of voters. They are thoroughly organized, and organization is respected, and we shall find that if this industry is not protected in the future as it has been in the past, the protest of the coal-miners will be registered at the polls. Thus we find an interest manifested in their behalf by Alabama on the one hand and West Virginia and Maryland upon the other.

This is a large force that the Republican party is being augmented by from the Democratic ranks. Mr. Chairman, the American people have lived a long time since the 4th day of March, 1893, and the workingmen of this country have lived a long time during that period; and they have found at last, sir, that bankrupt industries make poor paymasters. [Applause on the Republican side.] The coal and iron industries are connected together by the strongest of bonds. The woolen industry is likewise connected with them, because the question of the comfort and the question of the strength of the nation are points upon which we ought all to be united. It makes no difference whether iron can be bought somewhere else cheaper than in America; it makes no difference whether wool and woolen products can be bought cheaper somewhere else. If we strike down the iron and the wool industries of this country, we shall find ourselves in time of war helpless, appealing to foreign countries for comfort upon the one hand and for strength for self-defense upon the other. So that these industries ought to be protected, regardless of the question whether the price will be cheapened a little by a change in the tariff or not.

Business men talk politics and often vote against their own interests. Their political judgment is biased by party prejudice and party association. But when it comes to investing money the most radical free trader acts just like a Blaine Republican, and withholds his money and wants no share in the glorious in-

vestments of the professor who aspires to the doubtful honor of linking his name with the most odious measure ever hurried through our American Congress.

"Oh, that mine adversary would write a book!" said the inspired one. Had he lived now, he would say, "Oh, that mine adversary would write a tariff bill!"

I asked a Democratic member of this House privately the other day why this bill was brought forward at this time; why his party at so unfortunate a moment, when times are so hard and when there is so much suffering, should insist on rushing this measure through the House.

Said he to me, "Times are about as bad as they can get. Is not this as good a time as any to pass the bill?" That reminded me of the old German who married a new wife, after his first wife had been dead only two weeks. He was remonstrated with and they said to him, "Why, your wife has only been dead two weeks." He said, "Well, isn't she just as dead as she ever will be?" [Laughter.] On the same principle, gentlemen say this is as good a time to pass this bill as they will ever have. Things can not get any worse.

Mr. Chairman, it is urged that there should be an exception made in the bill in favor of cotton machinery; that one industry in the South should be singled out and given a preference over other industries of this country; that the machinery for the manufacture of cotton should come in free, and that machinery for the manufacture of other articles should pay a revenue or a protective tariff.

Now, is not this an unwarranted discrimination? Is this in accordance with the principles of my friend from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who was elected upon the platform of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none?" Why should he now select the cotton industry and say that the machinery used in the manufacture of cotton goods should come in free, while the machinery for the manufacture of other articles should come in under a duty?

From any point of view, from a Democratic or a Republican standpoint, it is wholly and utterly indefensible.

It has been the policy of this Government to protect all of the iron industries, and that protection has resulted in a vast expansion of those industries on every hand. It has resulted in the industries traveling South, even into the State of the gentleman who offered this amendment [Mr. ROBBINS] and the gentleman from Georgia who spoke in its favor [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. It has resulted in cheapening these articles to the consumer everywhere.

Mr. Cleveland under a protective tariff purchased 5 per cent Government bonds for the sinking fund at a premium of $1.29. Now, with the prospect of a Wilson bill going through under whip and spur, he is offering 5 per cent bonds at $1.17. This is an unerring test of confidence.

The barometer gives warning when the sky is cloudless, and the keen intellect of the business world anticipates and discounts advantages yet to come and prepares for evils that it foresees with unerring prescience.

Every Saturday night every workman in America is reminded that the Republican party is no longer in power. The workingmen who carried Illinois for Cleveland and Stevenson have ceased to create wealth, and to-day they march with hoe and broom, with shovel and scraper, and clean the streets of Chicago on alternate days, taking their pay in soup. It is a pitiful story. And how is this condition of disaster met by the party in power? The evil step which produces all this is not retraced, but the ship is steered directly into the breakers.

What administration has ever before so persisted in wrong after the error was apparent? When Mr. McClellan found his line of campaign hopelessly wrong he changed it to the James River. Mr. Cleveland retracts no error and acknowledges the existence of no fact, but drives his subservient Congress to irretrievable ruin. At home and abroad he unites the misdirection of Buchanan with the obstinacy of Jackson. The workingmen of the country have for thirty years demanded fewer hours of work. Mr. Cleveland has reduced the hours of labor more in ten months than the Republican party has in thirty years. What Administration ever closed its eyes and ears against the people as the present one has done? If Jackson's firmness is to be copied let his intense Americanism be also remembered.

Mr. Chairman, this is called a "bill to reduce taxation, and for other purposes." It does not reduce taxation. It only proposes to transfer it from one object to another. It is a protective tariff bill without protection, and a revenue tariff bill without revenue. It proposes to take the tax from foreign goods generally and to supply the deficiency with a levy distinctively domestic.

A tax levied on foreign goods, it is claimed, is not paid by the foreigner either in whole or in part, and although the foreigner believes that he pays it and rejoices over its repeal, it is proposed to remove all doubt upon the question by the repeal of protection duties.

The question of dispute between a system of revenue and protective duties has been so thoroughly discussed of late years that no one can hope to throw much new light upon it. Clay and Webster have given the same reasons for protection in the form of prophecy that their successors of to-day are enabled to point out as no longer matters of prophecy, but matters of performance.

The true test of all systems of political economy is, "Do they work well?"

Why theorize when the air is resounding with facts? A McKinley bill clouds the sky with smoke by day and lights the clouds with fire by night. A Wilson bill, even when only pending, carries gloom and ruin in its very promise. The rainbow in its front forebodes a coming not a passing storm.

It is sometimes said that free trade is all right in principle, but wrong in practice as applied to the condition of this country. No law can be deemed right in principle that ignores the surroundings in which it is to be enforced.

Laws adapted to one country are the bane of another. America has within herself all the germs of greatness. Any system that causes her to look to herself for the production of wealth is good for the nation. And there are certain things which every nation must produce within herself or become the dependent of other lands. The products of iron and the proper clothing for her people are absolutely necessary at all times. In peace they give her comfort and security. In war they give her strength, power, and independence. Let America destroy her woolen and iron industries and she will be helpless when war crosses her borders or blockades her ports.

When the Greek philosopher visited Crœsus and was shown into his treasury of gold, silver, and precious stones, he said: "Oh, King; you can keep this silver and gold and these jewels until some nation comes with stronger iron than yours, and then the nation with iron will own the iron and the treasures also." [Applause.]

Even the Democrats of West Virginia appeal to Congress to spare the coal and iron industries of that State.

The acute form of the panic has passed by, and confidence, in a degree, has been restored, if we can call that confidence which results in partial resumption of business at lower wages and shortened hours. History is repeating itself. America has prospered when her workingmen were protected. She has seen hard times under the policy of free trade.

Well do I remember that in the campaign of 1892 I never made a speech in which I did not tell my hearers that the whole logic of the situation might be embraced in four words, "Let well enough alone." How many thousands now regret the fatal disregard of so plain a duty! This experience is nothing new. The change of our protective tariff in 1833 produced the panic of 1837. By its sliding scale it fell below the protective point in 1836. Few remember it now, for few there are old enough. But those who are old enough can not forget that period. It was one of the darkest in our financial history. Whenever an era of hard times comes we always find different persons assigning different causes for it. But it was a striking coincidence that the crisis of 1837 followed so sharply on the heels of the revenue tariff of 1833, when the law ceased to protect in 1836, owing to the annual reduction under the "sliding scale." The dark days of 1857 followed a further reduction in the tariff, and the fact that the reduction of the tariff in 1846 was not immediately followed by disaster is an exception that only emphasizes the rule. The Mexican war with its artificial stimulus to business, and the gold discoveries of California postponed but did not prevent the evil day. And it makes no difference what party does the deed. In 1873, when the Republicans revised the tariff laws, reducing the duties below the protective line, the panic followed. These are more than coincidences, and the great Whig uprising in 1840 was the result of the awakening of the people on that question.

What is sown in wantonness is reaped in repentance. Candidates may rely upon flattery and puffing, but when the candidate ripens into the official, when he becomes the Government, the supreme test of his policy is the markets. The present Administration has now been with us since March 4, 1893. It has been supplemented and reënforced every day of its existence by the threat or promise of a speedy meeting of a Congress in full harmony with its views. No one had assurance of a respite even until the usual time for Congress to meet.

The last Administration was arraigned upon an imaginary condition of things, which every sensible man well knew was not real. The present Administration is being judged by its results. Know a tree by its fruits. The people got tired of hearing the prosperity of the country attributed to Republican policies and Republican laws. They are very weary already of the change.

If anyone in this House owned an interest in a manufacturing establishment, would he not in common prudence reduce his output until he would know what the laws would be under which he should make his goods? This is only ordinary prudence. If, on the other hand, you are merchants, you will not want a large stock of goods on hand when the new laws take effect. It is mere common prudence to quit manufacturing on the one hand, and to quit buying on the other. It would be surprising if, with the great change that is threatened, there should not be a great tremor, a commercial shudder, through the whole business frame of the Republic.

But the Democratic leaders refuse to yield to the logic of the situation. They refuse to restore the confidence of a distracted public by publicly disavowing their un-American schemes.

If the free-traders refuse to recognize the facts of history of 1837, 1857, and 1873, they may be expected to ignore the visible fact of 1893. A revenue tariff or free trade is intended to encourage imports. If we consume imported goods we must pay for them. If we consume them instead of American goods our home production must fall off. The balance of trade must be paid for in gold. The result is to drive the Americans out of work and contract the currency at the same time.

But it is argued that if we buy more goods abroad the foreigners will buy more of us. Not so. All men buy where they can buy the cheapest. Brazil, in 1889, bought of us $9,351,081 worth of our products, and we purchased of her $60,403,804. She sold her coffee to us and purchased her goods from England. There is not much sentiment in trade. We needed coffee and bought it of Brazil. England needed breadstuffs and bought them of us.

In 1890 tin was one of the objects of especial Democratic denunciation. Under the old duty of 1 cent a pound the foreign manufacturers were enabled, by skillful advances and reductions of price, to break down and destroy all attempts to carry on the manufacture in the United States. In 1892 the Democratic Congress passed a bill to repeal the McKinley duty and to stop the building up of this industry in America.

Soon after the McKinley law took effect a Democratic majority was elected to the Fifty-second Congress, and it was understood that if again successful in 1892 the tin duty would be repealed. But, notwithstanding these adverse circumstances, the business was started up, and but for the Democratic victory in 1892 the United States would within a few years produce all the tin plate she will need. And this result was attained without increasing the price of tin plate but very slightly.

By the fruits of any law should it be judged. Have exports increased or decreased under the McKinley law? Has it been followed by adversity or prosperity? Has the certainty of its repeal been a signal of joy, or has it been accepted as a danger signal? When a Democratic weather bureau hung out the flag informing the nation that the McKinley law was bound to go, did the country prepare for fair weather, or did it accept the signal as a sign of a storm? A cold wave was looked for, and it came.

We have had protection and prosperity for thirty years, but the McKinley bill was framed purposely on protection lines. Previous tariffs, whilst protective in their purpose and scope, were not so clearly modeled in the line of protection to American interests as this measure which has been the object of so much vituperation and abuse, and so little careful consideration at the hands of its opponents. It is called an "atrocity," but calling it atrocious does not make it so.

It was denounced because it would prevent exports. Let us take the statistics and see how it worked. Let us compare the four years of Mr. Cleveland with the four years of Mr. Harrison. The books have been posted and the account closed. It is now too late to add to the one or to detract from the other. Let us see how this "atrocity of class legislation" has worked. We are now beyond the stage of denunciation, and have arrived at the period of realization.

Exports of our agricultural and manufactured products for the following years.

Cleveland period:	
1885	$726,682,946
1886	665,964,529
1887	703,022,923
1888	683,862,104
Harrison period:	
1889	730,282,609
1890	845,293,828
1891	872,270,283
1892 (the dreadful McKinley era)	1,015,732,011

(Statistical Abstract, 1892, page 194.)

And of this vast export, the people of Iowa are interested to know that the hog product amounted to the splendid sum of $81,497,696, nearly double the silver product of the United States.

The McKinley bill did not take effect until October, 1890, and the years 1891 and 1892 may well be called the "atrocious" years of tariff history. The country is even now sighing for more such "atrocity." It was not until the change in the political complexion of the Senate on February 20, 1893, that it became evident that the McKinley law could be repealed. That was but a few days before Mr. Cleveland's inauguration, and fast following upon the heels of that event the people were confronted with the destruction of protection as a fact, and the panic of 1893 was soon upon us. It seems that it should be needless to discuss the propriety of making at home all the necessities as well as the luxuries of life, so far as it is practicable to do so. We have seen prosperity with protection, and we have seen adversity without it. Wages in America depend upon something for the wage-earner to do.

The more work there is to do, the more demand there is for labor. In former times the distance and expense of conveying foreign goods to this market gave a good degree of protection. Now time is annihilated by the telegraph and telephone, and space shrinks under the touch of the steam engine as applied to either water or land transportation. The wage-earners of America, if thrown into equal competition with those of Europe, must be content to accept the wages which prevail in the Old World. There is no longer protection in the cost of transportation.

The presence of hundreds of thousands of foreign laborers in our midst proves that this is a better country for the worker than the Old World from which they came. Men do not turn from the homes of their childhood and abandon the graves of their ancestors without the knowledge that a better life may be found in some foreign land. The strangers in our midst tell us what their wages were in Europe.

My old friend, Col. HENDERSON, sums up the situation in his usual terse way when he says that he "is sorry for a man who has lost a million, but he is still more sorry for the man who has lost his job."

We are interested out in Iowa in hogs, in sheep, and all manner of agricultural products, and manufacturing has become one of our great sources of wealth.

That a reduction of tariff will kill sheep we all know, for the Republican reduction of 1873 found us with 51,000,000 sheep in the United States, and in seven years they were reduced, in 1890, to 42,000,000. In 1892 they had recovered to 44,938,365. In 1883 we imported 146,000,000 pounds of wool and in 1889 we imported 283,000,000 pounds.

The farmers of the great Northwest understand the benefit to them of the home market. They have been told time and again that the price of their products is fixed in the London market. But they very well know that the price of their surplus is regulated in the English markets by the size of the surplus, and that the greater the home market the less the surplus to send to foreign markets, and the smaller that surplus thus forced abroad by lack of markets at home the higher price it will bring. With railroads penetrating the heart of India and Russia, great competition arises against the agricultural products of the United States, and our farmers well know that this condition will be only aggravated instead of being relieved by the destruction of the home market. Men out of work are light consumers and make a poor market for the farmer's products. Since the Democratic cyclone paralyzed our industries, it is very evident that idle men are light eaters, and the farmer registered his intelligent protest in the election of 1893 against the present Democratic policy.

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

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

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

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my main purpose in rising at this time is to refute the unjust and unkind criticisms of the people of the section of our country which I have the honor in part to represent on the floor of this House. Gentlemen whose votes and speeches during this session of Congress have been squarely against the principles of our party—squarely against the enunciations of our platform—have the audacity to question the Democracy of the people of Alabama and the entire South.

Let me tell these gentlemen that the people of Alabama and the South are not protectionists; they are Democrats in every sense of the word. The people of Alabama have upheld the Democratic banner for three-quarters of a century—from its first admission as a State to the present time. They were Democrats

in the dark days of reconstruction, when to be a Democrat was at the cost of liberty, property, and sometimes life; when imprisonment and confiscation and death were the penalties. In those dark days the Democrats of the South, as they have ever since, followed unfalteringly the banner of the Democratic party.

They were not dress-parade Democrats. They were confronted by a powerful and relentless enemy; they accepted the gage of battle; they upheld the Democratic flag in the deadliest din of the conflict, and where the strife was fiercest. They follow that banner now. They demand only that the pledges of the Democratic party for a quarter of a century shall be redeemed. They demand a tariff for revenue as promised in every platform of our party from 1868 to the present time.

Mr. Chairman, a reform club dinner was given in New York two years ago. The membership of that club is very largely from New York and New England. Every member of this House who sat at that table, and who has spoken on this bill, has advocated the interests of New England and his oratory has been directed against the interest of the South. At that reform club the Democracy of our distinguished Speaker was not of the kind which those in control of that organization desired should be heard in that hall. That club, Mr. Chairman, is the powerful agency which has exercised too much influence in this measure. It is that which too largely dominates this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. TUCKER. Was my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], at that dinner?

THE BILL SHOULD BE FAIR TO ALL SECTIONS.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. No, sir. Now, Mr. Chairman, what we want is to be fair and liberal to our friends of the Northeast, but we do not think that New England should have two bounties and that the South should bear two burdens.

I reassert that the people of the South do not ask for any protection. For a third of a century they have suffered under tariff and financial laws which have made the people of the Northeast wealthy, and have almost reduced many people of the South to poverty. This bill assumes that a large part of the revenues of our country must come from tariff taxation, and all the people of the South ask is that the bill should be fair to all sections. Tariff taxation is a burden upon those who consume, while at the same time it bestows a bounty upon those who produce. The present bill places all the burdens upon the South, while the benefits and bounties are given to the Northeast.

The tax is raised or remains the same upon nearly a thousand articles we buy, which is a bounty to the Northeast, and a burden upon the South. It then removes the duty from substantially everything we produce, which places a second burden upon us, and gives a second bounty to the favored sections of the Northeast. The bill is a free-trade bill for Alabama, and a protection bill for Massachusetts. Mr. BRYAN, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, admitted in his speech that Massachusetts and the Northeast received $5 benefit from the bill where the South received $1, and that one dollar which the South received all goes to Maryland, and none of it to Alabama.

The people of the South will vote for this bill, but while it is being considered they ask at least that some of the unjust discrimination against them be modified. [Applause.]

We were assured that cotton bagging would be placed upon the free list, but to our surprise we find the duty on that article is still retained, but we accept that burden without complaint, because we realize that a tariff should be for revenue, and we know that the free list gives no revenue to the Government. That the bill does the South great injustice no one will deny.

NEW ENGLAND GETS FIVE DOLLARS TO ONE DOLLAR OBTAINED BY THE SOUTH.

I have in my hands the exact words of Mr. BRYAN, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who helped to frame the bill, and to which I have referred. He very frankly admits this injustice. These words are from the speech which he delivered in this Hall ten days ago. This gentleman said:

> There is one section in this country which gets the lion's share, but it is not the South. [Applause.] For every dollar that the Southern States get out of this bill New England will get $5 out of this bill. [Applause.] One State, Massachusetts, will reap more benefit from the tariff left in this bill than all the Southern States combined. The State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania alone will reap more benefit than all the Southern States combined. Why, sir, the little State of Rhode Island has more money invested in the manufacture of cotton goods and woolen goods than all the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, and yet you say that a bill which gives to this little State 38 and 39 per cent is a sectional bill, drawn in behalf of one section.

The South would fare better under absolute free trade than under a bill which discriminates five fold against our section, and I beg to ask if it would not be better for us to join with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote with him for absolute free trade? It would close up every custom-house, but I say do not place free trade on the South and bestow all the bounties on New England.

MR. WILSON'S SPEECH OF MAY, 1884.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means fully understands this injustice. I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains Mr. WILSON'S speech delivered in this Hall May 5, 1884.

It is as follows:

> As I have said, I favor a bill for the reduction of taxes. Where this bill departs from its general scheme of merely reducing taxes and seeks to enlarge the free list, it bears unevenly and, as I believe, unjustly upon some of the interests of my own State. To take any one great interest and transfer it suddenly to the free list, is to hold it tributary to all the rest, while depriving it of any share in the common "protection." Whatever reduction is made should be made so gradually as not to wreck, to disturb, or to alarm any of our great industries, and this return to a peace tariff ought to be made by even progress and on a scale of justice to all. This bill would permit reciprocal free coal with Canada, a provision, I think, little apt to be carried out, and free coal from England. Coal is not free, so far as the foreign and coastwise trade is concerned, having otherwise a duty of 75 cents per ton, which is less than 20 per cent ad valorem under a tariff whose general average is over 40 per cent. Should we proceed to the consideration of this bill by sections, I shall present to the committee such facts and figures as will bear fully upon this question, and I have every confidence—indeed, I may add, I have every assurance that can now be given—that this inequality and discrimination will be corrected, and the interests of my own State share only in the general fortune of all.

This, Mr. Chairman, is not a demand for protection. Mr. WILSON in his speech contended that the duty of 75 cents a ton should be retained upon coal, and no one charged him with being a protectionist. We propose to reduce the duty from 75 cents to 40 cents, or even to 30 cents a ton, which would be a duty of about 8 per cent or 10 per cent; while the average duty on this bill is 40 per cent.

More than ten years ago I expressed my views on the subject of tariff in the following language:

> It seems to me that the tariff question should be regarded as a problem of political economy, the solution of which would be to find what laws will do most towards stimulating and building up the industries of our country. To attain this I think the tariff must be revised so as to be fair to all interests, so as to encourage a trade with foreign nations, and so as to bear heaviest upon articles of luxury and lightest upon articles of necessity.

On January 9, 1889, the Hon. A. P. GORMAN, in reply to a suggestion of Senator VEST that coal be put on the free list, said:

> As I have before said, there never was a Democratic statesman, there never has been a President elected by the Democratic party, or a Secretary of the Treasury, or a committee of either branch of Congress that was controlled by Democrats, knowing that revenue must be raised from the tariff, who ever dreamed of putting coal upon the free list? My friend wishes to reverse all precedents. No, Mr. President, the Democratic party is not a free-trade party.

I have examined the various laws very carefully, and I find that the Senator was quite correct in his statement. In order to present before the House my investigation on this subject and kindred subjects, I have prepared a table showing the date of each tariff enactment, and the duty imposed in each act on coal, iron ore, and cotton. It will be seen that for a number of years cotton was taxed sometimes as high as 30 per cent. The people of the South made no complaint when it was placed upon the free list.

The imports of cotton are now becoming quite considerable, and if it were a New England production a tariff tax would without doubt be demanded.

It will be seen by the table that coal has always been taxed, and that iron ore has always been taxed, except during a period of four years, from 1832 to 1836. The table is as follows:

Dates of all tariff acts from 1789 to 1890 and the duty imposed by those acts upon coal, iron, and cotton.

Date of act.	Coal.	Iron ore.	Cotton.
July 4, 1789	2 cts. per bushel	5 per cent	
Aug. 10, 1790	3 cts. per bushel	do	3 cts per pound.
Mar. 2 and 3, 1791	do	do	do.
May 2, 1792	4½ cts. per bushel	7½ percent	10 per cent.
June 5 and 7, 1794	5 cts. per bushel	10 per cent	15 per cent.
Jan. 29, 1795	do	do	do.
Mar. 3, 1797	do	12½ per cent	do.
July 8, 1797	do	do	do.
May 13, 1800	do	do	do.
Mar. 26 and 27, 1804	do	15 per cent	17½ per cent.
Mar. 3, 1887	do	do	Do.
Mar. 4, 1808	do	do	Do.
July 1, 1812	10 cts. per bushel	30 per cent	35 per cent.
Feb. 25, 1813	do	do	Do.
July 29, 1813	do	do	Do.
Mar. 3, 1815	do	do	Do.
Feb. 5, 1816	do	do	Do.
Apr. 27, 1816	5 cts. per bushel	15 per cent	3 cts. per pound.
Apr. 20, 1818	do	do	Do.
Mar. 3, 1819	do	do	Do.
May 22, 1824	6 cts. per bushel	do	Do.
Feb. 11, 1825	do	do	Do.
May 19 and 24, 1828	do	do	Do.
May 20 and 29, 1830	do	do	Do.
July 13 and 14, 1832	30 per cent	Free	30 per cent.
July 4, 1836	28 per cent	15 per cent	28 per cent.
Sept. 11, 1841	26 per cent	20 per cent	26 per cent.
June 30, 1842	23 per cent	do	23 per cent.
Aug. 30, 1842	30 per cent	do	25 per cent.
July 30, 1846	do	do	
Mar. 3, 1857	24 per cent	15 per cent	
Mar. 2, 1861	$1 per ton	10 per cent	
July 14, 1862	$1.10 per ton	do	½ ct. per pound.
Mar. 3, 1863	do	do	Do.

Dates of all tariff acts from 1789 to 1890, etc.—Continued.

Date of act.	Coal.	Iron ore.	Cotton.
June 30, 1864	$1.25 per ton	10 per cent	5 cts. per pound.
Mar. 3, 1865	do	do	Do.
Mar. 16, 1866	do	do	Do.
May 16, 1866	do	do	Do.
June 1, 1866	do	do	Do.
July 28, 1866	do	do	3 cts. per pound.
Mar. 2 and 22, 1867	do	do	Do.
Mar. 25, 26, 29, 1867	do	do	3 cts. per pound and free.
Feb. 3, 1868	do	do	Do.
July 20, 1868	do	do	Do.
Feb. 19, 24, 1869	do	do	Do.
July 14, 1870	do	do	Free.
Dec. 22, 1870	do	do	Do.
May 1, 1872	75 cts. per ton	do	Do.
June 6, 1872	do	do	Do.
May 9, 1874	do	20 per cent	Do.
May 6, 1882	do	do	Do.
Dec. 23, 1882	do	do	Do.
Mar. 3, 1883	do	75 cts. per ton	Do.
Oct. 1, 1890	do	do	Do.

COAL PRODUCTION.

I give below a table which shows the amount of coal produced by the various States of the Union during the last five years.

We see by these figures that Alabama was in 1892 the fifth State in the Union in the production of coal, and since that time she has risen to the fourth place, being excelled by Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio only. It may also be seen that in ratio of increase during that period Alabama has outstripped all the other States of the Union:

Coal produced in the United States and Territories for the years 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, and 1892.

States.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.
Alabama	3,300,000	4,000,000	4,200,000	4,500,000	5,250,000
Arkansas	250,000	300,000	500,000	400,000	450,000
California	75,000	80,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Colorado	2,185,477	2,373,875	3,000,000	3,600,000	3,775,000
Dakota, N. and S.	75,000	100,000	100,000	150,000	150,000
Georgia	200,000	225,000	225,000	225,000	250,000
Illinois	12,000,000	12,500,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	14,000,000
Indiana	3,140,979	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,400,000	3,250,000
Indian Territory	500,000	600,000	700,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Iowa	4,200,000	4,000,000	4,200,000	4,000,000	3,750,000
Kansas	2,125,000	2,300,000	2,600,000	2,750,000	2,800,000
Kentucky	2,342,058	2,205,434	2,483,144	2,879,082	3,000,000
Maryland	3,106,670	2,637,839	3,231,185	3,420,660	3,058,350
Michigan	40,000	60,000	60,000	90,000	100,000
Missouri	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,750,000	3,700,000	3,250,000
Montana	35,000	123,871	150,000	170,000	600,000
New Mexico	750,000	750,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Ohio	11,500,000	12,000,000	12,250,000	12,300,000	13,500,000
Oregon	125,000	125,000	75,000	90,000	60,000
Pennsylvania—					
Anthracite	38,145,718	35,407,710	35,865,174	40,448,336	41,893,316
Bituminous	33,000,000	33,000,000	34,000,000	36,000,000	37,500,000
Tennessee	2,250,000	2,650,000	2,900,000	2,750,000	2,500,000
Texas	175,900	200,000	300,000	350,000	400,000
Utah	270,000	260,000	361,000	390,000	370,000
Virginia	1,900,000	2,000,000	2,250,000	3,000,000	3,500,000
Washington	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,800,000	1,200,000
West Virginia	4,700,000	4,726,047	5,424,904	6,200,000	6,500,000
Wyoming	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,250,000	2,000,000
Totals	132,390,902	132,124,776	139,515,407	149,752,418	154,996,666

PROGRESS OF UNITED STATES.

In order to show the great progress of the United States in the production of iron ore and coal, I present a table showing the world's production of these articles. It will be seen that the United States produces more iron ore than any other country, and, if we except Great Britain, the United States exceeds all other countries in the production of coal. The table is as follows:

Table showing world's production of iron ore and coal, taken from late reports.

Countries.	Iron ore.		Coal.	
	Years.	Tons.	Years.	Tons.
United States	1890	16,036,043	1890	140,682,729
Great Britain	1890	13,780,767	1890	181,614,288
Germany and Luxemburg	1890	11,406,132	1890	89,220,834
France	1887	2,579,465	1890	26,083,118
Belgium	1887	202,431	1890	20,365,960
Austria and Hungary	1890	2,200,000	1889	25,326,417
Russia	1890	1,768,097	1889	6,118,550
Sweden	1891	987,405	1890	258,000
Spain	1890	5,788,743	1890	1,210,082
Italy	1890	220,702	1890	376,326
Canada	1890	68,313	1890	2,783,626
Other countries	1890	2,000,000	1890	12,000,000
Total		57,038,098		506,309,930
Percentage of the United States		28.1		27.8

I also present a table showing the world's products of pig iron and steel. By this we see that the United States now leads the world in the production of both of these great agencies of civilization, and that in the year 1890 the United States made more than one-third of the pig iron and more than one-third of the steel which was produced by all the nations of the earth.

The table is as follows:

Table giving world's production of pig iron and steel, as shown by late reports.

Countries.	Pig iron.		Steel.	
	Years.	Tons.	Years.	Tons.
United States	1890	9,202,703	1890	4,277,071
Great Britain	1890	7,904,214	1890	3,679,043
Germany and Luxemburg	1890	4,658,451	1890	2,161,821
France	1890	1,962,196	1890	717,975
Belgium	1890	787,836	1890	221,296
Austria and Hungary	1890	925,308	1890	499,600
Russia	1890	912,290	1890	372,625
Sweden	1891	490,913	1891	172,774
Spain	1890	179,433	1890	63,011
Italy	1890	14,346	1890	107,676
Canada	1890	19,439	1889	24,887
Other Countries	1890	80,000	1890	5,000
Total		27,137,129		12,302,799
Percentage of the United States		33.9		34.7

UNITED STATES OUTSTRIPS GREAT BRITAIN.

I have prepared a table which I present, showing the comparative progress in the production of Bessemer steel ingots and Bessemer steel rails in the United States and Great Britain during the fifteen years, from 1877 to 1891. It will be seen that in 1891 we doubled Great Britain in both of these productions.

The table is as follows:

Table showing in gross tons the production of Bessemer steel ingots and Bessemer steel rails in the United States and in Great Britain from 1877 to 1891.

Years.	United States, gross tons.		Great Britain, gross tons.	
	Ingots.	Rails.	Ingots.	Rails.
1877	500,524	385,865	750,000	508,400
1878	653,773	491,427	807,527	622,390
1879	829,439	610,682	834,511	520,231
1880	1,074,262	825,196	1,044,382	732,910
1881	1,374,247	1,187,770	1,441,719	1,023,740
1882	1,514,687	1,284,067	1,673,649	1,235,785
1883	1,477,345	1,148,709	1,553,380	1,097,174
1884	1,375,531	996,983	1,299,676	784,968
1885	1,519,430	959,471	1,304,127	706,583
1886	2,269,190	1,574,703	1,570,520	730,343
1887	2,936,033	2,101,904	2,089,403	1,021,847
1888	2,511,161	1,386,277	2,032,794	979,083
1889	2,930,204	1,510,057	2,140,791	943,048
1890	3,688,871	1,867,837	2,014,843	1,019,606
1891	3,247,417	1,293,053	1,642,005	662,676

PRICES OF IRON AND STEEL 1872 TO 1891.

Mr. Chairman, it is the veriest pretence to say that placing coal and iron ore on the free list will benefit the people at large by reducing the price of manufactured iron. Since 1872 the duty on coal and iron has been 75 cents a ton. I give below a table showing the average annual price of four leading iron and steel products. The prices given are yearly averages of monthly quotations for No. 1 anthracite foundry pig iron, best refined bar iron, per gross ton, at Philadelphia; steel rails, per gross ton, at Pennsylvania mills; and cut nails, per keg, wholesale, at Philadelphia.

The table is as follows:

Table showing average annual price of four leading iron and steel products for twenty years, from 1872 to 1891.

Years.	No. 1 anthracite foundry pig iron.	Best refined bar iron.	Steel rails.	Cut nails, per keg.
1872	$48.88	$97.63	$112.00	$5.46
1873	42.75	86.43	120.50	4.90
1874	30.25	67.95	94.25	3.99
1875	25.50	60.85	68.75	3.42
1876	22.25	52.08	59.25	2.98
1877	18.88	45.55	45.50	2.57
1878	17.63	44.24	42.25	2.31
1879	21.50	51.85	48.25	2.69
1880	28.50	60.38	67.50	3.68
1881	25.12	58.05	61.13	3.09
1882	25.75	61.41	48.50	3.47
1883	22.38	50.30	37.75	3.06
1884	19.88	44.05	30.75	2.39
1885	18.00	40.32	28.50	2.33
1886	18.71	43.12	34.50	2.27
1887	20.92	49.37	37.08	2.30

Table showing average annual price of four leading iron and steel products for twenty years, from 1872 to 1891—Continued.

Years.	No. 1 anthracite foundry pig iron.	Best refined bar iron.	Steel rails.	Cut nails per keg.
1888	$18.88	$44.99	$29.83	$2.03
1889	17.75	43.40	29.25	2.00
1890	18.40	45.92	31.75	2.00
1891	17.52	42.56	29.92	1.86

We see by the above table that foundry pig iron has fallen from $48.88 to $17.52 per ton.

That refined bar iron has fallen from $97.63 to $42.56 per ton.

That steel rails have fallen from $112 to $29.92 per ton; and that cut nails have fallen from $5.46 to $1.86 per keg.

There is another point which has not been answered by the gentlemen who control this bill. The evidence is very conclusive that a powerful syndicate will have absolute control of all importations of coal, and that another syndicate will equally control the imports of iron ore. Wealthy capitalists in Boston, Philadelphia, and other cities upon tide water have invested largely in iron-ore beds of foreign countries, and arrangements have been made by which these can be extended.

The Juragua Iron Company, which is composed of officers and stockholders of the Pennsylvania Iron Company and Bethlehem Steel Company, have already invested over $2,000,000 in Cuba, and are now prepared to ship iron ore to the United States at the rate of 2,000 tons a day, and, in view of free ore, other companies are preparing to ship largely to this country, not only from Cuba, but from Spain, Elba, and Africa.

What has been said about iron ore applies almost with equal force to coal.

The Boston people want free coal as well as free ore.

Massachusetts people have been telling us that if we would grant their request for free coal, free iron ore, and free wool they would gladly consent to their products being placed on the free list, and that Massachusetts would become solidly Democratic, but to our surprise these people are demanding 40 to 50 per cent duty on all they produce. And so far from being Democratic, the old Commonwealth goes solidly Republican by the enormous majority of 35,000.

In anticipation of the free coal tariff a powerful company has been organized and chartered by the Dominion government to mine, transport, and sell Nova Scotia bituminous coal. The capital is $18,000,000, and much of the stock is owned in Boston. Henry M. Whitney, of Boston, is president, and the other Boston directors are Messrs. Dimock, Pearson, and Windsor. It is expected that the American directors will secure free coal legislation. Sir Donald A. Smith, K. G. M. G., is one of the Montreal directors. These mines have been worked for some years.

IMPORTATIONS OF IRON ORE INTO IRON-PRODUCING COUNTRIES.

I have prepared a partial table from such data as I could obtain, showing the imports of iron ore into the six principal iron-producing countries of the world. Each of these countries except the United States admits iron ore free of duty, and yet we see that during the last few years the United States imports have become a fair proportion to that of other countries, notwithstanding the fact that a duty of 75 cents per ton is levied on the iron ore imported into this country. It will readily be surmised that with the duty reduced as proposed the imports into this country would be very largely increased and would afford a handsome tariff revenue.

The table is as follows:

Imports of iron ore into various European countries and United States.

Year.	Great Britain.	Belgium.	France.	Germany and Luxemburg.	Austria-Hungary.	United States.
	Gross tons.	*Metric tons.*	*Metric tons.*	*Metric tons.*	*Metric tons.*	*Gross tons.*
1874	754,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1875	458,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1876	672,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1877	1,140,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1878	1,173,860	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1879	1,083,692	.....	.....	.....	.....	284,141
1880	2,634,401	.....	.....	.....	.....	493,408
1881	2,449,277	.....	.....	.....	.....	782,887
1882	3,282,496	.....	.....	785,360	.....	589,655
1883	3,178,310	1,612,469	1,601,217	800,373	.....	490,875
1884	2,728,672	1,488,140	1,412,724	.....	.....	487,820
1885	2,817,597	1,333,601	1,419,521	.....	.....	390,786
1886	2,875,176	1,365,939	1,158,581	.....	.....	1,039,433
1887	3,765,788	1,435,782	1,154,405	1,036,217	45,885	1,194,301
1888	3,562,071	.....	1,310,695	1,163,373	37,151	587,470
1889	4,031,265	1,805,213	1,545,363	1,234,789	46,492	853,573
1890	4,471,790	1,644,422	1,610,244	1,522,501	48,730	1,246,830
1891	3,180,543	1,534,276	1,457,527	1,408,025	68,121	912,856
1892	3,780,503	1,681,074	1,683,758	1,655,843	.....	806,585

PORTS WHICH RECEIVE IRON ORE.

I give below a table showing in detail our imports of iron ore for the last three years, and also showing what ports have received this product.

The table is as follows:

Table showing the amount of iron ore imports into the United States during the last three years, and the ports at which the ore had been received.

Districts.	1890.		1891.		1892.	
	Gross tons.	Values.	Gross tons.	Values.	Gross tons.	Values.
Baltimore	481,250	$1,015,093	453,373	$1,219,015	328,326	$758,033
Buffalo Creek	82	185	114	342	1	3
Cuyahoga	4,675	15,460	.....	.....	.....	.....
Detroit	.....	.....	44	75	.....	.....
New York	38,717	101,908	25,809	87,335	23,433	61,260
Oswegatchie	12,617	23,446	1,958	3,591	8,605	17,196
Perth Amboy	25,524	50,984	14,089	42,087	4,428	8,153
Philadelphia	683,665	1,641,654	416,846	1,098,992	438,920	940,783
Puget Sound	.....	.....	588	2,189	2,568	9,597
Vermont	239	258	.....	.....	.....	.....
All other	61	5,130	35	280	304	619
Total	1,246,830	2,854,118	912,856	2,433,906	806,585	1,795,644

It will be observed that substantially all the product was received at Baltimore and Philadelphia, and it is not surprising that the distinguished gentleman who represents the Baltimore district should speak so earnestly in favor of the abolition of duties on this product. I admit that free iron ore and free coal will be a benefit to the city of Baltimore, and the distinguished gentleman from the Baltimore district [Mr. RAYNER] fully understands and appreciates the advantages.

A few days ago the Baltimore Sun contained the following paragraph, which I presume that gentleman read:

The Wilson bill is not a free-trade measure. But it is a free raw material measure. American industries have nothing to lose and everything to gain from free raw materials. It will not ruin, but revive them to admit wool, coal, iron ore, and lumber free of duty.

The people of Alabama will gladly give free iron ore and free coal to the people of Baltimore, provided they are willing that articles similar to those manufactured there should be admitted free of duty also.

ARTICLES UPON WHICH WILSON'S BILL INCREASES THE TARIFF.

I now present a carefully prepared table containing fifty-two classes of articles on which the Wilson bill has increased the duties even higher than the duties imposed by the McKinley bill. In the brief debate that has been allowed no member of the committee has explained to the House the necessity of this.

These fifty-two classes of articles include hundreds of items on which the South pays duty. I admit that some of these items are articles of luxury to which increase no Democrat will raise an objection, but it includes many items which are used by the laboring people of the South who ought not to be thus burdened. Even tools used by miners are subjected to an increase while the products of their mines are made free.

The table is as follows:

Articles upon which the Wilson bill increases duties to a higher rate than those imposed by the McKinley bill.

Articles.	McKinley bill, present law.	Wilson bill, proposed law.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Acids, specific gravity not exceeding 1.047	13.19	20
Collodion, in finished or partly finished articles	43.44	45
Bark, extracts for dyeing, other than hemlock, not specially provided for	8.28	10
Soap, castile	19.48	20
Tartar, cream of, and patent	21.45	25
Plaster of Paris, ground	6.07	10
Sheets of iron or steel, common or black, including iron or steel known as common or black taggers iron or steel, and skelp iron or steel, value 3 cents per pound, or less, currugated or crimped	25.24	35
Sheets and pla es and saw plates of steel not specially provided for, value above 16 cents per pound	24.78	25
Wire of iron or steel—		
Not smaller than No. 10	32.54	35
Smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	26.08	35
Coated with zinc or tin or any other metal (except fence wire and iron or steel, flat with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing) smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	15.75	35
Wire of iron or steel covered with cotton, silk, or other material and wires or strip steel, commonly known as crinoline, corset, and hat wire	16.66	35
Wire rope and strand—		
Smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	26.50	35
Made of steel wire smaller than No. 26	13.67	35
Wire cloths and wire nettings made in meshes of any form from iron or steel wire smaller than No. 10 and not smaller than No. 16 wire	24.84	35

Articles of duty upon which the Wilson bill increases duties, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	McKinley bill, present law.	Wilson bill, proposed law.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, by whatever process made; die blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; steamer, crank, and other shafts; shafting; wrist or crank pins; connecting rods and piston rods; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds, not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron-molded steel castings; and steel in all form and shapes not specially provided for, cold-rolled, cold-hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot-rolling or hammering—		
Value above 13 cents and not above 16 cents per pound	29.41	35
Value above 16 cents per pound	25.85	35
Sheets and plates and saw plates of steel—		
Not specially provided for, cold-rolled, cold-hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot-rolling or hammering, value above 16 cents per pound	31.19	35
Not specially provided for, cold-rolled, cold-hammered, blued, brightened, etc., value above 16 cents per pound	15.33	35
Tubes, pipes, flues, or stays, boiler or other, of wrought iron or steel	10.18	25
Card clothing, other (not manufactured from tempered steel wire)	25.92	30
Castings: Cast-iron pipe of every description	19.81	25
Nails and spikes, cut, of iron and steel	23.58	25
Spikes of wrought iron or steel; horse, mule, or ox shoes of wrought iron or steel	19.66	25
Tacks, brads, or sprigs, cut, not exceeding 16 ounces to the M		25
Rivets of iron or steel	20.78	30
Crosscut saws	16.98	25
Saws, mill pit and drag, not over 9 inches wide	16.67	25
Screws, ½ inch and less in length	1.33	30
Aluminum, in crude form, and alloys of any kind in which aluminum is the component material of chief value	22.28	25
Brass, bars or pigs	9.97	10
Hogs	12.03	20
Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled	15.95	20
Oatmeal	17.82	20
Rye	4.94	20
Rye flour		20
Fish: Anchovies, etc., in tin boxes, half boxes, not more than 5 by 4 by 1⅞ inches	22.43	30
Grapes	19.62	20
Orange or lemon peel, preserved or candied	29.92	30
Extract of meat—		
Fluid	18.01	20
All other, not specially provided for	17.95	20
Ginger ale in bottles, not more than three-quarters of a pint	17.25	20
Mineral waters, etc.—		
Bottles containing not more than one pint	22.59	30
Bottles containing more than one pint, not more than one quart	19.52	30
Otherwise, or in bottles more than one quart	24.00	30
Hemp and jute carpets	15.83	20
Hose, linen, hydraulic, made in whole or in part of flax, hemp, or jute	34.31	35
Hair cloth, known as crinoline cloth, square yards	27.99	30
Hair cloth, known as hair seating	23.22	25
Pearls	10.00	15
Precious stones and imitations of, cut, but not set	10.00	15
Alabaster and spar, manufactures of	25.00	30

It seems to me it would be in accordance with our pledges of reform to reduce the tariff upon most of these articles, at least as low as they were in the McKinley bill, and then a duty of 10 per cent on iron ore and coal would be in the line of our principles of a tariff for revenue.

The Democratic platform of 1876 said:

We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

The Democratic platform of 1880 proclaimed for—

A tariff for revenue only.

The Democratic platform of 1884 said:

We denounce the abuses of the existing tariff.

The platform also said:

We demand that Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes.

Which is but another way of expressing a demand for—

A tariff for revenue only.

The Democratic platform of 1888 reaffirmed the platform of 1884, and indorsed—

The efforts of our Democratic representatives in Congress to secure a reduction of excessive taxation.

The convention also indorsed and recommended—

The early passage of the bill for the reduction of the revenue now pending in the House of Representatives.

The Democratic platform of 1892 said:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only.

This is not new Democratic doctrine. It was cardinal Democracy fifty years ago as it is to-day.

A half century ago President Polk in his letter of acceptance said:

I am in favor of a tariff for revenue.

It would also be in line with the principles laid down in the Democratic platform of 1840, 1844, 1848, 1852, and 1856, which said:

Resolved, That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country.

It is certainly an injury to the South to place substantially all the articles which are produced in that section on the free list and then increase the duties upon articles which the people of that section are compelled to buy.

I have always contended that a large free list was not in accordance with Democratic principles. It produced no revenue, and we always found that a large free list resulted in unduly increasing the duties upon articles upon which duty is collected. I believe that articles which are necessary to the people of moderate means should be made free, and I think there are articles used by the manufacturers which ought also to be free, but certainly it should not include articles which are controlled by syndicates. The only effect of such reduction is to enrich corporations which are already too wealthy and powerful.

The sugar legislation of the last Republican Congress has resulted in making an absolute gift of from seventy to eighty millions of dollars to the sugar trust.

This powerful monopoly has been the largest recipient of the sugar legislation in the McKinley bill; and I am convinced that if iron ore is placed on the free list the steel trust will be the largest beneficiary; and I am also convinced that to place coal on the free list will not be a farthing's benefit to a single citizen of Alabama.

ARTICLES, TAXES UPON WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN DECREASED.

I hold in my hand another table which I prepared by comparing the present law with the proposed bill, which shows there are one hundred and twenty classes of articles upon which the duty proposed by the Wilson bill are precisely the same as the duties imposed under the McKinley bill.

I am convinced that if the tax on many of these articles had been reduced a larger revenue would be derived and burdens upon the people would have been lessened.

I hope the committee will see the propriety of reducing the duty on some of the schedules.

The table is as follows:

Duties upon articles which are the same in the Wilson bill as they are in the McKinley bill, that is to say, articles the duties upon which have not been decreased by the Wilson bill.

Articles.	McKinley bill, present law.	Wilson bill, proposed law.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Alcoholic compounds not specially provided for	163.43	163.43
Chalk preparations not specially provided for	20.00	20.00
Chloroform	19.64	19.64
Coloring for brandy, wine, beer, or other liquors	50.00	50.00
Ethers of all kinds not specially provided for	35.89	35.89
Fish glue, value above 7 cents, not above 30 cents, a pound	25.00	25.00
Gelatin, value not above 7 cents per pound	25.00	25.00
Gelatin, value above 7 cents, not above 30 cents, per pound	25.00	25.00
Glue, value above 7 cents, not above 30 cents, per pound	25.00	25.00
Morphia, or morphine, and all salts thereof	47.09	47.09
Oils—		
Containing 50 per cent or more of castor oil	30.00	30.00
Fusel oil, or amylic alcohol	10.00	10.00
Hempseed and rapeseed	24.12	24.12
Olive, fit for salad purposes	26.92	26.92
Paints and colors—		
Blues, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil	20.03	20.03
All other paints and colors, dry or mixed, or ground in water or oil, including lakes, not specially provided for, and artists' colors of all kinds, in tubes or otherwise	25.00	25.00
Crayons	25.00	25.00
Smalts and frostings	25.00	25.00
Brown, Spanish, Indian red, and colcothar, or oxide of iron	25.00	25.00
Brown, Vandyke, Cassel earth or Cassel brown	25.00	25.00
Potash, preparations of which alcohol is a component part, or in preparation of which alcohol is used	15.51	15.51
Soda ash	20.00	20.00
Tiles, not glazed, ornamented, painted, enameled, vitrified, or decorated	25.00	25.00
Cement, Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic, in barrels, sacks, or packages	24.09	24.09
Plate glass, fluted, rolled, or rough, ground, smoothed, or otherwise obscured (excess of 1 pound per square foot dutiable at same rates)—		
Not exceeding 16x24 inches square	20.76	20.76
Above 16x24 inches, not exceeding 24x30	34.97	34.97

Duties upon articles which are the same in the Wilson bill, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	McKinley bill, present law.	Wilson bill, proposed law.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Plate glass, cast, polished, finished, or unfinished, and unsilvered—		
Not exceeding 16x24 inches square	22.22	22.22
Above 16x24 inches, not exceeding 24x30	33.32	33.32
Plate glass, cast, polished, silvered—		
Not exceeding 16x24 inches square	20.39	20.39
Above 16x24 inches, not exceeding 24x30	26.06	26.06
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, and looking-glass plates—		
Not exceeding 16x24 inches square	19.34	19.34
Above 16x24 inches, not exceeding 24x30	28.68	28.68
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, silvered, when ground, obscured, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, stained, colored, or otherwise decorated—		
Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches, square	23.67	23.67
Above 16 by 24 inches, not exceeding 24 by 30	16.00	16.00
Plate-glass, cast, polished, silvered, when ground, obscured, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, stained, colored, or otherwise ornamented or decorated—		
Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches, square	14.80	14.80
Above 16 by 24 inches, not exceeding 24 by 30	29.54	29.54
Plate-glass, cast, polished, unsilvered, when ground, obscured, frosted, sanded, enameled, beveled, etched, embossed, engraved, stained, colored, or otherwise ornamented or decorated—		
Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches, square	24.52	24.52
Above 16 by 24 inches, not exceeding 24 by 30	35.98	30.98
Grindstones, finished or unfinished	13.74	13.74
Wire, card, for the manufacture of card clothing	35.00	35.00
Fire-arms, muskets, and sporting rifles	25.00	25.00
Needles, knitting, and all other not specially provided for	25.00	25.00
Engraved plates of steel	25.00	25.00
Stereotyped plates and electrotype plates, and plates of other materials engraved or lithographed for printing	25.00	25.00
Chronometers, box or ship's, and parts thereof	10.00	10.00
Watches	25.00	25.00
Watches, cases, movements, glasses, and parts	25.00	25.00
Tobacco—		
Leaf, other unmanufactured and unstemmed	81.93	81.93
Leaf, other, stemmed	95.44	95.44
All other	198.59	198.59
Rice, paddy	51.04	51.04
Rice flour, rice meal, and broken rice, which will pass through a sieve, known commercially as No. 12	14.08	14.08
Peas—		
Dried	18.10	18.10
Split	15.84	15.84
Cod, haddock, hake, and pollock, dried, smoked, salted, or pickled, otherwise than in barrels	19.12	19.12
Herring, dried or smoked	37.94	37.94
Other fish, dried or smoked	17.90	17.90
Pickled or salted, not in barrels or half-barrels	17.17	17.17
Herring, pickled or salted	14.16	14.16
Oranges in bulk, M	31.15	31.15
Lemons in bulk, M	11.63	11.63
Limes in bulk, M	26.59	26.59
Barrels or boxes containg oranges, etc., exclusive of contents	30.30	30.30
Ginger, preserved or pickled	35.00	35.00
Peanuts or ground beans—		
Unshelled	72.86	72.86
Shelled	16.82	16.82
Chicory root, burnt or roasted, ground or granulated, or in rolls or otherwise	54.40	54.40
Chocolate, other than confectionery and sweetened chocolate	9.21	9.21
Cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for	5.80	5.80
Cocoa butter or butterine	13.75	13.75
Dandelion root and acorns prepared, and other articles used as coffee or as substitutes for coffee, not specially provided for	40.15	40.15
Mustard, ground or preserved, in bottles or otherwise	38.09	38.09
Spices—		
Cayenne pepper, unground or otherwise	35.10	35.10
Vinegar	27.40	27.40
Wines, champagne and all other sparkling—		
Bottles containing ½ pint or less, dozen	53.82	53.82
Bottles containing more than ½, not more than 1 pint	52.62	52.62
Bottles containing more than 1 pint, not more than 1 quart	55.22	55.22
Still wines—		
In casks	69.39	69.39
In bottles containing not more than 1 pint	26.25	26.25
In bottles containing more than pint, not more than quart	28.96	28.96
Vermuth, including ginger wine and cordial—		
In casks	50.49	50.49
In bottles containing not more than 1 pint	30.00	30.00
In bottles containing more than 1 pint, not more than 1 quart	53.38	53.38
Sheathing	10.00	10.00
Books, pamphlets, bound or unbound; charts, and all printed matter not specially provided for	25.00	25.00
Engravings, bound or unbound; etchings, and photographs	25.00	25.00
Buttons and button forms: Button forms, lastings, mohair cloth, silk or other manufactures of cloth, woven or made in patterns of such size, shape, or form, or cut in such manner as to be fit for buttons exclusively	10.00	10.00
Agate buttons	25.00	25.00

Duties upon articles which are the same in the Wilson bill, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	McKinley bill, present law.	Wilson bill, proposed law.
	Per cent.	*Per cent*
Dice, drafts, chessmen, chess balls, and billiard, pool, and bagatelle balls, of ivory, bone, or other materials	50.00	50.00
Emery, grains, and ground, pulverized, or refined	25.19	25.19
Gunpowder, and all explosive substances, firecrackers of all kinds	147.32	147.32
Fulminates, fulminating powders, and all like articles, not specially provided for	30.00	30.00
Gunpowder and all explosive substances used for mining, blasting, artillery, or sporting purposes—		
Valued at 20 cents or less per pound	25.80	25.80
Valued at above 20 cents per pound	8.68	8.68
Furs dressed on the skin, but not made up into articles	20.00	20.00
Furs, not on the skin, prepared for hatters' use	20.00	20.00
Beads of glass, loose, unthreaded or unstrung	10.00	10.00
Human hair, clean or drawn, but not manufactured	20.00	20.00
Precious stones and imitations of, set, and not specially provided for	25.00	25.00
Imitations of, not set, composed of paste or glass, not exceeding 1 inch in dimensions	10 00	10.00
Calfskins, tanned, or tanned and dressed	20.00	20.00
Skins for morocco—		
Finished	20.00	20.00
Tanned, but unfinished	10.00	10.00
Skins, chamois or other, not specially provided for; bookbinders' calfskins; kangaroo, sheep, and goat skins, including lamb and kid skins, dressed or finished	20.00	20.00
Upper leather, dressed, including patent, enameled, and japanned leather, dressed or undressed, and finished	20.00	20.00
All leather not specially provided for	10.00	10.00
Miscellaneous manufactures—		
Amber, manufactures of	25.00	25.00
Asbestos, manufactured	25.00	25.00
Bladders, manufactures of	25.00	35.00
Coral, manufactures of	25.00	25.00
Catgut, or whipgut, or wormgut, manufactures of	25.00	25.00
Jet manufactures	25.00	25.00
Paste, manufactures of	25.00	25.00
Wax, manufactures of	25.00	25.00
Candles and tapers of wax	25.00	25.00
Pencil leads, not in wood	10.00	10.00
Waste, all not specially provided for	10.00	10.00
Unmanufactured	10.00	10.00
Manufactured	20.00	20.00
Repairs on vessels	50.00	50.00

I hope, Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this bill will enable the House to correct certain features which I think all will admit are susceptible of improvement. That the bill is in the line of a great and beneficial reformation no one will question or doubt, but it seems to me, in this long list of articles, there is a fertile field for tariff reduction. It seems to me that there are many articles among those I have numerated in which the tariff tax could be materially reduced. If it creates a deficiency in the revenue it can be remedied by the income tax bill, which I shall support with all my heart.

No one appreciates more than myself the importance of a thorough revision of the present iniquitous tariff. I believe the tariff can be revised so as to be fair to all interests and to all sections, and so as to be just to all classes of people. I believe that with such a revision we can build up a foreign trade which will add greatly to the wealth of our country, and I feel confident before this bill is enacted into law that the changes necessary to perfect the bill will be adopted.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I take it from the gentleman's remarks that he will oppose this bill?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. No, sir; I will vote for it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, to my mind the monopoly created by the tariff on coal is one of the most unjustifiable of all the monopolies that have found shelter and encouragement behind the tariff barrier. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What is the purpose of a protective tariff on coal? It is to confine the manufacturing industries and the individual consumers of this country to the mines owned by domestic monopolists for their fuel. It is to enable the monopolists of these natural resources to increase the margin which their control enables them to wring from production. It is to enable those monopolists to levy private taxes for their own enrichment upon the hearths and industries of the whole people of this country.

Coal is a natural deposit stored up by the action of natural laws operating through countless ages for the general benefit of all mankind, but now controlled by a few monopolists who have secured absolute title to the lands which include the deposits.

The tariff barrier secures special privileges to the coal barons, whose names and practices have become odious to the entire people of this Union, by enlarging their powers of oppression and extortion. The protective tariff has never been laid for the ben-

efit of American labor. The coal-miners depend for their wages, not upon the monopoly price of coal, but upon the demand for coal in volume. The greater the volume of coal that is demanded the greater demand there will be for coal-miners, and it is the demand for coal-miners and for coal-handlers, and not the price of the output, that determines what the wages of labor shall be.

The lower the price of coal the greater the demand for coal in manufactures and private consumption, and the price of labor in its mining and transportation and distribution increases with the volume of coal demanded.

When coal is cheapest in the market, the wages of coal-miners are highest. When the pools and trusts that control the anthracite and bituminous coal deposits of this country arbitrarily raise the price of coal, as they do every autumn, they reduce the demand for coal proportionately; they limit the output of their mines; they close the small mines and throw the miners there working out of employment; they run their larger mines upon shorter time, and limit the earnings of the laborers who are still employed.

Even during the present month the coal combines have taken advantage of a little revival of business in different places to raise the price of coal arbitrarily against the manufacturing industries and against the homes of our people.

The manufacturing interests and domestic consumers of coal in California are taxed on their coal to the extent of $800,000 a year for public uses, without the slightest advantage to anybody. They are subjected to an additional but incalculable private tax, levied because of the shelter of the protective tariff, by the estate of Nicholas Luning, which owns the coal mines of the State of Washington. That private tax ranges from $1 to $15 per ton whenever the failure of importation from Australia enables them to control our markets. Only three years ago they arbitrarily raised the price of coal for domestic purposes throughout the West from $8 to $20 per ton, and held it there during an entire winter. Encourage domestic industries by giving them free fuel as well as free raw material. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

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

Mr. HICKS was recognized and obtained unanimous consent to speak for ten minutes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill appears to be to raise revenue, and certainly the gentlemen who have had the measure in charge could have found many ways to raise revenue without striking down the great industries of the country.

There is certainly no occasion to attack the farmer, the miner, and the mechanic in their industries, when there are sufficient other sources from which abundant revenues can be realized, without compelling the farmer to compete with the markets of the world in free wool, the miner with free coal and iron ore, and the mechanic with the low-price manufactured goods and wares that will be dumped upon our shores from foreign lands.

Says Mr. Frederick C. Howe in his excellent article on Federal revenue and the income tax in the annals of the American Academy for January, 1894:

It is believed that the rate upon distilled spirits could be increased to $1.25 per gallon without material loss in quantity consumed, while the revenues would be increased thereby $30,000,000.

An equal amount could be obtained from an increase in the rate upon malt liquors from $1 to $2 per barrel. As a popular beverage the consumption of beer is increasing at a phenomenal rate, the quantity taxed per capita nearly doubling during the thirteen years subsequent to 1880.

In 1880 the consumption was 8.25 gallons per capita. In 1893 16.2.

A like sum could also be secured with comparative ease from a doubling of the rates upon cigars and tobacco, which are taxed at a lower rate in this country than in almost any other. The receipts from this source in 1893 were but $32,000,000; by doubling the tax the revenues could be increased to $64,000,000, while with an increase in the rate equal to that now in force in Great Britain, the receipts could be augmented to $85,000,000, while, were the same rates imposed as are collected in France, this sum would be swolen to $112,000,000. These statistics, as well as the estimates, are taken from the special letter of Hon. David A. Wells, to the Secretary of the Treasury, July 8, 1893.

Mr. Wells is well recognized as competent free-trade authority, and his figures no doubt will be respected by the gentlemen who advocate the pending measure. Says the same authority in the same article:

With these alterations made the revenues from these three internal sources might be increased from $159,000,000 to $253,000,000, as follows:

	Receipts, 1893.	Estimated receipts.
Distilled spirits	$95,000,000	$125,000,000
Fermented liquors	32,000,000	64,000,000
Tobacco	32,000,000	64,000,000
Total	159,000,000	253,000,000

With such a balance sheet as this, and with such unparalelled showing of resources no apprehension need be felt for even the most radical alterations in existing revenue arrangements, for it is safe to assert that contemporary history can make no other such exhibit of unemployed powers and unopened resources.

Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to urge and do not advocate the increase of revenues from these sources, as suggested by Mr. Howe, yet, rather than strike down the farming, the mining, and the manufacturing industries of this great country, and compel our workmen in this fair land to be reduced to the low wage level and serfdom of Europe and Asia, I would certainly feel like seeing an increased tax placed upon these luxuries, rather than see the wholesale striking down of the industries affected by this bill now under consideration.

Pennsylvania stands at the head of the column of the coal-producing States of this country. Forty-six million tons was the output of bituminous coal in Pennsylvania during the year 1892, and over 50,000,000 tons of anthracite were produced during the same year. To produce this vast quantity of coal over 300,000 men were employed, and this vast army of workingmen, each representing on an average a family of five, would indicate that over a million of persons in that State alone are dependent for their support upon this great industry. Why the gentlemen who have charge of this measure should undertake to strike at this industry without any just or good reason certainly has not been explained to the satisfaction of gentlemen who are here representing these industries, nor to the satisfaction of the people of the great coal-producing States of this country. Why should coal be put upon the free list, except that the books say coal is raw material, and the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia says that raw material should be free?

But, Mr. Chairman, coal should not be classed as raw material, only as it is found in the bowels of the earth. When it is at the mouth of the pit or delivered on the car it is just as much the finished product of the miner as a well-finished coat is the finished product of the tailor. We all know that in the mines it has very little value and is worth only from 5 to 15 or 20 cents per ton; but delivered on the car, ready for transportation, it is worth from 75 cents to $1.10 per ton; and when you come to consider the vast army of workingmen interested in this industry, and then estimate that other vast army interested in its transportation, you will find that in the State of Pennsylvania alone over 2,000,000 persons are dependent upon the production and the transportation of coal; and I can say without fear of contradiction that if you carefully estimate the tonnage hauled by the great railroad companies of the country, such as the Baltimore and Ohio, the Pennsylvania Central, the Chesapeake and Ohio, the Norfolk and Western, or any of the great transportation lines, you will find at least 50 per cent of their freight traffic is directly due to the moving of coal.

Mr. Chairman, there are no accurate figures as to the production of bituminous coal in this country in 1893 yet obtainable. Estimates range from 115,000,000 to 130,000,000 net tons. The following table gives the total production of bituminous coal by States, and the total anthracite output in tons of 2,000 pounds in the year 1892:

	Net tons.		Net tons.
Alabama	5,529,312	North Dakota	40,725
Arkansas	535,558	Ohio	13,562,927
California	85,178	Oregon	34,661
Colorado	3,510,830	Pennsylvania bituminous	46,694,576
Georgia	215,498	Tennessee	2,092,064
Illinois	17,862,276	Texas	245,090
Indiana	3,345,174	Utah	361,013
Indian Territory	1,192,721	Virginia	675,205
Iowa	3,918,491	Washington	1,213,427
Kansas	3,007,276	West Virginia	9,738,755
Kentucky	3,025,313	Wyoming	2,503,839
Maryland	3,419,962		
Michigan	77,090	Total	126,856,567
Missouri	2,733,949	Pennsylvania anthracite	52,472,504
Montana	564,648		
Nebraska	1,500		
New Mexico	661,330	Grand total	179,329,071
North Carolina	6,679		

Total value coal produced	$207,565,381
Value anthracite produced	82,442,000

I also attach the following table showing the number of persons engaged in the coal industry of Pennsylvania during the past five years, and also showing the dangers attending their employment:

ANTHRACITE.

Year.	Number of employés.	Fatal accidents.	Nonfatal accidents.
1888	115,648	362	1,037
1889	119,640	384	998
1890	117,763	387	1,011
1891	123,035	427	1,003
1892	129,797	396	1,023

BITUMINOUS COAL AND COKE.

1888	177,179	452	1,303
1889	180,716	489	1,229
1890	184,707	524	1,390
1891	196,958	664	1,317
1892	208,586	529	1,416

This proposition of the Committee on Ways and Means to strike down the coal industry and place this product on the free list, affects not only Pennsylvania, but every coal-producing State in the Union.

My friend from Ohio [Gen. GROSVENOR] has explained to the committee how it affects the people of Ohio. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] has each explained how it affects the people of his respective State and seriously injures them in this great industry. I respectfully invite attention to the testimony of Governor McCorkle, of West Virginia, as given before the Committee on Ways and Means, in which he says that to take the tariff from coal is a direct blow at a great industry of his State, and he says further before the same committee:

You will never strike a man who is interested in the coal industries but you will strike the coal miner, the railroad transporter, and the river man. If you take the tariff off coal, which is less in proportion than the average duties, I believe it will hurt you, but putting aside the refinement of theories and controversies the great proposition remains that you will hurt every man, woman, and child engaged in the coal industry; therefore I say take your hands off the tariff on coal and leave it as it is.

Col. Lamb, of Norfolk, Va., Hon. H. G. Davis, of West Virginia, Hon. H. E. McCullough, of Philadelphia, and many other distinguished and representative men of the coal trade, appeared before the same committee, and I commend their sentiments to the careful scrutiny of those who favor this bill, and these able gentlemen all agree that free coal means ruin and irretrievable disaster to this great industry. Says Mr. McCullough, "A reduction in the tariff must make a reduction in the wages of the miners, and a reduction of 1 cent per ton in the coal Pennsylvania produces means a reduction of $800,000 to the miners."

It is quite a serious matter, and if the duty is taken off coal we will be shut out from New England, and the price will be governed by how much it will cost us at the mines. The railroads are carrying it now a distance of 400 miles for $1.40 per ton; there is no money in it. I have nothing to do with the railroads, but as a miner I do not see how any lower point of cost of transportation can be reached. If you take the duty off you will deal a blow to the industry from which it will not recover as long as I live. I hope that this reduction will not be made, and I for one emphatically protest against it.

So I might go on citing testimony upon testimony. At this point I ask the Clerk to read from an address delivered by Hon. M. E. Ingalls, of the State of Ohio, and president of the Big Four Railroad, at a Jackson banquet a few evenings ago in the city of Columbus.

The Clerk read as follows:

The criticisms I make here to-night I make as a Democrat, as one who voted for Cleveland three successive Presidential elections. We are in the midst of evil times—mills have stopped, industry is paralyzed, and everywhere idle men are filling the streets and asking for work, and there is none. No such calamity has ever before befallen this community in its history. The Committee on Ways and Means has sent to Congress a tariff bill which in addition to the deficit of $50,000,000 will produce $75,000,000 more of loss, leaving the Government at the end of the fiscal year short $125,000,000 unless it can be made up in other ways. How do you expect to make up this $125,000,000?

WAS EVER SUCH FOLLY?

Cover your heads in shame, my fellow Democrats, for your party in power these days of peace propose to go back and enact the war taxes of the past; and why? In order that they may make a tariff framed according to the theories of a few men familiar only with the books, and reduce the duties on certain articles which do not demand it and make certain articles free which are not called for. Was ever such folly? The gentleman who fathers this measure is a distinguished member of Congress, coming from a little village in the mountains of West Virginia. He is a student of the doctrine of free trade and well educated as a theorist. By some chance he is made chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and is put astride of the commerce of this country and proposes to demonstrate his theories, although in so doing he may wreck the country and his party.

COAL AS RAW MATERIAL.

What justification is there in free coal? None, except that the books say raw material should be free, and this committee, with no business experience, but wedded to their theories, have classed coal as a raw material, when every ton at the mouth of the pit represents 90 per cent of labor and 10 per cent of material. It would seem to me that if you wished protection for labor here was a better chance for it than anywhere else. Who asks for free coal? The people? No; no one except a few New England and New York speculators who rushed over into Novia Scotia the week after election, when they thought they could establish free trade, and bought everything that could be brought in here if the duties were taken off, from a coal mine to a limekiln.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I might make citation after citation from testimony in the same line. I denounce this entire measure as a dishonest and discriminating measure. You tax rice and admit barley free; you tax woolen goods, and you declare in favor of free wool. You have declared against the farmers, not only of the great State of Pennsylvania, but of the entire country. Yot have declared against the mechanics of the country; and now, by striking down this great mining industry, you go from bad to worse. I assure you your day of reckoning will most assuredly come.

The district which I have the honor to represent has over 10,000 persons engaged in this great industry, and produced last year more than 375,000 tons of coal. My district embraces but one-tenth of the persons interested in this industry throughout the great State of Pennsylvania. We, their representatives, are here not only to raise our voices but to cast our votes against such a discriminating and unjust measure.

I am pleased to see the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], and Representatives from other States interested in this great industry, standing here and protesting against this unjust measure that is so fraught with ruin and disaster to the mining and the railroad interests of the country. I am especially gratified and pleased to see my friend and colleague [Mr. SIBLEY] take the firm stand he is taking in opposing this bill *in toto*.

I very much regret that he is not joined by more of his Democratic colleagues from the great State of Pennsylvania not only in opposing free coal but the entire bill. Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, West Virginia, Alabama, and all the great producing States of this country should stand side by side for protection and in seeing that these industries upon which so many of our people are dependent shall not be stricken down—I was going to say in the House of their friends; but I regret to say the action of the Democratic party, especially in reference to this measure, has proven that they are not the friends of the working people of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the duty on coal either increases or decreases its price, or has no effect. If it does not increase the price, then gentlemen who are pleading for a duty on coal are doing it unnecessarily. If it increases the price, then somebody must pay that increased price. In that case, more than in the case of any other article, the person who pays this increased price is everybody; for coal is light, heat, motion, and force. Through it we make gas for light at night. We use it for fuel in domestic purposes. It is the force with which our factories are run; and it gives motion to our vehicles of transportation.

So that everybody uses this article. It is transmuted into everything that men do, bear, suffer, or enjoy. It is a necessity of life in every sense in which that word can be used. It is not a mere implement of industry, it is a necessity to the manufacturer of the implements of industry. It enters into the production of all we wear. There is no article of which it can be said that it is of such universal use. In a sense that is real it is a part of the food of the people, for by its means food is rendered palatable and healthful.

So that we are confronted, when we reach this question, with the fundamental principle that ought to lie at the foundation of all taxation, that no burden, save under the most dire necessity, should be laid upon an article of absolute need and universal use. We must, therefore, if we can, do without this taxation. In looking for objects and subjects of taxation, there is nothing that can not better afford to have burdens put upon it than this.

We are also confronted for the first time with another proposition. This is not protection to the producer of the coal, either to the miner or to the owner of the coal. It is protection to the transporter of the coal. The whole argument here is that the coal which lies in the mountains of Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Kentucky, and the States along the Apalachian range must have their market in part at Boston and on the seacoast; and when the long haul from the mountain range to the seaboard is compared with the short haul from the Nova Scotia mines the duty is necessary to equalize, not the labor of the miner, but the difference in the cost of transportation.

It costs the same to put the coal on the car in West Virginia and in Nova Scotia. It must be rehandled at Newport News or Baltimore and also in Nova Scotia. It costs as much to transport it from Nova Scotia to Boston as it does from Baltimore or Newport News to Boston. The coal of Nova Scotia is worth from 60 to 80 cents a ton less, intrinsically, than our Apalachian coal; so that the duty is to cover the difference in the cost of transportation on the railroad from the mines in our mountains to the seaboard, compared with the transportation from the mines in Nova Scotia. Let us understand it frankly—this duty carries the protective idea one step further in practical legislation than it has ever been carried before. We are asked to make the duty so that it will cover the difference in the cost of transportation as well as the difference in the cost of production.

One more thought, Mr. Chairman; I am a Southern man in all that goes to make up that term, but I believe no section ought to be made tributary to any other section. The largest scope of free trade that we have ever seen has been in America. They are not entitled in New England to secure for New England advantages that will make the interior tributary to her, nor on the other hand should the coast be made tributary to the interior.

While in one sense the country is one, in another and equally

important sense we are by climatic and other reasons a country of sections. Cotton compacts certain States; wheat and tobacco bind other States together; coal and iron form combinations: the sea produces homogeneity in certain interests. We must keep this in mind when we are legislating, and must not force one section to pay tribute to another section. This duty on coal is a tribute collected from all who use it, and laid on some sections for the benefit of other sections.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in this House so ill-informed as not to know that if there is any section of this country any more interested than another section to have free wool, free coal, and free iron ore it is New England, and above all, Massachusetts. But New England and Massachusetts do not ask it. It is only the exceptional man in New England who asks that what goes into one end of his factory shall go in untaxed, and that what comes out at the other end shall be taxed. Neither does New England occupy that position. New England is for all legislation of every kind and description that will benefit the whole country to its most remote borders, and she will take her chances with the rest. We have an advantage over all the rest of the country in our very rugged physical situation and moral conditions.

We have frugality, industry, and skill as high or higher than any other part of the country. We desire that every other part of the country shall have every possible advantage that can be conceded to it by New England without doing absolute and positive wrong to New England.

The question with New England is not as to what industry she has, but that all her people be employed. She regards enforced idleness as the most grievous of all taxation. We have the boot and shoe industry, the cotton industry, the woolen industry, and scores of others that our people may work at as well as the coarser iron industry, and we have a larger part of the higher and finer iron industries than any other State in the Union. Now, why should we ask for free ore and free coal, that we may establish another industry to the detriment of any other part of our country?

Why should we ask that the sea, which is no more a barrier to-day than was the Mississippi between its two banks when I was a boy—why should we ask that because we are on the border of the sea we should have any advantage over the central or western portions of this country? We not only do not want it, but we will vote solidly against it. We will vote for 75 cents a ton on coal and ore the same as we now have, and we will vote against any tariff on coal short of that. If you will not protect yourselves, then we will protect you if we can. If you will not keep the duty on coal up to the protective point in the provisions of the bill of 1890, we will vote against anything short of that as a distinctive revenue duty. You can not grow bristles on the back of Massachusetts with mugwump oil. [Laughter.]

We have no iron ore, we have no coal, we have no natural gas. [Laughter.] But we have any quantity of solid facts that not one of you have ever attempted to answer, and never will. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, then, should we ask, with no natural advantages in coal and iron ore, that this great country, with its grand possibilities and present development, should be hindered or clogged that Massachusetts may pursue one industry rather than another? To pursue the coarser iron industries would but divert our people now fully employed from one industry to another. I ask this House to consider the country as one whole. Massachusetts is not here saying if you will protect her industries she will vote for a bill that will strike down the industries of any of the other parts of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I had inserted in the RECORD, as read from the Clerk's desk, a letter from the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] to the Central Labor Union of the city of Worcester. I now hold in my hand a letter and resolutions from the Central Labor Union, which I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk, to put myself in the position as desiring to do justice to the Central Labor Union of that city.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE RIGHT OF PETITION.

[Boston Sunday Post, January 21, 1894.]

WORCESTER, *January 20.*

Under date of this day the Central Labor Union of this city has prepared and forwarded to the Hon. JOSEPH H. WALKER, Representative from the Third Congressional district, of this city, the following letter:

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the Central Labor Union, of Worcester, Mass., held January 17, 1894, the attendance being unusually large, we, the undersigned, were appointed a committee to reply to your letter of January 12, 1894, addressed to the Central Labor Union, of Worcester, through its president and secretary, with instructions to return said letter to you, and to express the indignation of the said Central Labor Union at the course you have seen fit to pursue relative to the resolutions sent to you under date of January 3, 1894, beginning: "*Resolved*, That we, the Central Labor Union, of Worcester, Mass., * * * heartily indorse the 'Wilson bill,' although only a modicum of the relief demanded," etc., etc.

We are amazed, as must all patriotic citizens be, irrespective of partisan feeling, at the attitude you have assumed, and we can only characterize your letter to our union as un-American, autocratic, arrogant, and coarsely insulting to us.

In your letter you say you "shall not present these resolutions to Congress." These resolutions were sent to you as our Representative in Congress. It is the only way in which we can get our views before Congress—to have you present them. It is clearly our right to ask Congress to do whatever we think is for our advantage; and when you refuse to do what we ask, when our petition is clearly within our right, you cease to be a representative of a free people. There is no despotism so "besotted," if we may use your term, in any country of the world, as to refuse the sacred right of petition to the people under its government.

It has been reserved to a Representative of his constituents in the United States, from the ancient Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to deny the workingmen access to the lawmaking power and to say to them, "Your petition shall not go the House of Representatives."

These resolutions, which you say do not express the opinion of the majority of the members of the Central Labor Union, were regularly presented at one meeting, laid over for one week, freely discussed, and adopted. Your assumption, therefore, is not warranted by the facts.

But the real question is whether or not the workingmen of Worcester are to be denied the sacred right of petition. If we are in such "besotted ignorance" in passing these resolutions, we are in good company. The President of the United States, the majority of the Senate, and the majority in the House of Representatives hold these views; they are advocated by enlightened economists in this country and abroad. If they are the views of men of "besotted ignorance" you must settle it with them. Our right of petition should not be denied; and the greater our ignorance the more valuable to us is the right.

The resolutions of the Central Labor Union are its own. You have no right to assume that "mercenary and unprincipled emissaries" are so influential in your district. All this might be said to the House, if you wished, when you presented our petition. The House could make up its mind as to what sort of people lived in Worcester from your characterization of them; but our sacred right of petition should not be denied simply because you think so meanly of us.

We did not send these resolutions to you under the pretense that they expressed the views of the majority of your constituents. They expressed the views of those who passed them; and as an expression of the views of free citizens of a free Republic, they are entitled to consideration. We have not asked you to adopt them as your own. If we are in a minority that does not derogate in the least degree from our right of petition. And if you do not know how to present to Congress a petition embodying the views of men with whom you do not agree, we would suggest that you ask the present senior Senator from Massachusetts to give you a lesson in political toleration and respect for the rights if not the opinions of common people.

We would also call your attention to the example given nearly sixty years ago by a Representative from Massachusetts, whose illustrious name has become a part of American history, John Quincy Adams, who, in presenting to Congress a memorial from his constituents asking for legislation of which he did not approve, said: "The sacred right of petition shall never be treated by me other than with respect." The wholesome precedent thus established can not, in our humble opinion, be violated with impunity, but such violation must always be fraught with danger to the rights and liberties of a free people. You have deliberately violated this great principle.

With a few exceptions, we have been brought up from birth in a city whose public schools are among the best in New England; our city has a good public library, which we are free to use, and a reading room, in which we can have access to the journals of all nations; churches are plenty and well attended. If, with these opportunities, we are still in "besotted ignorance" and in "want of intelligence," our condition should call for the pity and kindly consideration of men of good will and not for sarcastic contempt.

With distinguished consideration, we are, dear sir,

Respectfully yours,

J. D. PIERCE,
THOMAS F. KENNEDY,
P. J. JUDGE,
Committee.

To the Hon. JOSEPH H. WALKER.

During the reading of the foregoing article the time of Mr. SIMPSON expired.

Mr. HUNTER. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. MORSE. I hold in my hand a petition from 1,309 working people of Taunton against the pending bill, which as an offset I would like to have read from the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask for an extension of time so that the reading may be finished.

Mr. MORSE. I will agree to that if the document which I have sent up can be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks that his time be extended until the reading of the article is completed. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I will agree to it if I can have that short communication read that I sent up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The reading of the article was resumed and concluded.

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time to which the debate is limited will expire in seven minutes and the Chair has reserved that for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia was recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, what becomes of the lead-ore interests of my State? I also represent a large coal interest. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The difficulty is that the committee, by

unanimous consent, extended the time of gentlemen, so that there is very little remaining, and that was done in each instance with the consent of the gentleman from Washington. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Well, I yield my time to the gentleman from West Virginia. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I have no doubt that I shall use it more profitably than the gentleman from Washington would; at least that I shall give the committee more facts. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of no consequence what the present members or a majority of the present members of the Ways and Means Committee did in reporting the Mills bill. Neither is it a matter of any consequence to anybody in the world what I may have said on this subject ten years ago. The Democratic party has advanced immensely on tariff reform in the last ten years, and I hope that I have at least kept up with the procession. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have been unable to find a justification of a duty upon coal either in the platform of the Democratic party or in the platform of the Republican party. In their platform the Republicans declared in favor of levying such import duties as would compensate for the wages of labor in this country as compared with the countries that come into competition with us in our own markets. Gentlemen seem to have failed also to observe that together with the advanced position taken by the Democratic party in the platform adopted at Chicago it expressly declared in favor of free raw materials.

I have the platform before me in which I find this declaration:

We indorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to remove its most oppressive features (referring to the McKinley bill) in the direction of free raw materials.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. OATES. Did not that have reference to the efforts made in the Mills bill? Have we ever made any such efforts since that?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Oh, no; that did not refer to the Mills bill; it referred to the efforts made in the last Congress to put wool and other articles upon the free list. It was a declaration in favor of free raw materials. Now, gentlemen are entirely mistaken in their theory of free raw materials when they say that the object is to benefit the manufacturer. The manufacturers are made for the consumers, and in giving the manufacturer free raw materials we are consulting not his interests, but the interests of the people who consume his products. [Applause.]

If we are to gather revenues through a tariff system we should levy those taxes for purposes of revenue and not for purposes of protection, and in selecting the articles on which to lay taxes for the sake of revenue we should select results and not processes, finished products and not the materials which go into those products. Every tax which we impose upon the material doubles and increases when it reaches the consumer; every tax that we impose upon the material increases the cost of the product and lessens the employment of the labor that produces that product by narrowing its market. Now, here is a tariff of 75 cents a ton upon coal.

It was in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, as I have heretofore said, that the wages paid to the miners of coal are from 40 to 60 cents a ton in my section of West Virginia, and in the Pocahontas region from 25 to 30 cents a ton. How, then, upon the theory of the Democratic platform, how even upon the theory of the Republican platform, can you justify a tariff of 75 cents a ton on coal? No man can contend successfully, in view of the facts brought out before the Ways and Means Committee, in view of the facts accessible to any one who will examine the subject, that we can not mine coal more cheaply in the great coal fields of this country than it can be mined in England or in Nova Scotia, about which gentlemen seem to have gotten up such a scare.

They are frightened by a prospectus; but if they will look at our exports and imports they will find that, whilst the importation of coal has increased at a moderate pace, the exportation of coal has increased at a rapid pace. We export three times as much coal as we did ten years ago. We send it to Canada, a million tons; we send it to England; we send it to Cuba; we send it to Germany; we send it to France; and our export trade is increasing all the time; so that the point in controversy is not, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as to what wages shall be paid the miner; the point in controversy is, shall we continue to tax the people of this country to enable railroad corporations to haul this coal to the remotest sections of the Union? [Applause.] The only question involved in this coal tariff is the question of railroad transportation.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is right.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. If you want to put more money into the treasury of the railroad carriers, vote for this duty upon coal. I have here before me the legislative acts of the Dominion of Canada. I find among them an act which declares that when the duty on Canadian coal is taken off by the United States the duty upon United States coal will be taken off by Canada. That law is upon the Canadian statute book, and so far as I can find has not been repealed. The marginal note is: "Certain articles to be free of duty in Canada when free in the United States," and in that list are coal, coke, and salt. In the act the word used is "may," but every lawyer knows that "may" means "shall" in such a statute. The act provides that this may take place.

Under proclamation of the governor in council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada—

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois (interrupting). Do you find agricultural implements in that list? I ask the question for information.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I have only a minute to spare. Agricultural implements is not the question before the House. The gentleman tries to get as far away from the pending question as he can.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. But agricultural implements are in the bill.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Now, Mr. Chairman, totally irrespective of that provision, whether it is to-day existing law or not, totally irrespective of any of these so-called reciprocity provisions, this provision in the bill ought to remain. It is the common knowledge of every man who reads the newspapers of the country that the price of coal is often put up and put down as the great railroad corporations choose——

Mr. REED. May I ask the gentleman a question? In your speech, which was quoted by your colleague to-day, you say:

Coal is now free, so far as the coastwise trade is concerned, having otherwise a duty of 75 cents per ton, which is less than 20 per cent ad valorem.

If coal is produced at 60 cents a ton, how does 75 cents a ton become 20 per cent ad valorem? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, that speech was made when I was mighty young. [Laughter.] But I am not pleading the baby act.

Mr. REED. I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will not plead the baby act. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. And I hope that I have not served in Congress ten years and not grown some. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not pleading the baby act. But when I come to make a tariff bill for all the people of the country, I have no right to look especially at the interests of my own district. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. That is all very nice and patriotic, and places the gentleman in line with the gentleman from Ohio and other philanthropic gentlemen; but what I want to get at is, how did the gentleman get that 20 per cent?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Well, that was ten years ago; and I do not know now how I got at it.

Mr. REED. Can you not imagine?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I presume I was taking the ordinary selling price of coal then in this country.

Mr. REED. Including railroad transportation?

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. No, sir; not including railroad transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is now closed. Before the Committee of the Whole proceeds to vote, the Chair desires to say that gentlemen representing the minority have not offered any amendment to the substitute. The Chair still holds that open for the offering of such an amendment if the minority desire to do so. If not, the Chair will recognize some other gentleman to offer an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What "minority" does the Chair refer to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was referring in that statement to the Republican minority. He is endeavoring to be perfectly fair to all sides of the House. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] would probably offer an amendment to the substitute. If he does not desire to do so, the Chair will recognize some other gentleman. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. Would it be in order to have all the amendments read now?

Mr. TURPIN. I desire to offer an amendment to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposed amendment will be read.

Mr. TURPIN. Before that is voted on I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted.

Mr. TURPIN. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that I would not feel authorized to offer this amendment to the substitute if the minority had one to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. They have declined to do so. The Clerk will report the proposed amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the substitute by adding, after the word "bushel," in line 8, the following:

"Said duty, 75 cents, shall be reduced 12½ cents the first year; 25 cents the second year; 37½ cents the third year; 50 cents the fourth year, and 62½ cents the fifth year, and shall entirely cease at the expiration of the sixth year after this bill goes into effect."

Mr. MAGUIRE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. What percentage of reduction is that? It seems to be 100 per cent. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TURPIN. Am I entitled to any time on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted. The Chair will now state the parliamentary situation. The original amendment was offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE] offered an amendment. The amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out of the free list coal, etc., and on page 55, immediately after line 9, paragraph 316 of the bill, insert:

"Coal, bituminous and shale, 40 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel (18.17); coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 20 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel."

The CHAIRMAN. To the amendment just read the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE] offered an amendment, on which the vote will first be taken.

The amendment of Mr. WISE was read, as follows:

Strike out "40 cents" and insert "50 cents," in line 1 of the amendment.

The question being taken on Mr. WISE'S amendment to the amendment, it was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Before taking the question on the original amendment the vote must first be taken on the amendment to the substitute, and then on the substitute.

The substitute offered by Mr. MCKAIG was read, as follows:

Amend House bill 4864 by inserting on page 55, after paragraph 316, line 9, the following words:

"Coal, bituminous and shale, 75 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 30 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel."

And by striking out, on page 71, paragraph (free list) 439, containing the following words:

"Coal, bituminous and shale, and coal slack or culm."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is now on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. TURPIN] to the substitute just read.

Mr. TURPIN. I ask that my amendment be again read. I do not think it has been understood, as the gentleman on my right [Mr. MAGUIRE] asked for information as to its effect.

The amendment was again read.

The question being taken on Mr. TURPIN'S amendment to the substitute, it was rejected, there being—ayes 2, noes 172.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will now be taken on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCKAIG].

The substitute was again read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is that a substitute for the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], which fixes the duty at 40 cents?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

The question being taken on the substitute of Mr. MCKAIG, it was rejected, there being—ayes 96, noes 146.

The question then recurring on the amendment of Mr. OATES, it was again read.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, there were—ayes 86, noes 147.

Mr. OATES. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. OATES and Mr. WILSON of West Virginia were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 131.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. This disposes of all the amendments upon the coal schedule, and under the order of the House the iron schedule is next to be considered for three hours. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. OATES. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Before that amendment is read, I wish to submit an inquiry as to whether this order includes that portion of the bill which relates to tin plate or not? The metal schedule includes the portion of the bill which relates to tin plate. Now, I do not think it was the intention of the House or of the committee, when they fixed this order, to include tin plate in it, and I hope the Chair will so rule.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a matter of some importance——

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the order itself will determine what it includes, and not the private opinion of any member or of the Chairman. It must be construed the same as any other resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have the order read, so that the committee may understand what it is. The Clerk will report the order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, when the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for further consideration of the pending bill, three hours be devoted to debate of that portion of the bill relating to duty on coal, that then a vote be taken, and that after that three hours be devoted to discussing the duty on iron ore.

The CHAIRMAN. This order relates to iron ore, and the Chair thinks it would exclude any amendment as to tin plate. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] has offered an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out of the free list iron ore, etc., and on page 19, after line 9, of paragraph 120, insert:

Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, also the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 40 cents per ton (42.70 per cent); sulphur ore, as pyrites, or sulphuret of iron in its natural state, 40 cents per ton: *Provided*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that if any other gentleman wishes to offer an amendment, so that it may be pending, it may be offered now or later.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I would like to offer an amendment upon the lumber schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be germane to the present subject.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I beg the pardon of the Chair; I misunderstood the suggestion.

[Mr. OATES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, proceeding along the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], we have lost sight of one fact, and that is that from the formation of the Government this question has been before the people of this nation. These arguments were exhausted by our forefathers in the framing of the Constitution. This whole question was discussed as to whether we should have a direct or indirect system of taxation, and they decided, solely on the protective theory, that we should have an indirect system rather than a direct.

That has been Democratic doctrine from the earliest days of this Republic. They granted that the indirect is the more costly system, but held that the protection afforded to American industries justified the indirect system, and therefore it was adopted as our form of taxation. Now, then, let us come to a revenue tariff, if you please, if we are Democrats—I may not be, under some of the interpretations given. I will stand for such a tariff as the platform adopted at Chicago demanded, but this committee have put nine hundred articles on the free list that will not be of any practical benefit, but must destroy, or at least will not preserve many American industries.

A gentleman says he wants these duties reduced because of its effects upon railway transportation companies which otherwise will get the benefit of it. Suppose the transportation companies are benefited. Is it the purpose of the Democratic party here to destroy any species of property rather than to conserve and guard all property? I have in my hand the figures of the tonnage of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and of the entire tonnage 62 per cent is made up of coal, iron, and lumber. Of the Huntington and Broad Top Railway it is from 66 to 70 per cent, and on all the railways in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania over 40 per cent.

What is true of Pennsylvania is true of her sister States, Alabama, Tennessee, Virginia, Maryland, Georgia, and West Virginia. If you destroy by 60 per cent the tonnage of these railroads, would not the other 40 per cent of the tonnage of these transportation lines be taxed to make up the deficit? You would increase the rates upon every article of merchandise and on every passenger carried, and you would bankrupt and destroy vested rights of field, factory, and transportation in this nation.

We must remember that if we destroy in the interests of English coal, iron, and lumber syndicates, our transportation of these articles that we destroy not alone the labor interests involved in their production, but destroy by the same percentage the occupations of those engaged in their transportation, the engineers, the firemen, the conductors, brakemen, switchmen, and shop men. The Democratic party must ever be too great to

wantonly destroy any interests of the nation that have constitutional and legitimate existence.

My time is short, but I want to call attention to one other feature that I do not think has been touched by any other member in this debate, and that is the coal traffic by water. We have for years been trying to build up a merchant marine to float the American flag, and we ought to know that Great Britain imposes a tonnage tax of 30 cents against American vessels, and this great traffic that is to come from Nova Scotia must be carried on in English bottoms, and the English flag is to float all along our coasts or we have got to pay 6 cents on every ton of coal or ore if we attempt to float the American flag.

Under the provisions of this bill you ruthlessly destroy your coastwise traffic, which has been built up through many years, without serving one object; and at a time when the deficit is running over $10,000,000 a month you bring in a measure reducing the revenue $75,000,000 more, and say that is Democratic! I think the Democratic end is on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, down in Alabama coal and iron are married. They are reclining in the same couch, and over them is spread the snow-white mantle of the limestone, that under a fair revenue tariff must make her the grandest Commonwealth on the face of the globe; and I was surprised to hear a gentleman stand up here, as I heard one, and say that although it meant ruin to such industries that if they cut off duties from their ore and their coal and lumber, he would still support this measure, because it was a Democratic measure, and he proposed to stand with his party.

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama. Does the gentleman refer to me?

Mr. SIBLEY. No, sir; I did not have the pleasure of hearing all of your remarks. I did, however, hear another gentleman make practically that statement. But I do not care whom it refers to; if a man takes that position I can not but believe he takes an illogical and a mistaken position, and my right hand will wither and my tongue will cleave to the roof of my mouth before I will ever support any measure which destroys the industries of my district or the industries of the district of any member on the floor of this House, unless you will give some compensating advantage to the nation at large. [Applause.]

I realize that this Government can come in and take private property for public use when such shall be necessary for the preservation of the nation's life, but I deny the power, at least the justice in so doing, when no compensating advantages follow. If the Democratic party is to be respected it must be through justice, which is so strict and so absolute as to command the approbation and confidence of every citizen, rich and poor, the dowerful and the weak alike.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize any gentleman who desires to speak in favor of the bill, two gentlemen having spoken in opposition to it. [Applause.] If no gentleman desires to speak in favor of the bill, the Chair will recognize any gentleman who desires to speak.

Mr. HENDRIX. Mr. Chairman, in the line of the good Democratic doctrine laid down by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], I am moved to say that while the impression may have been gained by the country from the action of this House that the Democratic party has gone over, horse, foot, and dragoons to the party of free trade, I, for one, as a Democrat, born and bred in that party, desire to protest against it and to say that it is not true. [Applause.]

I do not know, sir, by what strange perversion of the Democratic genius the Committee on Ways and Means has cast this tariff legislation along the lines which it has presented to this House. They are not in accord with the Democratic platform. They are not in accord with that proposition which came into the Democratic convention from the committee on resolutions and represented the ripe, matured, and carefully considered thought of the party, for which was finally substituted the proposition which appeared in the platform and which, as we all know, was rather one of the accidents of politics than the deliberate expression of the party's opinion. I would like to know who is the leader of the Democratic party in this country and its thought at this moment? By what commission do these gentlemen come in here and fly the flag of the free trader, of the single taxer, of the Populist, of the socialist, and of the communist? [Applause.] I understand no Democracy of that sort. It does not belong to the Democracy which I represent in this House. When I took the stump before the citizens of my district I went to them with the Democratic platform in my hand and said to them repeatedly, "I am no free trader. The Democratic party is the party of conservatism; the Democratic party is the party that takes within its embrace all those who earn their living by the sweat of their brow, and when the Democrats come into power in the councils of the nation you may rely upon them to preserve and defend the industries of this country."

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is just what beat us.

Mr. HENDRIX. I suppose that is what did it, but I intend to be honest here, and the Democratic party must be honest with the people, for if you talk protection to them at home and then come here and enact free trade, when you meet them again at the hustings they will change the character of the majority representation in this Hall. [Cries of "They will!" on the Republican side.] Good faith requires that there should be moderate, conservative, careful business lines drawn in this bill, especially at this period of a widespread economic revolution that exists around the whole world, and that commands us, that appeals to us from every part of this country, to deal with care with the mysterious and subtle currents of commerce and of trade, and not to go through them with seven-league boots that are iron-heeled and steel-tipped. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, when I witness some of these aberrations from true Democratic doctrine I am reminded of the story of the Irishman who was riding a mule. Looking around, he found that the mule had got his foot in the stirrup; whereupon he said, "Begorra, if you're goin' to get up I am goin' to get down." [Laughter.] And, sir, when I see the great apostle of the single tax in the gallery overlooking the processes of this assembly, I begin to try to pull myself together and wonder whether, after all I am the Democrat that I have always claimed to be. [Laughter.] I insist, sir, that before this committee dissolves and returns to the House the expectation of the country shall be met, moderate protection bringing forth a tariff that will be for revenue. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. MAGUIRE. It seems to me, sir, that if the gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDRIX] had read the masterly report presented by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means he would not now be in doubt as to the principles upon which the committee proceeded in drafting the measure now before the House.

Freedom of trade was the basic principle of the committee's action, as it was the basic principle of the Chicago platform. The position of the people of this country, asserted in the election of 1892, was a declaration against all special privileges of individuals and classes which have been maintained by the protective tariff. It was a declaration in favor of "equal rights to all, with special privileges to none."

It was a declaration against all laws intended for the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many. It was a declaration in favor of absolute freedom of trade, limited only by the necessities of this Government for public revenue, in so far as it may still be deemed expedient to raise revenue by a tariff on imports.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. OATES. If 40 cents a ton on iron ore is "protection," what are you going to do with the balance of this bill where it gives protection of 40 per cent?

Mr. MAGUIRE. If you ask me what I would do with it I can answer readily. I would wipe out every element and every symptom of protection in the bill. My judgment of the bill is that it does leave too much protection to special interests. But in so far as it takes away special privileges that have been built up and maintained by the tariff system, it is in accord with the demands and with the verdict of the American people. I have an abiding conviction that they will repeat their verdict whenever that issue is presented again. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Equal rights, equal opportunities, natural justice—these are the demands of the American people. Freedom of trade and freedom of production must and will be the future policy and mission of the Democratic party. The time is fast approaching when no Democrat will be a protectionist and no protectionist will be recognized as a Democrat.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise now for the purpose of discussing the general features of this bill, but simply to enter a protest on behalf of the iron miners of the Lake Superior region against the provision putting iron ore on the free list. During the last campaign in the State of Wisconsin the Republican candidate for governor addressed a meeting at Hurley, the largest mining town in the northern part of our State. This meeting, which was held a few evenings before the election, was largely attended by the laborers of that region.

There were many Democrats present. He told them that he believed if the Democratic party should prevail in that election, on the platform it had presented to the country, the victory would result in the ruin of our industries. Everything in that region at that time was prosperous. The mines were in operation; shipping was going on; everything was in the most active condition, industrially. He was jeered by some of the Democrats at that meeting. He paused and said: "Gentlemen, I take the responsibility of predicting that if next Tuesday you elect

Grover Cleveland and a Democratic Congress, within six months after the date of his inauguration you will be looking for a job.'

Mr. Chairman, that has come literally true. There is now distress in that region where there was formerly prosperity. Thousands of men are idle and dependent upon the charity of the public to carry them through the winter. The mines have closed down, and distress and poverty, such as were never known in Wisconsin, have come to visit an industrious people. A month or so ago the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Ashland, a body composed of men of both political parties, unanimously adopted resolutions declaring against free iron ore. Those resolutions were introduced by Mr. Thomas Bardon, a leading Democrat—the leading Democrat, I may say, with perhaps one exception, in Northern Wisconsin. I have introduced and had referred to the Committee on Ways and Means a similar resolution passed by the Chamber of Commeace of the city of Superior.

I send to the desk to be read resolutions adopted by the Stock Exchange of the city of Duluth, with the indorsement of the Chamber of Commerce of that city, and received by me after the bill was reported to the House. Before those resolutions are read I desire to give notice that to-morrow I shall offer an amendment to restore the present duty on iron ore.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Duluth Stock Exchange is and ever has been desirous of fostering and encouraging the iron-ore industry of the Lake Superior region and the building up in this section of our country the manufacturing of iron and steel in all its various branches, and as well the maintenance and enlargement of the transportation business of our northern lakes, which is now the pride of our nation and the wonder of the world; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urgently request the members of Congress from the Lake Superior region, and more particularly those from the State of Minnesota, and especially the honorable member from this district, to use their best endeavors to maintain the existing tariff on iron ore. We believe that any reduction in the tariff will seriously affect all these great branches of commerce and industry, and materially retard the development and prosperity of the great Northwest.

Resolved, further, That in the judgment of this exchange the present depressed condition of the iron-ore market and the suffering entailed by the stoppage of mining operations throughout the lake region, is largely due to the threatened reduction of the tariff on iron ore. It is our further belief that the maintenance of the present rate of duty would very quickly cause the resumption of active work, and give employment to thousands of idle men and relieve the dire distress now existing in many of the mining districts of this region.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask the Clerk to read the resolutions passed by the Chamber of Commerce.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEAR SIR. On January 9, 1894, the Duluth Chamber of Commerce unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Duluth Chamber of Commerce heartily indorses and ratifies the resolutions of the Duluth Stock Exchange upon the subject of retaining the duty upon iron ore, a copy of which is hereto attached and made a part of these resolutions; also

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to communicate this action to each of the members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States representing the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

We sincerely hope that your vote upon the question of retaining duty upon iron ore may be in accordance with said resolutions.

Very respectfully yours,

DULUTH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By J. C. MISHLER, *Secretary*.

Hon. N. P. HAUGEN,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the resolutions just read were, I am informed, adopted unanimously. With starvation staring their people in the face the Democrats of the Lake Superior region have forgotten the pledges of their party platform, and, actuated by the higher feeling of humanity, ask you to abandon the policy of this bill, the mere threat of which has brought suffering and calamity upon them.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to comprehend the idea which our Democratic friends find so comforting and satisfactory, that they may impose a tariff for incidental protection while at the same time holding that any protection whatever is not only a sham and a fraud but absolute robbery, and unconstitutional besides—unconstitutional robbery, according to the theory of the Democracy. They are willing to give us protection in the raising of revenue, which is taxation according to the necessities of the Government.

If there were no necessity for raising revenue, then it would follow that there should be absolute free trade. If it were necessary at the present time to raise $500,000,000 of revenue, they would so adjust the measure as to give as much protection as is to be found in the McKinley bill, and say that is all right. If it were necessary to raise only $250,000,000, then they would reduce the tariff accordingly, but would still arrange it with reference to the protection of favored classes, giving this "incidental protection" all the same, so as to "create monopolies" and to "rob the poor."

That is constitutional and that is right; but if the Government does not need any portion of the proceeds of this robbery in order to meet its ordinary expenses, then it is unconstitutional and wrong and undemocratic to levy any tariff whatever. This is their position, to state it precisely as they state it themselves over and over again here on the floor of the House; and I am utterly unable to comprehend it.

Now, a tariff for revenue is taxation. Raising revenue and taxation are the same thing, and our fathers fought the Revolutionary war in order that they might resent the taxation attempted by Great Britain, which was unequal and without their consent. The very fundamental idea of taxation, or taking money for revenue, is that all property be taxed equally. That I can understand to be the principle of taxation, of a tariff for revenue, and that any other theory of taxation or of obtaining revenue whatever, from the Democratic standpoint, is robbery; and that there is no possible way in which we can impose a tariff or any regulation of trade which shall result to the advantage of any particular man or class of men, or of any particular line of business.

Sir, I can not understand how money can be raised by unequal imposition upon property, unless protection in and of itself, protection *per se*, is not only constitutional, but when the public welfare requires it, is right. Our friends seem to think they are excusable on the ground that it is a very little one. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time has now arrived when, under the order of the House, the committee must rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROOKSHIRE] will perform the duties of the Chair at the evening session. The House will now take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be devoted to debate only on the pending bill.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock p. m. by Mr. BROOKSHIRE, as Speaker *pro tempore*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is in session for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The House, pursuant to the special order, resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BAILEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the tariff bill.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Chairman, the position occupied by the gentlemen who have addressed the House upon this bill can properly be classed as follows:

First. Those who favor a high protective tariff.

Second. Those who favor free trade.

Third. And those who believe "that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue only." "That the collection of such taxes should be limited to the necessities of government when honestly and economically administered."

The first class favor a high protective tariff. The second class favor free trade, and the last favors a tariff for revenue only.

Sir, in my opinion the position of the last-named class, who favor a tariff for revenue only, conforms more to the platform upon which a majority of this House were elected and the purposes of this bill.

Sir, there are some provisions of this bill that I do not approve, and one of them is the bounty on sugar which this House has so wisely stricken out. I supported the amendment to strike out that section of the bill providing for a bounty on sugar, and shall support such other amendments as will conform the provisions of this bill to my views, but when it shall have been passed upon and approved by the majority of this House I shall give it my support, although I may not then fully agree with all of its provisions.

Representing, as I do, sir, a people whose principal business is agriculture, I shall in the short time allotted me endeavor to demonstrate the false position of those who contend that the present high tariff benefits the farmers, and that the farmers have prospered under our present high tariff system; and I shall endeavor to show that the farmers are more prosperous under a low tariff, or tariff for revenue than under a high protective tariff, and that under our present high tariff the products of the farmers have decreased in price instead of increasing.

Sir, it is conceded by all that the tariff of 1846 was a revenue tariff; it was levied for the sole purpose of collecting a sufficient revenue with which to support the Government; it was a Demo-

cratic tariff and levied in the interest of all the people of this country, and not in favor of the few at the expense of the many. It operated alike for the benefit of every American citizen. Under it trusts and combines were unknown; under this low tariff farm values increased in ten years, from 1850 to 1860, 100 per cent, and the farmers of this country then owned one half of all the property of the United States. From 1850 to 1860 the value of the farms of the United States increased from $3,271,575,426 to $6,645,045,007, more than 100 per cent. During the same period, sir, the capital invested in manufactures increased from $533,245,351 in 1850 to $1,009,855,715 in 1860, almost 100 per cent. Under a low tariff, from 1850 to 1860, the tonnage of the merchant navies of the United States almost doubled, but since that time, instead of increasing, has decreased, as is shown by the following table:

Comparative growth of the tonnage of the merchant navies of the United States and of the principal maritime countries of Europe from 1850 to 1893.

Countries.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.
American	3,485,266	5,299,175	4,194,740	4,068,034	4,191,916	4,307,475	4,424,497	4,684,759	4,764,921	4,825,071
British	4,232,962	5,710,968	7,149,134	8,447,171	10,501,595	10,829,202	11,597,106	11,928,624	12,455,687	12,788,282
French	688,153	996,124	1,072,048	919,298	995,918	984,946	1,045,102	1,082,674	1,057,708	1,052,022
Norwegian	298,315	558,927	1,022,515	1,518,655	1,424,884	1,456,264	1,584,355	1,665,477	1,681,759	1,710,313
Swedish	.....	.....	346,862	542,642	458,034	462,392	475,964	473,101	498,505	505,711
Danish	.....	.....	178,646	249,466	256,103	259,409	280,065	295,944	310,676	323,801
German	.....	.....	982,355	1,182,097	1,387,635	1,409,838	1,569,311	1,678,446	1,703,754	1,735,683
Dutch	292,576	433,922	389,614	328,281	368,747	356,081	378,784	401,273	435,791	442,071
Belgian	34,919	33,111	30,149	75,666	119,730	111,934	110,571	111,744	112,541	115,709
Italian	.....	.....	1,012,164	999,196	885,459	846,901	816,567	828,158	818,840	796,247
Austro-Hungarian	.....	.....	329,377	290,971	290,486	276,294	269,648	265,980	273,812	298,674
Greek	.....	263,075	404,062	.....	277,341	291,120	307,640	332,107	356,483	379,699

The above tables have been compiled from the last annual report of the Commissioner of Navigation of the United States.

Sir, in 1850, the assessed value of all the property of the people of the United States was $6,024,666,909, and in 1860 had increased to $12,084,560,000, more than 100 per cent. This great prosperity, alike to the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, the mechanic, and the laborer was due to just and wholesome laws. Then, if you desired to borrow money, you would go from the towns and cities to the home of the farmer in the country.

Of this low tariff Mr. Blaine, the greatest leader the Republican party ever had, said:

The Whig victory of 1848 was not sufficiently decisive to warrant any attempt, even had there been desire, to change the tariff. Gen. Taylor had been elected without subscribing to a platform or pledging himself to a specific measure, and he was therefore in a position to reject appeals of the ordinary partisan character. Moreover, the tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his administration was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1849; large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. After 1852 the Democrats had almost undisputed control of the Government and had gradually become a free-trade party. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased not only among the people, but among the protective economists, and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested, or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented Presidential candidates.

Again, speaking of this low tariff, Mr. Blaine said:

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Democratic Congress, in the closing session of Pierce's administration, enacted what has since been known as the tariff of 1857. By this law the duties were placed lower than they had been at any time since the war of 1812. The act was well received by the people and was, indeed, concurred in by a considerable proportion of the Republican party.

Sir, a reduction of the present high protective tariff, in my humble judgment, would, so soon as put in force, be "well received by the people" and concurred in by that portion of the Republican party who are not receiving large profits by reason of the special privileges granted them by the McKinley act of taxing their neighbors and fellow citizens that they may grow rich.

Sir, under the low tariff of 1846 I have shown that the farmers owned one-half of the property of the United States, and that during its existence their property increased 100 per cent. During the same period, the manufacturer, the merchant, the laborer, and every other class of citizens were equally prosperous. After eleven years of prosperity under the tariff of 1846, Whigs and Democrats alike joined in 1857 in further reducing this tariff, and when this proposition was pending in the Senate, Senator Wilson, afterward Vice-President, used the following language in a speech before that body:

I wish to say to the Senate and the country that the Commonwealth I represent has a deep interest in the modification of the tariff of 1846 by this Congress. They are for the reduction of the revenue to the actual wants of an economical administration of the Government; for a free list embracing articles of prime necessity we do not produce; for mere nominal duties on articles which make up a large portion of our domestic industry, and for such an adjustment of the duties on the products of other nations that come in direct competition with the products of American capital, labor, and skill as shall impose the least burdens upon that capital, labor, and skill.

And in the same speech he further said:

We of New England believe that wool, especially the cheap wools, manila, hemp, flax, raw silk, lead, tin, brass, hides, linseed, and many other articles used in our manufactures can be admitted duty free, or at a mere nominal duty, without injuring to any extent any considerable productive interests of the country.

Mr. ALLISON said in this House, March 24, 1870:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect as any that we have ever had.

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891.

Years.	Silver, per fine ounce.	Gold value of silver dollar.	Articles that farmers sell.									
			Cotton, per pound.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Bacon and hams, per pound.	Lard, per pound.	Pork, per pound.	Beef, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.	Tobacco, per pound.
			Cents.	Cents.		Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1873	$1.32	$1.004	18.8	61	$1.31	8.8	9.2	7.8	7.7	21.1	13.1	10.7
1874	1.30	.988	15.4	71	1.43	9.6	9.4	8.2	8.2	25.0	13.1	9.6
1875	1.23	.964	15.0	84	1.12	11.4	13.8	10.1	8.7	23.7	13.5	11.3
1876	1.17	.894	12.9	67	1.24	12.1	13.3	10.6	8.7	23.9	12.6	10.4
1877	1.18	.929	11.8	58	1.17	10.8	10.9	9.0	7.5	20.6	11.8	10.2
1878	1.16	.891	11.1	56	1.34	8.7	8.8	6.8	7.7	18.0	11.4	8.7
1879	1.12	.868	9.9	47	1.07	6.9	7.0	5.7	6.3	14.2	8.4	7.8
1880	1.13	.886	11.5	54	1.25	6.7	7.4	6.1	6.4	17.1	9.5	7.7
1881	1.12	.881	11.4	55	1.11	8.2	9.3	7.7	6.5	19.8	11.1	8.3
1882	1.13	.878	11.4	66	1.19	9.9	11.6	9.0	8.5	19.3	11.0	8.5
1883	1.10	.858	10.8	68	1.13	11.2	11.9	9.9	8.9	18.6	11.2	8.3
1884	1.10	.861	10.5	61	1.07	10.2	9.5	7.9	7.6	18.2	10.3	9.1
1885	1.06	.823	10.6	54	.86	9.2	7.9	7.2	7.5	16.8	9.3	9.9
1886	.99	.769	9.9	49	.87	7.5	6.9	5.9	6.0	15.6	8.3	9.6
1887	.97	.758	9.5	47	.89	7.9	7.1	6.6	5.4	15.8	9.3	8.7
1888	.97	.727	9.8	55	.85	8.6	7.7	7.4	5.3	18.3	9.9	8.3
1889	.93	.724	9.9	47	.90	8.6	8.6	7.4	5.5	16.5	9.3	8.8
1890	1.06	.809	10.1	41	.83	7.7	7.1	6.0	5.4	14.4	9.0	8.6
1891	.98	.764	10.0	57	.93	7.6	6.9	5.9	5.6	14.5	9.0	8.7
Average decrease	26	26	53	6	30	14	25	24	27	32	31	19

Mr. Garfield, in 1878, in answer to the charge that the year of 1860 had not been one of prosperity, said in this House:

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity. Yet, to suit a theory of finance, we are told that 1860 was a year of great distress and depression of business, equaled only by the distress of the present year. I hold that the facts I have recited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace but of very general prosperity in the United States.

Now, sir, if a low tariff in 1846 brought prosperity to this country, as I have shown by the statement of the great leaders of the party of high protection, and also by the great progress made by the people of this country during that period, why will it not do so now? Mr. Blaine says that under a low tariff "money became very abundant," and "the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine." Sir, let us return to the prosperity and plenty of the good old days of 1850 to 1860. Then we had justice and equality written in every statute. No laws were then enacted to enrich one class of citizens at the expense of another; they were not framed so as to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. There were no presidents and officers of mammoth protected industries flooding the mails of each Member of Congress and the committee room of the Ways and Means Committee of this House with well-studied statements and petitions in an effort to secure for their infant industry, a generation old, the fostering care and protection of the Government.

How long, oh! how long, sir, will the protected industries of this country, which have grown old and rich under a high protective tariff, continue to plead the baby act.

This Government has allowed the manufacturers of this country for the past thirty years to dictate tariff laws in their own interest, and without any regard for the interests of the balance of the people. And as the manufacturers have grown rich, and richer each year, the balance of our people have grown poor, and poorer, until the farmers of this country, who owned one-half of the property of this United States in 1860, to-day only own one-fifth, and the products of their farms instead of increasing have decreased each year.

But, sir, we are told that a high protective tariff furnishes a home market for the farmer, and yet under that system the price of what he has to sell is fixed in a foreign market.

The price of the farmers' cotton is fixed in Liverpool. The same is true of their surplus wheat and corn. Sir, they compete with the pauper labor of Europe and of India that we have heard so much about upon this floor.

Amount of breadstuffs exported from the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

	Quantity.	Value.
Corn.....bushels..	46,037,274	$24,587,511
Wheat.....do....	117,121,109	93,537,970
Wheat flour.....barrels..	16,620,339	75,494,347
All other breadstuffs.....	.....	6,695,826
Total exports from United States.....	.....	200,315,654

Total amount of breadstuffs imported into the United States during fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, $2,612,697.

Every time $2 worth of breadstuffs were imported into the United States $200 worth were exported from the United States and sold in a foreign market, which not only fixed the price of it there, but the price at home. So the farmer as he plows his corn in the rich coves, hillsides, and valleys of north Georgia and the other corn-growing sections of this country, or cultivates his cotton in the great cotton belt of the Union, or reaps his wheat in the great growing West, competes with the unprotected labor of the world.

THE COTTON SUPPLY.

Crop of the United States for sixty years.

Year.	Bales.	Year.	Bales.	Year.	Bales.	Year.	Bales.
1829...	870,415	1845..	2,394,503	1861....	3,655,006	1880...	5,757,397
1830...	976,845	1846..	2,100,537	1862-'65.	No record.	1881...	6,589,329
1831...	1,038,848	1847..	1,778,651	1866....	2,193,987	1882...	5,435,845
1832...	987,487	1848..	2,347,634	1867....	2,019,774	1883...	6,992,234
1833...	1,070,438	1849..	2,728,596	1868....	2,593,993	1884...	5,714,052
1834...	1,205,324	1850..	2,096,706	1869....	2,439,039	1885...	5,669,021
1835...	1,254,328	1851..	2,355,257	1870....	3,154,946	1886...	6,550,215
1836...	1,360,752	1852..	3,015,029	1871....	4,352,317	1887...	6,513,624
1837...	1,422,930	1853..	3,262,882	1872....	2,974,351	1888...	7,017,707
1838...	1,801,497	1854..	2,930,027	1873....	3,930,508	1889...	6,935,082
1839...	1,360,532	1855..	2,847,339	1874....	4,170,388	1890...	7,313,726
1840...	2,177,835	1856..	3,527,845	1875....	3,832,991	1891...	8,655,518
1841...	1,634,945	1857..	2,939,519	1876....	4,669,288	1892...	9,038,707
1842...	1,683,574	1858..	3,113,962	1877....	4,485,423	1893...	6,717,142
1843...	2,378,875	1859..	3,851,481	1878....	4,811,265		
1844...	2,030,409	1860..	4,669,770	1879....	5,073,531		

The returns are for the years ending September 1. The average net weight per bale is 470 pounds.

Exports and domestic consumption of American cotton.

	1892-'93.	1891-'92.	1890-'91.	1889-'90.
	Bales.	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Bales.*
Export to Europe	4,354,790	5,815,365	5,750,443	4,885,326
Consumption, United States, Canada, etc	2,786,077	2,832,908	2,642,912	2,431,757
Total	7,140,867	8,648,273	8,393,355	7,317,083
	1888-'89.	1887-'88.	1886-'87.	1885-'86.
	Bales.	*Bales.*	*Bales.*	*Bales.*
Export to Europe	4,700,198	4,602,248	4,414,326	4,296,825
Consumption, United States, Canada, etc	2,372,641	2,259,606	2,265,324	2,087,785
Total	7,072,839	6,861,854	6,679,650	6,384,610

Cotton consumption of the entire world.

Consumption, bales (400 pounds).	Great Britain.	Continent.	Total Europe.	Total United States.	Total world.
1880-'81	3,572,000	2,956,000	6,528,000	2,118,000	8,640,000
1881-'82	3,640,000	3,198,000	6,838,000	2,197,000	9,035,000
1882-'83	3,744,000	3,380,000	7,124,000	2,375,000	9,499,000
1883-'84	3,666,000	3,380,000	7,046,000	2,244,000	9,290,000
1884-'85	3,433,000	3,255,000	6,688,000	1,909,000	8,597,000
1885-'86	3,628,000	3,465,000	7,093,000	2,278,000	9,371,000
1886-'87	3,694,000	3,640,000	7,334,000	2,423,000	9,757,000
1887-'88	3,841,000	3,796,000	7,637,000	2,530,000	10,167,000
1888-'89	3,770,000	4,069,000	7,839,000	2,685,000	10,524,000
1889-'90	4,016,000	4,280,000	8,296,000	2,731,000	11,027,000
1890-'91	4,233,000	4,538,000	8,771,000	2,958,000	11,729,000
1891-'92	3,977,000	4,524,000	8,401,000	3,220,000	11,621,000
1892-'93	3,583,000	4,576,000	8,159,000	3,189,000	11,348,000

So our farmers have for the past thirty years not only competed with foreign labor, but have increased their cotton crop from 2,193,987 bales in 1866 until they furnished, during the year 1892, 9,038,707 of the 11,621,000 bales of cotton consumed by the entire world, and during this same year the farm products exported from this country amounted $800,000,000 or 78.7 of our entire exports.

So it is not the fault of our farmers that they are not prosperous, but it is selling what they make in a free-trade market and buying all they use in a high protective market—this has caused the earnings of our farmers and the laboring people of this country to go into the hands of the protected classes, who have formed trusts and combines for their own benefit.

Sir, when the war between the States began we had a tariff for revenue of 18.84 per cent, but this tariff was increased in 1861 to 40.29 per cent. The author of the bill proposing this increase said, when it was presented:

This is intended as a war measure, a temporary measure, and we must as such give it our support.

Sir, I was a child, barely old enough for that great event in a boy's life, donning his first pair of pants, when the tariff was increased from 18.84 to 40.29 per cent, and since that time we have had thirty years of peace. A new generation has grown up, yet instead of 40.29 per cent this tariff tax has grown until to-day, under the McKinley bill, we pay an average tariff of 48.71 per cent, and when we attempt not to go back to the tariff of 1846 that brought prosperity and plenty to all the people of this country, but to reduce the present McKinley tariff act from 48.71 per cent to 30.31 per cent as is proposed in the Wilson bill, we hear the same gloomy predictions that were made when the low tariff of 1846 was proposed, but which in a few years after its passage was admitted by every one to be a blessing.

When the war closed we had a tax on the products of domestic manufactures that amounted to $127,000,000 in 1866. While they had over 40 per cent protection they were only required to pay about 5 per cent on their products. But, Mr. Chairman, this was a tax on the wealthy manufacturers, and it was repealed years ago. We had an income tax that brought into the Treasury in 1866 the sum of $72,000,000; but, I suppose, upon the poverty-stricken argument of being inquisitorial or encouraging the rich to commit perjury, this tax at a time when the people of this country were paying annually $140,000,000 in interest alone, was repealed.

And now, sir, when we ask those having large incomes again to contribute a small portion of that income to pay the expenses of this Government, we are met with the flimsy argument, by those who believe the millionaires should be exempt from taxation, that such a tax would be inquisitorial and would encourage the rich to commit perjury in order to avoid paying it. They believe it is all wrong to require the wealthy citizens of this country to state under oath what their annual incomes are, and yet under the system of making tax returns in most of the States, every farmer, business man, and laborer is required to give under oath the number and value of each acre of land they own, the number of horses, cattle,

sheep, hogs, and the value thereof, the value of their household and kitchen furniture. It is all right from the standpoint of those who desire to relieve the millionaires of this country to require other people to answer under oath what the taxable value of every species of their property is; even to to the dish rag in the poor man's kitchen.

But when it is proposed to ask the men of luxury and large incomes under oath what their annual incomes are, in order to require them to pay out of that income a tax to support the Government that protects them and their property, we are met with the statement that it is inquisitorial and encourages perjury. Such an argument is an insult to the intelligence of this House and a slander upon those who have incomes in this country. [Applause.]

How can you oppose an income tax because it is inquisitorial when you have an internal revenue system of spies, informers, frivolous prosecutions, illegal seizures, and oppression, and instead of giving Democratic sanction to it by increasing the tax on whisky from 90 cents to $1? I appeal to this House, in the name of the men, women, and children who have suffered from the harsh and oppressive provisions of the internal-revenue laws, that if you do not intend to wipe it from our statute books that you adopt in its stead a more humane and just system of collecting this tax, and instead of increasing this tax let us at least put into law the wise recommendations of the President in his last message, as follows:

I can not too heartily indorse the proposition that the fee system as applicable to the compensation of United States attorneys, marshals, clerks of Federal courts, and United States commissioners should be abolished with as little delay as possible. It is clearly in the interest of the community that the business of the courts, both civil and criminal, shall be as small and as inexpensively transacted as the ends of justice will allow.

The system is therefore thoroughly vicious which makes the compensation of court officials depend upon the volume of such business, and thus creates a conflict between a proper execution of the law and private gain, which can not fail to be dangerous to the rights and freedom of the citizen and an irresistible temptation to the unjustifiable expenditure of public funds. If, in addition to this reform, another was inaugurated, which would give to United States commissioners the final disposition of petty offenses within the grade of misdemeanors, especially those coming under the internal-revenue laws, a great advance would be made toward a more decent administration of the criminal law.

This would destroy the fee system and go far towards stopping frivolous prosecutions and in destroying the damnable business of spies and informers, who have, since Judas betrayed our Savior, been hated and despised of all men. Sir, I believe an income tax is a just tax; I believe all citizens having large incomes, over and above a comfortable living for themselves and those dependent upon them, should be required to pay a tax upon that income for the support of the Government, and the larger the income the heavier the tax they should be required to pay.

Sir, as one of the new as well as younger members of this House, who has attended all of its sittings, both during the extraordinary as well as the present session, allow me to say to my brethren on this side the Chamber that we should carry out every promise made the people without delay. I am one of those who believe that promises made to secure votes should be as honestly and faithfully kept as those made in ordinary business transactions. Let us not forget the law and the prophets nor become absorbed in worshiping the "golden calf," but let us rescue the people of this Republic from the destructive tendencies of the times and make this a land flowing with the milk of plenty and the honey of universal prosperity and constitutional liberty. [Applause.]

Sir, let us stop playing for petty party advantage, and, as the representatives of a free and brave people, let us enact without further delay such laws as will give every American citizen equal rights and advantages in the struggle of life, and strike from our statute books every law that gives any class special privileges, and give every citizen an equal chance for a fair share of the nation's wealth, and thereby give the old American spirit of loyalty to country, of love of family and home, and trust and confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of the people's representatives, an opportunity to assert itself. And to good markets for American products, well-paid labor, happy home, we will add, "Peace on earth, good will to man."

To those who are so lost to the noble impulses which should at this time control our action, and who have attempted to inject sectionalism into this debate, let me beg of them that they join us in an effort to secure to all our people equal and just laws, and in perpetuating—

A union of hearts and a union of hands,
A union which time can not sever;
A union of lakes and a union of lands,
And the flag of our Union forever.

[Applause.]

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, preliminary to a discussion of the practical effects of a protective tariff, I desire to notice the provisions of the Constitution under which Congress is authorized to provide revenues.

ARTICLE I, SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The annals of the American Congress are replete with debates upon the great problem affecting the revenues of the nation. In these Halls the voices of Webster, Clay, Calhoun, and many other distinguished statesmen were heard with pleasure and profit. Their achievements in oratory and forensic discussion were the outgrowth of their ardent love and patriotic devotion to the principles which they espoused. They differed widely but sincerely concerning constitutional authority and governmental policy relating to tariff legislation. It early became a question whether a duty should be levied solely for the necessary expenses of the Government, or whether duties and imposts on foreign commodities should be large enough to afford protection to American merchants and producers, and the surplus applied and expended in making internal improvements.

It was claimed on one side that it would build roads, improve rivers and harbors, and protect the people in their efforts to subdue the wilderness and develop the vast natural resources of the country. On the other side it was urged that the power of Congress was limited by the Constitution to levying taxes for the general welfare, and that imposts levied and collected for internal improvements and protection was class legislation, and therefore not included in the provision and was unauthorized. This has been the position of the Southern Democracy, and it has found considerable support among Northern Democrats. It is the principle expressed in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1892.

JEFFERSON'S CONSTRUCTION.

On the 2d day of December, 1806, Thomas Jefferson, then President, in his message to Congress, expressed his views on the protective tariff policy. Although he was clearly of the opinion that the public good would be subserved by such a policy, he seemed to doubt the power of Congress to enact such laws. Upon this subject he expressed himself as follows:

The question now comes forward to what object shall surplusses be appropriated, and the whole surplus of impost, after the entire discharge of the public debt and during those intervals when the purposes of war shall not call for them? Shall we suppress the impost and give the advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures? On a few articles of a more general and necessary use the suppression, in due season, will doubtless be right; but the great mass of the articles on which impost is paid are foreign luxuries, purchased only by those who are rich enough to afford themselves the use of them.

Their patriotism would certainly prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the constitutional enumeration of Federal powers. By these operations new channels of communication will be opened between the States; the lines of separation will disappear; their interests will be identified, and the Union cemented by new and indissoluble ties.

Education is here placed among the articles of public care. Not that it would be proposed to take its ordinary branches out of the hands of private enterprise, which manages so much better all the enterprises to which it is equal; but a public institution alone can supply those sciences which though rarely called for are yet necessary to complete the circle, all parts of which contribute to the improvement of the country and some of them to its preservation. The subject is now proposed for the consideration of Congress, because if approved, by the time the State Legislatures shall have deliberated on this extension of the Federal trusts, and the laws shall be passed and other arrangements made for their execution, the necessary funds will be on hand and without employment.

I suppose an amendment to the Constitution by consent of the States necessary, because the objects now recommended are not among those enumerated in the Constitution, and to which it permits the public money to be applied.

NULLIFICATION.

On the 29th day of May, 1828, and again on the 14th day of July, 1832, Congress passed laws imposing duties on imported foreign commodities in such manner as to afford protection to manufacturers of such commodities in the United States. This policy was then opposed by the people of South Carolina, and they met in convention for the purpose of expressing their opposition to protective tariff legislation.

On the 24th day of November, 1832, the convention passed an ordinance whereby they declared "that the several acts and parts of acts of the Congress of the United States, purporting to be laws for the imposing duties and imposts on the importation of foreign commodities, and now having actual operation and effect within the United States, are unauthorized by the Constitution of the United States, and violate the true meaning and intent thereof, and are null and void, and no law." And by the same ordinance it was declared in substance that if the Government undertook to enforce the laws in the State of South Carolina, the people of that State would henceforth hold themselves absolved from political connection with the Union, and that they would proceed to organize a separate government.

This occurred during the Administration of Andrew Jackson and was the occasion of his memorable proclamation issued on the 10th day of December, 1833. The truths expressed in that document are deserving of the most thoughtful consideration of every citizen of this Republic. A brief extract from it presents the purpose of the people of South Carolina to nulify the laws in its true light.

President Jackson said:

I consider then the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one State, incompatible with the existence of the Union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the Constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was founded.

That there was difference of opinion among the leading statesmen concerning the power of Congress to enact protective tariff laws in the beginning of our history under the Constitution is very true. And, therefore, modern free traders are not without some support in their interpretation of the Constitution as declared in the Chicago Democratic platform of 1892. But the very decided weight of authority sustains protective tariff laws under our Constitution. Whatever of honest doubt may have once existed practice and experience have settled the question as to the power and it ought now only to be a question of public policy.

But the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means of this Congress have made their report in favor of the passage of this bill, and have declared as follows:

The American people, after the fullest and most thorough debate ever given by any people to their fiscal policy, have deliberately and rightfully decided that the existing tariff is wrong in principle and grievously unjust in operation. They have decided, as free men must always decide, that the power of taxation has no lawful or constitutional exercise except for providing revenue for the support of the Government.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY.

This proposition of the Democratic majority of the committee is the old doctrine of the South Carolina nullification party of 1832. It is the reiteration of a principle which if carried out would have prevented the United States from adopting the protective and internal improvement systems which have enabled the American people to make so great progress in the development of the natural resources of this bounteous land, and such wonderful and rapid strides toward the best civilization. It is a construction of the Constitution which belittles the character of the National Government and magnifies the power of the States.

It was this view of the question, carried to its natural and ultimate results, that led eleven States to rebel against the lawful authority of the Government, and attempt the dissolution of the Union. A rebellion that caused the greatest war known to modern civilization; a war that in addition to over $1,000,000,000 expended during the war entailed upon us a national debt amounting, in 1865, to $2,845,907,626; a war which cost the lives of over 500,000 of the bravest and best men and boys of the Republic; a war which left behind it more than a million of maimed, wounded, and diseased soldiers; a war which made necessary the great pension roll, which is such a fruitful source of torment to the Democratic party.

FREE TRADE.

And, not satisfied with the crime of thirty years ago, the Democratic party propose to again inflict upon the people of this country other grievous wrongs. They propose to strike down the protected industries of the nation. They boldly declare upon this floor that the present measure is but the prelude to other legislation which will expunge from the statutes every vestige of protection. And if the Democratic party is perpetuated in power only a few years more their purpose will be accomplished.

The very threat and attempt to repeal the protective tariff laws have precipitated alarm and brought upon the country unparalleled disaster. To-day millions of men, women, and children are hungry and unable to earn their bread because American institutions are imperiled by the coming deluge of "tariff reform." A reform that will either drive home producers and manufacturers out of business, and transfer the industries to other countries, or reduce the price of American labor so low that manufacturing, mining, and all kinds of business can be done on as cheap wages in the United States as in Europe.

The foreign manufacturers can now employ labor at prices so much lower than American labor that it is possible for them to reduce the prices of their goods below the cost of manufacturing the same kind of goods in this country. I submit the following statement by a responsible firm in my district:

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, *January 15, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: Mr. Kelly has handed us your letter of 12th, asking information with reference to the steam road-roller trade.

Up to 1888 there were no heavy steam road-rollers made in the United States. They were all brought here from England, and the average price was $7,000. In many cases they were sold for a much higher price, but the average was not below $7,000. Immediately after the first American steam road-roller was put on the market the English manufacturers reduced their price in this country to $5,000, and they are now glad to get $4,000 for the machine they sold for $7,000 when there was no competition.

For fifteen years the American cities paid from $7,000 to $10,000 for their rollers, and if there was no American competition they would still be paying the same prices.

We can not afford, at the present prices paid labor, to meet the English prices. Eighty per cent of the cost of a roller to us is in labor paid out in our factory.

Yours, truly,

THE O. S. KELLY CO.,
J. B. CARTMELL,
Secretary and Treasurer.

Hon. G. W. WILSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The following table shows the average weekly wages in Massachusetts and Great Britain for the same kind of work from 1860 to 1883, including men, women, and children:

Articles.	Massachusetts.	Great Britain.
Carpetings	$6.08	$4.11
Cotton goods	6.45	4.66
Flax and jute	6.46	2.84
Hosiery	6.49	4.67
Woolen goods	7.32	3.60
Worsted goods	7.32	3.60
Brick	8.63	4.16
Calico	8.67	4.94
Food	9.81	7.72
Clothing	10.01	6.71
Agricultural	10.85	8.85
Hats	11.01	5.51
Furniture	11.04	5.51
Metals	11.25	7.95
Printing	11.37	7.40
Boots	11.63	5.52
Machinery	11.75	4.37
Tools	11.80	6.93
Wooden goods	12.19	4.89
Glass	12.28	5.67
Liquors	12.66	6.94
Carriages	13.80	4.89
Stone	14.39	8.58
Building	14.99	7.21

Average comparison of daily wages.

United States	$1.32	Germany	$0.36
England	.60	Spain	.32
Scotland	.56	Portugal	.32
France	.50	Scandinavia	.28
Austria	.40	Russia	.24
Holland	.38	Italy	.20

SHEEP AND WOOL.

It is proposed in this bill to repeal the tariff on wool. The accomplishment of this purpose will be the deathblow to the sheep and wool industries of the United States. There is now a tariff of 11 cents on imported unwashed wool of the merino grades, and of 22 cents on wool washed on the sheep's back, and of 33 cents on scoured wool; and there is equal protection to other grades of wool. What effect could free trade in wool have other than to make it impossible to continue the sheep husbandry in the United States?

Consider the vast interests of the farmers and sheep-growers of this country and see if it is well to strike down this great industry. There are 47,273,553 sheep in the United States, and their value is estimated at $125,909,264. It is probable that the number and value exceed this report. Calculate the direct loss to American woolgrowers under free trade. The value of sheep is determined by the value of wool, and if wool becomes unprofitable, sheep also become unprofitable. It is idle to talk of she epbeing profitable for mutton. In a few localities near large cities it is possible to handle sheep in small flocks for the mutton, but is impossible in the remote portions of the country.

The industry is one which does not stand alone. There are many farmers all over the country who are able to make husbandry fairly profitable by handling small flocks of sheep, who, if they were deprived of this auxiliary to the agricultural operations of the farms, would find farming unprofitable, and their little surplus would disappear.

WAR.

This is a great and growing country, and it would be the extremity of foolishness for us to place ourselves at the mercy of foreign countries for our sources of wool supplies. In times of peace the injury from such a policy would fall directly upon those employed in sheep-raising and woolgrowing, and indirectly upon the general industries of the country. But in time of war the evils of such a policy would be sorely felt by the Government.

The dependence upon foreign countries for our clothing, blankets, and all classes of woolen products would be the greatest obstacles we could possibly encounter in the successful prosecution of a war with any of the great governments of Europe.

If wool shall cease to be successfully grown in the United States, as I believe it will if this measure is carried out, it will be possible for the importers of wool to form combinations, which will put up the prices of woolen goods at their pleasure. And if they shall advance the prices as they did in former years under brief periods of tariff for revenue only, and Americans should again enter upon sheep and wool industries, the foreigner would reduce the prices, so as to again crush out the American industries.

I do not believe free trade in wool will permanently cheapen woolen goods. The competition of home manufacturers among themselves and with foreign competitors has reduced the prices to a very low standard. But workingmen could better afford to

pay a trifle more for woolen goods than be thrown out of employment.

It can not be expected that the producers of what the "tariff reformers" are pleased to call raw material will long submit to a tariff which affords protection to manufacturers of these raw materials. And if the day comes when protection shall be abandoned in the United States, the pitiful prices of labor in this country will make it impossible for workingmen to buy at any price. What will it profit a man to gain the whole world of cheap markets if he shall thereby lose his sole opportunity to earn living wages?

QUANTITY.

The amount of wool produced in the United States in 1892 was 294,000,000 pounds, the value of which depends upon the places where grown and the quality of the wool. And there was imported during the same year 148,670,652 pounds of wool. Of the domestic and imported wool there was consumed in this country in 1891 439,460,633 pounds. There was exported of domestic wool 202,456 pounds, and of imported wool 3,007,563 pounds. There is no reason why Americans should not produce all the wool required for home consumption.

Table showing value of imported wool.

Years.	Unmanufactured.	Manufactured.
1888	$12,428,993	$46,415,673
1889	17,614,529	50,098,259
1890	14,458,012	51,301,203
1891	17,326,567	31,227,617
1892	19,547,206	34,754,866
1893	13,593,581	29,284,894

From the foregoing table it fully appears that while the importation of wool was not largely affected by the McKinley tariff the importation of manufactured woolen goods largely decreased. The effect of the tariff on wool was to stimulate woolgrowing and increase the quantity of American wool and the manufacturing of woolen goods in the United States. It resulted in fostering a business directly beneficial to agriculturists, and likewise encouraged the investment of capital, and furnished additional employment for hundreds of thousands of laborers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have not been able to find Government statistics for the year 1893. But the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who has devoted much time to the subject, and as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives had unusual opportunities to obtain information, states that there were 364,000,000 pounds of wool produced in this country in 1893. The Government report puts the quantity in 1892 at 294,000,000 pounds. The gain in one year of 70,000,000 pounds shows how soon the American people would supply the wool required if protection was assured.

The State of Ohio produces a superior quality of wool, and the value of our wool clip exceeds that of any State in the Union. Sheep husbandry is one of our chief industries, and largely adds to our wealth. It affords employment for thousands of men and diversifies our industries. The people of Ohio are also growers of cattle, horses, and hogs. If one branch of stock-raising is stricken down, it will compel more farmers to engage in other stock-raising, and thereby make all stock-raising unprofitable.

And so, if the wool crop is destroyed and manufacturing of woolen fabrics transferred to Europe, where wool and labor are correspondingly cheap. American manufacturers will enter competition in other lines of business which are already overdone, and American laborers will seek other work where laborers are now unable to find profitable employment. And, for want of other occupations, artisans and laborers will seek to earn their living upon the farms, unduly increasing the number of farmers and farm hands until farming shall cease to be self-sustaining.

And yet, in the face of all this, every Democratic Congressman from the State of Ohio supports the repeal of the protective tariff afforded by the McKinley law. Men of Ohio, if you will continue to elect Democrats to Congress to join the free-trade Democrats of the South and of the great cities where importers of foreign goods dictate the votes, then you must assume your share of responsibility for the wrongs of the men whom you have elected to misrepresent you.

FARM PRODUCTS.

There was imported last year 104,257 tons of hay, valued at $964,755. This occurred under the present duty of $4 per ton on timothy. It is proposed to reduce the tariff on hay to $2 per ton, which will directly affect the farmers by a reduction of the price of hay. I can not take time to specify the reductions, but it is sufficient to say that there is a general reduction on all farm products. It would seem that the Democratic party have wholly disregarded the agricultural interests in which so vast a number of our people are concerned.

It is broadly asserted by Democrats on this floor that farmers are not benefited by a protective tariff. I submit that this is an inexcusable statement. The fewer individuals engaged in farming and gardening, and the larger the number of consumers and nonproducers, the better the prices will be for farm products. And the closer to the farm the market is the less will be the cost of transportation, and therefore greater profits to the producer. The thing which will most benefit the farmers is the growth of manufacturing in all parts of the country. It will bring to their own towns a good demand for their surplus products, and at the same time the lively competition between manufacturers of similar goods will compel them to reduce the selling prices to the lowest possible level of profit.

If the Democratic theory shall prevail the workshops and mines of this country will be closed and the business of manufacturing and mining transferred to Europe, where labor is much cheaper, or American proprietors will be compelled to reduce the wages of their workmen to the level of foreign wages. It must be apparent to any ordinary mind that it is not within the possibilities that labor should be as well paid under a tariff for revenue only as under a protective tariff. Whatever of reduction is made will necessarily, largely, be taken off the wages of the workingmen.

But we are told that with the reduced wages of the workmen, they will be able to buy in the markets of the world under free trade at lower prices. I doubt if that is true. If foreign manufacturers succeed in crushing out our home industries, they will then be able to dictate their own prices to American consumers. They did this in the beginning of our history and they are no less grasping now than they were then.

If it is true that protection enhances the price of clothing and other manufactured articles, which I do not admit, it is nevertheless better for the wage-earners that protection should be afforded for the purpose of maintaining higher wages.

If workmen get an average of $2 per day in the shops of this country for such work as brings only from 75 cents to $1.25 per day in Europe, is it not better for the American to have the protected wages?

If a man works three hundred days in a year at $2 per day he will receive $600. Suppose he could receive under free trade $100 a year in the cheaper living under free-trade, and you deduct the one hundred from the six hundred and there is still $500 to the advantage of higher wages. Now suppose you reduce his wages from $2 a day, the American price, to $1 a day, the European price, and you have $300 for the three hundred days' work. This is no imaginary picture of the probable condition of wages and prices under free trade. The fact is that under protected wages there is an advantage, and in the case put it would be the advantage of $200 per year.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the best interests of the whole people demand a reasonable protection to American enterprises and American labor. It is not well that capital should be unemployed. It matters not how much money there is unless it is in circulation. The way to put it into activity is to build up and enlarge great industries at home, instead of sending capital abroad. The rich can live anywhere. The world is open to them, because they have the means to travel and make their homes anywhere. But not so with the great mass of toilers.

They are domiciled and must live and die where they are. For these people and the philanthropic and industrious classes of our country I desire to direct my best efforts. They have grown accustomed to American ways of living. Their homes, though humble, are the abodes of honest and respectable people. Their children are educated in the public schools, and have been taught the advantages of a free Republic. They have learned to love liberty and the institutions which have opened up such possibilities to the American people. I would not disappoint them. I would sacredly guard, not only the liberties of these people, but I would make it possible for them to enjoy the liberties which are preserved to them.

And, sir, I firmly believe the best way to accomplish this end is to guarantee to labor its meed of protection against the pauper labor of foreign countries. I am no friend to anarchy or the commune. Obedience to law is the duty of all citizens. But it is our duty as legislators to see to it that the interests of all American citizens are preferred above those of any other country. Whether it be selfish or otherwise, I consider it our bounden duty to legislate in the interest of our own country, always cognizant of the fact that other nations are equally partial to their interests. [Applause on the Republican side.]

REVENUE.

The following table shows the value of imported commodities

for the following years (including free of duty and dutiable articles):

Years.	Free of duty.	Dutiable.
1888	$227,610,736	$437,213,741
1889	239,322,171	471,331,380
1890	264,856,748	497,738,647
1891	390,671,151	368,201,709
1892	415,724,932	360,079,667
1893 (eleven months)	387,433,058	338,924,637

The following table shows the value of domestic and foreign exports:

Years.	Domestic.	Foreign.
1888	$594,865,631	$11,137,826
1889	718,363,400	11,841,607
1890	748,577,696	10,473,100
1891	838,757,425	11,816,325
1892	837,018,333	13,856,509
1893 (eleven months)	763,108,868	19,414,108

From the foregoing tables it appears that the imports and exports have not varied greatly since the Democratic party came into power. But this is deceptive, and in order to present the matter in its true light we must take a monthly statement, which will show that dutiable importations have greatly fallen off since July, 1893.

Table showing imports of dutiable articles from January 1, 1892, and January 1, 1893.

	1892.	1893.
January	$31,697,751	$39,309,525
February	31,013,654	33,925,557
March	34,179,121	39,606,945
April	29,603,029	33,022,313
May	28,207,800	35,437,644
June	30,901,582	32,205,640
July	34,013,076	31,990,037
August	37,803,469	30,259,556
September	33,191,928	20,907,436
October	34,648,046	22,654,679
November	34,720,211	19,605,245
December	33,872,357	Not known

From the foregoing statement it is shown that during the fore part of the year 1893 the importations of dutiable goods was large; and during the later months it was greatly reduced.

Decrease of dutiable importations in five months of 1893.

July	$2,122,979	October	$11,993,367
August	7,543,913	November	15,114,966
September	12,284,492		

It is not difficult to explain why this difference in the importations of foreign commodities exists. The Democratic party is pledged to reduce the duties upon imported articles; and in anticipation of the repeal of the McKinley law importations are limited as much as possible. Importers and merchants do not want large quantities of goods on hand, the prices of which will be reduced if the duties are lowered on foreign imports. This cause has the same effect upon home manufactured goods. Manufacturers do not risk manufacturing large quantities of goods to be held in store subject to the competition with imported goods under a tariff for revenue only.

The wonder of the age is, that any political party in the United States should advocate a great reduction of the duties on imported commodities at a time when the revenues are insufficient to meet the demands of the Government. In some remarks which I made upon this floor during the extra session in the discussion of the bill to repeal the silver purchasing clause of the act of 1890, I expressed an opinion that there was no necessity for another issue of bonds. I am still of opinion that if there had been no tinkering with the tariff and the revenues, and the party in power had shown the ability required to administer the affairs of this Government, and would maintain a tariff that is sufficient to furnish the necessary revenue, there would not have been any necessity for additional bonds.

The people of this country would be doubly benefited by the maintenance of such a tariff, first, in raising revenue necessary to maintain the Government, and second, in affording needed protection to American industries and American labor. But now the Government must borrow money to pay current expenses or allow the credit of the Government to be impaired. The Democratic Administration and the Democratic majority of this Congress are responsible for the condition of public affairs which makes an issue of bonds necessary.

DEFICIENCY.

It is admitted by the majority that the present tariff bill will not provide sufficient revenues for Government purposes; and, to supply the deficiency, they propose to establish a system of income taxes. The income tax during the war was bitterly denounced by the Democrats, and the Republicans only justified it on the grounds of war necessity. The system was obnoxious to all classes of people and was attended with frauds and concealments, and was very unjust in its operations.

There is at this time no cause for the renewal of that system, except the purpose of the Democracy to enlarge the free list and curtail the tariff on imported commodities below the revenue standard. The Democrats have claimed to favor a tariff for revenue only, but now it appears they do not even favor such a tariff for fear it will afford incidental protection to American industries.

The President in his message expresses the opinion that the duties, though lower, will aggregate in a few years an amount sufficient for the necessities of the Government. If this shall be so, it will double the importations of foreign goods, and thereby curtail our home industries and deprive great numbers of laboring men of employment in the United States.

PENSIONS.

A revenue which is insufficient to pay pensions will be defective in plan and painful in operation. By the report of the Comsioner of Pensions it appears that on June 30, 1893, there were 966,012 pensioners. The amount required to pay the pensions approximates $160,000,000 annually. This amount may not be required long, for the roll will soon begin to decrease. But for several years yet there will be a large pension roll, and appropriations are necessary to pay them.

That there is considerable of opposition and hostility to our pension system can not be denied. If the system did not already exist the present Congress would not establish it. And if it were not for the fact that the old soldiers exercise the privilege of voting I do not think the system would long endure. The present Democratic Administration has exhibited some hostility to the pension roll. The charges of fraud in the pension list is a convenient way of justifying the opposition. It is probable that there are occasional frauds, but they are not numerous. There is no business anything like as extensive which has not been equally subject to abuses.

The policy of dropping pensioners from the roll without first determining whether the pension ought to be dropped was wholly one-sided. Nothing short of the indignant protests of the veterans caused that order to be revoked. But the present plan is not much better. The pensioner is now notified that he will be suspended within sixty days unless he proves up a stronger case than he did when his pension was granted. This is wrong in principle and unjust to the pensioners. Their claims were adjudicated by competent authority, officers having the same rank and power as those who now assume to undo that which was done by their predecessors.

A mere difference of opinion does not justify one Commissioner of Pensions in reviewing the decisions of others. If it is established that the evidence upon which a pension was granted was fraudulently procured, and is untrue, and that the pensioner could not come within the law, so as to authorize the Commissioner to grant the Pension, then it would be right to revoke the pension. But not so if the pensioner comes within the class to whom pensions may be granted, and there is only a difference of opinion between the Commissioner who allowed the pension and the one who revoked it.

The present Administration and the Fifty-third Congress are largely dominated by gentlemen who were either in the Confederate service or live in the South, where there is still much prejudice against the Yankees, as they are pleased to call the Northern soldiers. I think there is less of the prejudice among the Confederate soldiers than there is among the citizens. But of course there are large numbers of disabled Confederate soldiers, and it is an unpleasant duty for Congressmen who were connected with the Southern Confederacy to vote pensions to Union soldiers.

Their sense of justice to the soldiers who were loyal and fought for the Government conflicts with their sympathy for the soldiers who fought for the Southern Confederacy. The memory of their sufferings, and the fact that they are entitled to no part of the pension money, doubtless rankles in their hearts, although they may endeavor to conceal or suppress it. But it should never be forgotten that during the war loyalty was at a premium. The curse of that time was disloyalty in high places. The humble people followed their leaders into the vortex of war. There were many disloyal sympathizers in the North, who divided public sentiment upon the qu stions affecting the prosecution of the war. I think some of these gentlemen now occupy high places in the Government. Some Union

soldiers helped to put them there If they shall repeat the act they must suffer the consequences. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is not possible in the discussion of a revenue bill to devote much time to pensions. But I desire to enter my objections to the charges of wholesale frauds in the pension roll. I venture to say that the courts which decide the cases coming before them have not been more careful or correct in their decisions than the Commissioners of Pensions have been in deciding pension claims. Wherever a fraud has been discovered great publicity has been given to it, so that public sentiment might be formed against the correctness of the pension system. There is no mention made of the delays and difficulties attending the claims of those who are deserving of pensions.

I denounce the detractors of my comrades as unfair in their pretenses of purifying the pension roll. The criticisms are unwarranted and their strictures unjust to that great body of loyal men who imperiled their lives in defense of the Union. More courageous, honorable, and patriotic men never breathed the air of liberty, or bore their country's banner in triumph to greater victory. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE SURPLUS.

It is charged by distinguished gentlemen on this floor that the Republican party depleted the United States Treasury of a large surplus of money which remained in the Treasury at the expiration of President Cleveland's first term, March 4, 1889. The surplus accumulated because the Democratic Administration refused to apply it in discharge of the public debt. Why was this surplus allowed to lie idle? There is but one explanation. The purpose was to create an impression among the people that the revenues were far in excess of the necessities of the Government, and that, therefore, the tariff ought to be greatly reduced.

There was then outstanding United States bonds, some of which (about $180,000,000) were payable in September, 1891, and about $680,000,000 which were payable in 1907. Why did not President Cleveland's Administration apply the surplus in redeeming the bonds? When the Republicans came in to succeed the Democratic Administration on the 4th day of March, 1889, they found the surplus; and, like intelligent men of business, they immediately used it in redeeming United States bonds, by purchasing immature bonds at their market value. Not one dollar of the surplus was wasted.

If the Democrats had used the money as it accumulated, millions of dollars of interest on the public debt would have been saved, and other millions of the principal would have been paid. It was simply a question of business capacity. It is a case parallel to that of an individual who has immature interest-bearing obligations outstanding, and who has also money lying idle, using his unemployed capital in purchasing outstanding obligations. Who questions the wisdom of purchasing the immature notes or bonds and thereby stopping the accumulation of interest, rather than allow the money to go unused while the interest accumulated?

As evidence of the proper use of the surplus which President Cleveland's Administration allowed to accumulate, the following statement of the public debt is made:

	Public debt.
June 30, 1889	$1,640,673,340.23
December 31, 1893	963,605,917.13
Amount paid since June 30, 1889	677,067,423.10

If the public debt should be reduced at the same rate for ten years more it would be extinguished. If it is wrong to pay the debts of the Government with funds which are applicable for that purpose, then the Republicans committed a wrong. But if it is better that public money should be used to pay public debts instead of keeping it in the United States Treasury and certain favored national banks without interest, withholding the money from circulation while the interest on the debt was accumulating, then the Republicans did right and the Democrats did wrong.

ENGLAND AND FREE TRADE.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] made an elaborate speech in favor of the free-trade doctrine. He followed the line of argument used by political economists who have written from the European standpoint. And while all must concede his eloquence I doubt if any will concede the soundness of his argument when applied to the United States.

It must not be overlooked that England is many centuries old, while the United States is but little over a century. England only abolished her protective tariff in 1846. The conditions in England, when she repealed her protective tariff laws, were very dissimilar to those of the United States now. England had a vast population to be supplied with food, and the agricultural resources of the country were insufficient to afford the necessary supplies.

The people were starving for food because of its scarcity and high price. Large quantities of supplies were yearly imported and the protective duties on farm products made the cost enormous. A nation whose people do not produce sufficient breadstuffs for her own consumption, can not afford to impose a tariff on breadstuffs.

But such is not our condition. This country not only produces enough for home consumption, but exports to England and other European countries large quantities of agricultural products, the value of which last year amounted to $200,000,000. There is no necessity for importing food supplies to the United States, because our farmers are able to supply the demand at very low prices.

Our people never complain because food is scarce or high, but because they can not find employment whereby they can earn money with which to buy what the markets afford. The present time is an example of this fact. There is no scarcity of food in the United States. The prices are lower than they have been for years, but the working people are actually suffering for enough to eat.

But England could not stop with the repeal of the "corn laws," as the laws protecting agricultural commodities were called. England is the richest and greatest manufacturing country in the world. The demand for wool, cotton, and almost every article required in her manufacturing industries is far beyond the resources of that country. England is compelled to go into other countries to get needed supplies. It is from absolutely selfish motives that England has accepted free trade. She could not afford to tax imported commodities which could not be produced or obtained at home.

The product of the English forge and loom are largely in excess of the home demand. The manufacturers are compelled to find foreign markets for their merchandise. The United States is the best market, and if they could have substantially free admission to the ports of this country they would supply our people with the fruits of their looms. Is it surprising, then, that the English people desire free trade with the United States? If they could undersell our manufactures, as they could under a tariff for revenue only, and crush our manufacturing industries, they would have achieved a victory over our people more disastrous than the devastations and sufferings incident to war.

It is, therefore, not surprising that the importers of foreign merchandise and commodities should ally themselves with the free traders of other countries. And it is not strange that there should be many merchants in the great cities who desire free and untrammeled commerce with the world. It is most natural that the interests at stake should induce free traders to use their best endeavors to influence the American Congress to enact such laws as will redound to their benefit. I, for one, will not yield to the demand. I will not sacrifice the interests of our people for the benefit of foreigners. I will not consent to transfer any of the industries of the United States to foreign shores. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is argued by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] that it is better to receive in exchange for American exports an equal quantity of foreign goods and merchandise than to receive gold therefor. I think this argument is fallacious. The only accumulations to the wealth of the United States is what is received for our surplus. If, therefore, we can produce and manufacture all that our own people need in woolen and cotton fabrics, and other goods, we shall provide work for millions of men and women, who in turn become consumers of our products; and there will be no necessity for large importations.

What we produce and manufacture in excess of our home demands will go abroad in exchange for gold, and the gold will come to stay, because it is in exchange for our surplus; and there will be no demand for its return. By this means the drain upon American gold would cease and our financial condition be strengthened. It is like a man who has produced more than is necessary for the support of himself and family, and with his surplus paid his expenses and debts, and had something to add to his bank account. It is something added to his wealth, and can be invested in new enterprises.

REPUBLICANS.

I fully recognize the fact that the Republican minority of this House are powerless to avert the danger which is threatening the welfare of the American people. But, conscious of my duty as a member of this Congress, I desire to enter my protest against the consummation of this foul deed.

If the majority on this floor shall not heed the avenging cloud which already darkens the sky of the Democratic party; if they are insensible to public opinion and deaf to the entreaties of the great army of the unemployed; if they do not see American capital lying idle because of distrust and fear; if they are unmindful of the impending and inevitable evils which will surely follow the legislation contrived in this bill, then there is no way out of

these perilous times except to bring back to power the grand old party which saved the nation in war, and is equal to the task of saving the Republic in times of peace.

The question is asked, "What would the Republican party do if restored to power?" Why such a question? It is well understood what it would do. It would assure the American producers of a home market for their products. It would afford the American manufacturers such protection as would enable them to fairly compete with foreign manufacturers and employ American workmen at living wages. It would guarantee to American laborers plenty of work at American prices. It would identify the interests of all classes of people with each other, so that producers, manufacturers, and laborers would contribute to the welfare of each other and to the growth and prosperity of this great country of ours.

The Republican party was conceived in liberty and, although born in a time of adversity and amidst the threatenings of war, it never hesitated to espouse the cause of the people or faltered in its devotion to the Union.

It survived the perils of war and preserved the nation to future generations as the richest heritage ever bequeathed to men. And although that splendid party—proud of its achievements in peace and in war—has doubtless made some mistakes, it can never be said of the Republican party that it was ever, either on land or water or upon the islands of the sea, guilty of dishonoring the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have occupied more time than I expected would be allowed me, and I wish to express my thanks for the favor.

And now, in conclusion, I may be allowed to express the hope that in some way the machinations of the so-called "tariff reformers" may be thwarted and the fabric of the Republic may not be endangered and the interests of our people jeopardized by any such hostile legislation as is proposed in this bill.

I would that the beneficent system which has afforded protection to the industries of this country for so many years, and enabled our people to develop the resources of the Republic beyond all description, might not be stricken down by the ruthless hands of Democracy. Such marvelous growth and prosperity was never known in the world. Mountains have yielded their precious ores and the valleys their rich minerals; the forests have been converted into habitations for man, and the wildernes made tributary to civilization.

The sons and daughters of New England and the older States have followed the trend of civilization westward, and carried with them to the Pacific slope that intelligence and energy which have made the splendor of the West the wonder of the world. And, although there is now unprecedented want and suffering all over the land among those who have found it impossible to get work, who can doubt, if protection can again be assured, we shall see the fires of the furnaces and shops rekindled and their smoke ascending to the sky, and again hear the hum of machinery and the chorus of the anvil and the hammer, accompanied with the vocal glee of human voices, ringing out Democratic stagnation and starvation and ringing in Republican confidence and prosperity; when the roof of every home in the land shall afford shelter to contented and happy families, when the rudest table shall be laden with the necessaries and comforts of life, and when American textiles, made of American wool, by American workmen, under protection to American labor, shall abundantly clothe every man, woman, and child within the limits of this, the freest and best Government on the face of the earth? [Great applause.]

[Mr. HALL of Minnesota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. PATTERSON addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. HAINES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. BARTHOLDT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I had not anticipated taking part in the debate in progress before the Committee of the Whole, nor should I at this time if by so doing it would delay for a moment the vote on the pending measure, but as it will not, I feel that I owe it to my constituents and myself to make an explanation of my position, and in the time allotted to me I shall endeavor to do so.

Under our form of Government the burdens and favors, the responsibilities and privileges, occasioned by our laws should, as far as possible, be equally divided, for upon this and the principle that laws should be enacted so that the most good will result to the greatest number of our people, is the very corner stone of our Government and the spirit which controlled our fathers in framing the Constitution. In no one thing have these been so departed from as in the matter under consideration, for under the present system of tariff laws the burdens fall upon one class while the privileges go to another who do not share in the responsibilities.

This is no new question springing upon us unawares, for its discussion has entered more or less into the politics of our country since the adoption of our Constitution, but it has in the last decade been more prominently brought before the people than ever before, and has been discussed in almost every schoolhouse in our country, until every child is possessed of some knowledge of customs taxation.

The two great political parties in national convention in 1892 made an issue on this question so plain that no one could be mistaken as to the position of either, and upon that issue more than all others they went to the country asking the suffrage of the voters for their respective sides. The two leaders put forward had, by their past records and utterances, left no room for doubt in the mind of any voter as to the policy to be pursued after the election by either of them, and all felt perfectly secure in the assurance that each would use all the power at his command to enforce the principle which was represented in their respective platforms upon this question.

Our Republican friends then asserted, and still say, that it is right for the Government to make tariff laws for the protection of industries whose wares come into competition with those of foreign countries, with the revenue derived therefrom as a mere incident thereto; while the Democrats took, and still maintain the position that it was not right to use the taxing power for any other purpose than that of raising revenue to meet the necessary expenses of the Government, economically administered. Upon this issue the Democratic party was triumphant, elected its candidate, and returned to this House a large majority, and, while I am aware that surroundings, education, and interests had much to do with molding men's opinions, and that prejudices, formed and deep-seated, blind some to their own interests, I nevertheless have often wondered that the Democratic majority was not larger. That wonder ceases when I hear men of intelligence and standing hold forth in this hall in commendation of a system that taxes the many for the benefit of the few, and assert that it is just to tax men's necessities instead of their possessions.

In listening to these speeches one is, however, able to discover the "milk in the cocoanut" of the argument of gentlemen who believe in "protection for protection's sake." Each speaker championing the system—and I am sorry to say some who call themselves Democrats are numbered among that class—seems to imagine that some particular industry located in his section ought to have the fostering care given to, and the bounty of the Government showered upon, it, demonstrating that it is local benefits more than general good that prompts many to advocate protection and insist on its continuance.

Our Republican friends, judging from the stand taken during this debate, have learned but little from the lesson taught them when this issue was presented to the people for decision, and some of them seem to think that that result was a mistake which occurred through the ignorance of the voter; but let me assure them that they are in error, and that the people who are engaged in the vast industries of this country that are without the pale of this system of Government gifts have gained information on this subject, and the day will never again come when they can be induced by appeals to their prejudices to lend their aid to this system which has so nearly "impoverished" them. They realize that a tax, instead of being a blessing, is an evil, and should only be permitted on the ground that it brings compensatory benefits, and when it fails of this purpose it should be abolished. They are willing to be taxed in the shape of duties on imports for the purpose of raising revenue for the expenses of the Government, but never again will a majority of this people by their votes countenance this system when used, not as a revenue measure, but to enrich the few at their expense, which no reasonable man can deny is the case under the law sought to be repealed by this bill.

The people have paid dearly for the lesson, but they have learned it well. No clap-trap of the British flag character or by appeals to their prejudices on sectional questions will again delude the sturdy farmers and workmen of the North and West; for while experience is an expensive school, it is nevertheless a good one, and they have there had their training. Our people realize that it is poor consolation to be informed that in paying $50 for goods that should have been purchased for $25 that the other $25 has gone into the pockets of their neighbor; and when they are told that when the tax wall is lowered England will flood us with cheap goods they are not alarmed at this "terrible" prospect, as they were once upon a time.

True it is, there are some like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] who really believe that a consignment of goods shipped from England and given to our people would be a misfortune, but the number who think thus is becoming smaller every day, and doubtless the gentleman will soon have the field to himself. Nor can the prophesy, so often made upon this floor, that when this tariff wall is down the foreigners will control our markets and drive our manufacturers out, after which they will put up the prices of goods, frighten any one, for they know that whenever a business is

profitable it will be engaged in, and with the resources at hand it takes but a day to build and equip a factory or a shop.

History has shed light upon this question. As early as 1812, during our war with England, when the ports of France were blockaded and foreign commerce nearly entirely destroyed, industries sprung into existence to an extent never equaled since in the same length of time, even when the means of accomplishing that work were as different from what they are now as a rivulet is from a mighty river. Men have ceased to think it a disgrace to be known as free traders; they have learned the fact that the natural inclination and desire of every man is to buy where he can buy the cheapest and to sell where he can get the most for his wares, and anyone who would trade upon any other policy would surely come to insolvency. If this is the correct principle for a man to pursue, why is it not right for a company, a town, a State, and a nation? But protection reverses this rule, and compels the majority of the people to sell in open market of the world and to purchase in a protected one.

It is proven by reliable statistics that there are engaged in gainful occupations in the United States, in round numbers, 17,000,000 people; of this number 850,000 are engaged in occupations that are protected by our system of tariff taxation—a number equal to 5 per cent of the entire number; so, admitted for the sake of argument that all those engaged in or about protected industries are benefited, yet 95 per cent are made to suffer so that the 5 per cent may prosper. Is it fair that twenty men pay tribute to one in order that he may become rich and opulent so that he may endow libraries, grant large benefactions to science and art, for his own aggrandizement? For that is what it means at its very best.

In view of this tribute-paying is it strange that wealth has been accumulated by a few while the many have grown poorer?

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Will my colleague allow me to make a suggestion there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. It is contended by the gentlemen from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and other gentlemen on the other side that if labor would organize it would be able to extort from capitalists who now get the benefit of protection their proper share of the profit that should go to the laboring people.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. I will deal with that fully further on in my remarks.

And yet we are told that protection is for the benefit of labor, and we are pointed to the fact that wages are higher here than in England where they have practically free trade. Granted that wages are higher here than there, does that prove that it is caused by protection? If so, how will our friends reconcile this with the fact that wages are equally greater there than they are in Germany, France or Italy, where the system of protection prevails? An Englishman with as much reason, and I think far more, could say that free trade makes high wages, and in proof of his assertion points to Germany, France, and Italy. I think he might make the same statement with more reason, for England is more nearly like Germany and France in point of population, ownership of the soil, and form of government than either of them is like the United States. Different conditions exist here from what obtain in England. It has a dense population, and consequently a greater competition in the labor market, which, indeed, is the real medium by which wages are fixed.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. May I interrupt my colleague at that point?

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I wanted to suggest to him that there are 498 people to the square mile in England and Wales, 224 to the square mile in Germany, 187 to the square mile in France, and only 21 people to the square mile in the United States, or the population of England and Wales is 22 times as dense to the square mile as it is in the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. And I say, further, right here, that the entire population of the United States could be placed in the single State of Texas and yet it would not be as dense as it is in England to-day.

And again, we have an almost boundless agricultural country where the lands are owned by the many; there the titled few possess the real estate; our workmen are better and our genius for invention is more marked, and an evidence of this is shown when a comparison is made of the amount paid for piecework in this country and in England. It will be found that if anything the amount received by the English skilled workman is greater than that received by our own, which proves after all that wages are not far different when you consider the amount of work accomplished.

Our protection friends ask that the owners of industries be made the trustees for their workmen, and assert that the tribute given them by the Government is in turn paid to their employés. The facts do not support this assertion, and it is shown to be untrue, and is even contrary to the rules of common sense.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOHNSON] put it correctly when he said that a protectionist forgets that he is a trustee when employing his men and takes the one who will work for the least money, and has a free trade market to select from. It is false to say that tariff benefits labor, when the ports are open for competition to come in from every country upon the globe free and untrammeled. There is no protection for the laborer except organized intelligence and qualification in his branch of business. No protected baron is going to pay $2 per day for labor when he can get those equally skilled and able to perform the work for $1 per day. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE,] admits that the trades union is the only force given to the workingman by which the employer is compelled to keep faith with his employés and the Government, and yet we see every day those very trades unions forced to the wall by accumulated wealth, and when they demand a share in the bounty of the Government, granted upon the theory that it was for their benefit, they are driven from the workshops and their places given to others, or the works shut down and the workmen left to starve.

But we need not resort to theories to prove the falsity of the claim that the workingmen are benefited by a high tariff in an increase of wages, as we have too many practical illustrations to the contrary. Never in the history of our Government, not even during the war, were import duties higher than under the operations of the McKinley law; and where did wages advance, in what line of industry? For every one that any protectionist will show me, I will point out 100 where wages have been reduced, while everything he has had to buy to clothe himself and family has advanced, and this state of affairs has continued ever since the enactment of that law until to-day; we find our laboring classes without employment or means with which to buy food to sustain life. We are told by gentlemen on the other side that this deplorable state of affairs has been caused by the effort of the Democratic party to reduce the tariff; this certainly is a poor commentary upon their boasted system of protection.

If after thirty years of receiving tribute they are unable to stand up against even an attempt to take away a portion of their bounty it is better by far that these industries had never existed, and if anything is proven by this it is that in many instances even the beneficiaries are injured by protection, as the system fosters unhealthy growth and creates unproductive labor. A business that can not thrive without Government aid had better go down, for it is unproductive of good to anyone. Better for the employer and the employé to engage in business that is self-supporting and not dependent upon Government aid for existence.

The condition of the American workingman should be far better than it is, and it would be if this system of protection were abolished, for in this country we have naturally an immense advantage over every other country on the face of the globe, no luxurious royalty or titled pensioners, comparatively no standing army or navy, or other great drain of like character on our revenues; we are practically free from these, and yet thousands of honest and industrious men are driven to soup-houses to sustain life, while those who have made fortunes from this hard labor are surrounded by every luxury with the money that was given to them ostensibly for the purpose of benefiting those men who are now begging for bread.

Someone said upon this floor last week that 25,000 men owned one-half of all the wealth in this country, and that statement has not been contradicted. All wealth being the product of labor and laboring being energy expended in producing wealth, imagine how the faces of the workingmen have been ground in gathering together these vast fortunes in a few hands. Is it any wonder that three months enforced idleness drives them to penury and want? If a fair division of these Government benefactions had been made this condition of affairs would not exist. But again upon the question of wages, that gentlemen talk so much about as they pose here as the champions of labor, they would have us believe that there is uniformity of wages in this country, when everyone must know that this statement is untrue. Our own observation, as well as statistics, teaches us that there are differences in amounts paid to the same class of labor, even in adjoining States, and in many industries the difference in wages in different localities of the United States is greater than between that which is paid in this country and Europe as a whole. And more, it is even seen that in the unprotected industries it frequently occurs that wages are higher than in the protected ones. When a man is seeking work, he is not asked what will be required to support his family, but what can he do and how much work can he perform; it is what he accomplishes that is considered and not his personal needs.

There is little doubt but what there are products that can and and always will be made cheaper abroad than here, and for us to tax ourselves in order to make some home manufacturer equal to some one abroad is ridiculous and absurd. Better confine ourselves to those branches of business in which we have an advantage over all the rest of the world; then our wages will necessarily be higher, our output more productive, and our laborers will not be compelled to rely on Government aid for a continuance of employment.

Unquestionably, most, if not all, of the things we import can be made here—some of them at loss—and our Republican friends tell us that it is right and proper that a tariff high enough should be placed upon all to make it profitable here, thus placing the burden upon the consumer of that article to build up an industry that can only

be maintained at the expenses of the people. They tell us that these industries will soon be self-supporting and Government aid could then be withdrawn. Whoever heard of a protected industry consenting to an abolition of the tariff? No man who lives. Let even a proposition of that kind be made and the country is besieged with circulars, money is expended, every influence brought to bear, every energy exerted by the owners of these protected industries to defeat any measure tending to even a reduction of these benefactions.

The first tariff law that passed in this country, in 1789, was intended by its promoters to run seven years to assist infant industries. Instead of seven, its duration was twenty-seven years, and when altered it was but to increase it. Ever since that time until the present, protectionists have been crying for assistance to infant industries, notwithstanding several generations have passed away.

In 1844 the election was fought on somewhat similar issues to those which obtained in 1892. At that time the country was in a similar situation to that in which we find ourselves to-day. The beneficiaries of the tariff and their champions were overwhelmed and a system of tariff for revenue was inaugurated that made our country bloom like a rose and prosper as it had never done before. The country increased in population and prosperity; our merchant marine grew in magnificent proportions on the high seas and became the wonder of the world.

With the enactment of the Morrill tariff, and its kindred measures since passed, that prosperity has gradually vanished, and our merchant marine has been wiped from existence. Our great staples, wheat and cotton, under the restrictive policy of these measures, find no markets, and as the tariff has increased they have declined in price until they can not be produced at a cost exceeding the amount obtained in the market when offered for sale, and that price is regulated by a country which will not buy from us if she can procure elsewhere, and who can blame her people for so doing? England retaliates, not by placing a tariff upon our wheat, corn, cotton, and beef products, for she well knows that that would be simply making the price of those commodities dearer to her people; but by her assistance competitors have been brought into the field against us and have forced us to accept lower prices for all these products, and this at the expense of the producer of these articles, who bears the burden without having received any of the benefits from our system of tariff laws.

England for two hundred years tried the protective system, and how similar in some respects was her condition under its operations to ours at the present time? She saw her merchant marine driven from the high seas and her wealth amassed in a few hands, vast sums of money being used to elect men favorable to that system; lobbyists besieged Parliament, and the use of money was even resorted to to secure champions in that body. Brave men who had their country's interests at heart came to the front and these evils were eradicated by the abolition of the protective system.

Our Republican friends underestimate the intelligence of the producer of farm products when they attempt to delude him further in support of protection by telling him he is given a home market, for he has learned by experience that when more is produced than consumed home market is a delusion and a snare, and that what should be a blessing—large and abundant crops—actually becomes a curse, for that remaining, after home consumption is supplied, is actually used to force down the price of the entire product. Nor will farmers be longer hoodwinked by a tariff on wheat, for they know that when the product exceeds the home demand, which is always the case with this staple, he must seek a market abroad, where he sells against all competitors.

And he knows also that the price of his product is fixed not by New York, Baltimore, or Chicago, but by the markets of London, and that when he sells in that market, taking the price paid there, he knows he is denied the privilege of bringing goods that he and his neighbors wear back with him, for the reason that if permitted so to do that the manufacturer of merchandise in this country would be injured thereby. And he further knows that to-day he could obtain in goods which he is compelled to have for his own and his family's comfort an amount equal to $1 per bushel for his wheat, based on English prices; but under existing conditions for his bushel of wheat, whether sold at home or abroad, he receives but 60 cents, and with that 60 cents can buy but 37 cents worth of unprotected clothing.

Nature has done much for the State that I in part have the honor to represent on this floor. We have a genial climate and a fertile soil that produces like a garden, giving to us large returns in crops for the labor expended in cultivation. In the district I represent we raise enough wheat to supply two States like Indiana with breadstuff, and with proper legislation, equitable laws, and unrestricted markets, would outrank any State in New England in its wealth per capita. As it is, the man who relies on this industry alone does well if he realizes any interest on his investment, and those who are in debt must deny themselves even the comforts of life to pay the interest on the mortgages which cover their homesteads. These people have come to know the cause of all this and are demanding that they have a fair chance in life's battle, and with the help of the Democratic majority in this Congress I think I can safely promise that they will receive, if not all that they ask, at least enough for them to be able to see the promised land beyond which in due time they will occupy.

We are told that clothing is cheaper than it was formerly and that this is due to the tariff. If this be true, why are goods also cheap abroad? Yea, cheaper than here? This condition is not due to the tariff, but is due to better facilities for their manufacture, made so by the inventive genius of man, where one machine in many instances is made to perform the work of 50 men. Is it any wonder that goods are cheapened? They are cheaper, and would be cheaper still were it not for the opportunities given manufacturers by the tariff to keep up prices and control the output. Under its provisions they are able to, and do, form trusts and combinations, which a prominent Republican said "were private affairs" for the purpose of adding to the cost an amount nearly equal to the custom duty on the article, thereby preventing importation as well as demanding from the consumer more than a just equivalent for the article sold, and also preventing a supply greater than the demand—a privilege not accorded to our farmer friends. This is particularly true in the case of woolens, for with free wool and our present facilities for manufacture there is no nation upon the globe that can make this class of goods cheaper than we can, as has been fully demonstrated many times upon this floor.

There are several industries, it is true, that have been brought into existence by the protective laws that no doubt are being operated at little or no profit, and in all probabilities never will.

We can never hope to equalize ourselves with all nations. Our climate and conditions are different. What can be produced cheaply in one country might be impossible, or at least impracticable, in another, and therefore the very laws of nature sanction an exchange of commodities between nations, and surely it is no compliment to Americans to say we are not capable of making good bargains in the open market in the way of barter, and that for our protection we must confine ourselves to a home market. This is too narrow a rule for the people of this great and growing country to follow. It is only by trade that we can enrich ourselves, and when the opportunity to trade is abridged the ability to accumulate is weakened.

We have wheat, corn, cotton, and meat of a better quality and a greater quantity than is raised elsewhere, to trade for other commodities; why should we be prevented from doing it, to our loss generally and to the ruin of our agricultural classes? Let all hothouse industries go to the wall; we will be the gainer by it, for new markets will thereby be opened for the products of our farms, which under the present system have been so discriminated against.

I have listened anxiously throughout this entire debate for some protectionist to inform us what benefit the grain raiser of the West has derived from the McKinley tariff, but no one has done more than to attempt to deny that Mr. Blaine had said that the McKinley law would not make a market for another barrel of pork or a bushel of grain; but whether he made the statement or not, no evidence has been offered here to prove that it was not substantially true.

The protective system received a fatal blow at the hands of our Republican friends when they removed the duty from sugar, for it gave to the people a practical illustration of the sweets of free trade on one of the necessaries of life, and clearly demonstated to them how they were being robbed year by year by the tariff system. This lesson was further illustrated by the granting of a bounty to the sugar interests, which, while to my mind is less objectionable, its unfairness is to the ordinary person more apparent, and is easily seen to be an outrage upon other interests not similarly favored. For my part I am at a loss to know why the Vermont maple-sugar producer, or the Louisiana cane-grower, can consistently ask that the wheat and corn interests of my district should be taxed to pay them a bounty on their product. But of the two systems, tariff or bounty, I much prefer the latter, as we then know exactly what we are required to pay, while by the former we give without knowing how much is contributed.

When we give to a charitable object we all like to have the privilege of saying how much we shall give. For my part I do not favor either bounty or a protective tariff, and shall vote to abolish both. All this country needs is fair trade and liberal dealing with all nations. Our geographical position, our productive soil, and temperate climate, together with our large area of arable land that yields abundantly a great diversity of products, and to which famine never comes, give us an advantage over all other nations on the face of the globe; and there is no reason why this people, with the organized intelligence possessed by them, should not commercially rule the earth by land and sea. All that we can produce might find a ready market abroad, but for this unfair, selfish, and narrow policy. Existing conditions can in part be remedied, and the Democratic party has undertaken the task of accomplishing that result.

I am convinced that if the bill now under consideration becomes a law, it will do much toward giving our people a fair price for their products and leave in the hands of labor a fair share of its earnings, and will pave the way to better things and ultimately correct the abuses that have grown up under the policy of protection. I shall vote for it with pleasure, and feel that I am not only doing my duty by the people I represent but also my duty to my country. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, the American protective principle is older than our Government. It found a deep lodgment in several of the original colonies and was advocated for the avowed purpose of providing, by the encouragement of manufactures and coastwise commerce, other employment than agriculture for a part of the people, thus furnishing home supplies for a home market; but as such efforts were local and not national, and as each colony sought its own immediate advancement rather than the prosperity of all, the result was necessarily unsatisfactory.

Therefore practical free trade cast its blight over the colonies, and when they became free and sovereign States they remained dependent upon England for nearly everything the soil did not produce. To add to the financial misfortunes of the time, resulting largely from the repressive trade regulations enforced for years by England from which, at last, they were free by treaty, but not in fact, they were jealous each of the other, and would unite in no general government clothed with sufficient power to legislate upon questions of finance or of taxation, their union being little better than a defensive league among independent States, each carefully reserving "every power, jurisdiction, and right * * * not expressly delegated." So that period of our history known as "Under the Confederacy," despite the efforts and warnings of the most sagacious men of the time who advocated the wisdom and necessity of protection, was a season of unrestrained free trade. The result is well known and beyond dispute.

Of it Webster says:

From the close of the war of the Revolution there came a period of depression and distress on the Atlantic coast such as the people had hardly felt during the sharpest crisis of the war itself. Shipowners, shipbuilders, mechanics, artisans, all were destitute of employment, and some of them destitute of bread. British ships came freely, and British ships came plentifully; while to American ships and American products there was neither protection on the one side, nor the equivalent of reciprocal free trade on the other. The cheaper labor of England supplied the inhabitants of the Atlantic shores with everything. Ready-made clothes among the rest, from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet, were for sale in every city.

From 1783 to 1789 were sad years for those who had achieved their political, but not their financial, independence.

Our people paid their money to English manufacturers for foreign goods and it became scarce at home.

The products of the country were sold at prices which were disappointing to the farmer and brought little relief to the country. Everywhere there were discouragement and discontent and want and distress, refusing to leave, were unwelcome guests in many a household. Only a limited quantity of the most ordinary and coarsest manufactures were produced here.

Large shipments of foreign goods imported without the payment of duties from well-established factories destroyed the domestic manufactures and mechanical employments which nonconsumption agreements and the war had created and temporarily sustained. Such is the brief record of the only purely free-trade era in this country. No one denies that it was a period of personal suffering and financial dishonor. To escape from it nearly all the wise and patriotic men of the time advocated the formation of a government which could "lay and collect duties and regulate commerce," and thus restrain importations.

Upon this point Washington said:

The promotion of domestic manufactures will, in my conception, be among the first consequences which may naturally be expected to flow from an energetic government. I propose to demonstrate the sincerity of my opinion on this subject by the uniformity of my practice in giving a decided preference to the products and fabrics of America whenever it may be done without involving unreasonable expense or very great inconvenience.

The Constitution having been adopted and elections held, the House of Representatives, a quorum being secured, elected its Speaker on the first day of April, 1789. The Constitution was then new, and in this first Congress there were sixteen who were members of the convention which framed the Constitution, and many others who were in the conventions of the States which ratified it. It will be remembered also that Washington, who presided over the constitutional convention, was President of the new Republic.

Under these circumstances, if protection is "a fraud," and if the Federal Government "has no constitutional power" to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, as the latter-day Democrats assert, would not these patriotic men then in and out of Congress, who prepared, discussed, and promulgated the Constitution, have prevented its perversion or desecration in the very first months of its practical existence and at the beginning of the Government under its provisions? And if they had been false to the trust reposed in them, would not the people have demanded that the charter of their liberties be respected? Let the records of that hour tell their patriotic story. The first petition ever presented to the National House of Representatives was for protection and the preferment of home labor.

The Journal of the House gives this account of it:

Saturday April 11, 1789.

A petition of the tradesmen, manufacturers, and others, of the town of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, whose names are thereunto subscribed, was presented to the House and read, stating certain matters, and praying an imposition of such duties on all foreign articles which can be made in America, as will give a just and decided preference to the labors of the petitioners, and that there may be granted to them, in common with the other manufacturers and mechanics of the United States, such relief as in the wisdom of Congress may appear proper.

Such was the first appeal of the people to their representatives in Congress, and the second petition came, not from Philadelphia, where many manufactories were established, but from the later home of free trade and nullification, the city of Charleston, in South Carolina. The House Journal records it as follows:

Monday, April 13, 1789.

A petition of the shipwrights of the city of Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, was presented to the House and read, stating the distress they are in from the decline of that branch of business, and the present situation of the trade of the United States, and praying that the wisdom and policy of the National Legislature may be directed to such measures in a general regulation of trade and the establishment of a proper navigation act as will tend to relieve the particular distresses of the petitioners, and in common with them, those of their fellow-shipwrights throughout the United States.

And the next general petition presented by the people to their Representatives in Congress was from the city of New York, and is given by the Journal as follows:

Saturday, April 18, 1789.

A petition of the mechanics and manufacturers of the city of New York, whose names are hereunto subscribed, was presented to the House and read, setting forth that in the present deplorable state of trade and manufactures they look with confidence to the operations by the new Government for a restoration of both, and that relief which they have so long and anxiously desired; that they have subjoined a list of such articles as can be manufactured in the State of New York, and humbly pray the countenance and attention of the National Legislature thereto

These petitions were each referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and were given careful public consideration.

What response did Congress make to these early, varied, and persistent demands of the people? Did that first Congress, elected by those who adopted the Constitution, tell them that protection is a fraud and unconstitutional, or did it insist that it should be incidental only, and suggest that it should be accidental as well that the Constitution be not strained, or did they speak in honeyed though deceitful words of the beauties and virtues of tariff reform?

Let the statutes of the United States give their effective answer.

The first law enacted by Congress prescribed the official oath for Government officers. It was an essential incident of the new order of things, and could not be delayed. The next act of Congress was a tariff law framed according to the wishes of the people, and reported by Madison. It passed the House by a vote of more than five to one and the Senate unanimously, and was approved by Gen. Washington.

That there might be no mistake in this regard the statute is introduced by a preamble in these words:

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

Washington in his annual message for 1796, said:

Congress has repeatedly and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.

The Democratic party of to-day is in danger of being committed by its leaders in this House to the policy of raising revenue by internal taxation rather than by the exaction of duties upon imports.

They claim to be Jeffersonian Democrats, but, as in a majority of their claims and assertions, they are not sustained by the facts of history or the opinions of the fathers of the Republic.

Let us see what Jefferson thought on this point. In his message to Congress in 1801, he said:

Weighing all probabilities of expense, as well as of income, there is reasonable ground of confidence that we may now safely dispense with all the internal taxes.

And in his second inaugural address he uses this language:

The suppression of unnecessary offices, of useless establishments and expenses, enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes. These, covering our land with officers and opening our doors to their intrusion, had already begun that process of domiciliary vexation, which, once entered, is scarcely to be restrained from reaching successively every article of produce and property. * * * The remaining revenue on the consumption of foreign articles is paid cheerfully by those who can afford to add foreign luxuries to domestic comforts, being collected on our seaboard and frontiers only and incorporated with the transactions of our mercantile citizens, it may be the pleasure and the pride of an American to ask, What farmer, what mechanic, what laborer ever sees a tax-gatherer of the United States?

And in his sixth and eighth annual messages, the income from the then existing tariff laws being in excess of the public needs, he recommended that the surplus revenue be expended in the improvement of roads, canals, and rivers, for public education, and other great foundations of prosperity and union, rather than that the tariff should be discontinued.

Is not this a worthy precedent for the degenerate Democracy of this day, when the revenue now collected from all sources is insufficient to meet current expenses, and the Secretary of the Treasury announces that it is necessary to increase the bonded debt of the nation to pay the demands upon the Treasury, and that the exigency is so great that he takes the responsibility, Congress being in session, to issue bonds to supplement the decreasing revenues, under an authority to prepare and provide for the redemption of legal-tender notes which has remained in "innocuous desuetude" for more than fifteen years, his party at the same time proposing to reduce the revenue from customs at the rate of $75,000,000 per annum, and to destroy the manufactures dependent upon the existing tariff, apparently for no better purpose than to substitute therefor, for

the benefit of no one, the very internal-revenue taxes which Jefferson deprecated?

How many of the Democrats on this floor, or anywhere, who support the Administration are willing to sustain Jefferson in his patriotic assertion of genuine Americanism when he wrote:

My idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw material.

Are the Democrats of this House and those who elected them the followers of Jefferson, or are the Republicans of to-day more nearly in accord with the true historic principles of that great party-leader and statesman?

Let the Democrats who have rejoiced in the thought that they were Jeffersonian Democrats carefully review the present situation, and they will discover that their party has abandoned its early principles, and that it now stands for the reverse of those grand doctrines upon which it endeared itself to the working men and women of America, and that instead of being the defenders of our manufactures, commerce and business prosperity, they are the open allies of England, our perpetual commercial enemy, and that there is rejoicing throughout Great Britain whenever the Democratic party gains a political victory.

Generally each succeeding tariff act, prior to 1812, increased the duties to be collected, and when war became necessary Congress doubled the existing duties and added 10 per cent upon importations in foreign bottoms. During the first quarter century of our national life no prominent public man was a free trader, and all of them whom the American people love and venerate were pronounced in their advocacy of protection.

Madison, ever watchful of the rights of the people, was a careful student of the Constitution and personally had full knowledge of the intent of the people in adopting it. His opinions upon constitutional questions are therefore of great value and entitled not only to the most careful consideration, but may be regarded as of the highest authority.

In view of the fact that the Democratic party in its platform of 1892 denounced the existing tariff laws "as a fraud" and "a robbery" and further declared "it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Goverment has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only," it may be interesting to consider his views regarding protection. They are fully expressed in his writings. As late as 1828 he wrote:

That the encouragement of manufactures was an object of the power to regulate trade is proved by the use made of the power for that object in the first session of the First Congress under the Constitution, when among the members present were so many who had been members of the Federal Convention which framed the Constitution and of the State conventions which ratified it; each of these classes consisting also of members who had opposed and who had espoused the Constitution in its actual form.

A further evidence in support of the constitutional power to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade, an evidence that ought of itself to settle the question, is the uniform and practical sanction given to the power by the General Government. * * *

* * * No novel construction, however ingeniously devised or however respectable and patriotic its patrons, can withstand the weight of such authorities or the unbroken current of so prolonged and universal a practice.

And upon another occasion he said:

Every President, from Gen. Washington to Mr. J. Q. Adams inclusive, has recognized the power of a tariff in favor of manufactures, without indicating a doubt, or that a doubt existed anywhere.

And again:

A nation leaving its foreign trade in all cases to regulate itself might soon find it regulated by other nations into a subserviency to a foreign interest.

And again, in 1832:

It appears from the debates in the House of Representatives (those in the Senate not having been taken) that not a doubt was started of the power of Congress to impose duties on imports for the encouragement of domestic manufactures. It is not unworthy of farther notice, that propositions of that character were made by three members from Virginia; by one of a duty on coals, in favor of her coal pits; by another of a duty on hemp, to encourage the growth of the article; and by a third, a prohibition on beef, in favor of American graziers; a duty being proposed at the same time by a member from South Carolina on hemp, as a proper encouragement to the culture of that article in the suitable soil and climate of that State. None of these propositions appear to have had revenue in view; and that as to beef, of course, excluded revenue. If any doubt on the point of constitutionality had existed, these propositions, though not agreed to, could not have failed to call forth an expression of it.

After the close of the war of 1812 some of the people clamored for a reduction of taxation and claimed that the duties on imports were too high, and, as the people had suffered much during the war and the necessary expenses of the Government were less in time of peace, the low tariff act of 1816 was enacted to meet the popular demand. The panic of 1817 soon followed. After seven years of this low tariff Henry Clay was Speaker of the House and in a speech graphically described the then situation as follows:

The general distress which pervades the whole country is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native products; by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by successive unthrashed crops of grain perishing in our barns for want of market; by the alarming diminution of the circulation medium; by the universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labor; * * * and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of property in the nation, which has, on an average, sunk not less than about 50 per cent within a few years. * * * It is most painful for me to dwell on the gloom of this picture. But I have exaggerated nothing. Perfect fidelity to the original would have authorized me to throw on deeper and darker hues."

Col. Benton, of Missouri, portrayed in even more vivid language the suffering of the people at that time and stated their condition as follows:

No price for property or produce; no sales but those of the sheriff and the marshal; no purchasers at execution sales but the creditor or some hoarder of money; no employment for industry; no demand for labor; no sale for the products of the farm; no sound of the hammer but that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Stop laws, property laws, replevin laws, stay laws, loan-office laws, the intervention of the legislatures between the creditor and the debtor—this was the business of legislatures in three-fourths of the States of the Union. * * * Relief, the universal demand, thundered at the doors of all legislatures, State and Federal.

Relief did not come until the enactment of the tariff act of 1824, which was approved by President Monroe. In a preceding message he had said:

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

And again:

It may fairly be presumed that, under the protection given to domestic manufactures by the existing laws, we shall become, at no distant period, a manufacturing country on a large scale.

The protective tariff of 1824 received the support and votes of Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, James Buchanan, Thomas H. Benton, and other prominent Democrats, and their action was justified by the prosperity which followed.

The still more protective tariff of 1828 received the support of all of those distinguished gentlemen, then in Congress, and was approved by John Quincy Adams. This beneficent legislation was then, as now, resisted by those representing the discontent of nonmanufacturing localities, and soon the standard of nullification and treason was raised in South Carolina, and was as promptly suppressed by Andrew Jackson.

His views were well known prior to his election, for he had stated them as follows:

Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus products? Except for cotton he has neither a foreign nor a home market. Does not this clearly prove, when there is no market either at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture, and that the channels of labor should be multiplied? Common sense points out at once the remedy. Draw from agriculture the superabundant labor, employ it in mechanism and manufactures, thereby creating a home market for your breadstuffs, and distributing labor to a most profitable account, and benefits to the country will result. Take from agriculture in the United States 600,000 men, women, and children, and you at once give a home market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes us. In short, sir, we have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants.

It is time we should become a little more Americanized; and, instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of Europe, feed our own, or else in short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall all be paupers ourselves.

How strange it is that a party advocating practical free trade should regularly celebrate an anniversary in honor of Jackson, who was elected upon assurances which as distinctly affirmed the right of protection as the Republican platform of sixty years later, and who personally advocated the principles now held by the minority in this House. Certainly, if Jackson is the "patron saint" of modern Democracy, he has miserably degenerated since he was in the flesh. If he is to be judged by his words and acts in public life, if now living, he would be in hearty affiliation with the Republican party.

Notwithstanding there was no general sympathy with the action of South Corolina, it was decided to reduce the protective tariff by easy gradations to 20 per cent. This reduction led to the panic of 1837, in which the business of the whole country was demoralized, and many a business man, previously prosperous, bankrupted and reduced to penury and want.

The memory of those disastrous days has not vanished, and some of the older men on this floor could bear personal witness to the disasters and misery of that time.

Prosperity came under the tariff act of 1842, which was so popular that the Democratic party entered the next campaign as its avowed supporters. But, true to its natural instincts, that party abandoned the people and turned to the free-trade theories and principles of Great Britain.

It enacted the law of 1846, known as the "Walker tariff," which brought our country nearer to a free-trade basis than ever before under the Constitution. Various causes, not applicable to the country at this time, postponed for several years the disasters inherent in such legislation. Of this period of financial disaster President Fillmore, in his annual message of 1851, said:

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,000,000 in 1847 to $21,000,000 in 1851, with almost a certainty of a still further reduction in 1852. The policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand and raising the price of our agricultural products in foreign markets. The foregoing facts, however, seem to show, incontestibly, that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

This condition of affairs culminated in the panic of 1857. Every interest was prostrated. No one could paint a more dismal picture of the condition of the country than that given by President Buchanan, in his annual message for that year. He said:

With unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and the elements of natural wealth, our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is in a deplorable condition.

All these financial disorders occurred in a period of free trade and are officially certified by a President whose Democracy has never been challenged. Business prosperity came again under the stimulus of the Morrill tariff of 1861 and remained during and since the war of the rebellion, culminating, under the McKinley tariff, in the glorious commercial, mechanical, and manufacturing successes of 1892, to be followed, upon the return to power of the party which enacted the "Walker tariff," by a year of business depression greater than the American people endured at any time during the protection period of over thirty years which ended upon the 4th of March, last, and equaling in many respects the woes and ruin so accurately described by Presidents Fillmore and Buchanan.

This brief sketch of our tariff legislation teaches—

First. That our country has never prospered or working men and women been fully employed or well paid under a low or nonprotective tariff.

Second. That our country has never recovered from financial disaster following a low tariff until a protective tariff has been enacted.

Third. That the South has compelled the Democratic party to repeal protective tariffs and enact so-called revenue tariffs every time it secured control of the Government, for the reason that the Southern, which is the ruling part of that party, never has been favorable to free and independent labor.

Fourth. That the Democratic party has abandoned the principles held by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and other distinguished leaders, and has substituted therefor the free-trade theories of England, and that the Republican party is in accord with the policy and practice of the fathers of the Republic.

That these propositions are true may be emphasized by stating some general facts. In 1854, after eight years of experience under the Walker tariff, there was a soup house for the poor in every ward of New York City and thousands of unemployed laborers paraded the streets, demanding work that they might support themselves and their families. In 1892, after thirty years of protection, there was no public soup house in all this broad land and nowhere was any honest laborer, willing and able to work, without remunerative employment. In 1893, simply because the party pledged to the support of the principles of the tariff of 1846 is again in full control of the Government, there are in every large city public eating houses for the poor or organized relief corps for the distribution of charity, hundreds of thousands of able-bodied and willing wage-earners are without employment, and women and children suffering from hunger and cold.

Let us consider other facts.

In the State of New York in 1851 there was 1 pauper to each 24 inhabitants; in 1856, 1 to every 17 inhabitants, and in 1859, at the very close of this "golden era of tariff reform," there was 1 pauper to every 13¼ persons.

As the "reform" became more "golden" and venerable the number of paupers steadily increased.

Let us now look at the reverse picture in that State.

In 1890, after thirty years of protection, there was only 1 pauper to each 583 persons.

But some one may say that these periods are too brief to be reliable for statistics. Let us then turn to England and place her in comparison with the United States. No one claims that the number of paupers in England is less than 787,545, or one to each fifty persons. In the United States, by the last census, the number of paupers is 73,045, or one to each eight hundred and fifty persons, being by population seventeen times less than in free-trade England. Does this result prove that protection is "a fraud" and "a robbery" of the poor? It is also in this connection well to remember that there are more than twice as many paupers in England than among all the teeming millions of Russia, and nearly three times as many as in Italy. So much for pauperism. Let us look for a moment to a more pleasing side of the question.

Everyone knows that the deposits in the savings banks are largely by the wage-earners. In Great Britain, the home of free trade, with a population of 38,000,000, there are only $536,000,000, or $14 per capita, deposited in the savings banks.

In New York, with protected industries and a population of 6,000,000, there are $550,000,000 deposited in savings banks, or $90 per capita.

And in my own little State, rich in all that makes life respected and happy, there were on the 30th day of June, 1892, over $72,000,00 deposited in savings banks, being an average of $426.24 to each depositor, or, if divided among all the people of the State, men, women, and children, there would be $192.66 for each person.

While the country was rejoicing in the splendid prosperity of 1892 the majority of the voters elected a Democratic President and gave the Democrats a majority in both Houses of Congress.

That party was pledged to reverse the protective policy of the nation under which it had prospered for more than thirty years, during which time our population had more than doubled, our wealth increased beyond any precedent, the money in the country more than quadrupled, our imports increased from $336,000,000 to $813,000,000, our exports from $316,000,000 to more than one billion, the balance of trade, from being $20,000,000 against us had become nearly two hundred millions in our favor, our post-offices nearly trebled, the revenue from postage increased in even greater proportions, our railroad mileage increased from 30,000 to 174,000 miles, the number of telegraph offices increased tenfold, our total agricultural productions had increased threefold, our manufactures in a greater proportion, our schools, colleges, and churches had kept pace with our industrial progress, and in the essential elements of prosperity and civilization we were leading the nations.

That it is wise to abandon the precedents under which such remarkable progress was attained I can not believe. Yet a majority in this House are supporting a bill which even while pending has deranged business, stopped manufactures, discouraged the farmer, turned thousands from remunerative employment to enforced idleness, brought distress to millions of women and children, and is about to add fifty millions of dollars to the bonded debt of the country, thus increasing the burdens of the people in a time of profound peace and, until the ascendency of the present administration, of remarkable prosperity.

The interest on this unnecessary addition to our national debt will be a lasting and sad reminder of the incompetency of our rulers.

Fortunate, indeed, shall we be if we are not subjected to even worse results than those that already beset us.

So far as the people have been able they have by the recent elections and by the thousands of petitions sent here, endeavored to avert further action in the direction of free trade, but their petitions are disregarded and their votes must again be recorded before any relief can be secured.

The results expected of the Wilson bill by its friends are shown by the exhibit of the Ways and Means Committee recapitulating its schedules as follows:

Schedules.	Importations of fiscal year, June 30, 1893.		Duties estimated under proposed bill (H. R. 4864).	Average ad valorem under—	
	Values.	Duties received.		Present law.	Proposed bill.
				Per cent.	*Per cent.*
A.—Chemicals, oils, and paints	$19,096,205.67	$6,094,066.85	$4,460,502.46	31.91	23.35
B.—Earths, earthenware, and glassware	23,513,506.16	12,101,661.60	8,082,058.26	51.46	34.37
C.—Metals, and manufactures of	44,983,859.48	26,495,561.22	15,970,053.97	58.90	35.50
D.—Wood, and manufactures of	2,690,445.36	917,985.28	636,313.43	34.12	23.65
E.—Sugar	1,328,908.50	193,294.48	98,522.32	14.55	7.41
F.—Tobacco, and manufactures of	12,588,407.12	14,831,989.99	11,528,783.11	117.82	91.58
G.—Agricultural products and provisions	35,723,828.48	11,902,261.00	7,806,311.65	33.32	21.82
H.—Spirits, wines, and other beverages	13,874,921.06	9,698,336.91	8,421,347.54	69.90	60.69
I.—Cotton manufactures	20,510,438.98	11,333,605.23	7,885,585.28	55.25	38.45
J.—Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of	41,706,792.44	18,767,353.37	12,724,279.49	45.00	30.51
K.—Wool, and manufactures of	36,993,409.16	36,448,667.46	14,714,879.23	98.53	39.78
L.—Silk, and silk goods	37,919,948.92	20,310,258.74	17,113,647.62	53.56	45.13
M.—Pulp, papers, and books	8,680,319.32	2,070,124.10	1,658,398.97	23.35	19.10
N.—Sundries	48,092,597.81	13,146,620.65	11,292,340.96	27.34	23.48
Section 4.—Unenumerated	1,432,660.52	272,644.62	272,644.62	.....	.....
Articles transferred to free list	50,933,409.41	13,789,022.31	.....	.....	Free.
	400,069,658.48	198,373,452.97	122,665,668.91	49.58	30.66

Total duty received in 1893	$198,373,452.97
Total duty estimated under proposed bill	122,665,668.91
Estimated decrease of duty	75,707,784.06

The hour allotted me will not permit a consideration of all of these schedules, and as the manufacturing schedules have been more fully considered I ask your attention to some statistics concerning the proposed legislation on agricultural products.

The following table shows the articles produced by the farmers upon which duties are now collected, and which prevent the cheaper labor of Canada from having an advantage in our markets, but which upon the enactment of the Wilson bill can be imported free of duty:

Articles.	Duties now levied.	Wilson bill.
Apples	25 cents per bushel	Free.
Bacon and hams	5 cents per pound	Do.
Preserved meats	25 per cent.	Do.
Beef, mutton, and pork	2 cents per pound	Do.
Bristles	10 cents per pound	Do.
Cabbages	3 cents each	Do.
Cider	5 cents per gallon	Do.
Eggs	5 cents per dozen	Do.
Feathers	10 per cent.	Do.
Flax straw	$5 per ton	Do.
Flax, not hatcheled	$22.40 per ton	Do.
Hemp, not hatcheled	$25 per ton	Do.
Hair	15 per cent.	Do.
Lard	2 cents per pound	Do.
Milk	5 cents per gallon	Do.
Green pease	40 cents per bushel	Do.
Trees and all nursery stock	20 per cent.	Do.
Seeds, all kinds	do	Do.
Straw	30 per cent.	Do.
Tallow	1 cent per pound	Do.
Teasels	30 per cent.	Do.
Wool	11 to 12 cents per pound	Do.
Wool waste and noils	30 cents per pound	Do.
Rags and flocks	10 cents per pound	Do.

The following articles are made subject to a duty of 20 per cent in the event that they are imported from countries imposing a duty upon the same when exported from the United States, otherwise they may be imported free of duty:

Articles.	Duties now levied.	Wilson bill.
Buckwheat	15 cents per bushel	Free.
Corn	do	Do.
Oats	do	Do.
Rye	do	Do.
Wheat	25 cents per bushel	Do.
Wheat flour	20 per cent ad valorem	Do.
Rye flour	do	Do.

The following table shows the changes proposed in the rate of duty upon those articles which are still retained upon the dutiable list:

Articles.	Duties now levied.	Wilson bill.
Horses and mules	$30 per head	20 per cent.
Cattle	$10 per head	Do.
Calves	$2 per head	Do.
Hogs	$1 50 per head	Do.
Sheep	$1 per head	Do.
Lambs	75 cents per head	Do.
Barley	30 cents per bushel	Do.
Butter	6 cents per pound	Do.
Cheese	do	Do.
Beans	40 cents per bushel	Do.
Hay	$4 per ton	$2.
Honey	20 cents per gallon	10 cents.
Hops	15 cents per pound	8 cents.
Onions	40 cents per bushel	20 cents.
Potatoes	25 cents per bushel	10 cents.
Castor beans	50 cents per bushel	25 cents.
Flaxseed	30 cents per bushel	20 cents.
Vegetables	25 per cent.	10 per cent.
Poultry, live	3 cents per pound	2 cents.
Poultry, dressed	5 cents per pound	3 cents.

By the schedule of the committee it is shown that the loss of revenue under the Wilson bill upon agricultural products alone will be $4,095,949.35, and this represents only a fraction of the actual loss to our farmers in the home market. This will be a very serious matter to them and without essential compensation. The other schedules show the destruction of home markets and the encouragement of importations to an almost equal degree.

How strange and inexcusable it is to reduce our revenues in this way when our necessary expenditures exceed our present possible income, and unusual taxation and an interest-bearing bond issue are proposed to provide for the deficiency.

Can any one tell why this attack is made upon our business prosperity? No producing industry has asked for it. The people do not want it, and their remonstrances have been long and loud. They do not care for free wool, which breaks down the sheep raiser, or free coal, which takes the bread from the hard-worked miner, or free iron, which not only limits the production of our mines but prevents the manufacture of our own ores, or free agricultural products, which transfers to the Canadian the profits which have heretofore been the support and comfort of our farmers, or any of the many provisions of this bill which limit production and necessarily decrease wages. But they do care for steady work and undiminished pay.

Give them work and protect their earnings from the competition of those who are compelled to toil for less pay and our wage earners will be contented and happy.

Give them work for their hands and they will find work for their teeth, homes for their families, and schools for their children.

If you enact your free-trade measures and deprive them of work you must be responsible for the result.

To show the wages paid under the Walker tariff of 1846 I insert here the pay roll for the month of February, 1848, of the employés of the Gilford Manufacturing Company, then in businsss in the present city of Laconia, N. H. To this pay roll is added a column showing the amount paid per hour for each of the fourteen hours they were then required to work, and another column showing what that rate of pay is reduced to a ten-hour basis.

February, 1848.

Name.	Time.	Rate.	Amount.	Rate per hour for 14 hours.	Rate per day on 10 hours' basis.
	Days.			*Cents.*	
J. V. Goodwin	25	$1.50	$37.50	10⅞	$1.05⅞
Jas. Robie	25	.42	10.42	3	.30
Thos. Kelley	25	.25	6.25	1 11/14	.17⅞
Nancy J. Piper	24	.53	12.71	3 11/14	.37⅞
Nancy Robie	25	.72	17.87	5⅛	.51⅜
Mary Robie	25	.63	15.81	4½	.45
Susan E. Robie	25	.65	16.43	4 9/14	.46⅜
M. J. Dolloff	11	.50	5.58	3½	.35⅝
Catherine Buzzell	23½	.62	14.57	4⅜	.44⅞
Merriam Leavitt	23½	.68	15.98	4¾	.48⅝
Ruth Smith	2½	.68	1.70	4⅝	.48⅝
H. E. Semple	25	.58	14.62	4⅛	.41⅜
B. Moulton	16½	.66	10.88	4⅝	.47⅛
L. A. Flanders	18	.51	9.18	3 9/14	.36⅜
S. E. Martin	25	.57	14.25	4 1/14	.40⅝
S. Taylor	25	.75	18.75	5 5/14	.53⅝
Ruth Taylor	25	.75	18.75	5 5/14	.53⅝
Eleanor Hinds	25	.33	8.33	2 5/14	.23⅝
P. Hayford	25	.41	10.33	2 13/14	.29⅜
M. A. Tilton	3	.31	.93	2 5/14	.22⅛
Mary Tilton	3	.17	.55	1 5/14	.12⅛
Eleanor Leavitt	2	.17	.32	1⅛	.12⅛
Mary A. Swain	8	.34	2.72	2⅜	.24⅜
L. A. Drake	8	.38	3.06	2⅝	.27⅛
Caroline Jewett	20	.28	5.66	2	.20
Mary E. Tucker	1⅔	.42	.73	3	.30
W. Tucker	3 mos., 78	1.50	117.00	10⅝	1.05⅝
Jere Jaques	2 mos., 50	.88	44.00	6⅛	.62⅛
Chas. Kelly	20½	.58	11.96	4⅛	.41⅜
Wm. Elkins	25	.58	14.55	4⅛	.41⅜
Lewis Badger	16½	.51	8.35	3 9/14	.36⅜
John Kelly	20½	.25	5.12	1 11/14	.17⅞
Amanda Smith	8	.52	4.16	3⅝	.37⅛
S. J. Tucker	25	.43	10.78	3 1/14	.30⅞
Angelina Folsom	25	.49	12.18	3½	.35
Amanda Semple	25	.48	12.08	3⅜	.34⅜
Caroline Semple	25	.43	10.78	3 1/14	.30⅝
Mary Semple	25	.33	8.33	2 5/14	.23⅝
Mary Parsons	25	.42	10.42	3	.30
Sarah A. Gilman	14	.38	5.25	2⅝	.27⅛
Sarah A. Clay	22	.33	7.33	2 5/14	.23⅝
Hannah Keyser	25	.50	12.52	3⅝	.35⅝
E. Hackett	21	.53	11.10	3 11/14	.37⅞
Mrs. F. Smith	25	.50	12.50	3⅝	.35⅝
Sarah Leavitt	25	.45	11.25	3 3/14	.32⅛
Eliza J. Dolloff	6	.54	3.25	3⅜	.38⅝
Mary A. Ames	10½	.43	4.58	3 1/14	.30⅝
David Edwards	4½	.50	2.25	3⅜	.35⅝
Caroline Parsons	21	.35	7.33	2½	.25
Mrs. J. Gilman	2	.37	.75	2 5/14	.26⅜
Emily Morrill	23½	.23	7.83	2 5/14	.23⅝
Melissa Young	17	.46	7.78	3⅜	.32⅜
Ann Parsons	25	.33	8.33	2 5/14	.23⅝
Geo. Smith	16½	.42	6.92	3	.30
Olive J. Chapman	24½	.33	8.17	2 5/14	.23⅝
Emeline Folsom	25	.37	9.30	2 9/14	.26⅜
Hannah Taylor	25	.42	10.42	3	.30
E. Ladd	25	.38	9.50	2⅝	.27⅛
Ann D. Eagan	3	.35	1.05	2½	.25
John Tucker	4½	.25	1.12	1 11/14	.17⅞
Phoebe Ames	14	.33	4.67	2 5/14	.23⅝
Lydia Flanders	5½	.54	2.98	3⅝	.38⅝
J. Blackey	14½	.52	7.55	3⅝	.37⅛

This table shows that the average pay of each employé, including the overseers, was 51.6 cents per day of fourteen hours, or, reduced to the ten-hour basis, was only 36⅞ cents, and there was no general improvement in wages until after the enactment of the Morrill tariff, when they rapidly increased. In a hosiery mill in that place, in 1869, the average pay per day was $1.16 4/10. In 1892 the average pay had increased to $1.57 per day. In other words, the pay under the McKinley tariff of 1890 was more than four times greater than under the Walker tariff of 1846.

The following table shows the purchasing power of $100 at differ-

ent times within the last thirty years, and fully demonstrates the well-known fact that the necessities of life have grown cheaper, though wages have increased:

	1862-'67.	1872-'77.	1882-'87.	1892.
Sugar ..... pounds..	600	894	1,333	1,848
Tea, Japan ..... do....	137	244	454	500
Mess beef ..... barrels..	7	8⅞	8⅞	13
Mess pork ..... do....	4.2	5.6	6.6	8.7
Lard ..... pounds.	666	909	1,143	1,579
Coffee ..... do....	367	518	993	551
Flour ..... barrels..	13.7	16.1	15.1	19
Corn ..... bushels..	120	141	166	175
Bacon ..... pounds..	725	990	1,041	1,316
Butter ..... do....	294	300	370	351
Molasses ..... gallons..	188	285	392	800
Rice ..... pounds..	800	1,111	1,540	1,730
Starch ..... do....	1,052	1,063	2,273	2,666
Soap ..... do....	1,000	1,470	2,000	2,500
Potatoes ..... bushels..	98	120	125	154

	1866.	1872-'77.	1882-'87.	1892.
CANNED GOODS.				
Salmon ..... dozen..	25	63	85	77
Tomatoes ..... do....	40	48	93	108
Corn ..... do....	33	45½	100	111

And the following table, 1850 and 1892 being compared, shows even more marked reductions in the price of several important articles, and that given quantities of our agricultural products will now purchase more than forty years ago:

	Salt.	Refined sugar.	Standard prints.	Cotton cloth.	Cut nails.
One bushel wheat would buy:	*Barrels.*	*Pounds.*	*Yards.*	*Yards.*	*Pounds.*
In 1850	.75	15.00	14.08	25.00	40.00
In 1892	1.90	21.10	17.27	31.66	57.00
One bushel corn would buy:					
In 1850	.38	7.60	7.15	12.66	20.00
In 1892	1.15	12.75	10.43	19.13	35.00
Ten pounds butter would buy:					
In 1850	1.00	20.00	18.83	33.33	54.00
In 1892	2.90	32.22	26.36	48.33	88.00
Ten pounds cheese would buy:					
In 1850	.47	9.40	8.85	15.66	25.00
In 1892	1.80	20.00	16.18	30.00	54.00
One pound medium washed wool would buy:					
In 1850	.19	3.85	3.62	6.41	10.00
In 1892	.72	8.00	6.54	12.00	22.00

But the Democrats say that a tariff is a tax. Sometimes it is a tax paid by foreign manufacturers and sometimes it is paid by the home consumers. That depends upon the article subject to tariff rate. The truth of this is evident from the decrease in the price of steel rails, nails, salt, the cheaper and medium grades of clothing, tin plate, all cottons, and hundreds of other articles until they are sold in our open markets, in many instances, for one-third their price prior to their being manufactured here under the fostering care of our protective tariff.

On the other hand there are articles subject to customs duties which can not be manufactured here at present so as to compete in price with the foreign article. In such instances the home consumer undoubtedly does pay a part and in some cases, temporarily, the whole of the duty which is then "a tax" on him from which he would be relieved by free trade; but such relief would prevent any chance of our country ever being self-providing in that regard, and would, carried to its legitimate conclusions, become a final bar to our further progress in such manufacturing or would reduce the wages which would have been paid in such work to the level of other countries. I am opposed to either result.

But if we adopt the policy of the Democratic party and enter upon free trade, then, beyond all question, our entire revenue becomes a tax paid by the people without rebate or diminution. Therefore, if the contention of the Democratic party is wholly true and all tariff duties are a tax, the American people can gain nothing by substituting any other taxes in lieu of them. But should we enter upon free trade then the customs revenue should be secured from those articles or products which can not be produced here, and that is the Republican doctrine as is shown by the free list under the act of 1890.

No one doubts that if the Wilson bill could be submitted to the people they would defeat it by a million votes, or that if this House would pledge itself by a public resolution that it would not permit any change in our tariff laws until the people, by the election of Representatives to the next Congress, could decide, under the fierce light of recent events, what they wish, that business would revive within thirty days and prosperity again bring happiness to our land.

If the Democratic party was controlled by practical and patriotic men, caring more for their country than for economic theories, they would be willing to delay their proposed action until the question of protection or free trade could be directly presented to the people and their verdict obtained. What that verdict would be they know too well, and therefore, while the power is retained by them, force the people into economic conditions they do not want and refuse to listen to the cry of ruined business and the appeal of honest men for work, that they may honorably supply to those they love the necessities of life.

Gentlemen of the majority, are not the prosperity of the country, the happiness of millions of your fellow-citizens, and the glorious reputation we bear among the nations of the world more dear to you than your free-trade theories, which in our land have always ended disastrously whenever attempted? You are denying the stern logic of economic results and refusing to listen to the instructive lessons of experience.

The people demand that you see to it that no harm comes to the Republic, and that the brotherhood of man be first established at home.

One of our grandest statesmen has said:

Theories are the offspring of the closet; exceptions to them, the lessons of experience.

Let us step out of our closets and listen to the voice of the active business men and toiling masses of the people whose knowledge is based upon personal service, and we shall hear that they do not desire any substantial change in our protective policy or any legislation such as the Wilson bill proposes. If we do not listen to them now they will justly take into their own hands the duty of legislating for themselves and the country, and then prosperity will return to bless our homes and reëstablish the nation in the high position of honor which heretofore has made it the bright beacon light of hope to the toiling masses of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BELTZHOOVER. Mr. Chairman, the founders of the Republic and a large majority of their intelligent and patriotic successors in public affairs have always been in favor of raising the Federal revenue from duties on imports, and of so adjusting the collection of these duties as to protect and promote the industries of the nation. This system of collecting our revenues from customs and making these exactions from foreigners incidentally redound to the benefit of our own country, was born with the Government itself, and grew out of the same causes which brought about our independence. The policy of England toward the colonies was designed expressly to crush our manufactories, Lord North, the prime minister, declaring that he would not willingly permit even a hobnail to be made by us.

An act of Parliament in 1750 made it a criminal offense to erect any mill or engine for rolling iron or any plating forge to work with a trip hammer or any furnace for making steel. The fine for violating this statute was £200, and a fine of £500 was imposed on all the colonial governors who failed to enforce the law. Against these tyrannical attempts to prevent the development of our industries we rebelled, and when we achieved our liberity protection by taxation on imports became one of the basic facts of our institutions.

Mr. Webster, the great expounder of the Constitution, said:

I defy the man in any degree conversant with the history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, to say that protection of American labor and industry was not a leading, I might almost say the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted.

Mr. Madison, the leader of the Convention which framed the Federal Constitution, declared that it was then understood that customs were to form the principal revenue of the new Government, and that incidental protection would result from the laws thus raising revenue. (Jour., 515.)

In that Convention when the report of the committee on detail was under discussion, Mr. Randolph moved to amend what is now section 7, article 1, and which then read, "All bills for raising money be" by adding the words "for the purpose of revenue," and the motion was lost.

Mr. Madison, in discussing the motion, said:

The word *revenue* was ambiguous. In many acts, particularly in the regulation of trade, the object would be two-fold. The raising of revenue would be one of them. How could it be determined which was the primary or predominant one, or whether it was necessary that revenue should be the sole object in exclusion even of other incidental effects? When the contest was first opened with Great Britain their power to regulate trhde was admitted, their power to raise revenue rejected. An accurate investigation of the subject afterward proved that no line could be drawn between the two cases. * * * In levying indirect taxes, which it seemed to be understood were to form the principal revenue of the new Government, the sum to be raised would be increased or diminished by a variety of collateral circumstances influencing the consumption in general—the consumption of foreign and of domestic articles—of this or that particular species of articles, and even by the mode of collection which may be closely connected with the productiveness of a tax.

The very first legislative act passed by the First Congress under the Constitution and approved by Washington, was a tariff

act to raise revenue "for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and encouragement and protection of manufactures."

JEFFERSON, MADISON, AND JACKSON.

Thomas Jefferson, in his second message, spoke of the duty of Congress:

To protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances.

When the question of disposing of the surplus revenues was arresting public attention, and the suggestion was made to dispense with some part of the customs duties, he said:

Shall we suppress the imposts and give that advantage to foreign over our domestic manufacturers?

Again he said:

The general inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation. He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependency upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in caves or dens. I am proud to say that I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comforts. The prohibiting duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made within ourselves, without regard to difference of price, secures us against a relapse into foreign dependency.

In 1809 he wrote:

My own idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw materials.

In 1817 he was elected a member of the Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufactures, and in his letter of acceptance said:

The history of the last twenty years has been a significant lesson for us all to depend for necessities on ourselves alone, and I hope twenty years more will place the American hemisphere under a system of its own, essentially peaceable and industrious and not needing to extract its comforts out of the eternal fires raging in the Old World.

President Madison, in a special message to Congress in 1809, said:

It will be worthy of the just and provident care of Congress to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens.

Again in 1815:

But there is no such subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress than consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and obtained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant attention of Congress.

In a letter in 1828, he says:

It is a simple question under the Constitution of the United States whether "the power to regulate trade with foreign nations," as a distinct and substantive item in the enumerated powers, embraces the object of encouraging by duties, restrictions, and prohibitions the manufactures and products of the country. And the affirmative must be inferred from the following considerations:

1. The meaning of the phrase "to regulate trade" must be sought in the general use of it; in other words, in the objects to which the power was generally understood to be applicable when the phrase was inserted in the Constitution.

2. The power has been understood and used by all commercial and manufacturing nations as embracing the object of encouraging manufactures. It is believed that not a single exception can be named.

3. This has been particularly the case with Great Britain, whose commercial vocabulary is the parent of ours. A primary object of her commercial regulations is well known to have been the protection and encouragement of her manufactures.

4. Such was understood to be a proper use of the power by the States most prepared for manufacturing industry while retaining the power over their foreign trade.

5. Such a use of the power by Congress accords with the intention and expectation of the States in transferring the power over trade from themselves to the Government of the United States.

6. If Congress have not the power it is annihilated for the nation; a policy without example in any other nation.

7. If revenue be the sole object of a legitimate impost and the encouragement of domestic articles be not within the power of regulating trade, it would follow that no monopolizing or unequal regulations of foreign nations could be counteracted, etc.

8. That the encouragement of manufactures was an object of the power to regulate trade is proved by the use made of the power for that object in the first session of the first Congress under the Constitution, when among the members present were so many who had been members of the Federal Convention which framed the Constitution, and of the State conventions which ratified it; each of these classes consisting also of members who had opposed and who had espoused the Constitution in its actual form. It does not appear from the printed proceedings of Congress on that occasion that the power was denied by any of them. And it may be remarked that members from Virginia in particular, as well of the anti-Federal as the Federal party, did not hesitate to propose duties, and to suggest even prohibitions, in favor of several articles of her production. By one a duty was proposed on mineral coal, in favor of the Virginia coal pits; by another, a duty on hemp was proposed, to encourage the growth of that article, and by a third, a prohibition even of foreign beef was suggested as a measure of sound policy.

Andrew Jackson, in 1824, wrote:

It is time that we should become a little more Americanized, and, instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own.

In a letter dated June 12, 1824, published in Niles' Register, page 245, he says:

Heaven smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. That same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us we deserve not the continuation of His blessings. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals, lead, iron, and copper, and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the grand materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our own manufactories and laborers may be placed on a fair competition with those of Europe.

In his second annual message as President of the United States, he said:

The object of the tariff is objected to by some as unconstitutional.

The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the Federal Government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable restriction relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case; this indispensable power thus surrendered by the States must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

That part of his message on manufactures was referred to the Committee on Manufactures in Congress, and both the majority and minority report of that committee indorsed his utterances relating to the constitutionality of protection of the American industries.

Mr. Mallory, who presented the report for the majority of the committee, said:

The committee are gratified to have the opinion of the President, clearly and fully expressed, that the tariff for protecting domestic industries is constitutional.

Our Government has adopted and endeavored to sustain by repeated legislative enactments a policy which has had the sanction of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. It has been sanctioned by the continued acquiescence of the States and the general understanding of the people.

Mr. Menell, in presenting the views of the minority of the committee, said:

With the President we also concur in the constitutionality of an adjustment of import duties with a view to the protection of our own agriculture and manufactures.

It would be difficult to frame a more direct, convincing, and conclusive argument on that point than is presented in the message.

The tariffs of 1816, 1824, 1828, and 1832 were all protective tariffs, and all promoted the growth and prosperity of our common country. The tariff of 1832, was adopted under the first administration of Andrew Jackson and was approved by him and was the platform on which he was overwhelmingly reëlected

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

This policy, indorsed by an enormous majority of the sturdy, thrifty people of the nation, and the legislation predicated on it did not suit a turbulent and revolutionary element which, making up in noise what it lacked in patriotism, defied the Government and tried to nullify and defeat the tariff of 1832. This little rebellion was suppressed, but its authors, by their bulldozing tactics, obtained a compromise in the act of 1833. In 1836 there was no Democratic platform, but Mr. Van Buren, an incidental protectionist, was elected on the Democratic ticket. In 1840 the revenue reformers obtained a recognition of their views and planted in the Democratic declaration of principles of that year the provision, "that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government," and Mr. Harrison, the Whig candidate, was triumphantly elected. In 1844 the platform of 1840 was readopted, and by placing Mr. Dallas of Pennsylvania on the ticket and pretending to stand by the tariff of 1842, the Democratic candidates were successful.

In 1848 the Democratic platform more emphatically than theretofore declared "that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government." In 1852 and 1856 the same declaration was contained in the Democratic platform, with incidental remarks about rigid economy in the conduct of public affairs. In 1860 the Democratic conventions both adopted the platform of 1856. In 1864 the Democratic platform did not mention the tariff. In 1868 the Democratic national convention practically returned to the old landmarks and declared for "a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports and such equal taxation under the internal-revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country." It is also proper to observe that this platform declared against an income tax.

In 1872 the Democratic platform and ticket were nondescript and, like an artful dodger, remitted the whole question to the Congressional districts. This was not a straddle, but a spread. In 1876 the Democratic platform declared that "We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue," and in 1880 it changed the location of one word only, and declared "for revenue only."

In 1884, when the Democratic party made its first square and successful contest for a quarter of a century, the platform substantially reiterated the Andrew Jackson platform of 1832, as follows:

Knowing full well that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsive to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved.

The necessary reduction of taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government economically administered, including pensions, interest, and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity.

In 1888 the Democratic platform readopted the platform of 1884, with an addition which emphasized its devotion to the interests of labor. It provided:

The Democratic party will continue with all the power confided to it the struggle to reform these laws in accordance with the pledges of its last platform, indorsed at the ballot box by the suffrages of the people.

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations.

In 1892, the report of the committee on platform of the Democratic national convention, which was concurred in by the representatives from forty-three out of the forty-four States in the Union, declared:

We reiterate the oft-repeated doctrine of the Democratic party that the necessity of the Government is "the only justification for taxation, and whenever a tax is unnecessary it is unjustifiable; that when custom-house taxation is levied upon articles of any kind produced in this country the difference between the cost of labor here and labor abroad, when such difference exists, fully measures any possible benefit to labor. But in making reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth."

After this plain declaration of forty-three out of the forty-four States at the instance of the representative from that one State, in one of those unaccountable moods which pass over large bodies when moved by passion, the foregoing declaration was stricken out and the following substituted:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

On the ballot to adopt this substitute for the report of the committee on platform, Pennsylvania cast her 64 votes for the immemorial Democratic policy which protects labor and promotes our industries.

The New York World of November 30, in an editorial explaining that the adoption of this section of the platform of 1892 over the report of the committee had no significance, says:

The Democratic party has never favored free trade. Nor has it ever proposed a destructive revision of the tariff. The declaration in the Chicago platform that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, was thoroughly understood by the people. It was proposed by a radical element in the committee which was never dominant in the party, and was adopted by the votes of men who hoped that it would defeat Mr. Cleveland. The fact that the New York snap delegation voted for this ultra and unnecessary rhetorical flourish, though New York Democrats in general and Tammany Hall in particular had always been in favor of moderate protection, showed the animus under which it was adopted. The foolish dictum did not express the sober sense of the convention.

Which one of these declarations therefore embodied and expressed the sentiments of the Democratic leaders of the country on the question of the tariff, and upon which was the contest fought and won? No intelligent man who watched the conflict can doubt that so far as the tariff was the issue it was upon that which promised to protect labor and promote our industries. Mr. Cleveland in his Madison Square Garden speech on July 20, 1892, declared that—

Ours is not a destructive party. We are not at enmity with any of the rights of our citizens. All are our countrymen. We are not recklessly heedless of any American interests nor will we abandon our regard for them.

In his letter of acceptance, dated September 26, 1892, Mr. Cleveland, in exactly the same line, stated—

We wage no exterminating war against any American interests. We believe a readjustment can be accomplished in accordance with the principles we profess without disaster or demolition. We contemplate a fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens rather than the precipitation of free trade. We will rely upon the intelligence of our fellow-countrymen to reject the charge that a party comprising a majority of our people is planning the destruction or injury of American interests.

These declarations must also be taken in connection with his views in his message of December 6, 1887, when he said:

In a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered as well as the preservation of our manufactures. * * * It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated.

A SUMMARY OF THE AUTHORITIES.

These few citations, which might be multiplied almost indefinitely, from the history of the Republic and from the views of the patriotic Democrats who aided in founding it and have largely controlled the administration of its affairs and from the platforms of the Democratic party, establish *inter alia* certain clear and well-defined propositions:

First. That those who originated the movement for the Federal Union and those who formed the Federal Constitution and administered the Government for the first half century under it, believed and held that protection was one of the chief objects contended for in the conflict for our political independence, and was constitutional.

Second. That it was understood and agreed by those who framed the Constitution and founded the Government and administered it when its purposes were clearly known, that the sources of Federal revenue were to be duties on imports and excise taxes, which were in all cases to be so adjusted as to afford protection to American industries and American labor.

Third. These two propositions embody the beliefs of an overwhelming majority of the Democratic party, as expressed in its platforms and the declarations of its most distinguished leaders.

These are the views of Washington, Madison, Jackson and the fathers of the Republic in relation to the method of raising of Federal revenues and the protection of our interests and embody the expression of the belief in which the great Democratic party was intrusted with power in the last national contest.

The Democratic platform of 1884 distinctly declared that "from the foundation of the Government taxes collected at the custom-houses have been the chief source of Federal revenue and such they must continue to be." The same platform unequivocally asserts that—

Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, including pensions, interest, and principal of the public debt can be got under our present system of taxation from the custom-house taxes—

And declares that—

Reduction of taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, etc.

The Democratic platform of 1888 reiterates the devotion of the party to the interests of labor and the promotion of our industries. The platform of 1892, as reported, declares emphatically for the protection of labor, and Mr. Cleveland in his speeches and letter of acceptance assures the people of the nation that "we are not recklessly heedless of any American interests," and that "we will readjust the tariff without disaster or injury to our industries." While the voice is the voice of Jacob the hands which have framed this bill are the hands of Esau. This bill is based on the doctrine, so frequently stated during this discussion and so vigorously applauded, contained in the minority report on platform of the Democratic national convention of 1892, that protection is unconstitutional and robbery. Instead of adhering to the settled policy of raising revenue from duties and taxes on whisky and tobacco, it abandons these fertile sources which have been sanctioned by the traditions of more than a century and cuts down the income from duties more than $75,000,000 for the next fiscal year when there is already a deficit of more that $80,000,000 in the Treasury for the present fiscal year.

It is interesting to note, as indicating the bitterness of the long and enduring contest, that in both cases where armed resistance was made to the authority of the Government it was based on the objection of certain people to the tariff. In 1832 that was the sole ground, and in 1860 Jefferson Davis, in his Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government, assigns it a chief place. In no period of the contest between the contending sides on this subject, however, before the present bill, did the free-trade leaders ever openly contend for anything but a tariff for revenue only. In their support of this bill they throw off all disguises and make the first bold, open effort by legislation to defeat the collection of the revenues for the support of the Government by a

tariff so as to get rid of even a revenue tariff and the incidental protection which it affords.

IS THIS A REVENUE TARIFF BILL?

There is a provision in all the recently framed State constitutions which is based on the universal experience of those interested in securing honest legislation, that every bill must state honestly and clearly in its title the substance of the law which it proposes to enact. The title of this bill declares that it is to reduce taxation and provide revenue, but both these things are untrue in the sense in which the people of the nation understand them. The great Democratic majority which voted for tariff reform meant that the tariff taxes should be reduced to a revenue basis. They never meant and do not now understand that the tariff is to be diverted from raising revenue and our commerce turned loose to the world on a free-trade schedule, while income taxes and inheritance taxes and corporation taxes, *et id omne genus*, all of which are iniquitous, vexatious, oppressive, and unpopular, are to be substituted.

This bill does not reduce taxes, but simply changes their form and shifts them from those who now pay them and gives respectability by imitation to the financial policy of Wilkins Micawber, who, when he gave a new note for an old one, always ejaculated, "Thank God, there's another debt paid." It does not raise revenue by tariff, but on the contrary, when the Government is on the verge of bankruptcy, cuts down the revenue from tariff $75,000,000 and proposes the experiment of making good the deficiency by a tax on incomes or by some other equally unjust and undemocratic method.

While all the people of this country are profoundly anxious for a reduction of the burdens of taxation, where is the evidence that they want or will approve of such a gerrymander of the question as this? What becomes of the solemn assurance contained in Mr. Cleveland's message of 1887, that "a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions" may be necessary, "but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated?" What will the producers of coal, and iron ore, and lumber, and wool, think of such a bold desertion of their great interests, notwithstanding such a plain and unequivocal promise? Had they a right to contemplate that their vast industries would at one fell swoop have all their advantages under the protection of our laws withdrawn, and their products put upon the free list in defiance of such declarations and in the face of an enormous deficit in our revenues? Mr. Cleveland, in his last letter of acceptance, said very explicitly:

> We contemplate a fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens rather than the precipitation of free trade.

What are "necessary tariff burdens"? Necessary for what? To raise revenue for the discharge of the debts of the Government, beyond all question. "A fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens," in the judgment of all fair and intelligent men, must mean such a tariff as will raise the necessary revenue by equitable and ratable exactions from all the subjects of taxation. Thousands of our countrymen have therefore petitioned and protested against this bill, and have produced statistics and testimony and argument against it, and crowded the rooms of the committee which had it in charge every hour of the limited time allowed them to be heard, while not a single witness nor a syllable of argument appears in the record on the other side.

The case as it stands on the pleadings and evidence before the House, and on which we are to pass judgment, has a large volume of undisputed testimony for the defense and not a word in support of the plaintiff's case. What did this committee base its findings on? The ancient and august court of the Areopagus always sat in the silence of night so that they might not see and be moved by the unhappy victims of their malignant decrees. This great committee, while not always sitting at night, shut out every ray of the floods of light which illumine the whole heavens which bend over an anxious nation, and without evidence which can be cross-examined or rebutted or answered, but in defiance of overwhelming evidence evolved from the recesses of their own esoteric wisdom this bill which seriously affects many of the interests of the millions of industrious, progressive, and toiling people of this land.

THE FREE LIST.

Why put $51,000,000 worth of imports, the property of foreigners, on the free list and exempt them from taxation, and in the same bill hunt up and mulct an equal amount of the property and earnings of our own citizens? If this bill were made in England or Germany or France, I could understand its anxiety to shift the burdens on to the broad shoulders of Yankee thrift and energy and industry. If it were the product of the wild-eyed, long-haired communists, who are never happy unless they are letting the blood out of a corporation or some of its friends, the problem would not be so hard. But the Democratic party triumphed in the elections of 1890 and 1892 by crying out for reform of the tariff when the Treasury had a surplus, and it was the firm belief of the people that the tariff should only be used for raising revenue. But we are at the very antipodes of that position now, for we not only have no surplus, but a large and growing deficiency. We need the revenue, and an honest tariff for revenue should make an honest adjustment and apportionment of the amount required among all the various objects of taxation.

In 1893, under the act of 1890, we collected $185,774,000 of tariff duties on imports from abroad on the same items which are left taxable under the present bill. Under this bill, with the allowance for an increase of imports of $43,000,000, we will receive in duties only $135,485,000 on the same items entailing a loss of more than $50,000,000 in revenue which the Treasury needs so badly. In addition to cutting down the duties on taxable items the present bill adds to the free list over $51,225,000 as above stated, on which duties amounting to over $13,761,000 are remitted. In brief, under the McKinley law in 1893 we collected by tariff $198,373,452. Under the proposed law we will only collect, if imports continue the same, the sum of $122,665,668, making the aggregate loss to the Treasury $75,707,784.

In addition to $13,761,000 of duties having been lost by the enlargement of the free list, it is still more unjust to have remitted about $30,000,000 more duties which were paid on luxuries under the present law. This large sum is made up chiefly of the taxes;

On Havana and other foreign cigars and leaf tobacco	$3,303,207
On liquors	1,276,990
On laces and embroideries	3,075,779
On silks and silk plushes	3,196,631
On kid gloves and jewelry	1,268,797
On ostrich feathers, downs, artificial flowers, etc	260,165
On opium for smoking	400,073
On plate glass and chinaware	830,240
On paintings and statuary	339,265
On perfumery, cosmetics, and fancy articles for smokers	101,250

The toiling masses must be greatly relieved by the surrender of $14,112,397 of duties on these articles!

It will be further observed that more than half of the woolen goods imported last year were goods of fine quality used by the people of liberal means who are not content with equally good American goods at a lower price, but will have foreign goods, and who are entirely willing to pay the highest duties to obtain them. Of the $21,723,788 of revenue surrendered by the reduction of duties on manufactures of wool, not less than $11,000,000 is on fine woolens of this character, which, under the circumstances of their importation and use, are practically articles of luxury or of voluntary use, and are therefore, articles on which the highest duties should be retained.

A very large proportion of the imports of manufactures of cotton, on which the bill proposes to remit $3,448,020 of revenue by a reduction of duties, is fine and fancy cottons in the nature of articles of voluntary use; and the same may be said of many imported articles in other schedules on which duties are reduced by this bill.

Not far from $30,000,000 of the $76,000,000 of revenue surrendered by this bill, therefore, comes from articles of luxury or voluntary use.

Why shall art works, bristles, feathers, flax, hemp, wood, lumber, shingles, laths, wool, coal, coke, iron ores, clays, fish, coffee, eggs, oils, salt, and seeds which are now taxed be placed on the free list and relieved from all taxes? If we did not need the money so badly or had a surplus it is plain how, on sentimental or æsthetic grounds, art works which yielded last year more than $300,000 of revenue might go on the free list; but this large sum that you knock off from works of art must be raised by taxing something else.

I do not like to antagonize this sweet-scented style of tariff reform, but if you must make up what you lose on works of art by taxing decedent estates and tax all above $500, as they do in some sections, it will be rather pleasant to the poor heirs who, each, out of a family of a dozen, get some old relative's estate, to know that what they are mulcted from their pittances goes to relieve works of art. Why should iron ore, which yields from $800,000 to $1,000,000 revenue per year, be put on the free list, thereby losing this large sum, and striking the hundreds of thousands of toilers whose support for their wives and children depends upon the industry? Why should the vast army of laborers who mine ore be put in direct competition with the pauper wages of the Old World? They tell us because it is one of the great raw materials! To whom is iron ore a raw material? To the great steel plants and rolling mills, who are as able to pay taxes as are any persons in this nation. But is iron ore a raw material to the thousands of toilers whose daily life is spent in mining it?

Why, it is just as complete a finished product to them as the finished steel rail is to the great plants whose energies are devoted to that pursuit. So it is with almost all this list of raw materials.

Why should the great steel plant across the river from my home, and where hundreds of my constituents earn their daily bread, have their raw material free and protection on their finished product, while greater hundreds of the poor laboring men who are equally entitled to my voice and vote shall have no protection? The finished product of the one is the raw material of the other. This method of enlarging the free list when the Government needs the revenue is a more odious favoritism to some and a more oppressive and unreasonable discrimination against others than high protective tariff. The struggle between the various interests to get upon the free list is as selfish and mean a scuffle for favoritism as that which strives for a bounty or protection. When you tax one class of men so that others may go free you adopt the worst form of favoritism.

The remission of all taxes for one industry is certainly as bad in all essential respects as taxing another for its benefit, which it really is, for by as much as you increase the free list by just so much more you must tax those not relieved. The protective duties of even the McKinley law almost all yield large revenues, and thus far conform to the Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue. The free list not only defrauds one class for the benefit of another, but it defrauds the revenue also. There can be no favoritism under an honest revenue tariff. Every import must pay its share towards the support of the Government. To take off any duty is to be guilty of favoritism toward one article and its users and unfair to all the rest. There must be uniformity of rate or there will be injustice; and there can be no dead heads in the custom-house. Raising revenue, not cutting off revenue, is the object of a tariff for revenue only.

The free list should rest, in any event so far as it is ever tolerated, on the rule laid down by President Grant:

> Those articles which enter into our manufactures, and are not produced at home, it seems to me, should be entered free. Those articles of manufacture which we produce a constituent part of, but do not produce the whole, that part which we do not produce should be entered free also.—*President U. S. Grant, Sixth Message, 1874.*

WHY DO FOREIGNERS WANT THIS BILL?

Who wants this bill? So far as the record shows not a human being appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to ask for it or advance an argument or give a reason for its adoption. It is suggestive of the character and tendencies of the bill, however, that all the foreigners in the world want it and look forward to its passage with an anxiety surpassing that of the hordes that gathered on the borders for the opening of the Cherokee Strip. England wants it. Canada wants it. Mr. A. A. Healy wants it, and in an article in the December Forum says:

> The belief is very prevalent among English statesmen, capitalists, and business men that lower duties would greatly stimulate and increase our various industries, and that we should be able, with free raw material, to secure and hold many foreign markets for our goods that are now possessed by their own countrymen. It is well known that Mr. Gladstone shares this belief. I have knowledge that it is held by not a few sound business men on the other side of the water. America will, therefore, be a much more attractive place for investment to English capitalists, as soon as our tariff has been reduced.

It is proper to commend to the attention of the patriotic promoters of this bill the earnest indorsement and approval which it receives from Mr. Gladstone. There is not a more selfish, grasping, domineering, and arrogant Englishman living in all that concerns England than the present prime minister. His sneers at the mere suggestion in Parliament of the ex-Secretary of the American Navy as an authority on naval affairs are as recent as they are contemptible. His treatment of the subject of bimetallism, in which the nations of the earth are profoundly interested, and his denial of a decent hearing on the subject, because England is the great creditor nation, and therefore benefited by the financial stringency which monometallism produces, is in the same line. He lays it down as a fundamental doctrine that "the duties of government are paternal," and has practiced it throughout his whole career. And yet we have here a bill on which the credit and prosperity and perhaps the perpetuity of the Republic depend framed so as to command the approbation of our historic commercial and political foes.

The English adoption of free trade is the result of the most enlightened selfishness and greed that ever animated a nation. They worked the doctrine of protection for their home industries until they had reaped from it everything that could possibly be gained. When their industries were thoroughly established, their limit of population and utmost available home market reached, and their ships and commerce covering every sea, so that open ports and free trade were of vastly more benefit than protection at home, they abandoned it and became violent free-traders in principle.

The English papers approve this bill. The London Standard says:

> It will be the fault of English enterprise and industry if we derive no benefit from it.

The London Daily Telegraph says:

> The reforms proposed in the new tariff bill are of the highest importance to the commerce of the world. They mean an economic revolution in the United States.

In Canada there is the liveliest interest displayed in regard to the measure. The Montreal Herald, after in a large black headline asking the question, "Is tariff reform in danger?" declares that "On this side of the line a fearful interest in the struggle for tariff reform in the United States is taken." The result, it is said, must mean much for Canada. The Herald perceives and says that there is trouble abroad for the reformers and for the Canadians in the fact that all the Democrats are not enemies of protection, and that among Representatives and Senators there is a large and influential number of them that have been as consistent protectionists as the rank and file of the Republican party. All economic legislation of this kind must of necessity be dictated by what has been properly termed enlightened selfishness, and the nation that pursues any other policy will be left in the advance of the world.

Putting iron ore, coal, lumber, and the principal agricultural products on the free list will be especially disastrous to the belt of agricultural, lumbering, and mining States along the Canadian border. Under the bill, if it should become a law, we would have free trade in these articles with Canada. Extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the United States and Canada lie side by side, divided only by an imaginary line, with similar forests and mines, with the same character of soil, but with cheaper lands, cheaper labor, and more undeveloped resources upon the Canadian side. It is proposed to throw down the barrier which had protected agriculture in the United States and compelled the Canadians to contribute largely to our Treasury, and to admit the products of the cheaper soil and cheaper labor of Canada into the United States free. It is proposed that we shall make an exceedingly foolish bargain with Canada, and give her the markets of seventy millions of people for the privilege of sending free certain agricultural products into a country having five millions of people.

HOW WILL IT AFFECT WAGES?

How will this bill affect the wage-earners of the country? Mr. Hewitt, one of the very cleverest and ablest authorities on this subject in this country, gives it as his opinion that "Free trade will simply reduce the wages of labor to the foreign standard."

The true question, therefore, is, Shall we prefer the productions of foreign labor and foreign countries to the productions of our own citizens and of our own country? Shall we protect and foster the industry of our own citizens, or shall we permit it to be destroyed by an unequal and unfair competition with foreigners? In the proportion that foreigners throw into our market their productions, in the same proportion is the industry of our country impaired and the laboring class deprived of the means of subsistence, and foreign labor takes the place of our own. If the foreign manufacturers glut our market with their manufactures we become the principal sufferers. How to protect ourselves, how to protect the industry of our own citizens and encourage labor, how to rescue us from a dependence upon foreigners, is the great object of the American system and the true foundation of the wealth of the nation.

Labor is wealth. Nations are made of individuals. National wealth is made up of individual labor. Diminish labor, throw it out of employment, and you diminish national wealth. If you substitute foreign labor for our own, you increase foreign wealth at the expense of our own nation. Throw ten or twenty thousand laborers out of employment by introducing the produce of foreign laborers and you inflict a serious injury upon the country, and confer a corresponding benefit upon the foreign country. That community is always the most prosperous in which there is full employment of labor. Those are wise measures of a government which add to the means of employing industry, and equally wise are those which tend to preserve or protect the productive industry of the country from the injurious operation of foreign regulations, from ruinous and unequal contest with foreign industry, and from a desperate competition with foreign bankrupts or foreign pauper labor in our own market. Such a policy is wise, it is dictated by sound sense, by the universal principle of self-preservation, and is pursued by every intelligent nation.

Labor must find something to operate upon; it is in the power, and it is the duty of a wise government to aid in giving such a direction to labor as shall best promote the interests of the country; and those interests are best promoted when the labor of the citizens is judiciously employed upon the resources of the country.

In no event let us reduce the wages of labor here to the standard of foreign and pauper labor, for the condition of the laboring man even in England is a distressing and hopeless one.

While health and strength remain he may barely earn an existence for himself and his family; no hope of better position and

competence sustains him; the end that he looks forward to is the poorhouse. Says an English statesman, Joseph Chamberlain: "Of the working classes, one in two, if he reaches the age of 60, is almost certain to come upon the poor law for his subsistence." Says Canon Blackey, commenting on returns collected by many clergymen: "Half our working people, if they reach 60 years of age, are doomed to die as paupers."

INCOME AND OTHER TAXES.

How are the revenues from duties cut off by the bill to be raised? The distinguished committee which has the matter in charge has struggled with the question for months and by a 6 to 5 decision settled upon an income tax. These gentlemen have learned that it is much easier to tear down the landmarks of economic legislation established by our fathers than it is to erect others in their stead. They are now engaged in a conflict not only with nine-tenths of the people of the United States in the centers of population and wealth, but they are in conflict with the recommendations of their own Administration. The taxation of incomes from corporations, collateral inheritances, as well as individual incomes are equally odious in the eyes of those who have investigated the subject. "An income tax is obnoxious, inquisitorial, and un-American," says the New York Herald in an able editorial on the subject, in which it commends a tax on inheritances.

The language of Thomas Jefferson in relation to these methods of taxation covers the point, perhaps, as fully as can be:

To take from one because it is thought that his own industry or that of his fathers has acquired too much in order to spare others who or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry and skill is to violate arbitrarily the first principles of association, the guaranty to everyone of a free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it.

The most logical and persuasive advocate of what he calls a graduated income tax is Mr. Reynolds, of San Francisco, who has recently sent to the Members and Senators of the present Congress a pamphlet embodying his views. He says, *inter alia:*

We have just as much right to control the proclivity to indulgence in inordinate greed as we have to restrain the drunkard from becoming a nuisance, the sportsman from indiscriminate slaughter at all seasons, or the robber from his propensity to steal.

The establishment of a standard of worth in the money-making line can be secured by a system of graduated income taxes which would bear so heavily on annual incomes above $300,000 as to induce those who have reached that happy condition to desist from efforts for further aggrandizement.

The relations of the Government to the people might be compared to the position of a farmer, in this respect: that it is just as unwise to permit a selfish few to monopolize the wealth of the country as it would be foolish for the farmer to allow a few vicious brutes to monopolize the haystack.

This is the doctrine which has prevailed in savage and semi-civilized countries in all ages. Income taxes have existed in all times, and have always been odious and oppressive. The Roman empire fell under the weight of direct taxes, and of all these the capitation or direct tax, proportioned according to revenue or income, seems to have been the most baneful. (Hume's Essays 1, 355; Gibbon, volume 2. 149, 150; Zozemus, 2, 115.)

Rulers always cling to such a tax as a convenient and serviceable instrument of tyranny. Just as nations have gained their freedom, they shook off such taxes, which have fallen with the march of civilization. In a recent interview with Li Hung Chang, the great prime minister whom Gen. Grant called the Bismarck of China, that distinguished Oriental statesman said that the reason great public improvements, such as railroads, telegraphs, telephones, and the other accessories of modern civilization, have not been developed in China is largely attributable to the practice of levying oppressive and arbitrary imposts on those who are known to be rich whenever the Government is in financial straits. In other words, for centuries, whenever the Chinese Government has found an embarrassing deficit in its revenues, instead of drawing on the gold reserve or issuing bonds they have levied an income tax on all their rich people. They generally have taken all the income their victims have, so that the only safety for rich men in China has been found, after long experience, to be to hide their money instead of investing it. We used to hear of some statesmen who wanted to build a Chinese wall around this country, but now we have a different class, who want to import and impose upon us the barbaric and antiquated fiscal policy of the Flowery Kingdom. The Democratic national platform of 1868, during the continuance of the former income tax, distinctly declared against it in demanding simplification of the system and discontinuance of inquisitorial modes of assessing and collecting internal revenue.

The income tax is against all the traditions of the Democratic party. It was demanded for the first time by any party in this country by the Populist platform adopted at Omaha in 1892. It is a populistic and anarchistic measure, and will be so regarded by the intelligent voters of the nation.

It is a tax on honesty, because it will be paid by those who are honest to its utmost exaction, while it will be eluded by the dishonest in every way in their power. It will therefore be an unequal tax, and promote perjury and fraud. In this way it becomes a tax corrupting the morals of the people and is against public policy.

Mr. McCullough, the distinguished English economic writer, in his treatise on taxation, pages 125, 126, etc., opposes it on all these and other grounds.

An income tax is an imposition on energy, enterprise, and accumulation—the greatest of all the sinews of wealth, power, and progress in the Republic. It is an insidious and communistic leveler which exacts sufficient penalty from the thrifty, sober and laborious to make up for the delinquencies of the idle dissolute and improvident. It is a tax which is sectional in its worst form, because its burdens will be discharged in a very large degree by a few States and a small section of the country. In one collection district in New York, under the last law, the receipts for the fiscal year 1867 were $5,436,233, while the entire tax collected during the same period from the eleven States of Virginia, Texas, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, and Florida was less than one-half that amount. In 1869, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California, although but possessing 40 per cent of the total wealth and population of the country, paid upwards of three-fourths of the entire income tax collected. It is a class tax which is always abused except when it falls upon an unpopular class, such as the 85,000 persons who, it is believed, will come within the list of those having taxable incomes under this bill. It is a tax which, it is as plain as the sunlight, the authors of the Federal system of government did not intend should be resorted to except in great national exigencies. It is being used in this bill, for what seem to me to be unsatisfactory reasons, to supplant and abolish the tax above all others which was intended, by common consent of a vast majority of the people of the nation, from the origin of the Government to this hour, to provide the revenue for the Federal Treasury. It is a monarchical tax in the sense that all the debt-ridden governments of the Old World have resorted to a graduated income tax of the most searching and stringent provisions to wring from their subjects the enormous sums necessary to sustain their vast armies and crowded civil lists. England, Germany, Austria, Belgium, and other monarchies are cited as examples for the imitation of our young Republic in the reform of its fiscal policy against the teachings and traditions and warnings of our history. In the case of England there is an additional reason for an income tax. She is the great creditor nation of the world, having more than $10,000,000,000 loaned abroad upon which other nations pay her interest. No other tax except an income tax would bring any return from this vast sum into the English treasury. England laid her first income tax in 1797, and when two years later it was reimposed by Sir William Peel his carriage was mobbed on his way home from Parliament. When its repeal came in 1816, in obedience to the universal demand of the intelligence and eloquence of the strongest men of the nation, Mr. Alison, the historian, tells us it was received with applause only equaled by the triumph at Waterloo. There has always been a deep-seated feeling in England against such a tax except when demanded by the exigencies of war. When Sir Robert Peel moved for the reimposition of the tax in 1842 he placed the demand on the ground that it was an absolute and imperative necessity because all indirect taxation had reached its limit. Lord John Russell said in reply:

To resort to the desperate measure of an income tax is nothing less than to proclaim to the world that your resources are exhausted and that indirect taxation has reached its limits. France, in all her struggles, has never resorted to an income tax, because her people are more imbued with the spirit of liberty than any other nation in Europe.

An income tax is an incongruous incorporation into our government of the fiscal methods of political systems with which ours has nothing in common and against which ours is, or ought to be, an emblazoned protest before the world. It has had its origin in the necessities of military government; and it has been tolerated because the necessities of war have been held more sacred than the rights of liberty. Its precedents are those of tyrannies; its methods are a counterpart of the violences of the Inquisition. Herein lies the instinctive revolt of the American citizen against this form of tax.

It is a startling confession of the decadence of the Democratic party in those cardinal points of policy which have constituted its strongest claim upon public confidence. That party opposed the tax at the crucial period of our history when the stern necessities of war seemed to compel but a transient resort to this means of revenue. Now, with no such plea of military exigency and with an alternative resource ready at hand and preferred by the people, this same party commits itself to the odious impost.

There is at least a doubt as to who pays the tariff tax—whether the consumer or the foreigner. There will be no doubt as to who pays the income tax. It would be well for those who propose to abolish a tariff tax which, to say the least, perhaps the foreigner pays, and put in its place an odious tax which our own people pay, to give the American for once the benefit of the doubt.

INVASION OF STATE RIGHTS.

But there is another strong and convincing reason for not enlarging the area of Federal taxation. The Federal Government

has monopolized the best sources of public revenue in taking exclusive possession of the customs and taxes on spirits and tobacco. To the States and the local governments have been left taxes on real estate, corporations, and personal property. This bill proposes that the Federal Government, still maintaining its monopoly of customs and internal-revenue taxes, shall deliberately throw away a large part of the customs revenue, and then, to make good the deficit thus produced, shall invade the sources from which the States derive their resources. The taxes in the States for State, county, municipal, and other purposes, which already amount to more than two-thirds of all the expenses of government in this country weigh heavily on all the resources of their citizens, and this bill proposes to load the people of the great State which I represent and a few others with an additional burden which reason and justice and all the precedents of our history forbid.

Mr. Hamilton, in number 34 of the Federalist, warns the Federal Government of the danger which must necessarily follow in the wake of its invasion of the subjects of taxation allowed to States. He says:

> As to the interference of the revenue laws of the Union and of its members, we have already seen that there can be no clashing or repugnance of authority. The laws can not, therefore, in a legal sense, interfere with each other, and it is far from impossible to avoid an interference even in the policy of their different systems. An effectual expedient for this purpose will be mutually to abstain from those objects which either side may have first had recourse to. As neither can control the other, each will have an obvious and sensible interest in this reciprocal forbearance.

CONCLUSION.

These are some of the considerations which constrain me to hope that this bill will be so amended as to conform to the platforms and redeem the solemn pledges of the Democratic party. The people of this country were led to believe in the last national campaign that the McKinley law levied oppressive burdens on the taxpayers solely for the benefit of monopolies, and in utter disregard of the demands of the Government for revenue. The Democratic masses particularly felt assured that as soon as their leaders came into power they would revise and reform the tariff so as to lop off all favoritism and inequality and unfairness, and make it a tariff for revenue only. They never thought for one moment that the tariff would be abolished instead of being reformed. They never had any reason to believe that, instead of collecting the revenues of the Government from duties on imports which, if they burden the consumer at all, cover all the people of the Union alike, the Democratic tariff reformers, when they came into power, would supplant this equitable and general tax by an odious, vexatious, sectional, and unjust imposition which was never intended except for the exigencies of war and which would collect four-fifths of its exactions from a few States of the Republic.

The founders of the Government never designed that this should be done. The patriotic men who laid the foundations and built the bulwarks of the Democratic party were hostile to such a course. The Democratic national platform of 1884, reiterating and voicing this doctrine, explicitly declared that "from the foundation of the Government taxes collected at the custom-houses have been the chief source of Federal revenue, and such they must continue to be." The McKinley law, not withstanding all that has been justly said against it, raises revenue. If the tariff reform leaders can not so reform that law as to raise revenue from duties they ought to say so, for their failure to do this in the present bill is a confession of their indisposition or inability to do what they promised.

I am opposed to taxation for the purpose of protection, and incidentally for revenue; but I am now and always have been and always hope to be for the collection of the vast preponderance of our Federal revenues by tariffs so adjusted as to raise the most money with the least burden to our people, and at the same time to protect and promote all the industries of the nation in every way in our power. I have profound respect for the heroic missionaries who carry Christian civilization into heathen lands, but I despise missionary statesmen whose duties are at home, who are forever troubling their philanthropic souls about the welfare of our rivals in the great commercial conflicts of the world. No intelligent legislator in all the realm of history from Moses to Washington, has not been for his own country and his own people before all the other countries and peoples of the earth. Plato, the sublimest of all the philosophers, held that there is no affinity nearer than our country; and Paul, the greatest of the apostles, declared that he that provideth not for those of his own house is worse than an infidel; and this sentiment runs through all the history, philosophy, poetry and song of all ages, climes, classes, and conditions of civilized men. The old Democratic newspaper which has been published in my native town for almost a century, and from which I learned the precepts of my Democracy, has borne through all those years emblazoned at its head that shibboleth of never-faltering patriotism, "Our country: may she always be right; but right or wrong our country."

The great State which I have the honor to represent has become historic in her devotion to the interests of her own people. In all the debates of the stormy period of the Revolution, in the convention which formed the Federal Constitution, in the first Congress which convened under it and in all that have met since, her representatives have stood shoulder to shoulder for the protection of her vast resources and for the promotion of the prosperity and happiness of her thrifty, toiling millions. It is a great Commonwealth, whose foundations were laid in justice and peace and fair dealing. Always true to the principles of human liberty and human progress; always loyal to the glorious Union of the States, it has stood from Valley Forge to Gettysburg with an escutcheon unstained as the sunlight, and must ever remain the grand and imperishable Keystone of the Republic.

ADDENDA

From a vast number of similar letters I ask leave to print the following:

HARRISBURG, PA., *December 9, 1893.*

MY DEAR SIR: I address you as the nearest Democratic Representative I can turn to to utter a word of warning against the too radical change contemplated by the new tariff bill. I have favored tariff reform and openly said that the present duties are entirely too high. They could fairly be reduced one-third without injury to America's industrial interests, and in a few years hence we could stand another reduction. The change from specific to ad valorem rates is a step backward, too, as proven by experience. The reduction in pig iron is over 50 per cent—too much for one time. I fear the result of too great reduction will react and be a deathblow to the Democratic party for a long time. The true Democratic policy was reflected in the Chicago convention in the deliberate report of the committee on resolutions, and not by the amendment to the report rushed through with a hurrah by the radicals. Hoping a caucus or something else may call a halt, I am,

Yours, respectfully,

HENRY MCCORMICK.

Hon. F. E. BELTZHOOVER,
Washington, D. C.

PRINCESS FURNACE, WRIGHTSVILLE, PA., *December 20, 1893.*

MY DEAR SIR: I understand you are taking an interest in behalf of your constituents in reference to the duties on iron and coal as proposed by the Wilson bill, and with that view, I will trouble you with an explanation of the situation it would leave me in if it should become a law. I am a manufacturer of pig iron. My furnace is located in Virginia, and I employ about 200 men at furnace and mining ore on my property, and I would here mention that in giving you the cost of my pig iron, I wish you not to forget that as the ore is mined on my own property, the expense of transportation is only 7 cents per ton, and no profit paid to anyone for the ore as in most cases, and I am perhaps the only individual furnace operator in this country, and most all others are owned by large companies with large capital, and under similar conditions of course able to stand out longer in dull times than I could expect, yet from the fact that with very few exceptions the furnaces of Virginia have been obliged to stop some time since, as well as those of our own State, yet I have run my furnace until last week.

I give you this as proof beyond question that my iron was made at as little cost, if not less, than the others, or I could not have run along so long after they had lost their capital in the business and being dependent upon my own resources entirely. I am now stopped because of the pending tariff question or legislation, as my customers inform me they will not buy till after they know the result. But now to the future.

My market is almost entirely in the East, from Philadelphia to Boston. After having worked down the cost of coke till there is no profit for the coke men, and railroad and water freights to the very lowest figure possible, and charging nothing for royalty on my ore, which is constantly reducing the value of my property, and nothing for interest on my money invested, or repairs for the plant, I find under all these conditions that the cost of the iron can not be gotten less than $10 per ton for a good foundry ore, and I think you will agree with me that the others could not get so low, or they would not have been obliged to stop long ago by reason of losing their capital, even when they were getting more for their iron by $1.50 per ton than now. My freight to Philadelphia is $2.75, and farther East is $4.25 per ton, but say about the lowest $3, and it costs $13 in the markets, even without anything for my ore or interest.

Now, I have a friend in Glasgow, Scotland, who is in the same business, and he writes me they can put good foundry iron on ship at $8 per ton, freight to any of our ports not over 75 cents per ton, and most of it comes over in ballast at 20 cents per ton. With the proposed tariff of 22½ per cent, or $1.80, would make the total cost delivered in our markets $10.55, or $2.50 per ton below that which I am able to do, even under circumstances above named, which I could of course not continue. Now, from that very fact, as before stated, not only the furnaces of Virginia have been compelled to shut down, but the greater portion of Alabama and other States, notwithstanding the statement made that they mine the ore very cheaply by reason of the use of large steam shovels. But this is misleading, as that is performed in very rare cases, or they would not have been obliged to suspend operations long before I did.

Now, I have been a Democrat all my life and have worked for the success of the party, but I have $300,000 invested in this business—my all, and the accumulations of a lifetime—and I fail to see why the party must ruin and destroy it, as well as that of perhaps the largest industry of this country, if it is done. And, again, I can assure you the party will have lost all control of the two Virginias, for I think I well know the feeling among the manufacturers and employés of these States, and I have no doubt it will have great influence on the future of our party.

I would respectfully ask for a duty of not less than $5 per ton on pig iron. Make it less than this and I believe we are mostly debarred from any further business as manufacturers of pig iron. I have called upon and corresponded with some of our Virginia Congressmen, and have some very satisfactory replies from them.

I would be pleased if you would confer with Mr. TUCKER, Representative from my district in Virginia. I have a very satisfactory letter from him, and I think he knows of my place of business, Glen Wilton, Va.

Begging pardon for encroaching so much on your time with my state-

ment, but I think you will appreciate the serious matter it is to have to face the prospect of having my business of a lifetime's building up wiped out so quickly, as it would be by the passage of the Wilson bill in its present shape.

Very truly, yours,

D. S. COOK.

Hon. F. E. BELTZHOOVER,
Washington, D. C.

BOILING SPRINGS, PA., *January 11, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: I sincerely hope you will do all in your power to restore a fairly protective duty on iron ore. We have a vast amount of ores suitable for the manufacture of iron and steel, and if the tariff question is settled and we have a reasonable duty there will be a revival of the business and employment for the hundreds of our now idle hands. If the Democrats do not stand up for the protection of labor they will never elect another President. I send you inclosed a number of clippings from the newspapers, which express my views better than I can.

Respectfully,

J. C. LEHMAN.

Hon. F. F. BELTZHOOVER.

KEYSTONE FARM MACHINE WORKS,
York, Pa., January 8, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Don't you think the clause in the "Wilson bill" relating to the admission of agricultural implements free of duty should be made conditional, *i. e.*, we open our markets, if other countries, especially Canada, do the same?

Don't you think it would be a more business-like exchange?

Canadian competition will be injurious enough to manufacturers, but we should surely be given a chance to try to introduce some of our "ingenuity" in return,

Yours, truly,

KEYSTONE FARM MACHINE WORKS,
MICHAEL SCHALL, *Proprietor.*

Hon. F. E. BELTZHOOVER, *Washington, D. C.*

MECHANICSBURG, PA., *January 6, 1894.*

DEAR SIR: Has your attention been called to the fact that the Wilson bill puts agricultural implements on the free list, notwithstanding the fact that Canada imposes an import duty of 35 per cent on our implements? May I ask your efforts to have this clause apply to only such countries as impose no tariff on our implements?

Very truly,

GEO. S. COMSTOCK.

Hon. F. E. BELTZHOOVER, *Washington, D. C.*

THE GEISER MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Waynesboro, Franklin County, Pa., January 9, 1894.

DEAR SIR: We take this opportunity to write you and ask you to use your every effort to defeat the clause in the Wilson bill found in lines 23, 24, and 25, on page 80, or to have same amended to read same as lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, on page 82, using the word "implements" in place of "salt." We believe this would answer the purpose and protect the American implement manufacturers against Canadian machinery, as we believe we are deserving of protection in these lines until such time as they see proper to allow us to ship our machinery into their country free of duty. We trust you will use your every effort to have this bill changed or amended to protect your constituents in your own district, as well as those of your State.

Thanking you in advance for your services in this direction, we are,

Very truly, yours,

THE GEISER MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
J. A. MIDDOWER, *Secretary.*

Hon. F. E. BELTZHOOVER, *Washington, D. C.*

HUNTINGDON AND BROAD TOP RAILROAD COMPANY,
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE,
Southeast corner Walnut and Fourth Streets,
Philadelphia, January 8, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Many of the industries of Pennsylvania are still languishing. What efforts are being made to keep them going are more in the line of humanity than from any prospect of return to manufacturers. It is not owing to delay in legislation on the tariff question so much as the fear of that legislation when it comes. The dread of the passage of the Wilson bill to Pennsylvania means even greater depression than already exists.

The Committee of Ways and Means has not carried out the policy of the Democratic party in the Wilson tariff bill. It does not even provide revenue for the Government. It can not do so, excepting by largely increased importations. This means large exports of gold and the curtailment of home productions just to that extent, or else starvation wages, hardship, and discontent among the laboring classes. The Wilson tariff bill is not a bill meeting with favor among the members of the Democratic party. They are crying aloud against it all over the country. Certainly it can not be in accordance with the wishes of the party when they ignore and condemn it.

It seems to be Mr. WILSON'S bill. Representatives of this great Commonwealth who oppose this measure will earn the gratitude of the people. While unquestionably tariff reform is needed, hoped for, and asked for, a destructive tariff will be condemned and will be an injury to the party as well as to the country. Almost every interest in the State of Pennsylvania is assailed by it. Almost every interest asks for its defeat or else its modification, so as to be more in the line with the platform of the party. Certainly the Democratic party does not want to destroy the people who put it in power.

Hoping that our Representatives will take an independent and patriotic stand against the Wilson bill as emanating from the Committee on Ways and Means and will set their faces firmly against the destruction which will surely follow in its wake, I remain.

Yours, very respectfully.

SPENCER M. JANNEY, *President.*

Hon. FRANK E. BELTZHOOVER, *Washington, D. C.*

BOARD OF TRADE OF THE CITY OF READING, PA.

[On January 4, 1894, the membership was 565.]

At a meeting of the Reading Board of Trade, held January 4, 1894, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas the incessant tariff agitation for a number of years and the fear of lower duties on imports has created a large decrease in values and a declining market in all lines of American manufactures and produce, resulting in general stagnation of business, commercial bankruptcy, intensified by great want and distress among the people: Therefore,

Resolved, It is the sense of this meeting that Congress should make but moderate changes in the present tariff, and do that very promptly, or abandon further action on the question and thus hasten the return of prosperity.

Resolved, That the secretary notify the Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania in Congress of this action.

JEROME L. BOYER, *President.*

Attest:

CYRUS T. FOX, *Secretary.*

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BROOKSHIRE having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BAILEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. BOWERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the following bills; which, with the accompanying reports, were ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, to wit:

The bill (H. R. 450) to restore William A. Winder to the United States Army, and to place him on the retired list with the rank of captain of artillery. (Report No. 272.)

The bill (H. R. 3194) to amend the record of Simon Rice, of Company A, Sixth Maryland Volunteers. (Report No. 273.)

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the following bills, and the same were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to wit:

The bill (H. R. 5376) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Downing.

The bill (H. R. 641) to remove charge of desertion standing against John P. Ryan.

The bill (H. R. 650) to remove charge of desertion standing against Oliver O'Brien.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAWLINS (by request): A bill (H. R. 5407) granting 40 acres off the Fort Douglas military reservation, on which to establish an orphans' home—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 5408) to permit the city of Louisville to use certain grounds belonging to the United States in said city as a public park—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 5409) to amend section 840 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEREDITH: A bill (H. R. 5410) for the free coinage of American silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SWEET: A joint resolution (H. Res. 118) declaring the sympathy of the Government of the United States to be in favor of the effort now being made to establish a republican form of government in the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNPHY: A resolution inquiring as to whether Chief Supervisor Davenport is rightfully in possession of any room in the New York post-office and court-house building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky; A resolution expressing the sense of the House relative to employment of United States forces in Hawaii; also relative to the proposed annexation, and to foreign intervention in the affairs of Hawaii—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 5411) for the relief of Mrs. Cassa Simpson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) granting an increase of pension to A. Loomis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPEHART: A bill (H. R. 5413) for the relief of John L. Charles—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 5414) to extend the time for building a street railway on the military reservation, Fort Riley, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 5415) for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles L. Bullis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTER: A bill (H. R. 5416) for the relief of Luke McGrath, alias Luke Ainsworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) for the relief of Thornton Ralls—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) for the relief of James Winbigler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5419) for the relief of John G. Pickler, of Eatons Cross Roads, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5420) to correct the military record of William K. Culver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYLER: A bill (H. R. 5421) to make Commodore William P. McCann, of the Navy, a rear-admiral on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: A bill (H. R. 5422) for the granting of an invalid pension to Levi Moser, late sergeant of Company I, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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. ALDERSON: Petition of 69 citizens of West Virginia, protesting against the placing of coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 194 citizens of West Virginia, protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 198 citizens of West Virginia, protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 489 citizens of West Virginia and Maryland, protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 16 citizens of Brooklyn Rush Run Post-Office, Fayette County, W. Va., against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 135 citizens of Fire Creek, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 92 citizens of Dimmock, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 94 citizens of Conchoe, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 102 citizens of Prince Raleigh County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Elmo, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of miners and employés at the coal mines and coke ovens of the Pulaski Iron Company, of West Virginia, protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Flat Top Coal and Coke Association of West Virginia, adopted at the meeting held at Roanoke, Va., protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade of Charleston, W. Va., adopted September 26, 1893, protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of miners and citizens of Conchoe, W. Va., against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of mine operators and other citizens of the Flat Top Coal Region, held at Bramwell, W. Va., protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the coal operators of the Pocahontas coal field of Virginia and West Virginia, protesting against the placing of coal on the free list—to the committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of miners and citizens of Fire Creek, Fayette County, W. Va., protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 102 citizens of Fayette, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore, as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 134 citizens of Stone Cliff, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore, as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of miners and citizens of Alaska, W. Va., protesting against free coal, as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the citizens, operators, and miners of the Wells Branch Coal Company of West Virginia, protesting against the placing of coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of employés of the Keystone and Acme mines, in West Virginia, protesting against the placing of coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 98 citizens of Claremouth, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore, as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 84 citizens of Keenys Creek, Fayette County, W. Va., against free coal and iron ore, as proposed by the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition and resolutions of 155 citizens of Caperton, Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal and iron ore, as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 22 citizens of Dubree, Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal and iron ore, as proposed in Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of miners of Dimmock Coal Company, of Dimmock, W. Va., protesting against free coal and iron ore, as proposed in Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 77 citizens and miners of Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal and iron ore in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 80 citizens of Red Ash, Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition and resolution of citizens at Nuttallburg, W. Va., opposing free coal, ore, and iron in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 101 citizens of Claremont, Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal and iron ore, as proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution adopted by miners of Elm Grove, Ohio County, W. Va., protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of 232 miners and workingmen of Ohio County, W. Va., protesting against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 81 citizens of Furker, Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal and iron ore in Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 93 citizens of Echo, Fayette County, W. Va., opposing free coal and iron ore in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Petition of J. F. Desper and 96 other citizens of Ashland, N. H., protesting against changes in the existing tariff laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARWIG: Two petitions of citizens of Madison, Wis., praying for the removal of duty on books printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Illinois: Petition of Wesley L. Stapleton, for pay for horse—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: Petition of H. E. Williams and others, of Hickman County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Local Assembly, No. 1630, Knights of Labor, in favor of establishment of Government telegraph lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANIELS: Petition of thread-workers and spinners of fine cotton yarns of Clark O. N. T. Thread Company and Clark Mile End Spool Cotton Company, of Newark and Kearney, N. J., protesting against any reductions of the tariff on spool cotton and fine cotton yarn—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the All Tobacco Cigarette Manufacturers' Association, of New York City and Baltimore, Md., against the reduction of duty on all-tobacco cigarettes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Three petitions of the citizens of Iowa and honorably-discharged Union soldiers and sailors of the late war without regard to party, for the enactment of a just and equitable service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, protest of the Sioux City Typographical Union, No. 180, against placing all scientific publications of individuals or institutions on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Memorial of the Cotton Machinery Builders, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of 53 farmers, mechanics, and laboring men of Carthage Township, Athens County, Ohio, against the passage of the so-called Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Protest of A. E. Brigham, Westminister, Vt., and 21 other farmers, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the president and faculty of Iowa State University, for removal of duty on books printed in the English language—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of glass-workers of Everett, Pa., for the prevention of reduction of duties on foreign-made glass bottles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers of Blacklick Alliance, No. 85, of Cambria County, Pa., for defeat of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Sayre, Pa., protesting against the adoption of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Sugar Grove and West McHenry, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania: Memorial for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against Peter Fleming, to accompany H. R. 5402—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUK of Ohio: Petition of Mead Paper Company, of Dayton, Ohio, and of W. B. Oglesby Paper Company, of Middletown, Ohio, praying that sulphite, chemical, and ground-wood pulp be free from duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. B. Weston & Co., and others, paper manufacturers, of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against proposed tax of 10 cents on playing cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Richardson, Boston, relative to duty on china clay—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. Talmage & Sons, New York, relative to duty on rice—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. D. Moulton & Co., New York, relative to duty on salt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William A. Hazard, New York, relative to duty on salt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pacific Lumber Company, San Francisco, relative to duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Milwaukee Malt and Grain Company, relative to duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of flax and hemp-dressers of America, relative to duty on flax and hemp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James Reiley and others, of Newark, N. J., relative to duty on threads, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Barbour Flax Spinning Company, Patterson, N. J., relative to duty on threads, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. Hillinoson & Co., New York, relative to duty on drugs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Louisville Silvering and Beveling Company, relative to duty on mirrors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Browning, King & Co., and others, New York, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. O. Frye, and others, miners of lead ore, Missouri, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. W. Robinson and others, zinc-mine owners, of Virginia, protesting against the adoption of provisions of the Wilson bill relative to iron ore and zinc—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Big Stone, Gap, Va., against reduction of tariff on coal, coke, iron ore, and lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pike Dry Goods Company, the National Cash Register Company, and 115 manufacturers and laborers of Dayton, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. F. Lukens and 28 other citizens of Lebanon, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. J. Ross and others, Germantown, Ohio, praying for uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frederick Dilz and others, Hamilton, Ohio, praying for uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. J. Eichorn and others, Middleton, Ohio, praying for uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. M. Snyder and others, Miamisburg, Ohio, praying for uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James J. Shaefer and others, Dayton, Ohio, praying for uniform duty of 35 cents on unstemmed leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gem Shirt Company and others, Dayton, Ohio, against change of tariff on shirts, collars, and cuffs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrance of Dayton Typographical Union, No. 57, against the passage of the clause in Wilson bill placing "all scientific publications on the free list"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Petition of citizens of Cerro N. Mex., praying Congress not to put wool on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEFEVER: Petition of the Green and Flint Glass Bottle Manufacturers of the city of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., against the reduction proposed in the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of citizens of Wise County, Va., against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill now pending in the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Furniture Workers' Union, No. 24; of Boston Lodge, No. 264, I. A. of M.; of Lynn Typographical Union, No 120, and of Boston Typographical Union, No. 13, all of Boston, Mass., for Government ownership and control of the telegraph system of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Coal Club, of Boston and vicinity, for a light-ship and range lights in Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Gloucester (Mass.) Board of Trade and Business Men's Association, for the speedy completion of the Sandy Bay breakwater and harbor of refuge, Cape Ann, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McDANNOLD (by request): Petition granting an honorable discharge to Jacob L. Neighborger, of Company H, Thirtieth Iowa Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of the International Furniture Workers' Union, Local Union No. 24, of Boston, praying for the Government ownership of the telegraphic systems of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MUTCHLER (by request): Petition of the employés of the Stroudsburg Woolen Mills, for the defeat of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Petition of the Jeffrey Manufacturing Company, of Columbus, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of all the professors of the Ohio State University, urging that books printed in the English language be placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Petition of Edward N. Cahill and 45 others of Pawtucket, R. I., in favor of the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of McPoland and 21 others of Pawtucket, R. I., in favor of the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED: Protest of Hugh Bell and 138 others, employés of the Westbrook Manufacturing Company, of Westbrook, Me., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. C. Kipp and 179 other employés of Chattanooga Foundry and Pipe Works against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of William Smith and 79 other citizens of Tuscarawas Township, Stark County, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of John A. McMellen and 79 others, manufacturers, merchants, business men, and citizens, of West Bay City,

Mich., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. P. Smith and 302 others, laborers and mechanics, of North Manchester, Ind., for the friends of labor in the Fifty-third Congress to defeat the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRANTON: Protest of John S. Short, Martin P. Flynn, and others, of Scranton, Pa., against reduction of tariff on leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of A. L. Spencer, Dolph B. Atherton, and others, of Scranton, Pa., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Typographical Union, No. 2, Philadelphia, Pa., against placing on the free list all scientific publications of individuals or institutions—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Petition of the All Tobacco Cigarette Manufacturers' Association of New York, against the reduction of tariff on "all-tobacco cigarettes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of 214 employés of Alfred Dolge & Son, of Dolgeville, Herkimer County, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 180 employés of Little Falls (Herkimer County, N. Y.) Knitting Mills, against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles L. Marshall and 140 other employés of the Empire Woolen Company, of Clayville, Oneida County, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Freeman A. Seymour and 40 other employés of Dolgeville Woolen Company, of Dolgeville, Herkimer County, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 628 employés of New York Mills, Oneida County, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 685 employés of the Globe Woolen Company, of Utica, N. Y., against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letters from 212 individuals of Herkimer County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIPE: Petition of 66 flint-glass workers of Homestead, Pa., remonstrating against any reduction from the McKinley bill on the flint-glass schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of iron and steel workers of Cannonsburg, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the workers of Western, Pa., engaged in the manufacture of green and flint glass, protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of workingmen of McKeesport, Pa., protesting against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of D. A. 1630, Knights of Labor, of Pittsburg, for Government acquirement and control of the telegraphic systems—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition signed by 494 citizens of Shoshone County, Idaho, against lead-ore schedule of the Wilson bill, alleging that the passage of said measure will result in the destruction of the silver lead mining industries in said State—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: Petition of 68 citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, of all political parties, protesting against the passage of the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the citizens of the county of Orleans, State of New York, protesting against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of the Excelsior Machine and Cleveland Punch and Shear Works Company, and 15 other manufacturing firms of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. H. Rudd and 23 others, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill, and state we believe that its passage will destroy our industries, rob the workingmen of work and wages and bring upon the country still further distress, etc.,—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John B. Creary and 10 other farmers of Orange, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. E. Gould and 62 others, of Painsville, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 29 employés of Chapin Bolt and Nut Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John H. Davis and 115 others, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Owen Mullen, William J. Walsh, and 281 others, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 18 employés of Chafer & Becker, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the passage of the Wilson bill, and state we believe that the proposed measure, if adopted, will impoverish the country, lessen employment, reduce wages and earnings, and decrease the purchasing power of the people—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOMER: Petition of J. H. Kahler and 15 other citizens, in the interest of the fraternel, society, and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 24, 1894.*

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

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

ANNUAL REPORT ON MACKINAC ISLAND NATIONAL PARK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War transmitting, in accordance with law, a report from Capt. Charles T. Witherell, Nineteenth Infantry, as superintendent of the national park on the island of Mackinac in the Straits of Mackinac in Michigan for the year 1893; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

BUST OF THE LATE SENATOR SUMNER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from Mrs. Anna Shaw Curtis, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

WEST NEW BRIGHTON, STATEN ISLAND, N. Y.,
January 23, 1894.

To the Senate of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: I have a marble bust of Senator Sumner by Martin Millmore, of Rome, which was presented to Mr. Curtis by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the occasion of the memorial delivered by Mr. Curtis on Senator Sumner, which, if acceptable, I wish to give to the Senate, to be placed in the Senate wing of the Capitol.

I will send the bust on free of charge as soon as I know of its acceptance.

Respectfully,

ANNA SHAW CURTIS.

Mr. HOAR. The lady who writes the letter is the widow of the eminent orator George William Curtis, known by reputation to every member of this body; and the bust which she so generously offers for the acceptance of the Senate is one presented by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to her husband. I move that the letter be referred to the Committee on the Library.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. IRBY presented a memorial of the General Assembly of South Carolina regarding the equity jurisdiction of the courts of the United States in the matter of railroad receiverships and other matters; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hurley and Knight, in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against placing iron ore on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry cigar manufacturers, of Milwaukee, Fountain City, Watertown, Ripon, and Green Bay, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the imposition of a uniform duty of 35 per cent on unstemmed leaf tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of employés of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Worsted Mills, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on woolen goods; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the employés of J. H. Rice and Friedmen Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the trustees of the Dayton Art Gallery of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the admission of paintings and statuary free of duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Cream City Typographical