

N. Mex., praying for the passage of House bill 6169—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MARTIN of Indiana: Protest of Immanuel Lutheran Church of Decatur, Ind., against the proposed religious amendment of the Federal Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAGNY: Protests of St. Peter's Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Gibson and Whitley County, Ind., against the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McRAE: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Dr. John B. Rumph, of Ouachita County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. QUIGG: Petition of Thomas K. Cree and others, for additional legislation for the suppression of lotteries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHAW: Protest of W. Z. Friedrich, pastor, and E. H. Geske, Gustave Race and Henry Kuehn, trustees of St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of the town of Lincoln, Eau Claire County, Wis., against the so-called God-in-the-Constitution amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of the Furniture Movers' Union, of Detroit, Mich., in favor of governmental ownership and control of the telegraph systems—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TYLER (by request): Petition of citizens of Norfolk, Va., to exempt national and local building and loan associations from the operation of the income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS of Ohio: Papers to accompany House bill 6774 to grant an honorable discharge to John A. White—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of 80 citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for legislation restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 23, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the credentials of Thomas Jarvis, appointed by the Governor of North Carolina a Senator from that State to fill until the next meeting of the Legislature thereof the vacancy caused by the death of Zebulon Baird Vance in the term ending March 3, 1897; which were read and ordered to be filed.

INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in pursuance of law, a supplemental report including two judgments omitted from a prior list of final judgments rendered in favor of claimants against the United States not paid, arising from Indian depredations; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CAPITOL CORNER STONE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 21, 1894.

DEAR SIR: The general committee on the centennial of the Capitol has donated a bronze tablet, estimated to cost about \$900, to be placed upon the exterior southeast wall of the north wing of the original Capitol building, to commemorate the laying of the corner stone of the Capitol, September 18, 1793, by President George Washington.

As legislation will be necessary to carry out the purpose of the general committee, I have the honor to request that the subject may be brought to the attention of Congress, only suggesting that the matter of the inscription upon the tablet be left to the discretion of the joint committee appointed under the joint resolution of Congress approved August 17, 1893, and that the selection of the precise locality for the insertion of the tablet, as well as the work connected with such insertion, be placed under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

Very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

L. GARDNER,
Chairman General Committee.

HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
President United States Senate.

Mr. VOORHEES. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to introduce and have considered a joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, if there be no objection.

The joint resolution (S. R. 77) providing for the placing of a tablet upon the Capitol to commemorate the laying of the cor-

ner stone of the building, September 18, 1893, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the general committee of citizens of the United States, of which Lawrence Gardner is chairman, have donated to the United States a bronze tablet to be placed upon the Capitol to commemorate the laying of the corner stone of the building, September 18, 1793. Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States accept the said tablet, and that the Architect of the Capitol be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the same, when approved by the joint committee appointed under joint resolution of Congress of August 17, 1893, to be placed in or upon the southeast wall of the north wing of the original Capitol building, upon such suitable place as he, the said Architect, may select, at such distance above the corner stone laid by George Washington, September 18, 1793, as in the judgment of said Architect may be best suited to display the same, without detracting from the architectural effect of the building.

Mr. VOORHEES. It may not be improper to say that the committee having in charge the centennial celebration of the laying the corner stone of the Capitol have so well managed their affairs as to have a moderate surplus fund left with which to provide for this bronze tablet. The tablet is to be placed at a point to indicate the precise spot where the original corner stone was laid. That locality has been ascertained, and this is a movement to mark the spot for all time to come. I think it a charming and a most excellent thing to do, and the committee which have had charge of this matter are deserving of great credit. They have asked nothing of Congress, they have been at no expense to the Government, and they have the money to spare to make this provision. I thought it best to explain the matter. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. GRAY. While the Senator is on his feet in regard to this very appropriate act that has been performed, let me ask him whether the description on the tablet is to contain the name of any private person or of the donors of the tablet?

Mr. VOORHEES. I think not.

Mr. GRAY. It ought not to do so.

Mr. VOORHEES. I think it does not, although on that subject I am not at all advised. I should say not, very decidedly. However, that can be easily controlled or managed. I do not think there is any such purpose at all. It is a tablet to mark the precise locality of the original corner stone laid by George Washington, September 18 1793.

Mr. GRAY. The good taste of the gentlemen connected with this enterprise would suggest that no such thing should be done; but I think it ought to be assured.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5216) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PROCTOR. I present a memorial of property owners on L street in this city, in opposition to Senate bill 1630 and House bill 6596, authorizing the Belt Railway Company to extend its tracks and run its cars from New York avenue and L street westwardly along L street to Eleventh street and L street to Connecticut avenue, etc. As the memorial is a carefully prepared statement of matters bearing on this question, and is very important to the interests of a large part of the District, I ask that it be printed as a miscellaneous document and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HALE. Before that order is made I wish to say that for one I welcome very heartily any expression in reference to District street railroads that comes from somebody else besides the projectors. There is a general view on the part of speculators and schemers in street railroads that Washington is essentially a good place for their operations; and I am very glad the Senator from Vermont has brought here a protest from people who are interested in these roads, because they live in the neighborhood where a proposed road would run. I hope the Committee on the District of Columbia in considering this matter will give due attention to these people, and before anything is done have them called, and let there be a thorough hearing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorial will be referred to

the Committee on the District of Columbia, and printed as a document, in the absence of objection.

Mr. ALDRICH. The latter part of last month a delegation of 16 women employed in the various textile establishments of Massachusetts and Rhode Island visited the Capitol for the purpose of presenting a respectful protest to the Senate Finance Committee against the adoption of the Wilson tariff bill, which is now pending in the Senate. These women, I believe, fairly represent the views and opinions of the more than 2,000,000 wage-earning women of the United States. The majority of the Finance Committee declined to give them a hearing. They then asked the minority members of the committee to hear their statement, and the Republican members of the committee consented. All the Senators who heard their statement will agree with me that it was a very important and interesting one. I now present, in the form of a memorial, the statement made at the hearing, and ask that it be printed as a miscellaneous document for the use of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and the memorial will lie on the table and be printed as a document.

Mr. HARRIS presented sundry petitions of citizens of Bristol, Greenville, Knoxville, and Morristown, all in the State of Tennessee, praying that national building and loan associations and local building and loan associations be exempted from the provisions of the proposed income tax; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Sheboygan, Wis., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed Chinese treaty; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Fountain City Lodge, No. 13, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Fountain City, Wis., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., remonstrating against the proposed transfer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the Treasury Department to the Navy and Interior Departments; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MILLS presented a petition of sundry citizens of San Antonio, Tex., praying that national building and loan associations and local building and loan associations be exempted from the provisions of the proposed income tax; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Stonington, Conn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Durham, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PEPPER presented a memorial of sundry American workmen, residents of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Wilson tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Retail Clerks' Union and the Barbers' Union, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. McMILLAN (for Mr. STOCKBRIDGE) presented the memorial of John Wertheimer, of Cheboygan, Mich., and the memorial of J. C. Wooster, of Cheboygan, Mich., remonstrating against the imposition of an income tax on national building and loan associations and local building and loan associations; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. STOCKBRIDGE) presented petitions of the Book Binders and Rulers' Union; of the Trunk Makers' Union, and of the Furniture Movers' Union, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MARTIN presented the memorial of Isaac S. Lee, J. W. Tauber, A. Burrow, J. P. Ellis, Fred Hall, and 127 other citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of proposed Sunday legislation as advocated by the National Reform Association; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the petition of Isaac Moon and sundry other citizens of Randolph, Kans., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class

matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of Farmers' Alliance No. 74, of Nicktown, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Hill oleomargarine bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Powelton Building Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Cigarmakers' Union No. 242, of York, Pa.; of the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters' Helpers of the United States, of Pittsburg, Pa., and of Cigarmakers' International Union of America, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed Chinese treaty; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of J. G. Dietrick and 60 other citizens of Oxford; of Council No. 507, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Point Marion; of Council No. 853, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Oxford; of Venango Council, No. 358, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Franklin; of Council No. 290, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Manorville; of Council No. 658, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Smith's Ferry; of Council No. 181, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Erie, and of Reserve Council, No. 253, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the inspection of immigrants by United States consuls; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Fidelity Lodge, No. 17, Shield of Honor; of Alexander Henry and 25 other citizens, and of Charles H. Sevidge and 44 other citizens, all of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that fraternal society and college journals be admitted to the mails as second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Scranton, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Bailey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Encampment No. 60, Union Veteran Legion, of Johnstown, Pa., remonstrating against any change in the law providing for the management of soldiers' homes; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUTLER presented petitions of 52 citizens and business firms of South Carolina, praying that national building and loan associations and local building and loan associations be exempted from the provisions of the proposed income tax; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH. I present a statement on behalf of the States of California, Oregon, and Nevada, and joint resolutions and memorials to Congress from these States in relation to certain war claims, and praying for the reimbursement of moneys by them expended in the suppression of the rebellion when aiding the United States in maintaining the "common defense" on the Pacific coast. The bill S. 1295 has been reported favorably, and quite an elaborate report was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. This is a statement of additional matter which might be put in the RECORD, but I present it and ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it may be printed as a document to go with the report of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. WHITE on the 17th instant, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 12th instant, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

COURTS IN MICHIGAN.

Mr. VILAS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3713) to provide for the division of the eastern district of Michigan into the northern and southern divisions, and for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States therein, and for other purposes, to report it favorably, without amendment. I also, by the same instruction, ask for the immediate consideration of the bill. I

desire to state that it is simply a bill for the division of the eastern district of Michigan into two subdistricts. The bill has been carefully considered. There are no amendments proposed. It has been lying awaiting action for some time, and I ask that it be put upon its passage.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VILAS. I am also directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the division of the eastern district of Michigan into the northern and southern divisions, and for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States therein, and for other purposes, to report adversely thereon. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MARTIN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1942) granting to the Soule College Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church for educational purposes certain lands in Kansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 1943) granting a pension to Annie Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a bill (S. 1944) for the relief of certain Indians; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DOLPH. I will state that both this bill and an amendment which I submit to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill are intended to cure a difficulty which I think has been encountered in administering the law for the allotment of lands to Indians. Sometimes there is a controversy about the lands, and rights are entirely dependent upon the action of the Land Department. The object of this proposed legislation is to give Indians or persons of Indian descent who claim lands a right to maintain an action, or suit, or other proceedings in regard to them the same as if they were citizens of the United States.

I move that the bill and proposed amendment be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANCHARD (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1945) for the relief of Holmes & Leathers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEPPER. I was requested by a gentleman of the District of Columbia, claiming to represent a large number of persons, to introduce a bill and ask its reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1946) to dispose of idle labor and discourage idle wealth in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the bill be read the second time in full.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas it is desirable to employ the idle labor, advance the rate of wages, and bring homes within easier reach of the homeless; and

Whereas it is desirable to reduce rent and interest, and to keep vacant land from advancing in price; and

Whereas it is desirable to avoid the support of the destitute by charity; and

Whereas it is desirable to secure these ends and to make certain public improvements without taxing anything but the profits derived from gambling in land values and holding wealth in idleness: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be levied on all idle land subject to taxation within the District of Columbia a special tax each year, which tax in each case shall be equal to the increase in the market value of such land during the preceding year; and that the revenue thus obtained shall be appropriated to the employment of the idle citizens of the District in the construction and management of such public works as Congress may, from time to time, direct.

That all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith be, and they are hereby, repealed; and this act shall take effect when approved.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to know from the Senator from Kansas what is covered by "and so forth," where, as I caught the reading, it is provided that homes are to be brought within easy reach, and so forth. If that means existing homes within reach of the army that is marching on Washington, I certainly object to the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that I introduce the bill at the request of a gentleman of this District who prepared the measure. I know nothing about it except that, and I am in no wise responsible for it. I do not even know what "and so forth" in that connection means, if it occurs in the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill goes to the Committee on the District of Columbia?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 78) providing for the publication of an additional number of the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, sufficient to supply three copies to each of the several National Soldiers' Homes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BERRY (for Mr. JONES of Arkansas) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MARTIN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Select Committee to Investigate the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. WHITE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of Congress 15,000 additional copies of the report, with index, of the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the Nicaragua Canal: of which number 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5216) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEARINGS ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

Mr. PEPPER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 400, being a resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to be known as the Committee on Communication.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to prevail.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for a division.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the resolution be read at length, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. PEPPER on the 14th instant as follows:

Whereas there exists in many places and on the part of large numbers of citizens, individually and in organized bodies, a disposition to visit the city of Washington for the purpose of personally presenting to Congress their views with respect to pending and prospective measures of legislation; and

Whereas many of such persons and bodies are reported to be now on their way hither, with others likely to follow, for the purposes aforesaid; and

Whereas, to the end that these, our petitioners, shall have full and respectful hearing, and that proceedings attending their communications with the Senate shall be orderly and not subjected to interruption by the transaction of other public business: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That a select committee of nine members of the Senate be appointed by the Vice-President, to be known as the Committee on Communication, whose duty it shall be to receive all written or printed communications from citizens or bodies of citizens visiting the capital, or intending to make such visit, for the purposes mentioned in the preamble hereto, and to receive all petitions, memorials, and remonstrances of such persons and bodies and hear them orally in relation to the matters and things about which they desire to communicate with the Senate. The committee shall report fully to the Senate, from time to time, as other committees report.

The Sergeant-at-Arms will set aside a convenient room in the Capitol, or other building belonging to the Government, for the use of said committee and furnish the same with the necessary articles for the convenient dispatch of business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas to take up the resolution which has been read.

The question being put, there were on a division—yeas 16, nays 28.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for a vote by yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMERON. I do not know how he would vote on this proposition, but if he were present I should vote "nay." If the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] will intimate what the vote of his colleague would be on the proposition, I shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. CAREY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIXON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GIBSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM].

Mr. PETTIGREW (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CAMDEN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON].

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], but I am satisfied that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this proposition, and I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called.) I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL]. In his absence from the Chamber, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HIGGINS]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. PEPPER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I have observed that a number of Senators have announced their pairs. What I wish to inquire is, whether on a question of this kind pairs may properly be announced? If the Chair will state the rule in reference to it he will relieve my mind on this matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Kansas that it is a subject over which the Chair has no jurisdiction. It is a question for the determination of each Senator for himself.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the Senators who have announced pairs be requested to vote.

Mr. GORMAN. Regular order.

Mr. CALL. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], and therefore withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 26, not voting 41; as follows:

YEAS—17.

Aldrich, Allen, Allison, Cullom, Davis,	Gallinger, Hansbrough, Hawley, Kyle, Martin,	Peffer, Perkins, Power, Shoup, Stewart,	Teller, Washburn.
---	--	---	----------------------

NAYS—26.

Bate, Berry, Blanchard, Chandler, Cockrell, Coke, Frye,	George, Gorman, Gray, Harris, Jones, Ark. McMillan, Mills,	Mitchell, Wis. Morrill, Palmer, Pasco, Pugh, Roach, Sherman,	Turpie, Vest, Voorhees, Walsh, White.
---	--	--	---

NOT VOTING—41.

Blackburn, Brice, Butler, Caffery, Call, Camden, Cameron, Carey, Daniel, Dixon, Dolph,	Dubois, Faulkner, Gibson, Gordon, Hale, Higgins, Hill, Hoar, Hunton, Irby, Jones, Nev.	Lindsay, Lodge, McLaurin, McPherson, Manderson, Mitchell, Oregon Morgan, Murphy, Pettigrew, Platt, Proctor,	Quay, Ransom, Smith, Squire, Stockbridge, Vilas, Wilson, Wolcott.
--	--	---	--

So the motion was not agreed to.

YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. CAREY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 642) to protect the birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park, and to punish crimes in said park, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. VEST. I have some further amendments to propose to the amendment reported by the committee in addition to those which I offered on Saturday.

In section 4, line 41, after the word "years," I move to strike out the word "either," and after the word "both," to strike out "together with the," and insert "and be adjudged to pay all;" so as to read:

And shall be subjected to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding two years or both and be adjudged to pay all costs of the proceedings, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In line 53 of the same section, before the word "punishment," I move to insert the word "other;" so as to read:

Said forfeiture shall be adjudicated and ordered by the court as a penalty in addition to the other punishment provided in this act.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In section 5, line 24, before the word "appeal," I move to strike out the word "their;" so as to read:

But the United States circuit court in said district may prescribe rules of procedure and practice for said commissioner in the trial of cases and for appeal to said United States district court.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In line 30 of the same section, before the word "cause," I move to strike out the word "proper," and insert "probable," so as to read, "probable cause is shown for holding the person," etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In the same section, line 33, after the word "State," I move to insert the words "of Wyoming."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In line 37, of the same section, before the word "bailable," I move to strike out the word "offenses," and insert the word "cases," so as to read:

Provided, That the said commissioner shall grant bail in all cases bailable under the laws of the United States and said State.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In section 6, line 6, after the word "courts," I move to strike out the word "shall" and insert the word "may," so as to read:

And the said United States district and circuit courts may hold one session, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In the same section, line 7, after the word "Wyoming," I move to insert "or at any other convenient place in said State of Wyoming," so as to read:

May hold one session of said courts annually at the town of Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming, or at any other convenient place in said State of Wyoming at such date as the said courts may order, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In section 7, line 1, after the word "act," I move to insert "shall, in addition to the fees allowed by law to other United States commissioners, be paid annually a salary of \$1,000, to be paid quarterly."

As the bill stands as proposed to be amended by the committee it only gives to the commissioner, who must be a resident in the park, the same fees that are allowed by law to other United States commissioners appointed by the circuit court. As a matter of course, anyone who knows that park will immediately agree that that would be no salary at all. The commissioner will possibly have very few cases; no one can tell how many; and the fees would only amount to an insignificant sum, fifty or one hundred dollars a year, upon which he could not live. I submit if a commissioner is to reside in the park and stay there, winter and summer, he should receive a salary upon which at least he could live. I propose to give him, besides the fees, \$1,000 a year. It is a responsible position, and there ought to be a good man appointed to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In section 9, line 3, after the word "also," I move to insert the words "having in said building," so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be erected in the park a suitable building to be used as a jail, and also have in said building an office for the use of the commissioner, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I desire to offer two other amendments, which I overlooked. In section 1 of the proposed amendment of the committee, line 3, after the word "Park," I move to strike out the words "in the State of Wyoming;" so as to read:

That the Yellowstone National Park as now defined, or as may be hereafter defined or extended, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. In section 4, line 29, before the word "hundred," I move to strike out "one" and insert "three;" so as to read:

And shall forfeit or pay for every such offense the sum of \$300.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I have no further amendments to offer to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Territories as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CAREY. I move that the Senate ask for a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments. The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. QUAY. With the consent of the Senate, I have agreed to yield the floor to-day upon the pending bill to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN].

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. President, in all the legislation that has come before Congress in the history of the Government, there has been none probably that has created so general an interest and so profoundly stirred the public mind of the country, carrying apprehension and alarm, as the measure now under consideration in the Senate, unless perhaps we except the legislation between 1850 and the breaking out of the war in 1861, including the repeal of the Missouri compromise in 1854, and that soon followed it. The questions considered during that period, however, were more of sentiment and morals than such as relate to the material or economic interests of the country.

Measures looking to substantial changes in methods of raising revenue, and the application of economic principles, have at all times attracted more or less attention with those whose interests are more directly and immediately involved. Such was the case as far back as the consideration of the so-called Walker tariff law in 1846, as the debates in Congress at that time clearly show. This was an ad valorem tariff, the handmaid and near relation of free trade, and as nearly as possible an ideal Democratic tariff, but one that paralyzed industries, discouraged business, and impoverished the country and led up to the panic and crash of 1857, leaving the Government with a bankrupt Treasury, and an impaired credit, and a prelude to the disgraceful condition of things which existed when the Democratic party surrendered power in 1861.

The so-called Morrill tariff law, and those following later, largely increasing duties demanded by the exigencies of the war situation, were discussed with great interest in both Houses of Congress. Such, also, was the case with the Morrison bill, of horizontal structure, and the Mills bill, not without elements of fairness and justice, both of which, though not enacted into law, created a widespread interest through the country. The tariff revision of 1883, where duties were reduced, also excited much attention and created great interest throughout the country, as was also the case with the tariff law of 1890, or the so-called McKinley bill.

But, Mr. President, there has been no instance in the history of tariff legislation where the whole population of the country has been so deeply interested, excited, and alarmed as at the present time. And how could it be otherwise? There is scarcely an interest in any State of the Union, and certainly in no Northern State, which is not imperiled and threatened under the provisions of this bill—a bill not for protection and creation, but for destruction.

Mr. President, the effect of this bill, so far as the New England and other Eastern States are concerned, can not fail to be most disastrous, for I can see no possible escape from the closing of their great mills and factories, rendering valueless millions invested in plant; or else largely reducing the price of labor employed to substantially the basis of foreign labor, either of which must prove unfortunate and disastrous to those great industrial communities. And all this will be true, to a less extent perhaps, in my own State and the other States of the Northwest, engaged so largely in agricultural pursuits.

The people of Minnesota, prior to the enactment of the law of 1890, have been to a limited extent only, direct beneficiaries of protective tariff legislation. The interests of our people have been in the productions of the soil and in the creation of real wealth; yet in all the years since the settlement of the State, and during its development, intelligent observation and experience have taught them to believe in the policy of protection, and that too on its broadest lines and basic principles. They have learned to know by practical experience that the prosperity of each portion of the country can only be coincident of that of the whole. In other words, that the producing sections of the country could prosper only as the manufacturing and industrial sections prosper. They have learned that the best market for their

products was the home market, furnished by the development and maintenance of home industries.

Under the inspiration of this protective policy, they have seen industrial development throughout the entire land that has no parallel in history. They have seen the furnaces lighted on both sides of the Alleghenies; they have seen the iron rails span the continent upon a half dozen different lines, and a railroad system developed reaching every State, county, and hamlet almost in the land, with transportation of their products reduced by one-half or more. In the past few years they have seen industries of every kind and description, and in all localities, spring into existence as if by magic, until the country has become one great workshop, and millions of intelligent laborers employed on a basis never known under other conditions or in other countries, and coincident with all this development they have had furnished them a home market for their products.

They have learned that the well-paid, intelligent wage-workers of our own country are larger and better consumers of their products than the poorly paid and half-starved laborers of other countries; they have come to know that the laborer in New England, receiving from \$1.50 to \$2 per day for a day's work, is a better consumer for their flour, corn, their pork and their beef, and all their great productions, than the pinched and poverty-stricken laborer of other countries, receiving but 40 and 50 cents a day for the same service, and able to maintain an existence little above the animal, consuming food scant in quantity and poor in quality.

With scarcely an exception in a period of thirty years, the best market in the world for all this production has been found at home, and so upon general principles it has followed that the theories of doctrinaires and the clamor and appeals of demagogues have been disregarded, and Minnesota, from the day of its admission as a State into the Union in 1858, has remained strong and sturdy in its adherence to the policy of protection of American industries and American labor.

I have said that the people of Minnesota have been only to a limited extent direct beneficiaries of protective tariff legislation. This is true. Until the tariff act of 1890, their products have received no just or adequate protection against the competition of other countries.

In the enactment of the law of 1890 the farmers of the West for the first time in the history of tariff legislation received that to which they were entitled. It is the first instance that duties had been levied sufficiently large to operate as a barrier to the competition of the farm products of the Canadian Provinces.

In 1889 we imported from Canada 11,365,881 bushels of barley, valued at \$7,721,475; in 1890 substantially the same amount, and this was done under a duty of 10 cents a bushel. In 1893, with a duty at 30 cents per bushel, we imported 1,969,761 bushels only at a valuation of \$921,301, a falling off of over 9,000,000 bushels. The production of this 9,000,000 bushels was transferred from Canada to States of the Northwest, including Wisconsin, Minnesota, the two Dakotas, and Montana.

The present bill reduces the duty on barley to 30 per cent ad valorem, which, with the valuation probably put upon it in Canada, will make the duty less even than prior to 1890, so that there would seem to be no good reason, with this reduction of duty, why the same or even larger amounts will not be imported from Canada than prior to 1890.

This is one practical object lesson as to the effect of this bill on the productions of the West. I could go on with other productions, as potatoes, hay, flax, hops, eggs, pease, cheese, and other food and agricultural products, and show the same results would apply to them, but will not do so at this time, but shall take occasion when the bill is considered by paragraphs to treat the subject more in detail.

But, Mr. President, there is another provision in this bill which will affect the farmers of the Northwest more disastrously than even the reduction of duties to which I have referred, and that is the repeal of the reciprocity provisions in the law of 1890. There is probably no section of the country where the effect of reciprocity treaties with foreign nations consummated by the wisdom and persistent efforts of Mr. Blaine, under the late Administration, have been so marked and favorable as the States of the Northwest.

No legislation has been so favorably received and hailed with so much delight in the Northwestern States as the reciprocity legislation in the act of 1890. In these treaties no interests were more carefully guarded and advanced than the agricultural interests, and more especially those of the Northwestern States. No one appreciated more fully the importance of furnishing new markets to our agricultural products than Mr. Blaine, and he seemed to have had this constantly in view in the preparation of these treaties, not only with Spain and the South American Republics, but also with Germany.

You can, therefore, Mr. President, well imagine that the people of Minnesota, as well as the other Northwestern States, look with more alarm upon the repeal of this reciprocity legislation than any other of its provisions.

I now come to the discussion of the question of the abandonment of the policy of reciprocity with foreign nations, including our sister republics on this hemisphere, inaugurated and given vitality in the tariff law of 1890.

But before entering upon such discussion I desire to give notice that at the proper time I shall ask a vote of the Senate upon the following amendment to the tariff bill:

SEC.—That the removal and reduction of duties provided for in this act shall apply only to articles imported from countries which shall have made reciprocal and equivalent concessions in their tariff laws in favor of merchandise imported from the United States.

I am not only opposed, Mr. President, to termination of the reciprocity arrangements already existing between the United States and other countries, but I am in favor of applying the same principle in all our foreign trade.

It may be saying a great deal, but it seems to me that there is no provision in this remarkable bill, evidently having for its purpose the destruction of American industries and American interests, so absolutely without excuse; so utterly devoid of reason, and ordinary business sense; so disastrous to the many great interests of this country, and apparently so vicious in purpose and design, as the repeal of the reciprocity provisions of the act of 1890, the handiwork of one of the wisest and far-seeing statesmen that this or any other country has ever produced—Mr. Blaine.

The authors of this measure, both in the House of Representatives and the members of the Finance Committee in the Senate, have evidently broached this subject with great misgivings, even if not forebodings. They have, either from want of a clear understanding of the subject, or the requisite courage to meet this question in an open and manly way, floundered, until quite recently, amid uncertainty, doubt, and distrust as to what should be attempted or dared in connection with this important legislation.

The Finance Committee has, however, evidently "taken the bull by the horns," so to speak, and clearly disclosed their purpose and policy by incorporating into the bill the following language, which surely can not be misunderstood:

SEC. 104. That sections 3, 15, and 16 of an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," are hereby repealed; and all agreements or arrangements made or proclaimed between the United States and foreign governments under the provisions of said section are hereby abrogated, of which the President shall give such notice to the authorities of said foreign governments as may be required by the terms of such agreements or arrangements.

But, Mr. President, before entering upon the discussion in details of the provision as now clearly presented, I think it may be well to bring to the attention of the Senate and the country the doubt and uncertainty that has shrouded this question from the time the Committee on Ways and Means submitted the report which accompanied the bill when it was finally sent to the House of Representatives up to the present time, if for no other purpose, as indicative of a want of a clear understanding and of consistency and logic which has attached from its introduction and passage in the House of Representatives, and the finishing touches which it has received at the hands of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Senate which has reported the bill in its present shape, making such observations as occur to me in following it through its different stages.

In the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, which accompanied the bill when it was submitted to the House of Representatives, appears this paragraph:

It is the purpose of the present bill to repeal *in toto* section 3 of the tariff act of October 1, 1890, commonly but most erroneously called its reciprocity provision.

The section in the pending bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, reads as follows:

SEC. 89. That section 3 of an act approved October 1, 1890, entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," is hereby repealed, and that all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, but the repeal of existing laws or modifications thereof embraced in this act shall not affect any act done, or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause before the said repeal or modifications; but all rights and liabilities under said laws shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if said repeal or modifications had not been made, etc.

THE FORCE OF THE SECTION AND ITS EFFECT.

If I read this section aright, Mr. President, it was intended by the committee of the House of Representatives which framed this bill to deprive the Executive of any further authority under the reciprocity section of the act of 1890, but not to disturb the rights that may have been heretofore acquired under the pro-

visions of that section. In other words, the fifteen commercial arrangements which now exist between the United States and foreign nations by the authority of that act were intended by the House to remain as they are, but the President was forbidden to negotiate more like them.

It seems to me that no other interpretation can be placed upon the language of section 89 of the House bill, for it says distinctly that the repeal of existing laws shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued, "but all rights and liabilities under said laws shall continue, and may be enforced in the same manner as if said repeal or modifications had not been made." That this was the intention of the House of Representatives is shown by the discussion of the section referred to on the 25th of January, 1894. Mr. SPRINGER, addressing the House, said:

Mr. Chairman, I think there should be added to the end of this section a proviso that the treaties made in pursuance of the provisions of that act should remain in force the same as if the section had not been repealed. I offer an amendment of that character.

The Clerk read as follows:
"Provided, That all treaties heretofore made in pursuance of the provisions of said section shall continue in force until abrogated by their terms, the same as if said section had not been repealed."
Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the only object of this is to provide that the treaties that have been made in pursuance of this section which is now to be repealed shall be continued in force until abrogated by the terms of the treaty, the same as if the section had not been repealed.

To which Mr. TURNER, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, replied.

The proposition is to repeal the reciprocity clause by express and explicit provisions, but it does not in any way affect these existing agreements. I suggest to the gentleman that his amendment is entirely superfluous.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia added the following:

We are repealing what we never believed was constitutional—the authority given to the President of the United States, when in his judgment other countries charged duties which he does not believe to be reciprocal, he shall issue an Executive proclamation suspending a law and fixing rates upon certain articles imported from those countries.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, another member of the committee, said:

The proposition of the committee is to repeal the provision of the McKinley law which authorizes the President to make agreements without referring the questions to Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER, in the course of subsequent debate, returned to the subject, and put the question again directly to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. Said he:

I understand that the gentleman from West Virginia contends that it (the repeal of section 3 of the McKinley law) will destroy these agreements, because he is of the opinion that they ought not to have been made.

To which Mr. WILSON of West Virginia replied, "The gentleman is mistaken."

Whereupon Mr. SPRINGER said again:

If I understand the purport of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] it is to repeal the law under which certain commercial agreements have been made with certain foreign countries. If you repeal the authority for making those agreements you destroy the agreements themselves.

Mr. TURNER. Where does the gentleman from Illinois find authority for that proposition?

Mr. SPRINGER. I find it in the general principle that when a statute authorizes any particular thing to be done and you repeal the statute, the thing that is to be done or that has been done is abrogated.

THE EFFECT UPON THE DUTY ON SUGAR.

The repealing section in the bill when it was originally given to the public by the Senate Committee on Finance was precisely the same as that passed by the House of Representatives, excepting only the number, which in the original was 89, was changed to 106. It therefore was intended and understood to mean exactly what it did when it was discussed by the House of Representatives, or we are compelled to infer that the committee have not treated this very important subject with entire candor. But another section of the bill restored a duty upon sugar, which can not be collected upon four-fifths of the imports of that article into the United States as long as the reciprocity arrangements continue with Brazil, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Spanish and British colonies in the West Indies. Sugar would therefore have practically remained free if the bill had remained as originally prepared by the subcommittee, notwithstanding a pretense of restoring a duty in another section.

I regret very much, Mr. President, that the bill has again been changed so as to instruct the President to give notice of a desire on the part of the United States to terminate these treaties, because no such desire exists and the announcement of the purpose of the committee has been received with profound regret by the people of Minnesota, and I may add by all who have an intelligent appreciation of the efforts that have been made and the

methods which must be used to extend our commerce with foreign countries.

I may be pardoned for again referring to the debate upon this question in the House of Representatives. Mr. COOMBS, a Democratic Representative from New York, is a merchant who has been engaged for many years in trade with the West Indies and South America, and I am informed that the house of which he is the senior partner is the largest exporter of general merchandise for the United States to those countries, and he therefore speaks from practical experience and personal knowledge.

OPINION OF A DEMOCRATIC MERCHANT

Referring to the proposed repeal of what is known as the reciprocity section, Mr. COOMBS said:

I do not believe in letting go these arrangements or in releasing any hold we have upon these foreign markets. The men who would be the most injured by the abrogation of the section of the McKinley act now proposed to be repealed would be the farmers. Under these agreements (and I am in that business) the United States has been able to export the farm products of this market to Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the West India Islands. I do not believe we should take the first step to deprive our farmers of those large markets which they did not have before and which they will not have after these trade arrangements are abrogated.

Mr. BYNUM. To what extent have our farmers got there?

Mr. COOMBS. They have got there with their flour under the strength of these trade arrangements; the duties on that article have been removed. Flour is now taken from the United States which was previously taken from Spain. Every western miller and every western farmer is interested that the advantages we now enjoy shall not be ruthlessly torn from us. [Applause.] I speak of what I know. But let us keep hold of our present advantages in the interest of our farmers, our producers, and our manufacturers, just as long as we can and let the first movement for a change come from them. We make a new law as far as the admission of their materials free is concerned.

Undoubtedly they will admit it, but do not let us be the first ones to give away the interests of the farmer, which are affected more by this than any others. Let them do the abrogating, and do not let us do it.

A DECIDED DIFFERENCE OF OPINION IN THE COMMITTEE.

But, Mr. President, if we are to accept newspaper reports, there has been a decided difference of opinion among the members of the subcommittee who framed this bill as to its exact meaning and intention with regard to the reciprocity arrangements.

I find in the newspapers of Germany a cablegram from Herr Rudolf Cronau, a distinguished writer who was sent to the United States by the Cologne Gazette—perhaps the most prominent and influential journal in the German Empire, and the mouth-piece of the Government—announcing that he had been personally assured by Mr. VEST, a Senator from Missouri and a member of the Finance Committee, that the commercial arrangement between the United States and the German Empire would not be affected by the passage of this bill, but that German sugar would continue to be admitted free into the ports of the United States regardless of the restoration of the duty upon similar products from other countries.

I should like to ask my friend from Missouri if he gave Mr. Cronau any such assurances, or by what authority this announcement was cabled? This news has been spread all over Germany, and the peculiar relation of the Senator from Missouri to this bill has caused his statements to be received as the voice of an oracle; and it may be said that the German Empire and the German people are not accustomed to the publication of reckless and careless announcements concerning official matters by their public men.

I see in the Washington Post a corroboration of the cablegram of Mr. Cronau, and the mention of his name as the person to whom the Senator from Missouri made this statement. I also find a very interesting and intelligent dispatch from Washington in the Chicago Record of the same date, March 21, which includes also an interview with the chairman of the Finance Committee on the same subject:

RECIPROCITY IS SAFE—NEGOTIATIONS NOT DISTURBED—SENATOR VEST SAYS EXISTING COMMERCIAL AGREEMENTS WILL NOT BE AFFECTED BY THE TARIFF BILL.

[Special to the Chicago Record.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 12.

Senator Vest said this afternoon that the tariff bill as reported from the Committee on Finance did not repeal or abrogate any of the reciprocity arrangements that were negotiated between the United States and foreign nations under section 3 of the act of 1890, known as the reciprocity section.

This was in answer to an inquiry made by Mr. Rudolph Cronau, the correspondent of the Cologne Gazette, who was sent from Germany to Washington by that paper to watch tariff legislation, particularly that which directly affects the interests of the German Empire. A treaty was negotiated with Germany under the reciprocity section, in which it was agreed to admit German beet-root sugar free into this country provided she removed the embargo from American meats and reduced her rates upon other agricultural products from the United States. Under this treaty there has been a very large increase in the exchange of the articles affected. The exports of corn from the United States to Germany jumped from \$2,000,000 to \$7,000,000, rye from \$116,664 to \$3,759,584, wheat from \$295,953 to \$7,842,902, fertilizers from \$360,784 to \$1,493,445, oil cake from \$1,182,041 to \$2,328,169, and other articles in

a corresponding degree, while the imports of beet-root sugar from Germany increased from 173,310,790 to 325,503,840 pounds.

Mr. VEST explained further that it was the intention of the bill to repeal the reciprocity clause of the McKinley law for the purpose of depriving the President of the power to negotiate any further treaties under it, but it was not intended or desired to disturb those that had already been negotiated and were now in force. He alluded particularly to the commercial agreements with Spain and with Germany, and said that they would be in no way affected by the bill. The retaliatory measures that had been directed at Haiti, Venezuela, and Colombia would, however, be revoked by the bill, and the nations placed upon the same footing as others.

Mr. VOORHEES concurred in the views of Mr. VEST as to the understanding and purpose of the committee and the interpretation of the bill. Section 106 of the bill, as reported from the Senate committee, which was section 89 in the House bill, repeals section 111, which contains the reciprocity provision of the McKinley law, but it explicitly provides that "the repeal of existing laws or the modification thereof embraced in this act shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued before the said repeal," etc. "But all rights and liabilities under said laws shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if said repeal or modifications had not been made."

Mr. VOORHEES said he did not see how language could be any plainer. It was manifestly the intention of the committee, by recommending the repeal of section 3, to prevent the negotiation of any more treaties, but it had expressly provided that those which had already been negotiated should not be affected in any way. If it had been the intention or desire to abrogate or revoke the reciprocity arrangements with Germany, Spain, Brazil, and other countries the bill would contain a section instructing the President to terminate them, as was the case with the Hawaiian treaty. Mr. VOORHEES, then turning over the pages of the bill, called attention to section 105, which was inserted in the House bill by the Finance Committee. This provides that "the President shall, immediately upon the passage of this act, give notice to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands that the United States intends to terminate the treaty of June 3, 1875," etc.

"If we intended to terminate the German and Cuban treaties," said Mr. VOORHEES, "we should have added a similar section to the bill referring to them."

"Then we are to understand that German and Cuban sugar will continue to come in free after the passage of this act until the reciprocity arrangements are terminated by the President?"

"That is my understanding," replied Senator VOORHEES. "Is not it yours, Evans?" said he, turning to Mr. Evans, the tariff expert from the Treasury who has been assisting the committee.

"Yes," replied Mr. Evans. "this bill will in no way affect the operation of the pending reciprocity arrangements."

This information is confirmed by the Washington correspondent of the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, on the following day, who appears to have been startled at the utterances of the two members of the Finance Committee on this subject, but secured from the Senator from Indiana a confirmation of the statement. He casts some reflections upon the intelligence of the committee, which I regret to see:

A BLUNDER IN SUGAR DUTIES—SENATE AMENDMENTS DO NOT ABROGATE THE RECIPROCITY TREATIES—THE PROPOSED DUTIES, THEREFORE, ARE OF LITTLE IMPORTANCE, AS UNDER THE FOREGOING INTERPRETATION 85 PER CENT OF RAW SUGAR WILL CONTINUE TO COME IN FREE—RECIPROCITY PROVISIONS OF THE HOUSE BILL.

[From our own correspondent.]

WASHINGTON, March 13.

A colossal blunder has been discovered in the new tariff as amended by the Senate in regard to sugar. Those who supposed that a duty of 1 cent per pound had been imposed by the Senate amendments on raw sugar imported into the United States, with a graduated scale up to 1.4 cents per pound on refined sugar, were somewhat startled this morning to read interviews with Senator VOORHEES and Senator VEST declaring that the Senate amendments did not abrogate the reciprocity arrangements under the old McKinley law. The bill as it passed the House provided that the third section of the McKinley law should be repealed, "but the repeal of existing laws or modifications thereof embraced in this act shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceedings had or commenced in any civil cause before the said repeal or modifications, but all rights and liabilities under said laws shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if said repeal or modifications had not been made."

Senator VEST fell back upon this qualifying clause as leaving in force all the reciprocity arrangements made under the McKinley law, and as going no further than prohibiting the making of additional arrangements of the same sort.

Senator VOORHEES this morning concurred with this view so far as to say that the reciprocity arrangements would not be abrogated except by notice on the part of the United States. When asked if he was aware that sugar from Cuba, from Germany, and from Brazil would continue to enter the United States free of duty under this view of the case, he refused to continue the discussion.

The suggestion that the Supreme Court had declared legislation paramount to treaties was met by the reply: "You must go to the Supreme Court then for your information."

The effect of this view, that the treaties are not abrogated by the tariff bill, is to make the sugar duty of very little account. The imports of sugar into the United States during the fiscal year 1893 reached a value of \$102,108,587; Cuba sent to this country \$60,637,631 of this amount; Porto Rico, \$3,227,522; Germany, \$9,475,615; Brazil, \$2,054,201, and the British West Indies, \$9,487,434. All these countries have reciprocity arrangements with the United States, and if these arrangements continue in force and their sugar remains free of duty, the amount subject to duty under the tariff bill will be about 15 per cent of the gross imports.

Another singular feature of the bill is that the Hawaiian treaty, which was formally ratified by the Senate, is singled out for abrogation by the Senate bill. This fact is cited by the Senators as proof that the other reciprocity arrangements are not abrogated, but, on the other hand, it seems remarkable that sugar should be made dutiable from the Hawaiian Islands while it remains free from Cuba, Germany, and Brazil. The suspicion prevails in some quarters that the Senators who make these statements do not know the real effects of the bill themselves, and were not aware when they published their interviews that their argument as to the validity of the reciprocity arrangements would make a farce of the sugar duty.

I find on the same date, Mr. President, a telegram to the New York Tribune on the same subject, equally interesting and im-

portant, as it contains a confirmation of the statement that Senators VOORHEES and VEST were of the opinion that the passage of this bill would not disturb existing treaties:

RECIPROCIETY AND SUGAR—RESULT OF THE NEW TARIFF BILL IF THE TREATIES STAND—IMPORTED SUGAR WILL FIX THE PRICE OF DOMESTIC, THE SUGAR TRUST WILL HAVE ADDITIONAL PROTECTION, THE AMERICAN PRODUCERS WILL BE RUINED, AND THE REVENUE WILL FALL SHORT OF ESTIMATES—QUEER TREATMENT OF HAWAII.

[By telegraph to the Tribune.]

WASHINGTON, March 13.

Everybody who is familiar with the reciprocity agreements between the United States and other countries and with the geographical distribution of sugar production throughout the world, and who had also been informed that the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance estimated that the amount of revenue to be derived from the duty on sugar under the pending bill would exceed \$45,000,000 a year, was amazed when he read in the Tribune and several other newspapers to-day that Chairman VOORHEES and Senator VEST agreed in the statement that it was not the design of that committee to disturb or abrogate existing reciprocity arrangements, but simply to deprive the President of the authority to make any new arrangements with other foreign countries.

Chairman VOORHEES, according to the published statement, also declared that the bill could not be fairly construed as abrogating existing reciprocity agreements (except in the case of Hawaii), and called attention to sections 106 and 108 in support of his declaration. When his attention was again called to the matter to-day, and he was asked if the statement published this morning was correct, Mr. VOORHEES replied in the affirmative.

If the design of the majority of the Finance Committee is, and if the effect of the bill if enacted will be, such as Chairman VOORHEES and Mr. VEST assert, certain consequences will naturally and inevitably follow. In the first place, all sugars below No. 16 Dutch standard of color produced in countries with which the United States has entered into reciprocity arrangements will continue to be admitted free of duty. That means that 80 per cent of all the raw material of the sugar refiners of the United States will be admitted free, thus fixing the price that they will be obliged to pay for the other 20 per cent imported, as well as the price of domestic raw sugar.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1893, the total importations into the United States of beet and cane sugars under No. 16 Dutch standard, amounted to 3,733,040,296 pounds, of which 3,296,708,423 pounds were cane sugar and 436,333,873 beet sugar. Of the total amount imported 2,973,854,622 pounds, or about 80 per cent, were produced in countries with which the United States has reciprocity agreements.

Of the total amount of beet sugar (below No. 16 Dutch standard) imported 34,223,342 pounds came from Austria-Hungary and 325,503,840 pounds from Germany; and of the total amount of "cane and other sugars" imported, 15,836 pounds were produced in and imported from Guatemala, 218,450 pounds from Salvador, 332,967,481 pounds from the British West Indies, 64,035,840 pounds from San Domingo, 1,843,651,095 pounds from Cuba, 99,578,182 pounds from Puerto Rico, 114,598,997 pounds from Brazil, and 159,061,569 pounds from British Guiana. With all of these countries reciprocity agreements are in force.

In the same year the importations of sugar under No. 16 Dutch standard from Hawaii, which were admitted free of duty by virtue of the reciprocity treaty which it is now proposed to abrogate, amounted to 288,517,929 pounds.

In addition to these free importations there were admitted free of duty 15,490,679 gallons of molasses, of which 15,218,489 gallons, or more than 98 per cent, were produced in and imported from the British West Indies, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and San Domingo.

In the same year the total importations of sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard amounted to only 33,405,081 pounds. Of this total 32,676,000 pounds were dutiable at five-tenths of a cent per pound. It also follows, if the assertion of Chairman VOORHEES and Senator VEST be correct, that the rates of duty on all refined sugars imported under the proposed law (if any are so imported) will be considerably more than double the rates under the existing law, or from 1.1 to 1.4 cents a pound. In other words, according to their interpretation of the bill, raw sugars will continue to be admitted free of duty and the sugar trust will gain an additional protection (which sugar consumers will be forced to pay) of six-tenths to nine-tenths of a cent a pound. This will, indeed, truly be "a staggering blow to the sugar trust."

The cane and beet sugar producers of the country declare with one voice that these industries will be seriously injured, if not speedily ruined, if the rates of duty proposed by the majority of the Finance Committee shall be adopted. Of course, if the construction now given to the bill by two of its framers is correct, the rates of duty on sugars below No. 16 Dutch standard, no matter what may be their saccharine strength, will not be operative, and the sugar industries of the United States, deprived of the benefit of either a bounty or an adequate duty, will be destroyed. That is the prospect which the sugar-producers of the South and West now face.

But while it is proposed to continue to admit free of duty the raw sugars of Austria-Hungary, Germany, the British and Spanish West Indies, British Guiana, Brazil, San Domingo, Guatemala, and Salvador, it is also proposed to abrogate the Hawaiian reciprocity treaty and compel the sugar of Hawaii, most of which is produced by American citizens and American energy and capital, and the production of which is the chief industry of that country, to pay a duty. It is also proposed to impose a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on bananas and pineapples, the production of which has become an industry of some importance in Hawaii, and promises to increase in magnitude.

As Senator Lodge said in conversation with a Tribune correspondent to-day: "The bill discriminates most harshly and unjustly against Hawaii and Hawaiian products. It is hard for anybody to conceive what should have impelled the framers of the bill to do this thing, in view of the close commercial and political relations between the United States and that country, and the great probability, amounting to a moral certainty, that those relations will become even more intimate at no distant day."

Again as to revenue. If the bill should become a law in its present form, so far as sugar is concerned, and the law should be construed as the bill is construed by Chairman VOORHEES and Senator VEST, the duties on sugar and molasses would yield at the most only one-fifth as much revenue as the majority of the Finance Committee estimates, and in all probability the amount would be even less than that.

But, on the following day, March 14, I find in the newspapers an interview with the Senator from Missouri in this subject which appears to have been furnished to the press associations, and from its phraseology one would judge it were written in the same room where this bill was prepared, after conference with the representatives of the sugar interest and reflection.

HAVE NO USE FOR BLAINE'S PLAN—THE RECIPROCIETY TREATIES NULLIFIED BY THE WILSON BILL.

The question having arisen as to the effect the Wilson bill, as amended by the Senate Committee on Finance, would have upon the reciprocity treaties negotiated by the President under the McKinley act, Senator VEST, of the Democratic majority of the Finance Committee, was asked for his views on the subject. He said:

"The pending tariff bill does away with the whole system of reciprocity as created by the McKinley act, but it does not attempt to rescind any treaties made with foreign countries as authorized by the Constitution. While Congress has the unquestionable right to rescind a treaty it could only do so in express terms. The commercial arrangements made by President Harrison with foreign countries are necessarily nullified by the provisions of the pending bill.

"The unavoidable defect of the proposed legislation will be to so absolutely do away with the whole system of reciprocity as created by the McKinley act, including the power of the President to retaliate by putting a duty upon the exports from foreign countries which refuse to admit our exports into that country free of duty."

Senator VEST said further that he understood that the effect of the bill would be to nullify the agreement made with Germany, Brazil, and Spain whereby sugar is admitted free from those countries and their dependencies.

HOW THE RECIPROCIETY ARRANGEMENTS MAY BE TERMINATED.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this uncertainty and doubt in the minds of the committee as to the effect of this legislation was entirely unnecessary and inexplicable. The President of the United States on the 27th of June, 1892, submitted to the Senate, in answer to a resolution of inquiry, what is known to the index of the Senate folding room as Senate Executive Document No. 119, Fifty-second Congress, first session, which contains copies of all the commercial agreements that were negotiated under authority of section 3 of the tariff act of 1890, and a statement of the results that had accrued from those arrangements to that date. I find by examination of these treaties that all but three contain upon their face the method by which they may be properly terminated.

It appears, on page 32, that the negotiations with Brazil closes—

With the understanding that the commercial arrangements thus put in operation shall remain in force so long as neither government shall definitely, at least three months in advance, inform the other of its intention and decision to consider it at an end at the expiration of the time indicated; provided, however, that the termination of the commercial arrangement shall begin to take effect either on the 1st day of January or on the 1st day of July.

The next arrangement in order is that with Spain for Cuba and Puerto Rico, in which it is stated that—

This commercial arrangement, put in operation under the clause above stated, shall remain in force so long as it shall not be modified by the mutual agreement of the executive power of the two countries, always reserving the respective right of the Cortes of Spain and of the Congress of the United States to modify or repeal it whenever they think proper.

The next arrangement was with San Domingo, which was negotiated with the understanding that the commercial arrangement, when it shall have been promulgated, shall remain in force so long as it shall not be modified by the legislation of either government or by mutual agreement as to the executive power of the two countries.

The provision for terminating the treaties with the British colonies is found on page 87, and reads as follows:

It will be understood that the arrangement shall remain in force so long as it shall not be modified by the mutual agreement of the executive power of the two governments or by the legislative action of the Government of the United States, or the said colonies with the approval of the British Government.

The arrangement with Salvador, as given on page 93, provides that—

The Government of the United States may terminate the provisional arrangement proposed by you upon thirty days' notice to the Government of Salvador.

The arrangement with Nicaragua (see page 96) provides that—

Such treaty shall remain in force until the lawmaking power of either of the two countries decides otherwise, or until it is abrogated by the mutual consent of both governments.

The arrangement with Guatemala provides that—

It will be the understanding that it shall remain in force until it is modified or abrogated by the legislative action of either government, or by mutual agreement between the executives of the two countries.

The arrangement with Honduras provides that—

The Government of the United States may terminate the provisional arrangements now under consideration by giving the Government of Honduras thirty days' notice in advance.

I do not find, Mr. President, in the papers relating to the commercial arrangement between the United States and the German Empire any formal provision for its termination. Nor can I find any provision in the similar agreement with Austria-Hungary. But I may suggest that it is a universal law of nations that such agreements and treaties can be terminated at any time by either party upon giving due notice to the other.

A DISCOURTESY THAT WILL BE RESENTED.

You will find, Mr. President, that the abrogation of these arrangements will be the most unpopular piece of legislation this Congress has enacted or will enact, and that it will be resented by the citizens of the southern republics and colonies as well as by the people of the United States.

Those governments expect to be treated with ordinary courtesy. They expect that the etiquette that prevails among nations will be observed in all our relations with them. They have regarded the United States as the mother of republics. They have looked to her for example and precept. They have modeled their institutions upon our own. They have copied our Constitution and our form of government, and they have endeavored to follow in the path we have laid ever since they achieved their independence from the Crown of Spain. It is not probable, Mr. President, that any of those little republics will show forcible resentment, but even if they were able to do so the difference in population, in military strength, in wealth, and in area between them and the United States should make us the more generous and the more scrupulous in observing all of the obligations we have incurred.

I have received information, Mr. President, by means which I am not permitted to describe, that the governments of the other American republics regard the proposed action of Congress on this subject as an unwarranted and inexcusable exhibition of selfish indifference to their friendship and their welfare, and the passage of this act will go very far to destroy all the good effects that have followed the endeavors of this Government to promote closer social and commercial relations with them. They can not resent this as an insult, but I warn this committee that they will enter a solemn protest against what they consider a breach of faith on the part of the United States.

We sought these arrangements; they were made at our request and in pursuance of legislation which was under discussion in Congress and in the public prints for several months. They entered into them with the expectation that they would be permanent, and they discarded existing commercial relations with the European countries upon the implied assurance that the new relations they were entering upon with the United States would continue for years. There were protests entered by the diplomatic representatives of European nations, but they were ignored and the arrangements were consummated with an abiding faith that the United States would regard them as sacred. Now, Mr. President, we propose to show these people that they were but the footfalls of our political jealousy, to be kicked about here and there, to be taken up and discarded according to the whims and caprice of a political majority in Congress, and the attitude in which this Government now stands before the world is, in this respect, neither flattering nor just to itself.

We have been engaged since 1834 in endeavoring to extend our foreign trade. The product of the industry and the genius of our people have so far outstripped the requirements for home consumption that we will be compelled to seek new markets for the surplus or close our factories and let a portion of our harvests rot upon the ground.

The price of our wheat and corn, and in fact of all the agricultural products of the Northwest, are lower to-day than they have ever been, and the same is true of nearly every line of mechanical merchandise. This condition is largely the result of overproduction, and our hands and tools and machinery must lie idle or we must find purchasers for the results of their labor.

THE NECESSITY OF FOREIGN MARKETS.

The necessity of extending our foreign markets for manufactured goods could not be more forcibly demonstrated than by the reports that have just been issued from the Census Office. These show an enormous increase in the number of manufacturing establishments, from 253,852 in 1880 to 355,401 in 1890, and the amount of capital employed from \$2,709,272,606 in 1880 to \$6,524,475,305 in 1890, and in the amount of wages paid from \$947,953,765 in 1880 to \$2,282,823,265 in 1890. The value of the products at the same time has increased from \$5,369,579,491 in 1880 to \$9,370,107,624 in 1890.

In my own State, as in all of the other of the newer States of the Northwest, there has been an enormous increase during the last decade. The number of manufacturing establishments in Minnesota, according to the census of 1890, was 7,505, with a capital of \$127,686,618, with plants valued at \$65,377,472, employing an average of 79,629 hands, and paying average wages of \$38,189,239. The cost of the materials used each year by these factories was \$118,481,941, and the value of their product was reported to be \$192,033,478.

In the flouring interest, which is perhaps the most important in my State, the recent report from the Census Office on manufactures shows that there are in the United States 18,470 estab-

lishments, with a capital of \$203,473,500; with plants and machinery valued at \$136,539,851, with 63,481 people employed, to whom are paid annually the sum of \$27,035,742 in wages. The cost of the material used—that is, the amount of wheat ground annually by these establishments—was in 1890 \$434,152,290, and the value of their product was \$513,971,474.

The lumber interest, which stands next in the State I have the honor in part to represent, has 21,011 establishments, with an aggregate capital of \$193,339,968, with plants and machinery worth \$294,325,888; employing an average of 286,197 men, who receive an average of \$37,784,433 as wages. They consume materials to the value of \$231,555,618, and the annual value of their product in 1890 was \$403,667,575. The number of planing mills and factories for making sash, doors, and blinds in 1890 was 3,670, with an aggregate capital of \$120,271,440, with plants and machinery valued at \$52,327,364, employing 83,880 men in 1890, who were paid the sum of \$18,970,080 in wages. The materials consumed by them was valued at \$104,926,834, and the value of their product was \$183,681,552.

The most convenient and encouraging markets, for both our agricultural and mechanical merchandise, are those offered by the Latin American Republics and colonies, whose population of 50,000,000 or more have been purchasing annually between four and five hundred millions of merchandise in Europe, and an average of only about one hundred millions from us. The greater part of these imports could be furnished by our own farmers and manufacturers at prices as low as those obtained in Europe, and nearly all our products are acknowledged to surpass in quality those of any nation in the world.

WE CAN COMPETE WITH ANY NATION IN THE WORLD.

As there has been doubt raised upon this question I may again call upon Representative COOMBS of New York, who in a recently published interview with the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record, says:

[Special to the Chicago Record.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 19.

The one question that is always coming up in the debate on the tariff bill is whether the manufactures of the United States are able to compete in prices in foreign markets with the manufactures of England, France, Germany, and Belgium and other European countries, and it is constantly asserted on one side or the other that it is impossible for them to do so because of the excessive cost of producing and the higher price of labor in the United States. But those who have been talking are merely theorists. No man has as yet discussed the question on the floor of the House who has ever had any experience or practical knowledge of the facts.

Representative COOMBS, of Brooklyn, whose novel plan for a permanent tariff was described in these dispatches the other day, might give some accurate information, as the house of which he is the senior partner has been engaged for more than twenty-four years in selling goods in all the foreign markets of the world. While they may not do as large a volume of business as some other exporters, it is doubtless true that they sell a larger amount of miscellaneous manufactured merchandise in more foreign countries than any other house in the United States.

I asked Mr. COOMBS to-day what his experience had been in this particular; how the American manufacturer stands in foreign markets as to the price and quality of his goods, especially in the markets of South and Central America.

"Taking all classes of agricultural implements," said Mr. COOMBS, "housekeeping goods, furniture, drugs, and medicines, paper and stationery, leather goods, trunks, all kinds of cotton goods (except prints and percales), table cutlery, glassware, lamps, agricultural and mechanical tools, machinery of all kinds, and nearly everything we produce for export, we can sell these just as cheap as the Europeans can, in many cases even cheaper, and make a fair profit. We have a very large market for carriages and wheeled vehicles of all kinds, cordage, barbed wire, and binding twine. Our house sold 500 tons of binding twine in the Argentine Republic last year."

"How about the superiority of the American goods?"

"American goods are undoubtedly superior and are recognized as such all through South America, and to such an extent that the Germans particularly, and the English to a certain extent, have been forced to imitate them in pattern and fabrics, and in years gone by even forged our trade-marks. The latter, however, has been practically stopped by recent treaties, under which we have been able to prosecute manufacturers for infringement in those countries."

"Is there any class of goods that you think it impossible to compete with?"

"Woolen goods. We can compete with them in ordinary dress silks, but not in styles. We do not originate styles in this country. For instance, the French manufacturer will show a certain style of silk to a merchant in New York, say Arnold, Constable & Co., who will buy in a variety of colors, and no other house will be permitted to see that particular style until it is opened and exposed for sale on the counters of the purchasing firm. The moment it is put on sale agents of American manufacturers of silk will buy a dress pattern, and immediately commence imitating it. Silk that retails for \$8 and \$9 a yard one season will be imitated in as good a fabric and sold the next season at \$2.25 and \$2.50 wholesale. So that a large part of the tariff that is levied on silks is a tariff on taste. The same is true of high-grade muslins, which are imitated in Manchester and this country. The French originate styles; they have the designers. Some of our manufacturers have regular arrangements in Europe to obtain styles in advance. I have heard of one establishment that spent \$16,000 in one year to get styles in advance."

"It has been asserted that American prints or calicoes can not be sold in competition with those from Manchester; that is untrue. We can always sell American prints when we can get them in suitable styles and colors. Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic are large buyers in this line of goods. Our manufacturers will get up their styles for the season, manufacture from 10,000 to 20,000, send sample cards out, and rush them off. What the wholesale trade does not take at once will be sent to a house like Claffin's, who will take the balance. By the time the orders come back from Latin America for those prints the stock is all gone, and this is the cause of our failure to extend the sales of prints."

"The English manufacturer pursues a different course. He sends travelers to South America with samples of his styles before he manufactures

them. Each pattern has a variety of colors. He will take his orders for a number of cases or bales, which will be manufactured in exactly the colors wanted, and put in cases according to the assortments desired. This the manufacturer and wholesale merchants in this country refuse to do. The American print manufacturer as soon as he gets through with his season's supply will turn off his rollers and make no prints of that style; but the English manufacturer keeps his rollers of all stamped styles, and will manufacture any design of prints as long as there is a demand for them.

"I will give you a sample of how a New York commission merchant attempting to do business with Mexico in prints under these unfavorable conditions has to suffer. There was one house that purchased in advance \$800,000 worth of American prints in order to insure their ability to fill their orders. They have, after selling their \$800,000 worth of prints, maybe \$300,000 worth of unsalable colors on hand, which must be sold in the New York market at a great loss. There are certain colors that will not sell in Latin America. The Mexican merchant knows what his people want, but our manufacturer does not seem to give this fact any consideration. He has had enough customers in the United States and does not care about foreign markets.

"There is scarcely ever a difference of more than one-eighth of a cent a yard between the prices of Manchester and New York prints, and this difference is as often in favor of New York as of Manchester. Our people, with a wonderful thickheadedness, insist upon imposing upon foreign markets our own idea of styles and quality. It has been so with agricultural implements, with tools, etc., the styles of which we never would vary to suit the tastes of these markets. We have really forced the market to accept what we offer instead of furnishing what the people want.

"We can not compete in the Latin-American markets in hosiery or ribbons, gloves or laces, etc., but we do compete with France in high grades of perfumery. We can not touch the fine grades of pocketknives. Wherever our people will make shoes of the styles desired by a ready market awaits them. They generally insist, however, upon making and selling the South American people shoes made for us in this latitude, whereas they want something for the tropical zone; but, as I say, wherever we have furnished the styles desired in those markets we have never failed in getting good orders. We can compete with any country in nearly everything we manufacture in woolen goods except

"Our manufacturers of woolen goods have already been working under wrong conditions. For instance, they have never been able to get good assortments of wool without paying enormous prices for them. Our tariff has always been the very highest on the lowest grades of woolen goods, and has stimulated the production of that quality of goods, while the higher grade has been neglected. The tariff is high on low grades and low on high grades. There are about three factories in the United States that make woolen goods really fit to compete with high grades from England. Our house is also a very large exporter to the colonies in Africa. The assortment sent there is not as large as that sent to some other markets, but it includes a great variety of goods, and we readily compete with similar articles from England.

"The assortment that goes to the Argentine Republic is infinite. This is because the climate there is similar to ours, and in Chile, where the same climatic conditions exist, there is a demand for the same class of goods we make and use in this country. The same is true to a certain extent with regard to Venezuela. An order from a merchant in that country seems to have just as great variety as an order from a merchant in the interior of the United States. There is no cutting at all and the order will cover five hundred or six hundred items. This is also true of orders from Mexico, where the merchants have been every year withdrawing one class of orders after another from Germany and placing it with our merchants, because our goods are superior, and wherever they are known they find a ready market. We furnish the world with wrought-iron pipes and fittings, a very large percentage of the total cost of which is for raw material. Our last comparison of iron pipes and fittings with England showed that we are 23 per cent lower on assortment of sizes."

"How can our foreign trade be promoted?"

"The same as any other trade is promoted. Give us facilities for getting the goods and credits. England and Germany have comparatively small home markets for their manufactured products, and have for generations been building up a foreign business, in which their consuls have very largely helped them. Their banking system has also been of great assistance. It is possible for a merchant in Birmingham, for instance, who has £20,000 of capital, to go to a banker, show his capital, and say:

"I want credit for £100,000, using my £20,000 as margin. I propose to sell goods in the Argentine Republic to the extent of £100,000. I will draw drafts through you upon my customers; I want you to cash the drafts for me and credit the collections to my account."

"He will pay about 3 or 4 per cent interest, whatever the rate may be at the Bank of England. He will then sell his goods to the merchants in Buenos Ayres or Montevideo at six or nine months' credit at 6 per cent interest, drawing upon them through this banker. All their remittances are made to him. Should the banker become tired of the transaction the merchant goes to another bank, maybe just across the street, who will take the account. It is by this means that the banking system of England helps merchants and manufacturers in making markets for their merchandise. We, of course, have no such system in this country. The closest approach we have to it is that we can ship to our customers in Montevideo or Buenos Ayres or Rio, and convert our invoice into sterling, draw at 60 or 90 days' sight in sterling, and send the drafts to a London bank for collection.

"The London bank, if they know us well, will allow us to draw upon them at sight after they get the draft into their hands. They will charge us about one-half per cent, and 5 per cent interest, and for stamps, etc. It is not every manufacturer or commission house, however, that has credit enough to warrant such transactions, and when a house is established with sufficient credit to conduct its business in this manner, the credit becomes a part of its capital. Although laboring under this disadvantage, we have been able to make a serious impression upon those markets, and if instead of giving them from six to nine months' credit, we can under the best circumstances give them sixty or ninety days' credit, or make them supply us with bankers' credits with which to pay for the goods, it shows that we can certainly sell our goods cheaper than the English can, or they would not come for them."

ORIGIN OF THE RECIPROCALITY POLICY.

In the study of different methods suggested for the promotion of our commerce with the Southern countries, the recent International American Conference, composed of delegates from eighteen of the nineteen independent nations of the hemisphere, recommended as the best and most practical, the negotiations of reciprocity treaties "upon such a basis as would be acceptable in each case, taking into consideration the special situations, conditions, and interests of each country, and with a view to promote their common welfare." And it was the unanimous judg-

ment of the delegates that our exports to these countries and to the other republics could be increased to a great degree by the negotiation of such treaties as recommended by the conference, and, as Mr. Blaine remarked in submitting this recommendation to Congress:

The practical everyday experience of our merchants engaged in the trade demonstrated beyond a question that in all classes of merchandise which we have long and successfully produced for export, they are able to compete with their European rivals in quality and in price; and the reiterated statement that our Latin-American neighbors do not buy of us because we do not buy of them, or because we tax their products, have been annually contradicted by the statistics of our commerce for a quarter of a century.

The conference believed that while profit would come to all the countries if reciprocity treaties should be adopted, the United States would be by far the greatest gainer. The increased exports would be drawn alike from our farms, our factories, and our forests. None of the Latin-American countries produce building lumber, the most of them are dependent upon foreign markets for their breadstuffs and provisions, and in few is there any opportunity or inclination for mechanical industry.

To escape the delay and uncertainty of treaties, it was suggested by Mr. Blaine that a practicable and prompt mode of testing the question was to submit an amendment to the then pending tariff bill authorizing the President to declare the ports of the United States free to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed, whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports free of all national, provincial (States), municipal, and other taxes, our flour, cornmeal, and other breadstuffs, preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits, cottonseed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food, lumber, furniture, and other articles of wood, agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery, structural steel and iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street cars, and refined petroleum.

It will be noticed that Mr. Blaine suggested that the ports of this country should be free "to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere," which includes wool, fruit, lead (?) ore, and copper, two articles which he was willing to put upon the free list of the United States in order to secure control of the markets of Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic.

Congress accepted the suggestion of the Secretary of State, and an amendment was attached to the then pending tariff bill, which was not so broad in its scope as his proposition, but provided—

That, with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the 1st day of January, 1892, however, and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the Government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncurd, or of any such articles, imposing duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which, in view of free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension, duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the products of or exported from such designated country, as follows, namely:

Then follows the schedule of duties.

THE OBJECT OF THE RECIPROCALITY POLICY.

The object of this provision, as will be seen, was to enable the President, by diplomatic negotiations, to secure reductions in the import duties imposed upon the exports of the United States by countries whose staple products, under the provisions of the McKinley law, were admitted free into our ports. It applied particularly to the other American Republics and colonies, and to such European nations as produced sugar for export.

It was intended to remove or impair the protection that had permitted and encouraged the marvelous development of the natural resources of the industries of this land, but it was believed that, so long as the duties upon sugar and other raw products were to be removed, it was only just and reasonable to invite the country from which they come to make such equivalent concessions as would promote the sale of our agricultural and mechanical products in their markets, by enabling consumers to obtain them at lower prices, and by encouraging our manufacturers and export merchants to utilize the advantages thus secured for them. And under its authority commercial treaties were negotiated with Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Santo Domingo, Brazil, the Spanish colonies of Cuba and Puerto Rico, the British colonies of Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, Guiana, and the Leeward and Windward Islands in America, and with Germany and Austria-Hungary in Europe.

The treaties were very nearly uniform, and provided that in consideration for the free admission into the United States of certain raw products, such as sugar, coffee, rubber, hides, etc., originating in the countries named, they would admit to their

ports certain agricultural and manufactured merchandise produced in the United States, either entirely free from customs or at a rate of duty 25 and in many cases 50 per cent less than those imposed upon similar articles from other countries; thus giving the producers and manufacturers of the United States an advantage equivalent to the difference between the wages paid for similar labor in this and European countries.

ARTICLES AFFECTED BY THE NEGOTIATIONS.

Among the articles that were to be admitted free into most of the countries named under the treaties were wheat, flour, corn and corn meal, rye and rye flour, buckwheat and barley, vegetables of all kinds, hay and oats, salted and pickled pork and bacon, preserved fish, cotton-seed oil, coal, rosin, tar, pitch and turpentine, all forms of agricultural implements and machinery, all forms of mining and mechanical tools, implements and machinery, engines, instruments and books for the arts and sciences, all form of railway supplies, marble and other forms of stone, mineral medicinal waters, ice, petroleum, tallow, lumber and other manufactures of wood, lard, butter and cheese, and various other agricultural and mechanical products.

The articles admitted at 50 per cent of the regular duties included glass and crystal ware, clay tiles for pavements and roofs; stoneware, earthenware, and porcelain; cast and wrought iron and steel in all forms not included in the free list; needles, pins, cutlery of all forms; tin plate; all articles made of copper, bronze, brass, nickel, and other metals; furniture of all kinds; bread, crackers, preserved and canned goods, sausages, stuffed meats, pickles, jams, jellies, all forms of rubber and gutta-percha, oil-cloths, tarpaulin, etc.

Among the articles admitted at a reduction of 25 per cent from the regular duties were all forms of cotton goods, rope, cordage, twine, paints, varnishes, soaps and perfumery, medicines and drugs, candles, paper for printing, wallpaper, all forms of leather goods, trunks, valises, harness and saddlery, watches and clocks, and carriages.

In the arrangements with some of the countries these were considerably enlarged, and contained nearly every article produced for export in the United States. The list in detail furnishes an important and appropriate study, as it contains some articles that appeal directly to the interest of nearly every farmer and mechanic in the United States. For that reason I may be pardoned for inserting it here:

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY ARRANGEMENTS.

The following is a list of articles grown or manufactured in the United States that are favorably affected by the reciprocity arrangements. Upon many of them the duties have been removed, upon others the duty has been reduced.

[Where the term "cotton or partly" is used it signifies at least half cotton. Articles mentioned in this list as of rubber are to be understood as composed wholly or partly of rubber. Boots and shoes of all kinds are to be understood as made wholly or partly of leather except those of rubber.]

Abaca or manila hemp.
 Accacia wood.
 Acetal.
 Acetate of alumina.
 Acetate of amyl.
 Acetate of ammonia.
 Acetate of bismuth.
 Acetate of copper.
 Acetate of iron.
 Acetate of lead.
 Acetate of lime.
 Acetate of lithia.
 Acetate of mercury.
 Acetate of potassium.
 Acetate of sodium.
 Acetate of zinc.
 Acetone.
 Acids:
 Acetic.
 Arsenic.
 Arsenia.
 Benzoic.
 Boracic.
 Bromic.
 Carbolic.
 Citric.
 Gallic.
 Hydrobromic.
 Hydrochloric.
 Hydrofluoric.
 Lactic.
 Malic.
 Muriatic.
 Nitric.
 Oxalic.
 Phenic.
 Phosphoric.
 Prussic.
 Pyroligneous.
 Salicylic.
 Succinic.
 Sulphuric.
 Sulphurous.
 Tannic.
 Tartaric.
 Valerianic.*
 Aconite.
 Aconitine and its salts.
 Adzes.
 Adze handles.
 Agate ware.
 Agricultural implements.
 Agricultural machinery.
 Agricultural tools.
 Air pumps.
 Alabaster.
 Alabaster manufactures.
 Alarm clocks.
 Alarm gauges.
 Alcohometers.
 Alembics.
 Alewives.
 Alimentary substances.
 Alizarine.
 Alkalimeters.
 Alkaloids and their salts, when used in medicine.
 Alloys of copper and common metal, and manufactures of.
 Almanacs.
 Almonds.
 Aloes.
 Aloine.
 Althea.
 Ambulances.
 Ammonia and its salts, used in medicine.
 Ammoniac, gum.
 Ampoules.
 Anacahuita.
 Anchors.
 Anchovies.
 Anchusine.
 Andirons.
 Anemometers.
 Angelica root.
 Aniline colors and dyes.
 Annotto.
 Annunciators.
 Anodynes.
 Anthracite.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Antimony and its salts, used in medicine.
 Antipirine.
 Anvils.
 Aprons, cotton, rubber, or leather.
 Apparatus, scientific.
 Apples.
 Apple butter.
 Apples, canned or dried.
 Apricots.
 Areometers.
 Arms, side and fire.
 Armor plates.
 Armchairs.
 Arnica, and preparations of.
 Arsenate, used in medicine, paints, or dyes.
 Arsenic and salts of, used in medicine, paints, or dyes.
 Artificial leather.
 Artificial stone.
 Aseptol.
 Asafetida.
 Ashwood.
 Asparagus.
 Asphalt.
 Aspic.
 Astronomical instruments.
 Atlases.
 Atomizers.
 Atrophine.
 Attar of roses.
 Augers.
 Aurein.
 Automatic brakes.
 Awls.
 Awnings.
 Axes.
 Axles, car, wagon, machinery, or carriage.
 Azimuths.
 Azuline.
 Babbit's metal.
 Babon.
 Backstraps.
 Bags, cotton, or partly leather or rubber.
 Bagatelle boards.
 Bagging.
 Baize, partly cotton.
 Balances.
 Balconies, wood or iron.
 Baling.
 Balls, iron, brass, lead, copper, or other common metal, glass or porcelain.
 Balls, rubber or leather.
 Balmorals (shoes).
 Balsams.
 Balusters.
 Bamboo.
 Bananas.
 Bands for machinery and other uses, of leather, rubber, or cotton.
 Barbed wire, iron or steel.
 Bars, iron, steel, lead, copper, zinc, or other common metal.
 Barège, partly cotton.
 Barks, medicinal, tan or dye.
 Barley and barley meal.
 Barometers.
 Baroscopes.
 Barouches.
 Barrels, wooden and parts.
 Barilla.
 Barrows.
 Baryta salts used in medicine.
 Basins, iron, steel, copper, and its alloys, porcelain or earthen.
 Baskets, all kinds and sizes, rattan, osier, wood, and like material.
 Bath tubs, metallic, porcelain, stone, or earthen.
 Batiste, cotton, or part cotton.
 Battens.
 Batteries, electric or galvanic.
 Bayonettes.
 Beads, steel, copper and its alloys, glass, and porcelain.
 Beams, wood, steel, or iron.
 Beans, fresh, dry, or preserved.
 Bedsteads, wood or metal.
 Bed covers, cotton, or partly.
 Beechwood.
 Beef, fresh, or pickled.
 Beets.
 Beetles.
 Bells, all kinds and sizes of all materials except silver and gold.
 Belladonna.
 Bell metal.
 Bellows, all kinds.
 Belts, cotton, leather, or rubber.
 Belting for machinery, leather, rubber, or cotton.
 Benchshears.
 Benzino.
 Benzoates.
 Benzoin.
 Benzol.
 Bergamot.
 Berries.
 Betel.
 Bevels.
 Bibs.
 Bibles.
 Bicarbonates used in medicine.
 Bichlorates and bichlorides.
 Bichromates used in dyes.
 Bicycles and parts.
 Bidets.
 Billiard tables and cues.
 Binders.
 Bindings, book, leather, wood, or cotton cloth.
 Birch, and manufactures of.
 Bird cages, wood, wire, or other metal.
 Biscuits.
 Bismuth and its salts.
 Bistouries.
 Bisulphates.
 Bisulphides.
 Bitartrates.
 Bits, bridle.
 Bits, brace.
 Bitters, medicinal.
 Bitumen.
 Blacking.
 Blackboards.
 Black pudding.
 Blades for instruments, tools, knives, etc.
 Blankets, cotton or part cotton.
 Blende.
 Blocks (tackle) hatters'.
 Blooms, iron or steel.
 Blowpipes.
 Blubber.
 Blue, dyes or paints.
 Blueing.
 Boards.
 Boats, wood or metal.
 Bobbins and reels.
 Bodkins.
 Bodies, wagon and carriage.
 Bolders and kettles.
 Bolts, iron, steel, copper, and its alloys.
 Bombazine, partly cotton.
 Bones.
 Bonnets, cotton or part cotton.
 Books, printed or blank, bound or unbound.
 Boots, all kinds, leather or partly and rubber.
 Borates.
 Borax.
 Bosoms, shirt, cotton, or partly cotton.
 Bottles.
 Bottle stands, wood or metal.
 Bottoms, chair, boiler.
 Bougies.
 Bowls, glass, tin, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, wood, zinc, porcelain or earthen.
 Boxes, iron, steel, copper, and alloys, tin, wood or zinc, all sizes.
 Boxwood and its manufactures.
 Braces, carpenters'.
 Brackets.
 Bracellets, copper and alloys, and other common metal.
 Brads.
 Braids, cotton, or partly.
 Brakes, all kinds.
 Bran.
 Brasiers.
 Brass and all manufactures of.
 Brazil wood.
 Brazing.
 Bread.
 Breadstuffs.
 Brakes (carriages).
 Bream.
 Breast chains and straps.
 Breeding, leather.
 Bricks, all kinds.
 Bridges, iron, steel, or wood.
 Bridles.
 Britsles, shoemakers'.
 Britannia metal and ware.
 Britany cloth, cotton or partly.
 Broches.
 Broccoli.
 Brogans.
 Bromates, medicinal.
 Bromides, medicinal.
 Bromoform.
 Bronzo, and manufactures of.
 Brooms.
 Broom corn.
 Broughams.
 Brown, paints or dyes.
 Brushes, all kinds, made of vegetable fiber.
 Buchu.
 Buckets, wood or metal.
 Buckles, common metal, plain or covered.
 Buckram, cotton or partly.
 Buckskin, and manufactures of.
 Buckwheat and flour.

* When used in dyes, medicines, paints, or perfumery.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Buffalo, skin or leather, and manufactures of.
 Buffers.
 Buggies.
 Bugle trimmings.
 Bungs, wooden.
 Bureaus.
 Burettes.
 Burial cases, wood or metal.
 Burins.
 Burlaps.
 Burners, lamp.
 Burnishers.
 Buskins, leather or partly.
 Busts, bronze, iron, alabaster, marble, or jasper, etc.
 Butchers' tools.
 Butts.
 Butter and imitation.
 Butter of antimony.
 Butter of cacao.
 Buttons, iron, steel, copper, and its alloys, other common metal, glass, porcelain, and wood.
 Cabs and cabriolets.
 Cabbages.
 Cabinets.
 Cables, iron, steel, or vegetable fiber.
 Caffein and guaranin.
 Cages, wood or wire.
 Cakes.
 Calagualla.
 Calamine.
 Calamus.
 Caldrons.
 Caleches.
 Calendars.
 Calenders.
 Calfskin and manufactures of.
 Calicoes.
 Calisaya and preparations of.
 Calling irons.
 Callipers.
 Calomel.
 Caloric engines.
 Calorimeters.
 Cams.
 Cambrics, cotton or partly.
 Camelot, cotton or partly.
 Cameras.
 Camomile.
 Camlet, cotton or partly.
 Campeachy wood.
 Camphor.
 Canchalagua.
 Cans, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, tin, zinc, and wood.
 Canary seed.
 Candelabra.
 Candied fruits.
 Candles, tallow or stearin.
 Candlesticks, guards, and snuffers.
 Cane and manufactures of.
 Canes, walking.
 Cane knives.
 Canisters, copper, and its alloys, tin, or zinc.
 Canned goods.
 Cannon.
 Canoes.
 Cantaloupes.
 Cantharides.
 Cantharidine.
 Canvas, cotton or partly.
 Caoutchouc.
 Caps, cotton or partly, leather or rubber, straw or palm.
 Capers.
 Capstans.
 Capsules, for bottles, and medicinal.
 Cars, railroad and street, and parts.
 Caramel.
 Caraway.
 Carbonizers.
 Carboys.
 Card cases, common metal, leather, or rubber, wholly.
 Cards, hand or machine.
 Cardamon.
 Cardboard.
 Carding machine.
 Carmine.
 Carpenters' tools.
 Carpets, cotton or partly.
 Carriages, all kinds.
 Carriage bodies.
 Carrots.
 Carthamus.
 Carts, and parts.
 Cartridge shells, metallic.
 Cartridge boxes, leather or skin.
 Carved work, common metal, stone, or wood.
 Carvers.
 Cases, packing, printing, etc.
 Casks, wood.
 Caskets, burial.
 Casters, furniture or cruet.
 Cast iron, and manufactures of.
 Castings, iron or steel, copper and its alloys, zinc, or other common metal.
 Castoreum.
 Castor oil.
 Catches, door, etc.
 Catechu.
 Catheters.
 Catsup.
 Cattle, live.
 Cauliflowers.
 Cavessons.
 Caviar.
 Cedar.
 Celery.
 Cement.
 Ceramic products, crockery and porcelain.
 Cerulin.
 Ceruse.
 Chagrin, leather.
 Chains, all sizes, iron or steel, copper, and its alloys, or other common metal.
 Chairs, all kinds, wood or metal.
 Chaises.
 Chalk.
 Chambers, pots.
 Chamois leather.
 Chandeliers, copper and alloys, iron or steel, glass, or common metal.
 Charts.
 Chasing tools.
 Cheese.
 Chemical products for medicinal, perfumers, painters, and dyers' uses.
 Chenille, cotton or partly.
 Cherries, fresh, dried, preserved, or canned.
 Cherry wood and manufactures.
 Chess boards.
 Chestnuts and wood.
 Chests, wood or metal.
 Chick peas.
 Chicory.
 Chickens.
 Chimneys, lamp, locomotive, stove, etc.
 Chimney sweepers, iron or steel.
 Chinaware.
 Chintz.
 Chisels.
 Chloral.
 Chlorates.
 Chlorides.
 Chloroform.
 Chocolate-pots, common metal or porcelain.
 Chromates, medicinal or dye.
 Chrome paints and colors.
 Chronometers.
 Chucks.
 Churns.
 Cigar and cigarette cases, metal, rubber, or leather.
 Cinchona.
 Cinchonine.
 Cinnabar.
 Citrates.
 Citron.
 Clams, fresh salt, or canned.
 Clamps.
 Clarences, all kinds.
 Clasps, metallic, except gold and silver.
 Clay, and manufactures of.
 Cleats.
 Cleavers.
 Clevises.
 Cloaks, cotton or partly.
 Clocks, all kinds and parts of.
 Closets, water or earth.
 Cloths, cotton, or at least half cotton.
 Clothespins.
 Clothing, cotton.
 Cloves.
 Coaches and parts.
 Coal, anthracite and bituminous.
 Coal dust pressed in cakes.
 Cobalt, salts of, medicinal or paints.
 Cocaine.
 Cochineal.
 Cocks, wood or metal.
 Codein.
 Codfish, dry, salt, pickled, and parts of.
 Coffee mills.
 Coffee pots.
 Coffee roasters.
 Coffee machinery.
 Coffins, wood or metal.
 Coin, gold or silver.
 Coke.
 Collanders.
 Cold chisels.
 Collars, men or women, cotton or partly.
 Collars, animal, leather or metal.
 Collyria.
 Colocynth.
 Colopony.
 Colors (paints or dyes).
 Columns, iron, steel, or wood.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Combs, common metal, wood or rubber.
 Comfits, medicinal.
 Comforters, cotton or partly.
 Commodes.
 Commutators, electric.
 Compasses, artisans' or mariners'.
 Composing sticks.
 Condensers (steam).
 Conformators.
 Consols.
 Converters (steel).
 Cooking utensils.
 Coolers.
 Coopers' tools.
 Cooperage, wooden.
 Copaiba.
 Copal varnish.
 Copper, its alloys and manufactures of.
 Copperas.
 Copying presses.
 Cord, all sorts except silk.
 Cordage, all sorts.
 Cordovan leather.
 Corduroy.
 Corkscrews.
 Corn and meal.
 Corrosive sublimate.
 Corrugated iron.
 Corrugating machinery.
 Corsets, cotton or partly.
 Cosmetics.
 Cots, wood or metal.
 Cottolene.
 Cotton and manufactures of.
 Cotton gins.
 Cotton machinery.
 Cotton-seed cake.
 Cotton-seed oil.
 Cotton waste.
 Coulters.
 Couches.
 Counterpanes, cotton or partly.
 Coupés.
 Couplings, railway.
 Court plaster.
 Covers, dish, bed, table, carriage, furniture, etc.
 Coverlets, cotton or partly.
 Cows.
 Cow bells.
 Cowhides.
 Crabs (machines).
 Crabs, fresh, salt, or canned.
 Crackers.
 Cradles, wood or metal.
 Cramp-irons.
 Cranberries.
 Cranes.
 Cranks.
 Crape, cotton or partly.
 Cravats, cotton or partly.
 Cream of tartar.
 Creosote.
 Cretonne, cotton or partly.
 Cribs, wood or metal.
 Crimping irons.
 Cringles.
 Crinoline.
 Cristofle.
 Crockery, fine.
 Crochet work, cotton or partly.
 Crosses of copper and its alloys, common metal and wood.
 Crossbelts.
 Cross-cut saws.
 Cross-ties.
 Crucibles.
 Crucifixes, common metal, wood, or porcelain.
 Cruets, glass or porcelain.
 Cruppers.
 Crushers (ore).
 Crowbars.
 Crystal and ware.
 Cubebs.
 Cudbear.
 Cuffs, cotton or partly.
 Cultivators.
 Cumin.
 Cups, glass, porcelain, or common metal.
 Cupboards, wooden.
 Cupels.
 Cupping glasses.
 Curb chains.
 Curcumine.
 Curling irons.
 Currants.
 Currycombs.
 Curtains, cotton or partly or wood.
 Cushions, cotton or partly, leather or rubber.
 Cuspidors.
 Cutlery, iron or steel.
 Cyanides, iron or other bases, medicinal.
 Cylinders, machinery.
 Cymbals, copper and alloys.
 Cypress wood and manufactures.
 Daggers.
 Damask, cotton or partly.
 Damsons, fresh, preserved, or canned.
 Dates.
 Datura, medicinal.
 Deals.
 Decanters.
 Deer skins and manufactures of.
 Demijohns.
 Dental apparatus and tools.
 Dentifrices.
 Depilatories.
 Derricks.
 Desks.
 Deviled meats.
 Dials, watch or clock.
 Diamonds, glaziers'.
 Diaper, cotton or partly.
 Diaplama (plaster).
 Diaquilon (plaster).
 Diaries.
 Dice, wooden.
 Dictionaries.
 Dies and plates, all kinds.
 Digitaline.
 Digitalis.
 Dilators, surgeons.
 Dining tables.
 Dinner services.
 Dioramas.
 Dippers, tin or common metal.
 Disks.
 Dishes, table, kitchen, porcelain, crockery, or common metal.
 Disinfectants.
 Distilling apparatus.
 Ditching machinery and tools.
 Dividers.
 Dividing engines.
 Diving bells and apparatus.
 Dog carts.
 Dolls, wood, porcelain, or rubber.
 Dolomite.
 Donkey engines.
 Doors, wood or common metal, all kinds.
 Door bells.
 Door bolts.
 Door chains.
 Door frames.
 Door knobs.
 Door latches.
 Door locks.
 Door mats.
 Door plates, porcelain or common metal.
 Door springs.
 Dowels.
 Drag nets.
 Drag saws.
 Drain pipe, iron or clay.
 Drawers, chest or table.
 Drawers, cotton or partly.
 Drawing knives.
 Drawing plates.
 Drawing instruments.
 Drays and parts.
 Dredges and parts.
 Dredging machinery.
 Dregs, oil.
 Dress goods, cotton or partly.
 Dried fruit.
 Driers, painters'.
 Drills, cotton or partly.
 Drills (tools).
 Drills (seed-sowing).
 Drinking cups, glass or common metal.
 Drive wells.
 Drivers, coopers.
 Drugs, medicinal.
 Dubbers, artists'.
 Duck, cotton or partly.
 Dulcamara.
 Dumb-bells.
 Dumb-walters.
 Dummy cars.
 Dump cars, carts, and scows.
 Dung.
 Dusters.
 Dutch tiles.
 Dyes, all kinds.
 Dyers' implements.
 Dynamometers.
 Earths, for paints, crockery, or porcelain, refractory.
 Earthenware, all kinds.
 Ebony and manufactures of.
 Edge tools.
 Edgings, cotton or partly.
 Education pipes.
 Education valves.
 Eels, fresh, salt, or canned.
 Effigies, common metal, plaster, porcelain, or wood.
 Eggs.
 Elain.
 Elastic bands.
 Elastic cloth, cotton or partly.
 Elaterine.
 Elbows for tube, pipes, buildings, and vessels.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Electric apparatus.
 Electric machinery.
 Electric motors.
 Electro-magnetic apparatus.
 Electuaries.
 Elemi gum.
 Elevators.
 Elixirs, medicinal or toilet.
 Elm, and manufactures of.
 Embossed leather.
 Embroideries, cotton or partly.
 Emery.
 Emery cloth and paper.
 Emetics.
 Emollients.
 Emulsions, medicinal.
 Enameled iron or steel ware.
 Enameled leather.
 Encaustic bricks and tiles.
 Engines, all kinds.
 Engravers' tools.
 Envelopes, paper.
 Epsom salts.
 Erasers, rubber.
 Ergot.
 Ergotine.
 Essences, medicinal or toilet.
 Essential oils.
 Etagères.
 Etching instruments.
 Ethers, medicinal.
 Ethyl.
 Eudiometers.
 Euphorbium.
 Evaporating apparatus.
 Exhaust pipes and valves.
 Expansion engines.
 Express wagons.
 Extracts, solid or liquid, medicinal, dye, or tanning.
 Eyes and eyelets, iron, steel, or common metal.
 Eyeglasses.
 Eyes, artificial, glass, or porcelain.
 Fabrics, cotton or partly, rubber or partly.
 False teeth, sets of, rubber or partly.
 Fans, cotton or partly, palm.
 Fans, agricultural or mechanical.
 Fanning mills.
 Farina.
 Farm machinery, implements, and tools.
 Farriers' tools.
 Fastenings, door, sash, blinds of iron or common metal.
 Faucets, iron or steel, copper and alloys of, and other common metal, porcelain, or wood.
 Feed for cattle.
 Feldspar.
 Felloses.
 Felt, cotton or partly.
 Fencing foils.
 Fencing, iron, steel, or wood.
 Fencing wire, plain or barbed, galvanized or not.
 Fenders, wire or sheet metal.
 Fennel.
 Ferrules, iron or steel, copper and its alloys, or other common metal.
 Fertilizers.
 Figs, fresh or dried.
 Figures, common metal, marble, alabaster, porcelain, glass, wood.
 Filberts.
 Files.
 Filters, iron, steel, stone, earthen, or porcelain.
 Fir wood and manufactures.
 Fire extinguishers.
 Fire bars.
 Fire brick.
 Fire clay.
 Fire engines.
 Fire escapes.
 Fire irons.
 Fire screens, common metal.
 Fire shovels.
 Firewood.
 Firkins.
 Fish, fresh, dry, salt, smoked, pickled, preserved, canned, and in oil.
 Fish plates, railway.
 Fishhooks.
 Fish rods, nets, and lines.
 Fish nesks, spawn, roes, sounds, and tongues.
 Flagstones.
 Flannel, cotton or partly.
 Flasks, glass, porcelain, or common metal.
 Flax in cordage.
 Flax machinery.
 Fleams.
 Fleawort.
 Flint.
 Flooring.
 Flooring tiles.
 Flower pots, earthen or porcelain.
 Flowers, medicinal, dyeing, or perfume.

Flour, wheat and other cereal.
 Flues.
 Flue brushes.
 Fluor spar.
 Flutes.
 Flywheels.
 Foil, lead, brass, or tin.
 Folds, fencing.
 Forage.
 Forceps.
 Forges, all kinds.
 Forks, table or agricultural.
 Forms, printers'.
 Foundry tools and apparatus.
 Fountains, soda.
 Fountains, drinking.
 Fowls.
 Fowling pieces.
 Frames, wood, for houses, doors or windows, mirrors or pictures, embroidery, machine.
 Freezers.
 Fringes, cotton or partly.
 Frog plates.
 Fruits, all kinds, fresh, green, dried, preserved, canned, and pickled.
 Fruit evaporators.
 Fruit baskets, dishes, and boxes.
 Frying pans.
 Fulling mills.
 Funnels, common metal, glass, porcelain, or rubber.
 Furnaces, all kinds, and fixtures.
 Furniture, all kinds, and marble for same.
 Fuscine.
 Fustic.
 Fustine.
 Gaiters, leather or partly.
 Galbanum.
 Gallipot.
 Gallies, printers'.
 Galvanic batteries.
 Galvanized iron and wire.
 Galvanometers.
 Gamboge.
 Game bags, leather or rubber.
 Garancee.
 Garden tools and utensils.
 Garden seed.
 Garden products.
 Garlic.
 Garters, cotton or partly.
 Gas apparatus and machinery.
 Gas fixtures.
 Gas meters.
 Gasometers.
 Gas pipe.
 Gas-fitters' tools.
 Gasoline.
 Gates, wood or metal.
 Gauges (tools), measures.
 Gauze, cotton or partly.
 Gears, carriage or wagon.
 Gearing, machinery.
 Generators, steam, gas, or electric.
 Gentian.
 Ghirkins.
 Gigs.
 Gilders' tools.
 Gimlets.
 Gins, cotton and other.
 Gingham, cotton or partly.
 Ginseng.
 Girders, steel, wood, or iron.
 Girths, cotton or partly, and leather.
 Glass, and manufactures of all kinds.
 Glaziers' tools and diamonds.
 Globes, wood, glass, stone, or common metal.
 Globules, medicinal.
 Gloves, cotton or partly, leather or skin.
 Goats.
 Goblets.
 Gold coin or watches.
 Gongs, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, or common metal.
 Gooseberries.
 Gouges.
 Gourds.
 Governors, engine.
 Gowns, cotton or partly.
 Grain, and flour of.
 Granite.
 Grapes, fresh or preserved.
 Grape mills and presses.
 Graphometers.
 Grappling irons.
 Grass, forage or manufactured.
 Grates, all kinds.
 Graters.
 Grating, wood or metal.
 Gravers' tools.
 Grease.
 Greens, paints, colors, or dyes.
 Griddles.
 Gridirons.
 Grinding machines.
 Gristmills.
 Grits.
 Grocers' utensils.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Groovers.
 Grooving planes.
 Ground bone.
 Grubbers.
 Guaiacum gum.
 Guano.
 Gum, medicinal, dyes, or perfume.
 Gum elastic, and manufactures of.
 Gums.
 Gutta-percha, and manufactures of.
 Gypsum.
 Hackles, flax or hemp.
 Haddock, fresh, dried, or salt.
 Hair-brushes.
 Hair dyes.
 Hairpins.
 Hair oil.
 Hake, fresh, dried, or salt.
 Halibut, fresh, dried, or salt.
 Halters, leather or partly.
 Halter chains.
 Hams.
 Hames.
 Hammers, hand or machine.
 Hammocks, grass, cotton or partly.
 Hand bags, leather or partly; cotton or partly.
 Hand cars.
 Handcarts.
 Hand lathes.
 Hand organs.
 Hand presses.
 Handsaws.
 Handpikes.
 Hand vises.
 Handkerchiefs, cotton or partly.
 Handles, for knives, canes, umbrellas, tools, and implements.
 Hardware.
 Harness, all kinds.
 Harpoons.
 Harrows.
 Harvesters.
 Hats, cotton or partly; straw, palm, leather or partly; rubber or partly.
 Hat brims, straw.
 Hat boxes, leather, wood, or paper.
 Hatchets.
 Hatching machines.
 Hatters' blocks and tools.
 Hawser.
 Hay.
 Heads, cooperage.
 Headstalls.
 Heating apparatus.
 Hectographs.
 Hedging tools.
 Heliographs.
 Hellebore.
 Hemacite.
 Hematite.
 Hemlock, and manufactures of.
 Hemp, and manufactures of.
 Hemp seed.
 Hens.
 Herbs, medicinal, dye, or perfume.
 Herring, fresh, dried, salt, smoked, pickled.
 Hessians, cotton or partly.
 Hickory wood and manufactures.
 Hide scrapings for manure.
 Hides, tanned or dressed.
 Hinges, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, and common metal.
 Hoels.
 Hogsheads and shooks.
 Hoisting machines and apparatus.
 Hollands, cotton or partly.
 Hollow ware, iron, steel, copper, and glass, porcelain, or wood alloys, other common metal.
 Holly, and manufactures of.
 Holsters.
 Hominy.
 Hones.
 Hooks, all kinds, iron or steel, copper and alloys, other common metal.
 Hooks and eyes, common metal.
 Hook nails.
 Hoops, wood or metal.
 Horses.
 Horse brushes.
 Horse cars.
 Horse collars.
 Horse leather.
 Horse powers.
 Horse shoes and nails.
 Horses, rocking, wood.
 Hose, stocking, cotton or partly.
 Hose, rubber, cotton, or leather.
 Houses, wood, in parts.
 Howels.
 Hubs, wood or metal.
 Hulling machines.
 Hung beef.
 Hunting bags, leather or partly.
 Hunting boots.
 Hunting knives.
 Huskers.
 Hydrants.

Hydraulic apparatus and machinery, all kinds.
 Hydrochlorates, medicinal.
 Hydrometers.
 Hydrostats.
 Hydrosulphates, medicinal.
 Hydrometers.
 Hypophosphates and hypophosphites.
 Hyposulphites, medicinal.
 Ice.
 Ice tools.
 Images, common metal, wood, porcelain, or stone.
 Implements, agricultural, garden and others.
 Imposing stones.
 Imposing tables.
 Incense.
 Incubators.
 India rubber, and manufactures of.
 Indian corn or meal.
 Indian hemp.
 India ink.
 Indicators for machinery or street cars.
 Indigo.
 Ingots, copper.
 Ingot steel.
 Injectors, machinery.
 Ink, all kinds.
 Inkstands.
 Insertions, cotton or partly.
 Insoles, leather or partly.
 Instruments, agricultural, artisans', dental, mathematical, optical, surgical, scientific in general.
 Insulators, glass, wood, rubber, or porcelain.
 Invalid chairs.
 Iodides, medicinal.
 Iodine and its salts.
 Iodoform.
 Ipecacuanha.
 Irish cloth, cotton or partly.
 Iron, cast or wrought and manufactures of.
 Iron bands, hoops, straps, bars, blooms, bolts, bridges, castings, chests, clasps, filings, mills, pins, plates, plugs, pots, rods, rollers, roofing, safes, sheets, tubing, ware, wire, work, and all manufactures of.
 Iron machinery.
 Iron, railway.
 Iron shavings or borings.
 Jacks, hoisting.
 Jack planes.
 Jackscrews.
 Jaconet, cotton or partly.
 Jalap.
 Jalapine.
 Jams, fruit.
 Japan.
 Japan earth.
 Japanned leather.
 Japanned ware, common metal.
 Jars, glass, porcelain, or earthen.
 Jasper, and manufactures of.
 Jeans, cotton or partly.
 Jellies.
 Jennies, spinning.
 Jewelry, copper and its alloys, nickel, or common metal, rubber.
 Joiners' tools.
 Joints.
 Joists and scantling.
 Journal bearing and boxes.
 Jugs.
 Juniper berries and oil.
 Jute, and manufactures of.
 Kaolin.
 Kedg anchors.
 Kegs.
 Kerosene, crude and refined.
 Kettles.
 Keys, all kinds, iron, steel, copper, and alloys, nickel or common metal.
 Key rings.
 Kid, leather, and manufactures of.
 Kidney beans.
 Kip leather.
 Kitchen utensils.
 Knapsacks.
 Knees, wood, iron, or steel.
 Knife, fork, and spoon cases.
 Knives, all kinds, iron or steel.
 Knit goods, cotton or partly.
 Knitting machines and needles.
 Knobs, iron, steel, copper and alloys, nickel or common metal, glass, porcelain and wood.
 Knockers, door.
 Kousoo.
 Labdanum.
 Labels, copper and alloys, tin, or zinc.
 Laboratory utensils.
 Lacs.
 Laces, cotton or partly.
 Lace boots.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROACITY—continued.

Lace trimmings, cotton or partly.
 Lacquer.
 Lactates, medicinal.
 Lactometers.
 Ladders, wood or iron.
 Ladies' boots and shoes.
 Ladies.
 Lakes, paint.
 Lamps, all kinds, iron or steel, copper and alloys, nickel, common metal, tin, glass, and porcelain.
 Lamp burners.
 Lamp chimneys and founts.
 Lamp globes, shades, wicks.
 Lancets.
 Landais.
 Landers, all kinds.
 Lard and compounds.
 Lard oil.
 Lasts, shoemakers'.
 Latches.
 Laths.
 Lathes, hand or machine accessories, and tools.
 Latten, and manufactures of.
 Laudanum.
 Launches, oar or steam.
 Lavatories.
 Lavender.
 Lavender oil.
 Lawn, cotton or partly.
 Lead, and manufactures of, pig, sheets, plates, pipes, tubes.
 Leather, and manufactures of, in whole or part.
 Leather machinery.
 Leaves, medicinal, perfume and dye.
 Lees, fish oil.
 Leggings, leather or rubber or partly.
 Lemons.
 Lenses, all kinds.
 Lentils.
 Letters (type).
 Lettuce.
 Levels.
 Levers, all kinds.
 Lichen.
 Licorice.
 Life preservers, rubber or partly.
 Lighters (boats).
 Lightningrods.
 Lignite.
 Lignum-vitæ, and manufactures of.
 Lima beans.
 Lime, common or hydraulic.
 Limes.
 Limestone.
 Linden wood, and manufactures of.
 Lines.
 Liniments, medicinal.
 Linings, cotton or partly.
 Links, iron or steel, copper and alloys, nickel, common metal.
 Linseed.
 Linseed oil.
 Liquor cases.
 Liquor weighers.
 Litharge.
 Lithographic apparatus.
 Live stock.
 Lobsters, fresh or canned.
 Locks, all kinds, iron, steel, copper and alloys, common metal, wood.
 Locketts, copper and alloys, nickel or common metal.
 Locomotives.
 Logs.
 Logs, ships'.
 Lookingglasses.
 Looms.
 Lotions, medicinal.
 Lounges.
 Lozenges, medicinal.
 Lubricators.
 Lucerne.
 Lumber, all kinds.
 Lunch boxes.
 Lupines.
 Lupuline.
 Lustring.
 Lycopodium.
 Macaroni.
 Machines, motive, industrial, and scientific.
 Machinery of all kinds.
 Machinery oil.
 Machine tools.
 Macintoshes, part rubber.
 Mackerel, fresh, salt, or pickled.
 Madapolam, cotton or partly.
 Madder.
 Magenta dye.
 Magic lanterns.
 Magnesia and preparations, medicinal.
 Magnets, all kinds.
 Magnetic apparatus, all kinds.
 Magnifying glasses.
 Mahogany, and manufactures of.
 Mail bags, leather or cotton.
 Majolica ware.
 Malachite.
 Malates, medicinal.
 Mallets, all kinds.
 Mallows.
 Mandrake.
 Mandrills.
 Manikins, dressmakers' or tailors'.
 Manila hemp, and manufactures.
 Manna.
 Mannite.
 Manometers.
 Metal pieces, stone or iron.
 Mantillas, cotton, or partly.
 Manures, natural or artificial.
 Maps.
 Maple, and manufactures of.
 Marble, and works of.
 Marine engines.
 Marjoram.
 Marking awls.
 Marking ink.
 Marking iron.
 Marl.
 Marline.
 Marmalade.
 Martingales.
 Masks, cotton or wire.
 Massicot.
 Mast, roasted or ground.
 Masts, ship's.
 Mastic.
 Mats, straw or palm leaf.
 Materials for ship building.
 Mathematical instruments.
 Match boxes, common metal.
 Matico.
 Mattresses.
 Mattocks.
 Mattresses, cotton, or partly.
 Mauls.
 Meal of all cereals.
 Measures, metal, wood, cotton, etc.
 Meats, fresh, in brine, preserved by extraction of air, canned, in vinegar, salted, smoked, hung, pickled.
 Medals, copper and its alloys, nickel, common metal.
 Medallions, copper and its alloys, nickel, common metal, plaster of Paris.
 Medicinal preparations, all kinds.
 Megaphones.
 Megascopes.
 Melissa.
 Melodeons.
 Melons.
 Menthol.
 Mercury, and salts of, medicinal.
 Meridian instruments.
 Merino, imitation, cotton, or partly.
 Metals, manufactures of, all kinds except gold, silver, and platinum.
 Meters, gas or water.
 Methyl and its compounds.
 Metrometers.
 Metronomes.
 Micrometers.
 Microphones.
 Microscopes.
 Milk, condensed or canned.
 Milk vessels.
 Millet.
 Mills, all kinds.
 Mill tools.
 Milling machinery.
 Mince meat.
 Mincing knives.
 Miners' tools and implements.
 Mineral oils.
 Mineral paints.
 Mineral salts.
 Mineral tar.
 Mineral waters, natural or artificial.
 Minium.
 Mirrors.
 Mirror plate.
 Mitters.
 Mittens, cotton, leather, or rubber.
 Modeling tools.
 Molasses boilers.
 Molds, all kinds, for arts and trades.
 Molleton, cotton or partly.
 Monkeywrenches.
 Monocles.
 Mordants (paints).
 Morning gowns and jackets, cotton or partly.
 Morocco, and manufactures of.
 Morphine, and salts of.
 Mortars, metallic, porcelain, wood, stone, or glass.
 Mosaic flooring.
 Mosquito netting, cotton, or partly.
 Motors, all kinds.
 Moldings, wood or plaster.
 Mouthpieces for smokers, or musical instruments, glass, wood, metal or rubber.
 Movements, watch, and other machinery.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROACITY—continued.

Mowers and reapers.
 Mugs, metal, crockery, or porcelain.
 Mulberry wood, and manufactures of.
 Mules.
 Mule jennies.
 Muriates, medicinal.
 Mushrooms.
 Music, printed.
 Music stands and stools.
 Music instruments.
 Musk.
 Muskets.
 Muslin, cotton, or partly.
 Mussels.
 Mustard, medicinal.
 Mustard seed.
 Mutton, fresh, salt, or pickled.
 Muzzles, metal or leather.
 Myrrh.
 Nails, all kinds common metal.
 Nail brushes.
 Nail drawers.
 Nail drivers.
 Nail-making machines and tools.
 Nailers' tools.
 Nankeen, cotton, or partly.
 Naphtha.
 Naphthalins.
 Napkins, cotton, or partly.
 Napkin rings, wood or metal.
 Narcotics.
 Nard.
 Nautical instruments.
 Neatsfoot oil.
 Nectarines.
 Needles, wood or metal, all kinds.
 Neroli.
 Nets, cotton, or partly.
 Netting, cotton, or partly.
 Nickel, and manufactures of.
 Nicotine.
 Nippers.
 Nipples and breast shields, rubber.
 Nitrates, medicinal or manures.
 Nozzles.
 Nuts (fruit), all kinds.
 Nuts, iron or common metal.
 Oak, and manufactures of.
 Oars, wooden.
 Oats and meal.
 Obsidian.
 Obstetrical instruments.
 Obstrutors.
 Ochers (paints), all kinds.
 Octants.
 Odometers.
 Oils, animal and vegetable.
 Oils, essential.
 Oilcloths, cotton or rubber.
 Oil cans and feeders.
 Ointments.
 Okra.
 Olein.
 Oleomargarine.
 Oilbanum.
 Olives, fresh, canned, pickled, preserved, or stuffed.
 Omnibuses.
 Onions, fresh or pickled.
 Opera glasses.
 Opiates.
 Opium.
 Opobalsam.
 Opodeldoc.
 Opopanax.
 Optical instruments.
 Oranges.
 Orange flower.
 Orange water.
 Orchil.
 Orcins.
 Ore crushers.
 Oreganum.
 Organdies, cotton or partly.
 Organs.
 Orleans, cotton, or partly.
 Ornaments, iron, wood, glass, stone, or common metal.
 Oroide.
 Orpliment.
 Orris root.
 Orts.
 Osier, and manufactures of.
 Osnaburghs.
 Otter of rose.
 Ottomans.
 Ovens, iron or tin.
 Overshoes, leather or rubber, wholly or partly.
 Oxalates, medicinal.
 Oxen.
 Ox yokes and bows.
 Oxides for medicine, dyes, or paints.
 Oysters, fresh, canned, salt, pickled, preserved.
 Packing, asbestos, cotton, or rubber.
 Packthread.
 Packsaddles.
 Pads, cotton, leather, or rubber.
 Paddles.
 Padlocks.
 Pails, metal, wood, or leather.
 Paints, all kinds.
 Painters' materials.
 Painters' tools and implements.
 Palettes.
 Palings, wood.
 Pallsander.
 Palm leaf, and manufactures of.
 Pamphlets.
 Pans, metal or earthen.
 Panama straw, and manufactures of.
 Panels, wood.
 Panic grass.
 Paper, cigarette, news, painted, wall, wrapping, writing.
 Paper boxes.
 Paper collars.
 Paper machinery.
 Parabols, cotton, or partly.
 Paregoric.
 Paris green.
 Parlor furniture.
 Parsley.
 Parsnips.
 Passenger cars.
 Passenger elevators.
 Pastes, alimentary.
 Pasteboard, and boxes of.
 Pastilles.
 Patchouly.
 Patent leather.
 Patent medicines.
 Patterns, leather, for boots and shoes, and cotton, for clothing.
 Paving bricks.
 Paving stones.
 Paving ties.
 Pease, all kinds.
 Peaches, fresh, dry, preserved, or canned.
 Peanuts.
 Peas, fresh, dried, preserved, or canned.
 Pear wood, and manufactures of.
 Peat.
 Pecans.
 Pegs or pins, wood or metal.
 Pegging awls.
 Pegging machines.
 Pellets, medicinal.
 Peltry.
 Pemmican.
 Pens, steel, or common metal.
 Penholders.
 Pencils.
 Pencil cases.
 Pendants, glass or crystal.
 Pendulums.
 Penholders.
 Penknives.
 Peppers, all kinds.
 Pepsin.
 Peptone.
 Perambulators.
 Percalé, cotton, or partly.
 Percaline, cotton, or partly.
 Perfumes, all kinds.
 Periodicals.
 Periwinkles.
 Perspective glasses.
 Peruvian bark.
 Pessaries.
 Pestles.
 Petroleum, crude or refined.
 Petticoats, cotton, or partly.
 Pewter, and manufactures of.
 Phatons.
 Phenol.
 Phonographs.
 Phosphates, medicinal, or manures.
 Phosphites, medicinal.
 Phosphobronze.
 Phosphoguano.
 Photographers' apparatus.
 Photometers.
 Physical apparatus.
 Pianos.
 Picks.
 Pickaxes.
 Pickled fish.
 Pick socks.
 Pickled vegetables.
 Pictures, with frames and appurtenances.
 Pieces or parts for machinery, wagons, cars, locomotives, carriages.
 Pig copper.
 Pig iron.
 Pig lead.
 Pig zinc.
 Pigeons.
 Pigeon dung.
 Pigments.
 Pilchards.
 Pile-drivers.
 Pills.
 Pillars, iron, steel, stone, marble, or wood.
 Pillows, cotton, or partly, and cases.
 Pins, iron, steel, copper, and its alloys, common metal, or wood.
 Pin cases.
 Pincers.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCIITY—continued.

Pine, and manufactures of.
 Pine apples.
 Pine resin.
 Pipe, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, zinc, tin, other common metal, clay, or earthen, glass, rubber, and wood.
 Pipes or casks.
 Pipes, wood, smoking.
 Piperine.
 Pipettes.
 Pique, cotton, or partly.
 Pistols.
 Pistol cases and holsters.
 Pistons, machine.
 Pita, and manufactures of.
 Pitchers and jars, glass and porcelain, or crockery.
 Pitch, mineral or vegetable.
 Pitchforks.
 Pitchpine.
 Plack-fond.
 Plaids, cotton, or partly.
 Planes, all sorts.
 Planetariums.
 Planing machines and tools.
 Planishing tools.
 Planks, all kinds.
 Plants, medicinal and live.
 Plantains.
 Plantation machinery, tools, and implements.
 Plaster for manure.
 Plaster of Paris.
 Plasters, medicinal.
 Plates, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, nickel, tin, zinc, other common metal, porcelain, glass, earthen or wood.
 Plates, frog, railway.
 Plates, scales.
 Plate armor.
 Plated goods.
 Platilla, cotton, or partly.
 Platform scales.
 Platters, wood or metal.
 Pliers.
 Plows, all kinds, and parts.
 Plums, fresh, dry, canned, or preserved.
 Plumbers' tools.
 Plummets.
 Plush, cotton, or partly.
 Pneumatic machinery.
 Pocketbooks, leather or rubber, wholly or partly.
 Point edgings and laces, cotton, or partly.
 Pokers.
 Poles, wood, telegraph and other.
 Polishers' tools.
 Pomades, medicinal or toilet.
 Pomatum.
 Pomegranate wood and fruit.
 Poplar, and manufactures of.
 Poppies, and products of.
 Porcelain, and articles of.
 Pork, fresh, dried, salt, pickled, smoked.
 Portable engines, furnaces, and railways.
 Portfolios, leather or rubber, wholly or partly.
 Portmonnaies.
 Potash and salts of, medicinal.
 Pots, iron or earthen.
 Potatoes, all kinds.
 Potted meats.
 Potters' implements.
 Pottery.
 Pouches, leather or rubber, wholly or partly.
 Poultry.
 Pounce.
 Powders, medicinal, perfume, paints, dyes.
 Powers, horse or mechanical.
 Prawns.
 Precipitates for medicines, dyes, or paints.
 Preserves, all kinds.
 Preserved foods.
 Presses, all kinds.
 Priming instruments.
 Primings, paint or varnish.
 Prints, cotton or partly.
 Printed matter.
 Printers' implements and tools.
 Printing ink.
 Printing presses.
 Prisms.
 Privies, metallic or crockery.
 Probes.
 Products, garden, chemicals, field.
 Propellor screws.
 Proprietary medicines.
 Prospecting tools.
 Protractors.
 Provisions, meats, and dairy products and fish.
 Prunes.
 Prunella.
 Pruning implements.
 Prussians, cotton or partly.
 Prussiates, medicinal, dyes, or paints.
 Pulleys and blocks, all kinds.
 Pulp mills and machinery.
 Pumice stone.
 Pumps, hand or machine.
 Pumps (shoes).
 Pumpkins.
 Punches.
 Puncheons.
 Punching machines.
 Purpurine.
 Purses, cotton or partly leather or rubber.
 Puzzolani.
 Pyrometers.
 Pyroscopes.
 Quadrants.
 Quarry tools and machinery.
 Quartz, and manufactures of.
 Quassal.
 Quilts, cotton or partly.
 Quiltings, cotton or partly.
 Quinine and salts of.
 Rabbit planes.
 Racahout.
 Racks, furniture.
 Racks machine.
 Radiators.
 Radishes.
 Rafters, wood or metal.
 Rags, cotton or partly.
 Rag machinery.
 Rails, iron or steel and accessories.
 Railings, metal or wood.
 Railway material, all kinds.
 Raisins.
 Rakes, all kinds.
 Rams, hydraulic, and others.
 Rape seed.
 Raspberries, fresh, dried, canned, or preserved.
 Rasps.
 Ratany.
 Ratchets, machine.
 Rat and mouse traps.
 Rattan, and manufactures of.
 Razors and cases.
 Razor strops.
 Ready-made clothes, cotton or partly.
 Realgar.
 Reamers.
 Reapers.
 Reaping, hooks and cradles.
 Receiving apparatus, electric.
 Red lead.
 Reds, paints or dyes.
 Reddle.
 Reeds, and manufactures of.
 Reels, machine.
 Refining machinery, all kinds.
 Reflectors, glass or metal.
 Refrigerants, medicinal.
 Refrigerators.
 Registers, machine.
 Registers, passenger.
 Regulators, machine.
 Reins, leather or partly.
 Repts, cotton or partly.
 Reservoirs, wood, metal, or stone.
 Resin.
 Reticules, cotton, leather, or straw.
 Retorts.
 Revalenta arabica.
 Revolvers.
 Rhubarb.
 Ribbons, cotton or partly.
 Rifles.
 Rigging, vessels.
 Rings, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, nickel, other common metal, rubber, wood.
 Rivets, iron, steel, copper and its alloys.
 Riveting tools.
 Roasters, coffee and other.
 Rochelle salts.
 Rockaways.
 Rocking chairs.
 Rocking horses, wooden.
 Rods, iron, steel, brass and its alloys, nickel, common metal, wood.
 Rollers, agricultural, machine, etc.
 Rolling mills.
 Roofing felt.
 Roofing iron.
 Roofing lead.
 Roofing paper.
 Roofing slate.
 Roofing tiles.
 Roofing tin.
 Roots, medicinal, dye.
 Rope, vegetable fiber or metal.
 Rope machinery.
 Rope yarns.
 Rosaries, common, metal, or wood.
 Rosemary.
 Rose-water.
 Rosewood, and manufactures of.
 Rosin.
 Rotten stone.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCIITY—continued.

Rouens, cotton or partly.
 Rouge.
 Roulette tables.
 Rubber, and manufactures of.
 Rubber erasers and bands.
 Rudder, ship's.
 Rugs, cotton or partly, straw or palm.
 Rules, carpenters, etc.
 Rulers, wood, metal, or gutta-percha.
 Ruling machines.
 Running gear for vehicles.
 Rushes, and manufactures of.
 Rye and flour.
 Sabers.
 Saccharimeters.
 Sachels, cotton or partly, leather or rubber.
 Sachets and powders.
 Sacks, cotton or partly, leather or rubber.
 Sadrions.
 Saddles, all kinds.
 Saddlery.
 Saddlers' tools.
 Saddle-trees.
 Safes, iron, steel, tin, common metal, wood.
 Safron.
 Sago.
 Sails, cotton or partly.
 Salmon, canned, fresh, preserved, smoked.
 Salt, chemicals, for medicines, manures, dyes or paints.
 Salvagers, metal or wood.
 Sand.
 Sandalwood.
 Sandpaper.
 Sandstone.
 Santalin.
 Saponin.
 Saponaria.
 Saponin.
 Sardines, canned or salted.
 Sarsaparilla.
 Sash, window.
 Sash bolts and fixtures.
 Sashes, cotton or partly.
 Sassafras.
 Sateen, cotton or partly.
 Satin, cotton or partly.
 Satinet, cotton or partly.
 Sauces and condiments.
 Saucepans.
 Saucers.
 Sauerkraut.
 Sausages.
 Sausage machinery.
 Savin.
 Saws, all kinds.
 Sawing machinery.
 Scales, all kinds.
 Scalpels.
 Scammony.
 Scantling.
 Scarfs, cotton or partly.
 Schists, and oil of.
 School furniture.
 Scientific apparatus.
 Scissors and shears.
 Scows.
 Scrap iron.
 Scrapers.
 Screens, cotton or partly, wood or iron.
 Screws, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, nickel, common metal, and wood.
 Screw bolts and eyes.
 Screw-drivers.
 Screw jacks.
 Screw machines.
 Screw plates and dies.
 Screw presses.
 Screw propellers.
 Scrub brushes, ships'.
 Sculptors' tools.
 Scythes.
 Sea biscuits.
 Seaweed, manure.
 Seals or stamps, metal or rubber.
 Seaming machines.
 Sedatives, medicinal.
 Seidlitz powders.
 Seeds and grains for sowing, medicinal, dye, and perfume.
 Seeders.
 Seltzer water.
 Semen contra.
 Seneca root.
 Senna.
 Separators, grain and ore.
 Serge, cotton or partly.
 Sesame.
 Settees.
 Sewer pipes.
 Sewing machines.
 Sextants.
 Shad.
 Shades, lamp or candle
 Shafts, carriage, etc.
 Shafting, machinery.
 Shag, cotton or partly.
 Shagreen, and manufactures of.
 Shaving dishes.
 Shaves, carpenters' or cooper's.
 Shawls, cotton or partly.
 Shears.
 Shearing machines.
 Sheathing, copper and its alloys.
 Sheath knives.
 Sheathing paper.
 Sheep.
 Sheepskin, and manufactures of.
 Sheets, cotton or partly.
 Sheet copper.
 Sheet iron.
 Sheet zinc.
 Shelving, wooden.
 Shellac.
 Shellfish.
 Shingles.
 Shirts, cotton or partly.
 Shirt fronts, cuffs, and collars, cotton or partly.
 Shirting, cotton or partly.
 Shives, leather or partly.
 Shoe nails.
 Shoe pegs.
 Shoe polish.
 Shooks, box or hoghead.
 Shot, lead or iron.
 Shoulder belts.
 Shoulder straps.
 Shovels, metal or wood.
 Show case.
 Shrimps, fresh, canned, or pickled.
 Shrubs.
 Shutters, wood or iron.
 Shuttles, machine.
 Sickles.
 Sides, meat.
 Sideboards.
 Siding, wood or metal.
 Sienna.
 Sieves.
 Silver coin and watches.
 Sinapisms.
 Sinks, metal or stone.
 Siphon, metal, glass, or rubber.
 Sirens.
 Sirups, medicinal.
 Sisal hemp, and manufactures of.
 Skates.
 Skewers.
 Skiffs.
 Skimmers.
 Skins, tanned, dressed, or undressed.
 Skylights.
 Slabs, marble, jasper, alabaster, or other stone.
 Slate in all forms.
 Slaters' tools.
 Sleds.
 Sleighs.
 Sledges.
 Sleeping cars.
 Slippers, leather or partly.
 Smelts.
 Smelting furnaces.
 Smiths' tools.
 Smut machines.
 Snaffles.
 Snails.
 Snaths.
 Sneezewort.
 Snips.
 Snuffers.
 Soapstone, and manufactures of.
 Soap, toilet.
 Soda apparatus and fountains.
 Sofas.
 Solders.
 Soldering tools.
 Sole leather, and manufactures of.
 Sounds, fish.
 Sounding leads.
 Soup dishes.
 Souse.
 Sowers (seed).
 Spades and hoes.
 Spangles, copper and its alloys.
 Spar, mineral.
 Spars, ship.
 Sparadrasp.
 Spath.
 Spatulas.
 Spawn.
 Speaking trumpets.
 Spears.
 Spectacles and rims, common metal.
 Spectroscopes.
 Speculums.
 Spelter.
 Spermaceti.
 Spikes, metal or wood.
 Spikenard.
 Spiles.
 Spindles.
 Spinning machinery.
 Spirits turpentine.
 Spits.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Spittoons.
 Splints (surgeons').
 Splints, match.
 Spokes, wheel.
 Spools.
 Spoons, wood or common metal
 Spraying machines.
 Spreaders.
 Springs, metal or rubber, all kinds.
 Sprinklers.
 Spruce, and manufactures of.
 Spun goods, cotton or partly.
 Spurs.
 Spurge.
 Squares, carpenters', etc.
 Squashes.
 Squeezers, cork, lemon, etc.
 Stackers.
 Stage coaches.
 Stairs, metal, stone, or wood.
 Stamping tools.
 Stamp mills.
 Stanchions, wood or metal.
 Stands, candle, caster, flower, garden, lamp, music.
 Staples, iron, steel, or common metal.
 Starch, corn.
 Statues, iron, steel, copper and its alloys, common metal, stone, and wood.
 Staves.
 Steam apparatus, boilers, brakes, cars, cocks, cylinders.
 Steam dredges, engines and parts, launches, mills, motors, pipes, plows, powers, presses, pumps, tugs.
 Stearine, and candles of.
 Steel, and manufactures of.
 Steel bars, wire, ingots, plates, rods, and other forms.
 Steelyards.
 Steering apparatus.
 Stencils and plates.
 Steps, metal, stone, or wood.
 Stereoscopes.
 Stereotypes.
 Stereotype apparatus and tools.
 Stethoscopes.
 Stewpans.
 Sticks, wood, all sizes.
 Stills.
 Stirrups, metal, leather, or wood.
 Stock fish.
 Stockings, cotton or partly.
 Stoke bars.
 Stomach pumps.
 Stone, rough, dressed, or polished.
 Stonecutters' tools.
 Stoneware.
 Stools, all kinds.
 Stoppers, common metal, glass, wood, porcelain, or rubber.
 Storax.
 Stoves, iron, copper and its alloys, common metal, porcelain, or stone.
 Stramonium.
 Straps, leather or rubber.
 Straw for forage.
 Straw, and manufactures of.
 Street cars.
 String.
 String beans, fresh, pickled or canned.
 Stripes, cotton or partly.
 Strips or bands, leather, rubber, paper, cotton, or common metal.
 Stripping machines.
 Strychnine.
 Strubbers.
 Stud nails.
 Stuffed meats, all kinds.
 Stump pullers.
 Subliming pots and furnaces.
 Submarine apparatus, cables.
 Suet.
 Sugar bowls.
 Sugar mills and parts.
 Sugar plums, medicinal.
 Sulky plows.
 Sulphates, medicinal, dyes, and paints.
 Sumach.
 Sunshades, cotton or partly.
 Superphosphate of lime, manure.
 Surgical instruments.
 Surveyors' instruments.
 Suspensorys, cotton, rubber, or leather, wholly or partly.
 Suspensories.
 Sweepers, carpet.
 Sweeping machines, street.
 Switches, railway.
 Switches and switch boards, electric.
 Swords.
 Syringes, metal, glass, or rubber.
 Tables.
 Table mats.
 Table cloths, cotton or partly.
 Table covers, oilcloth or rubber.

Table knives and forks, iron, steel, copper, and its alloys.
 Table spoons, common metal.
 Table casters or cruet stands, common metal.
 Table steels.
 Tableware, glass, porcelain, or common metal.
 Tackle for vessels.
 Tackle, holsting.
 Tacks, all kinds.
 Tailors' implements.
 Talc.
 Tallow, and candles of.
 Tamping irons.
 Tamping machines.
 Tanks, metal, wood, or stone.
 Tanned leather or hides.
 Tanners' tools and implements.
 Tanbark.
 Tannin.
 Tapioca.
 Tapers, stearine or tallow.
 Tape, cotton or partly.
 Taps and wrenches.
 Tar, vegetable or mineral.
 Taraxacum.
 Tartar emetic.
 Tartrates, medicinal.
 Tassels, cotton or partly.
 Tea caddies, cups, kettles, pots, spoons.
 Teak.
 Teddiers.
 Telegraph apparatus, poles, wires.
 Telephones and apparatus.
 Telescopes.
 Tenders, locomotive.
 Tent cloths, cotton or partly.
 Tenter hooks.
 Terra cotta.
 Theine.
 Theriac.
 Thermometers.
 Thimbles, common metal.
 Thongs, leather.
 Thread, cotton or partly.
 Thread, shoemakers'.
 Threshers.
 Ticking, cotton or partly.
 Tiles, railway, iron or wood.
 Tilburys.
 Tiles, all kinds.
 Timbals.
 Timber, all kinds.
 Tin, in bar or pig.
 Tin, and manufactures of.
 Tin plate, and manufactures of, stamped, varnished, or lacquered.
 Tinctures, medicinal, perfumery.
 Tinder boxes.
 Tinsel.
 Tires (wheel).
 Tire benders.
 Tire shrinkers.
 Toasters.
 Tobacco boxes.
 Tobacco cutters.
 Tobacco machinery and tools.
 Toilet cases.
 Tolu balsam.
 Tomatoes, fresh, canned, or dried.
 Tong, all kinds.
 Tongues, smoked, salt, dried, or pickled.
 Tools, all kinds.
 Toothpicks, wood.
 Towels, cotton or partly.
 Toweling, cotton or partly.
 Toys, common metal, rubber, glass, porcelain, leather, or wood.
 Toy horses.
 Trace chains.
 Track cleaners (railway)
 Traction apparatus and engines.
 Tragacanth.
 Tramway materials.
 Transit instruments.
 Traps, iron, steel, copper, and its alloys, wire, wood.
 Traveling bags, cotton, rubber, or leather.
 Traversers, railway.
 Trenails.
 Trays, wood or metal treenails.
 Trees, live, and plants.
 Trellis work, metal or wood.
 Trepan and trephines.
 Trestlework, wood or metal.
 Tricot, cotton or partly.
 Tricycles.
 Trip hammers.
 Tripo.
 Tripoli, earth.
 Trocars.
 Troches, medicinal.
 Trolleys.
 Troughs, wood, stone, or metal.
 Trout, fresh, canned, or salt.
 Trowels, and other masons' tools.
 Trucks, all kinds.
 Truffles.

LIST OF ARTICLES AFFECTED BY RECIPROCITY—continued.

Trumpets, common metal.
 Trunks, wood, metal, or leather.
 Tubes, wood or metal.
 Tubes and tubing, iron or steel, copper and alloys, nickel, tin, zinc, or other common metal, lead, glass, porcelain, rubber, and wood.
 Tulle, cotton, or partly.
 Tumblers, glass or crystal.
 Tunny fish, fresh, canned, or pickled.
 Turbines.
 Turmeric.
 Turners' lathes and tools.
 Turnips and seed.
 Turntables.
 Turpentine.
 Tweezers.
 Twine, all kinds.
 Twist, cotton or partly.
 Type.
 Typewriters.
 Umber, raw and burnt.
 Umbrellas, cotton, or partly.
 Underclothes, cotton, or partly.
 Undershirts, cotton, or partly.
 Upholsters' tools.
 Upholstery, cotton, or partly.
 Upper leather.
 Urinals, iron, crockery, or porcelain.
 Urns, tea or coffee.
 Utensils, kitchen, and for all arts and trades.
 Vaccine.
 Vacuum apparatus.
 Valerian.
 Valerianates.
 Valises, cotton, leather, or rubber.
 Valves, machinery.
 Vanilla and extract.
 Vaporizers.
 Varnishes, all kinds.
 Vases, metal, glass, porcelain, earthen, stone.
 Vaseline.
 Vats, metal, wood, or stone.
 Veal.
 Vegetables, all kinds, dried, fresh, pickled, salted, canned, concentrated.
 Vegetable hair and manufactures of.
 Vehicles, all kinds.
 Vells and veiling, cotton or partly.
 Velocipedes.
 Velvet and velveteens, cotton or partly.
 Veneering.
 Venetian blinds.
 Ventilating apparatus.
 Verandas.
 Veratria.
 Verdigris.
 Vermicelli.
 Vermifuge.
 Vermillion.
 Vervain.
 Vesicants.
 Vests, cotton or partly.
 Vetches.
 Vials.
 Victorias.
 Vines.
 Vinegars, medicinal.
 Viols, violins, and violoncellos.
 Vises.
 Visors, leather or skin.

Volatile oils.
 Vulcanizing apparatus.
 Vulcanized rubber.
 Wadding.
 Wagons, all kinds, and parts.
 Wainscoting.
 Waiters, wood or common metals.
 Wallets, leather or rubber.
 Walnuts.
 Walnut wood, and manufactures of.
 Wash basins, boards, boilers, stands, tubs.
 Washers, iron, steel, or common metal.
 Washing machines and wringers.
 Wash stands, wood or metal.
 Watches, all kinds, and parts of.
 Water closets, iron, porcelain, or with other materials.
 Watermelons.
 Waters, cosmetic, mineral, natural or artificial, toilet.
 Webbing, cotton or partly.
 Wedges, iron or steel.
 Weighbridges.
 Weights, iron, steel, or common metal.
 Well tools and machinery.
 Well tubes.
 Whale oil and blubber.
 Whaling implements.
 Wheat and flour.
 Wheels, carriage, wagon, cart, car, machine, ship.
 Wheelbarrows and hand carts.
 Whetstones.
 Whiffletrees.
 Whips.
 Whistles, all kinds.
 White lead.
 White paints, all kinds.
 Whiting.
 Wicks, cotton, or partly.
 Wicker and work of.
 Willow and manufactures of.
 Winches.
 Windlasses.
 Windmills.
 Window blinds, frames, glass, sash, shutters.
 Winnowing machines.
 Wire and wire cloth, and manufactures of.
 Wire-drawing machinery.
 Wood, all kinds, and manufactures of.
 Wood-working machinery.
 Wooden houses, set up or not.
 Wool in goods; half or more of cotton.
 Woolmachinery.
 Wool cards, driers, mills, presses, washers.
 Work baskets and boxes.
 Wormwood.
 Wrapping paper.
 Wrenches, all kinds.
 Wringers.
 Writing machines (typewriters).
 Wrought iron, and manufactures of.
 Yams.
 Yards (vessels).
 Yarn, cotton or partly.
 Yellow paints or dyes.
 Yokes and bows, ox.
 Zinc, and manufactures of.

THE GREAT OPPORTUNITY THAT IS THROWN AWAY.

Under these treaties, Mr. President, the United States stands in position to command and control the greater share of the trade of the tropical portion of the southern continents, and it is possible, by surrendering the duties upon wool, copper, lead ore, and some other articles, to negotiate similar arrangements with Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic, whose foreign trade annually exceeds the sum of \$500,000,000, and whose imports annually surpass \$250,000,000. All of the articles I name except lead ore are placed upon the free list by the pending bill, without asking anything in return, or giving an opportunity by diplomatic negotiation to secure valuable concessions for the benefit of our farmers and mechanics.

Not only does this bill repudiate and reject all the advantages that have been obtained for our producers in the southern nations, but it throws away forever the prospect of obtaining a market for at least one hundred millions of the surplus products of our farm and factories which we can not sell at home.

The advantages secured for them in the southern countries have inspired the merchants and manufacturers of the United States to make a determined attempt to obtain a share in the markets which they had previously neglected, and the passenger lists of the steamers and the statistics of the postal service show that more commercial travelers have gone from this country to Central and South America, more buyers have come from those countries to this, and more correspondence has been

conducted during the last two or three years than was ever known before, and the increase continues to be very rapid.

EVERY TOWN AND VILLAGE INTERESTED IN THE TRADE.

Nor is this subject of importance only to the great commercial ports and manufacturing centers. Nearly every city and town in the United States has a direct and immediate interest in the extension of the trade. The men who make the articles of commerce do not know the destination of their wares, except in cases of large contracts of consignments. The South American trade, being conducted at present almost exclusively by commission men, is peculiar in this respect, and the workmen in the little factories that have sprung up in the towns and villages of the Middle and Northwestern States little know that the results of their labor are found scattered in nearly every country of Central and South America, and over all the islands of the sea.

Not long ago a gentleman interested in the promotion of our export trade to South America took the trouble to trace to its source every article of merchandise that composed the cargo of a vessel bound from New York to one of the southern republics. The result was astonishing. I shall not give the entire list, but only a few of the items for the purpose of illustrating the point which I have made, that every community in the Union has a personal interest in every effort that is made to secure larger markets for our products among the nations of this hemisphere, and to show the infinite variety of goods that can be sold in their markets. The following list shows a few of the towns and what they contributed to this cargo:

- ALABAMA.**
Bessemer: Cast-iron pipe.
- ILLINOIS.**
Belvidere: Sewing machines.
Canton: Agricultural implements.
Carpentersville: Copying presses.
Chicago: Axle grease, link belts, folding sawing machines, boilers, car axles, mining machinery, hardware, agricultural implements, machinery, furniture, provisions, electrical goods, cutlery, barb wire, reapers.
Freeport: Buggies.
Geneseo: Road carts.
Moline: Plows.
Peoria: Bolts.
Rockford: Furniture.
Pekin: Agricultural implements.
Rockford: Patent foot machinery.
Rock Island: Plows.
Sandwich: Reapers, mowers, agricultural implements, windmills.
Sterling: Agricultural implements.
- INDIANA.**
Evansville: Edge tools.
Indianapolis: Office desks.
Mishawaka: Pulleys.
Richmond: Grain drills, etc.
Shelbyville: Cabinets.
South Bend: Plows, wagons, carriages.
- IOWA.**
Dubuque: Wind-mills.
Ottumwa: Wood work.
- MICHIGAN.**
Detroit: Fans and blowers.
Grand Rapids: Furniture.
Three Rivers: Velocipede cars.
White Pigeon: Foot and hand power machinery.
- MINNESOTA.**
Minneapolis: Flour.
St. Paul: Prepared coffee.
Stillwater: Agricultural machinery.
- MISSOURI.**
Kansas City: Contracting machinery.
St. Louis: General merchandise, glass and crockery, drugs.
- OHIO.**
Alliance: Steel castings.
Bucyrus: Grain-cleaning machinery.
Cincinnati: Brass goods, carriages.
Canton: Plows.
Cleveland: Steam gauges, bellows.
Dayton: Sewing machinery, bronze castings, ice machines, agricultural implements, carriage wheels, hubs.
Dayton: File cases, filters.
Deliance: Machinery.
Hamilton: Steam pumps.
Piqua: Corrugated iron.
Sardusky: Whipstocks.
Springfield: Engines.
Toledo: Wagons.
Wilmington: Augur bits.
Mansfield: Agricultural implements, machinery, plumbers' material.
- COLORADO.**
Coal for Mexico.
- PENNSYLVANIA.**
Harrisburg: Bookbinders' machinery.
Pittsburg: Galvanized sheet iron, locomotives, chain.
- WISCONSIN.**
Madison: Printing presses.
Milwaukee: Trunks, machinery, furniture, ice machines, beer.
Racine: Wagons and carriages, machinery, furniture, engines and yachts, trunks.
Sheboygan: Furniture.

Other cities in the Northwest contributed to this cargo the following articles:

Portable road-making machine, gas engine, portable electric motor for drilling, boots and shoes, baseball bats, canned beef, brickmaking machines, patent evaporator, patent cereals, chairs, cheese, clocks, clothing, condensed milk, buckets, canned corn, corn meal, wool compressors, cotton-seed oil, dairy utensils, distillery plant, electric-light plant, bales of excelsior, fire bricks, flaxseed oil, passenger elevator and machinery, furniture, vegetables, seed, harness, hay-baling machine, hosiery, ice factory and cold storage plant, knitting machine, oatmeal, ornamental tiles, pickles, pressed bricks, plant, saddletrees, soap, spokes and hubs for wheels, starch, laundry machinery, strawboards, watches, wire screens, wooden ware, and material for repairing watches.

THE INTEREST OF MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS AROUSED.

Our people are just beginning to realize the value of the reciprocity arrangement. Trade is always conservative and sensitive, and feels its way cautiously when it is turned into new and unaccustomed channels; but the same intelligence and enterprise that has developed our internal commerce is now being applied to the extension of our foreign trade, and should have the protection and encouragement of the Government, instead of being deprived of the advantages it now enjoys. It requires time and patience and energy to acquire new markets and to successfully compete with established lines of trade.

The manufacturers of Europe have entrenched themselves in the southern markets by the experience of a century. Agencies and branches of commercial houses in London, Manchester, Hamburg, Frankfort, Antwerp, Paris, Lyons, and other European cities, have been established at the mercantile centers of Central and South America for generations, and the import trade of the southern continent is almost exclusively conducted by or through them. The relations so long established are satisfactory, and the consumers of that section are not seeking our trade.

It is therefore necessary for our merchants to invade these markets, and break down the existing lines of commerce, in order to sell their goods; and that they can do so is demonstrated by the testimony of Mr. Coombs, which I have quoted, and the experience of every man who has faithfully and intelligently made the experiment. Much money has already been invested, and much time has been spent in the introduction of our merchandise into the southern markets; in the establishment of agencies; in the study of the tastes and requirements of the people, and the conditions of the trade; in opening banking connections and credits, and in making the acquaintance of the buyers and consumers in the Latin-American countries and colonies.

This demonstrates that the advantages of the reciprocity arrangements have been recognized and are appreciated by those for whose benefits they were intended, but just now as they are beginning to see the results of their efforts, the majority of this Congress proposes to deprive them of the advantages they enjoy.

A REMARKABLE INCREASE IN THE USE OF THE MAILS.

The following table shows a remarkable increase in the weight of mails dispatched from the United States to Central America and the West Indies since the movement to increase our exports in that direction began:

Weight of letter mails.

Fiscal year.	Mexico and Central America.	West Indies.	South America.	Total.
	<i>Grams.</i>	<i>Grams.</i>	<i>Grams.</i>	<i>Grams.</i>
1885	1,274,869	6,131,428	4,718,625	12,124,922
1886	1,360,925	5,783,715	3,670,402	10,815,042
1887	1,798,506	6,217,331	5,040,574	12,956,411
1888	2,339,953	6,630,161	5,879,271	14,849,385
1889	2,751,076	7,260,761	6,374,454	16,386,291
1890	3,332,821	8,044,164	6,953,443	18,330,410
1891	7,175,411	10,042,020	7,919,943	25,137,374
1892	6,172,094	10,988,993	8,778,188	25,939,275
1893	5,477,476	11,478,084	9,191,900	26,147,460

Weight of printed matter.

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Mexico and Central America.	West Indies.	South America.	Total.
	<i>Grams.</i>	<i>Grams.</i>	<i>Grams.</i>	<i>Grams.</i>
1885	16,751,068	50,905,092	62,504,433	130,164,593
1886	19,455,594	57,070,472	64,933,003	141,459,069
1887	20,360,635	58,436,256	78,856,167	157,653,058
1888	25,611,295	64,085,508	87,509,160	177,205,963
1889	33,702,155	71,990,081	102,876,152	208,568,388
1890	39,037,056	81,703,195	116,148,222	236,888,473
1891	73,441,235	101,446,962	140,647,853	315,536,050
1892	86,884,063	115,186,048	157,132,390	359,202,501
1893	88,740,936	127,824,235	162,715,166	379,280,337

The following tables show the distribution by nations of letters and printed matter dispatched during the fiscal years 1892 and 1893:

Comparison between the years 1892 and 1893, by countries.

Countries.	Letters.		Printed matter.	
	1892.	1893.	1892.	1893.
WEST INDIES.				
Cuba	4,988,306	5,400,644	47,640,718	59,695,783
Windward Islands	1,793,942	---	20,296,123	---
Jamaica	1,059,195	1,118,979	12,396,084	14,886,067
Burmuda	945,365	987,980	9,679,035	9,566,700
Haiti	807,740	894,640	6,744,220	7,238,505
Curaçao	457,820	481,495	4,937,185	4,075,870
Puerto Rico	391,100	275,595	4,657,820	2,045,360
Bahamas	333,580	377,910	4,305,981	4,673,240
Santo Domingo	209,280	221,520	4,327,440	4,508,175
Turks Island	32,695	41,200	201,442	433,265
Other West Indies	---	1,738,121	---	23,701,555
Total	10,988,993	11,478,084	115,186,048	127,824,285
MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA.				
Mexico	1,777,040	1,143,495	20,411,299	19,027,478
Guatemala	1,154,567	1,150,056	17,037,972	17,692,390
Costa Rica	799,513	1,051,811	15,251,535	17,551,939
Nicaragua	845,781	655,067	10,392,200	9,388,552
Honduras	582,532	432,493	7,147,763	7,198,133
Salvador	729,381	801,985	14,091,763	15,434,083
British Honduras	283,290	242,999	2,551,414	2,447,780
Total	6,172,094	5,477,476	88,884,063	88,740,936
SOUTH AMERICA.				
Brazil	1,796,158	1,757,930	27,288,225	26,815,040
Colombia	1,788,921	1,886,488	35,094,729	37,465,285
Venezuela	1,664,330	1,687,170	22,843,275	21,711,010
Peru	1,026,591	1,058,470	20,356,350	20,232,475
Chile	1,020,591	1,104,444	22,148,969	21,632,493
Argentine Republic	646,429	841,414	14,841,305	18,206,800
Ecuador	455,045	475,151	6,699,750	8,449,807
Uruguay	205,671	211,986	4,054,259	5,331,820
Bolivia	103,800	125,030	3,182,870	3,968,550
Paraguay	14,971	15,177	619,203	724,451
Dutch Guiana	7,015	9,700	2,085	6,225
British Guiana	5,955	18,920	1,360	171,210
Total	8,778,188	9,191,900	157,132,330	162,715,166
Grand total	25,939,275	26,147,460	359,202,501	379,280,387

NO ONE HAS ASKED TO HAVE THESE TREATIES TERMINATED.

I am not aware that any one of these countries with which these arrangements have been negotiated wishes to terminate them, nor has there been any such desire expressed upon the part of any individual or corporation or commercial organization in the United States.

There is no such memorial or petition before this body; nor has any person made any such request or suggestion to the Committee on Finance.

If those who are most interested in this subject were to be consulted they would insist that the reciprocity section and commercial arrangements that have been negotiated under its authority be let alone. They have not come here with their protest, because they know it would be useless to oppose a policy that has been apparent ever since the present Administration came into power. They recognize the purpose of the present Executive and the majority in Congress to cancel or revoke or overthrow, so far as is in their power, every act of the last Administration, whether it refers to the Islands of the Pacific or the Republic of South America, with the same disregard of the honor of the nation, the interests of the people, and the friendly relations of our neighboring states.

THE VALUE OF THE RECIPROCIDY ARRANGEMENTS.

It is impossible to measure, as it is useless to conjecture, the value and importance of the reciprocity arrangements. They have been in operation but two or three years, and our merchants have not had time to see the full result of their efforts to introduce their goods into new markets; but it is gratifying to note that wherever commercial conditions have permitted there has been substantial gain in the exports from the United States.

In some cases it has been phenomenal, and can be traced directly to the advantages secured by the treaties and to the invasion of the market by our merchants and manufacturers.

In other countries where financial depression has prevailed a comparison of commercial statistics will show that the export trade of the United States has suffered less than that of any other nation, and that it has been a decided triumph to be able to hold our own. The testimony of all the commercial organizations of Europe, all the commercial publications, all of the diplomatic and consular representatives of the European coun-

tries in Central and South America all goes to show the value they place upon the commercial advantage the United States has obtained, and the danger threatened by them to their own commercial interests.

THE OPINION OF AN ENGLISH EXPERT.

Col. Howard Vincent, M. P., who has recently made an extensive tour through South America, in a recent address at Montgomery Hall, Sheffield, England, expressing the opinion of the British commercial community concerning our trade with Brazil, spoke as follows:

For the development of the prodigious resources of Brazil, England has advanced some £100,000,000. Under the settled government of the dethroned and deposed Emperor Pedro it produced a fair return in interest, and a larger one in orders to English workmen for steel rails, machinery, and railway plant. In 1890 we sold to Brazil twice as much as we bought. Now the tables are turned, and we sell but one-third of what we buy. The trade of Brazil with the world increased 20 per cent between 1880 and 1891, but only 6 per cent with Great Britain. It has still a downward tendency.

The Germans are very strong in the rich province of Rio Grande do Sul. But the United States has become our most formidable opponent. In 1881 they persuaded the credulous young republic to admit their manufactures either free of duty or at a great reduction over ours. The result has been a loss of revenue which has to be made up by an increase of some 50 per cent on the duties on English goods. This puts them at an obvious disadvantage. The only satisfaction is that our cutlery still holds its own. I wish it was possible to say the same of the edge-tool trade—axes, hatchets, picks, nearly all come from America. Beyond question there will be in the near future a reorganization of affairs in Brazil, and it will be necessary for us to take care that it does not take a direction adverse to our commercial interests.

THE ONLY INCREASE IN OUR TRADE LAST YEAR WAS IN THE RECIPROCIDY COUNTRIES.

I might call attention in this connection, Mr. President, to the enormous falling off in the exports from the United States to other countries during the same year, and to argue from that that our trade with Europe was a failure because the exports in 1893 were not equal to those of 1891 or 1892, and it is a strong argument in favor of these reciprocity treaties and a greater test of their value upon our trade with the republics and colonies with which they are made. The total exports of the United States in 1892 were \$1,030,278,148, while in 1893 they were \$847,665,194. The domestic exports to Europe alone fell off \$189,106,919; to Oceania the decrease was \$1,300,000; to Asia \$3,267,000, while the decrease in our shipments to South America was only \$483,000. And the increase of exports from 1892 to 1893 to the countries with which we have reciprocity was \$3,560,515, and the increase over 1891 was \$16,440,721.

The exports to Austria dropped from \$1,527,000 to \$571,000; the exports to Belgium from \$48,785,000 to \$26,740,000; to Denmark from \$8,000,000 to \$5,000,000; France, \$99,000,000 to \$46,000,000; Germany, \$105,000,000 to \$83,000,000; Italy, \$14,000,000 to \$13,000,000; the Netherlands from \$13,000,000 to \$38,000,000; Russia from \$5,000,000 to \$2,000,000; Sweden and Norway from \$6,500,000 to \$4,000,000; England from \$432,000,000 to \$361,000,000; Scotland, \$42,000,000 to \$36,000,000; Ireland, \$32,000,000 to \$22,000,000; China from \$5,000,000 to \$3,000,000; Australasia from \$11,000,000 to \$7,000,000, and to other countries in a corresponding degree. The only countries in the entire list of nations and colonies in the world with which we have commerce that showed an increased exportation from the United States that year were the Azore Islands, Gibraltar, Greece, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Turkey, Asiatic Russia, Philippine Islands, British Africa, French Africa, Portuguese Africa, the Dominion of Canada, and the Latin-American countries.

REASONS FOR A FALLING OFF IN TRADE.

Nevertheless in all of the Latin-American countries and in the West India Islands, except Cuba, there has been a period of financial and commercial depression unprecedented in its severity and continuance. This was due in Nicaragua, Honduras, and Brazil to revolutionary insurrections which have disturbed the peace, interfered with industries, destroyed confidence, impaired both public and private credit, wasted the fortunes and retarded the prosperity of the people. In other of the republics and in the British colonies there have been an extraordinary succession of poor crops which have reduced the purchasing power of the people, and compelled them to forego many imported luxuries to which they have been accustomed, to postpone private and public improvements, and to reduce the expense of living to correspond with the reduction of their revenue.

All of the southern republics and colonies have also suffered severely from the reduced value of silver, which is there common currency and standard, and a corresponding increase in foreign exchange. The price of labor and production and living has not in any measure decreased. A silver dollar which was worth 90 cents in gold in some of these countries a few years ago, is now worth less than 50 cents in foreign exchange, so that from this cause alone the value of foreign merchandise has been increased to a corresponding degree in all of the southern markets, and the aggregate value of their imports is reduced accordingly.

The English merchants have suffered from this cause, not only in Latin America, but wherever silver money is current. The commercial bodies of Great Britain, particularly those in trade with Cuba, Japan, India, and South America, including the London Chamber of Commerce, the greatest commercial organization in the world, have recently sent a memorial to the Government on this subject. They represent the urgency to be so great as to make necessary the reassembling of the International Monetary Conference, with a view to finding some remedy for the heavy fall and the violent fluctuations in silver which have disturbed the trade of the country beyond calculation.

In 1889 a Mexican silver dollar, which is the standard of value in most of the West Indian colonies, was worth 79 cents; in 1892 it was worth 74.4; on the 1st of January, 1894, it was worth 56 cents, in gold.

The Peruvian sol, the Colombian peso, and the sucre of Ecuador, which were worth 77 cents in 1889, were worth but 51 cents on the 1st of January last, in gold.

In January, 1891, the Brazilian milreis was worth 36 cents in gold; in June, 1893, it was worth only 24 cents, and in March, 1894, but 21 cents.

THE COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH BRAZIL.

The reciprocity arrangement with Brazil for a mutual reduction of duties was the first negotiated, and the first to go into effect, and although that country has been suffering almost continuously ever since from domestic political disturbances, our export trade has not diminished, and our imports have increased to a remarkable degree. The foreign commerce of Brazil is almost entirely controlled by Europeans. The large importing and commission houses are English; the banking capital is English, and the principal newspapers are owned or controlled by Englishmen, so that public sentiment, so far as it can be created or controlled by such influences, is prejudicial to the United States. When the treaty was proposed, and still more when it was promulgated, the British influence in official circles, in the Congress, and in the press was bitter and determined against it.

An attempt was made to have it denounced as unconstitutional. Public meetings were called and addressed by Englishmen to bully the Government and excite the animosities of the people, and every pretext was seized upon to make trouble. Then came a bitter and relentless war of rates, and the natural obstacles to an increased commerce were supplemented by unusual efforts on the part of European merchants to retain a trade that, under the reciprocity arrangements with this country, was seriously threatened. They reduced prices upon merchandise that might be bought in the United States and sold even at a loss, to prevent and frighten competition, and the steamship lines from Europe assisted them by cutting rates of transportation below the limit of profitable traffic. Writing on this subject the United States consul-general at Rio de Janeiro said:

The reduction of transportation rates from Europe seriously interferes with our shipping interests, and charterers can engage vessels on any terms; and they are often indifferent to risks and dispatch. Capt. Roy, of the sailing vessel *Corra*, is just in with a cargo of coal from Cardiff and was paid 16 shillings a ton only, while in 1888 for the same voyage and a similar cargo here received 23 shillings, and so with many others.

THE COMMERCIAL DEPRESSION IN BRAZIL.

This was continued until the summer of 1891 when the political revolutions commenced. The financial interests of the country and the foreign trade were the first to feel the changing situation. Public and private enterprises were interrupted and many of them abandoned; foreign capital was withdrawn; banks and mercantile houses failed or went into liquidation; the demand for machinery, railway supplies, and articles of luxury ceased; workmen were thrown out of employment; merchants found themselves with large stocks of imported goods on their hands, and no customers.

Both the national and State governments were busily occupied in efforts for self-preservation, and the period of the greatest prosperity in Brazil was immediately followed by a period of great financial and commercial depression. Exchange fell rapidly in sympathy with existing conditions. The nominal value of the milreis, the monetary standard in Brazil, is 54 cents in United States gold. In April, 1890, it was quoted at from 48 to 50 cents; in April, 1892, it was as low as 22 and 24 cents, and, as a result, the Brazilian merchant who had paid for his goods with the local money nearly at par, was obliged to sell them when it was at a discount of 50 per cent; and there was no corresponding increase in the milreis price for native products.

In January, 1891, the milreis was worth 44 cents in American money, so that when merchandise was contracted for to be paid in gold or its equivalent, as it always must be, it only required 2½ milreis to buy a gold dollar. When the time of payment came, six months later, a gold dollar was worth more than 4 milreis, and sometimes 5. Added to this was the uncertainty of future values, so that trade was paralyzed and the importation of foreign merchandise was limited to actual necessities, and the

receipts of the Government from duties on imported goods dropped 42 per cent from the total of the previous year.

DISTURBANCE OF TRADE BY THE REVOLUTION.

And conditions have been growing worse instead of better as those who have the newspaper dispatches are aware.

The harbor of Rio de Janeiro, the principal port of the Republic, has been practically in a state of blockade for nearly a year, and but for the gallant conduct of Admiral Benham the vessels laden with American merchandise would not have been permitted to unload. As the sympathy of Great Britain has been with the insurgents, her commerce has been almost entirely interrupted, and it was only in February last that Lord Rosebery, the British premier, received the following appeal for protection from the British shipmasters in the port of Rio:

Eighty British shipmasters, with 2,000 British subjects on board, representing £3,000,000 of money in their cargoes, demand, as loyal subjects, immediate protection of life and property in this harbor. Last Monday a British subject was shot dead, being recognized while landing. Appealed to Capt. Lang, the commander of the British fleet at Rio, who would not see us, and sent us to the British minister; minister refused to see us, and referred us back to Capt. Lang.

The same conditions have existed at Santos and Rio Grande do Sul, the two ports next in importance to Rio, which have caused an almost entire stoppage of trade. The following extract from a private letter will show the situation at the first-named place:

The harbor at Santos is filled with vessels, numbering, as I learn from reliable parties, all of two hundred, each awaiting its turn for discharging, which will consume from twelve to eighteen months. The custom-house is literally jammed with goods of all kinds, with lighters lying near filled with produce, many of them for weeks used for storage purpose, to the detriment and detention of other discharging vessels. The beach is covered with machinery in a very confused condition, waiting for shipment by rail into the interior.

NOT A FAVORABLE TIME TO TEST THE VALUE OF RECIPROCITY.

The financial condition in Brazil during the last year, Mr. President, has been worse than it can be remembered ever to have been in the past, and it is scarcely necessary to suggest that such conditions have not furnished a fair test of the value of reciprocity arrangements with that country. Yet there has been a notable increase in the exports from the United States.

In 1889 they amounted to \$9,351,081; in 1890, the first year of the treaty, they reached \$14,120,246; in 1892 they were a little more, and in 1893, the year of the greatest depression and blockaded harbors, they were valued at \$12,388,124.

Comparing these figures with the exports from Great Britain to Brazil, we find considerable cause for gratification. In 1889 they were valued at \$30,161,500; in 1890, at \$37,293,140; in 1891, at \$41,550,195. In 1892, the first year after the treaty went into effect, they had fallen to \$36,562,631.

The French suffered even more. There was very large gain in the trade between France and Brazil about the time of the overthrow of the empire, which was due to the establishment of a new line of steamers between Havre and the Brazilian ports, but since the reciprocity treaty with the United States was consummated all that was gained has been lost and the goods that were bought in France are now purchased in the United States. In 1889 the exports from France to Brazil were 70,132,528 francs; in 1890 they increased to 81,010,705 francs; in 1891 they jumped to 102,934,876 francs; but in 1892 when the effect of the treaty was felt they fell 33,000,000 and were only 69,520,091 francs. The exports from France for 1893 are not yet reported.

It should be said in this connection that the transportation facilities between the United States and Brazil are exclusively in the control of Englishmen, the American line having been discontinued two years ago because of a quarrel between Mr. Huntington and Mr. Rockefeller, the principal owners, and the shipowners discriminate seriously in freight rates against American goods.

TESTIMONY OF A RECENT BRITISH OBSERVER.

Col. Vincent, a member of the Parliament from one of the largest manufacturing districts in England, has recently made a tour of South America in the interest of his constituents, and in response to a request of the Chamber of Commerce of Sheffield, Col. Vincent prepared a memoranda upon British commercial interests in Brazil, in which he said:

The total volume of the British trade with Brazil amounts to over £13,000,000 a year, of which two-thirds consist in purchases in Brazil. This preponderance of import over export on our part is a new feature in the commercial relations between the two countries in the past twelve years, and one unfortunately often duplicated at the present day. In 1880 British exports to Brazil were double the imports thence. In 1890 they still exceed them by 20 per cent. But while the importations from Brazil have quadrupled in the last thirty years British imports have declined. Nor do we find that the whole volume of British trade with the Republic represents so satisfactory an increase as could be desired. While it amounts to about one-fourth of the total external trade of Brazil, British commerce, according to the eminent statistical authority of Mr. Muirhall, has increased 6 per cent between 1880 and 1891, while that of Brazil, with the rest of the world, increased 20 per cent.

In that year, 1891, moreover, the United States of America concluded with Brazil a reciprocity convention well calculated to make the British results

for the next decade still more unsatisfactory. The convention, the first of a series of twelve similar treaties already signed at Washington, a number augmentation of which is now in active negotiation, secured the admission into Brazil on and after April 1, 1891, of fifteen standard articles of American production (including the old British staples of agricultural tools and machinery, mining and mechanical tools and machinery, all machinery for industrial and manufacturing purposes, and all railway construction material equipment), "free" of duty, whether national, State, or municipal, and a reduction of 25 per cent in two thousand other classes of goods "on the tariff then in force or which may hereafter" be adopted. The consideration for this enormous advantage to the United States over Great Britain and the rest of the world was the free admission of Brazilian sugars, molasses, coffee, and hides—articles America could not do without. It is obvious that the advantage of this treaty was and is entirely on the side of the United States of America, and this fact Brazil, in her wild desire to translate the American Constitution into Portuguese, could not then see, but now recognizes too late.

The question for us, though, is not what good this or other reciprocity is likely to do for America, or the other contracting parties, but what harm it is likely and indeed certain to do British trade in the long run; slowly it may be, but not the less surely.

Already in 1892 the Brazilian budget law increased by 60 per cent the duties on cotton and wool manufactures, mainly derived from England, and by 50 or 60 per cent the duty upon other articles of import. It is satisfactory to find that Sheffield cutlery has not as yet been seriously affected. But it holds its own only by enforced cheapness, and that too often means an undue cheapening of wages. Axes, hatchets, picks, and other articles in the manufacture of which we excel, are, however, being obtained from the United States. Whatever the results up to the present time, the undermining of British markets is a matter which requires most careful watching, and it is satisfactory that Mr. Harford, Her Majesty's secretary of legation, is giving close attention to the question in Brazil.

It appears that the American sales to Brazil of cotton goods and manufactures generally have doubled, whilst those of hardware have trebled.

EFFORTS OF AUSTRIA TO GAIN CONCESSIONS.

The Austrian legation at Rio has endeavored in vain to obtain some concessions for flour imported from that country, whose trade was almost annihilated, when, under the reciprocity treaty, American flour was admitted at a greatly reduced duty. Uruguay and the Argentine Republic have also been trying for the last three years to obtain from Brazil a similar concession in favor of their flour on the ground that it is one of the necessities of life, and that the United States does not supply a sufficient quantity to meet the wants of the people.

The amount of duties remitted by Brazil on the articles imported from the United States under this arrangement averages about \$1,400,000.

The exports from the United States to Brazil show a large falling off in wheat, which was due to the attempt on the part of the milling companies of that country to boycott the cereals of the United States, and also to the enormous harvests in the Argentine Republic, which were larger than was ever known before, and could be sold at Rio much below the ruling rate at Chicago or Minneapolis, and for these reasons the exports of wheat fell from 580,127 bushels in 1891 to 63,928 bushels in 1893, but there was a decided increase in the shipments of flour from the United States to Brazil in 1892, which were valued at \$4,972,539, as against \$3,838,919 for the previous year. The exports of flour for 1893 were valued at \$3,647,251, which show a slight falling off due to the revolution and the commercial depression. There was a decided increase in the exports of cotton goods and other manufactured articles.

THE GREAT INCREASE IN TRADE WITH CUBA.

The most direct and profitable result that has come from the reciprocity policy of the last Administration is found in the statistics of our trade with Cuba, for there with the exception of a decreased value of silver and the natural increase in the rate of exchange, all conditions have been normal and favorable for a practical and fair test of its advantages to the agricultural and mechanical interests of the United States.

The commercial arrangement with Spain, acting in behalf of her American colonies, Cuba and Puerto Rico, was concluded June 16, proclaimed August 1, and went partly into effect September 1, 1891. Owing to the existing treaties with other nations it became necessary to adopt a provisional or transitory schedule for the time being, did not have full force until after the 1st of July, 1892.

The foreign commerce of Cuba is much larger in proportion in population of the island than that of most of the nations of the earth. The greater part of the exports have been sent to the United States in the form of sugar, molasses, and tobacco, but we have furnished only a small part of the imports, of which Spain and Great Britain have sold a larger share.

From 1876 to 1891 the people of the United States purchased from Cuba raw products to the amount of \$923,888,557. During this time we sold Cuba merchandise to the amount of \$188,695,845, leaving a balance of trade against us for the sixteen years amounting to \$735,192,512.

Our exports to Cuba have varied but slightly during the last sixteen years, the average being \$11,793,490, or \$431,398 less than total for 1891. The character of the exports is shown by a very long list comprising nearly everything that enters into the reach of man.

But commencing with 1891, when the commercial arrangement went partially into effect, the increase has been gradual and large in almost every line of merchandise. That year they were a little more than twelve million; in 1892 they had jumped to nearly eighteen millions; and in 1893 they had almost doubled, the total being \$24,157,698, or more than twice as much as for any year previous to the negotiation of the treaty. The greatest increase was in flour, which jumped from 114,447 barrels in 1891, to 366,175 in 1892, and 616,406 in 1893. There was also a large increase in other lines of merchandise.

The following table of exports from the United States to Cuba during the fiscal year 1891 and 1893 will show the value of the trade with that country to the farmers and mechanics of the United States:

Articles.	1891.	1893.
Agricultural implements	\$55,618	\$123,421
Mules	7,935	17,725
Manufactures of brass	25,230	44,150
Breadstuffs:		
Bread and biscuit	17,930	31,650
Corn	120,187	582,050
Corn meal	2,909	4,001
Oats	10,598	24,202
Wheat flour	591,885	2,821,557
All other	31,469	56,273
Bricks, building and fire	11,735	95,489
Broom corn	17,244	23,983
Carriages and horse cars	166,689	316,041
Clocks and watches	11,773	26,551
Coal	682,288	837,218
Copper, manufactures of	29,799	48,656
Cotton goods	101,799	148,788
Cod fish	23,565	98,520
Other fish, including oysters	40,551	72,312
Apples	3,181	45,229
Preserved fruits	11,755	53,210
Other fruits	7,203	28,515
Glass and glassware	67,174	117,870
Hay	18,389	54,791
India-rubber goods	29,354	42,879
Ink	6,921	10,199
Scientific instruments and apparatus	43,935	114,485
Cutlery	4,436	21,094
Builders' hardware	174,622	395,964
Machinery	1,317,256	2,792,050
Nails and spikes	40,069	127,583
Railroad iron	32,249	326,654
Saws and tools	107,291	243,544
Scales and balances	34,788	62,561
Sewing machines	112,319	246,218
Locomotive engines	237,827	418,776
Stationary engines	46,760	130,652
Boilers and parts of engines	181,720	322,284
Wire	715,203	1,664,671
Lamps, chandeliers, etc	29,297	51,389
Boots and shoes	100,733	193,776
Other leather goods	20,202	33,867
Lime and cement	9,032	71,570
Beer in bottles	12,223	32,032
Marble and stone	15,830	77,003
Spirits of turpentine	20,609	33,135
Crude petroleum	280,144	403,310
Illuminating oil	8,502	33,527
Lubricating oil	42,552	77,822
Other oils	7,999	33,414
Paints and painters' colors	23,527	49,143
Plated ware	14,206	20,722
Provisions:		
Beef products	11,760	89,460
Bacon	351,955	556,747
Hams	234,458	761,082
Pickled pork	33,315	59,276
Lard	2,079,534	4,023,917
All other meat products	28,331	81,956
Butter	18,119	49,257
Cheese	12,910	32,494
Milk	17,226	46,347
Soap	6,805	8,519
Stationery	24,557	30,740
Manufactures of straw	6,196	16,177
Candy and confectionery	27,539	35,911
Tin goods	19,319	24,777
Manufactured tobacco	35,154	61,494
Varnish	9,355	17,518
Vegetables:		
Beans and pease	115,930	392,962
Potatoes	168,354	554,153
All other	10,137	31,146
Wood and manufactures of:		
Boards, deals, and planks	604,886	1,058,696
Joists and scantling	15,803	37,232
Shooks	102,647	152,657
Staves and headings	35,492	66,630
All other lumber	18,991	64,746
Household furniture	108,988	217,126
All other manufactures	80,772	154,134
All other articles	120,772	164,448

There was a corresponding decrease in the exports from the European countries to Cuba. The exports from Great Britain fell from \$14,546,515 in 1890 to \$12,420,305 in 1891, and to \$8,390,855 in 1892. The exports from France dropped from 11,671,054

francs in 1890 to 6,626,281 in 1891, and to 4,792,398 francs in 1892. The returns for 1893 have not been received.

THE EFFECT ON THE FLOUR TRADE.

The negotiation of this treaty reduced the price of flour in Cuba nearly one-half. The duty previously was \$5.31 a barrel, which, counting the shipping price at New York at \$4.80, made it worth on delivery at Havana \$11.46. Now you can buy flour at Havana at \$6 a barrel, a price that brings it within the reach of the common people, who before the treaty was negotiated could not use it at all.

With regard to the result of canceling this treaty I desire to call attention to a letter which appeared in a recent number of the Washington Post, signed by the Hon. MICHAEL D. HARTER, a Representative in Congress from Ohio, which contains some important information and suggestions for the consideration of the Senate:

THE RESULT OF REVOKING THE TREATY.

Editor Post:

The fear that Spain will increase the duties upon agricultural products and upon manufactured goods going from the United States to Cuba, in case we place a tax upon sugar, is well grounded. A friend just from Havana tells me the merchants there look upon such action as certain. Of course sugar must go upon our tax list for revenue purposes, and the question arises as to how we can get this necessary revenue and yet retain our very valuable Cuban trade. I think it is easily answered.

Put into our tariff laws a provision that will double our tariff taxes upon all goods of every kind produced in any nation or in the colonies or possessions or any nation which may hereafter increase the duties upon articles produced or manufactured in the United States. The equity of such a provision is very plain as our placing of a duty upon sugar is for revenue purposes solely, and in no sense is intended to exclude the productions of any nation. Its effectiveness need not be argued, as it will prove an absolute preventive for the dreaded legislation referred to. The people of Cuba would welcome such a provision as I suggest fully as much as our own farmers and manufacturers.

MICHAEL D. HARTER.

WASHINGTON, March 16.

In connection and apropos to this letter of Mr. Harter's, I desire to say that it was my good fortune to spend about a week of the holiday recess of Congress in Cuba, and a large portion of that time in Havana, and can fully confirm what Mr. Harter states as to the sentiments and expressions of the merchants of Havana as to the restoration of duties upon our agricultural products and manufactured goods by the Spanish Government in case of the abrogation and termination on the part of our Government of present treaty relations. Of this there can be no doubt. There can be no reason why Spain will not at once seek to restore the condition of things that existed before the making of this treaty, allowing her to furnish to Cuba very largely both her agricultural products and manufactured goods, of which she was deprived by the terms of this arrangement.

During my visit in Havana I took occasion to look into and investigate, as far as time and opportunity would permit, this question of reciprocal trade between Cuba and the United States as developed under the operations of these treaty relations between the two countries, as well as to the general condition of things in that misgoverned island.

In conversation with American merchants and others doing business in Cuba, I learned that the effects of the commercial relations created by this arrangement had been really remarkable, and increasing in importance and magnitude day by day. The Americans doing business there are more than satisfied with the results. The Cubans are satisfied, and everyone is satisfied excepting Spain itself and the representatives of Germany, France, and other continental countries, who see the trade of the island gradually slipping away from them and finding themselves supplanted by the products of the American farmer and the wares of the American workshop.

I saw upon every hand evidences of all this. In the warehouses I noticed flour in large quantities, with familiar brands of Richmond, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and other flour-manufacturing points. I also saw the bacon and ham, and every description of our pork product, from Illinois, Iowa, and others of the great pork-producing regions of the Northwest. I found also that machinery for the sugar mills and other manufacturing establishments were being imported largely from the United States. I saw also on every hand American carriages, the Concord wagon and the Concord coach, and almost every description of carriages manufactured in this country. In fact, the people of Cuba are fast adapting themselves to the use of different articles of American manufacture, and the sentiment is fast developing to increase this kind of importation and trade.

Mr. President, this question of reciprocal trade is not a new one with the people of Cuba. They have looked forward for many years to a commercial disenthralment from Spain, and to the establishment of such natural commercial relations as can only be had with this country. The revolution occurring in Cuba a few years since was inspired by the thought, wish, and hope that it might result not only in breaking the political ties

that bound it to Spain, but to the establishment of the same character of commercial relations that have grown up under the present reciprocity treaty, looking also to the time when Cuba should become a part of this great Republic and enjoy what it has never had—a permanent and satisfactory form of government.

Cuba, about the fairest and richest spot on this globe, lying as it were at our very door, with natural resources almost without parallel, with a climate nowhere surpassed, has been lying prostrate for centuries at the feet of Spain, groaning under the burdens of taxation and the effects of bad government, that we in this country have never hardly been able to realize.

An island whose people should have been the richest and most prosperous in the world has been reduced almost to beggary by such taxation and bad government. So they have naturally looked forward to some change which would bring relief to them.

As we look back and consider the commercial situation as we now find it, and which has existed for so long a period prior to 1891, it seems to me almost incredible that steps were not sooner taken to relieve this country from the disadvantages of its commercial relations and trade.

While in Havana my attention was called to a letter written to the Brooklyn Eagle, June 5, 1885, by a very prominent and distinguished American gentleman, who had been doing business in Cuba for thirty or more years and a close observer of events, which made a deep impression upon me as not only evidencing the sentiments of Americans doing business in Cuba, but of the native-born Cubans themselves, and more especially the statements of facts made as to the conditions of trade which had existed there for so long a time. The correspondent of the Eagle quoted largely from an article published in the New York Sun, in 1876, which brought out clearly many startling facts which should offer food for reflection to our statesmen who are now seeking to reinstate the same conditions that existed in 1876, 1885, and in fact up to 1891.

Among other things, this article in the Sun called attention to the fact that the United States, in 1875, received over 85 per cent of the total productions of the island of Cuba; 2 per cent only of Cuban exports were sent to Spain, and 13 per cent to other countries. This article of the Sun is so suggestive and replete with information that I feel that I can not do better than to insert a portion of it in this connection:

In the six years from 1869 to 1874, inclusive, the United States imported Cuban goods to the amount of \$398,056,651. In the same space we exported to Cuba goods to the amount of only \$82,219,621, leaving a balance of trade for the six years against us and to the benefit not of Cuba, but of Spain, of \$315,839,040. Had Cuba no wants which our agricultural, manufacturing, and industrial interests could supply, there might be less motive for complaint. But we have a merchant marine which, by Spain's law in Cuba, is almost debarred from entering the ports of the island. Cuba requires annually hundreds of cargoes of beef for her field hands; but Texas and our Northwestern States are prevented by the tariff from supplying it. Millions of pounds of rice are annually consumed in Cuba; but our rice grown in Louisiana, Georgia, and the Carolinas is excluded, and the demand has to be supplied from India via Liverpool to give employment to Spanish shipping, under the protection of the differential tariff above mentioned.

An enormous amount of dry goods is annually consumed in the island, but the high duty on importation of these articles in foreign bottoms and our own navigation law, which retaliates on Spanish vessels, divert a trade, of which we should have a large share, to the manufactures of Catalonia, Great Britain, France, and Germany, to the absolute exclusion of our New England manufactures. And yet for the wherewith to pay for this beef, for this rice, for these dry goods, which we are prohibited from supplying, we furnish 85 per cent of the money.

A barrel of flour can be landed in Havana as cheaply as in New York, but here, again, the onerous Spanish tariff steps in, and always to our detriment, for while the Gallican and Catalonian miller is taxed in Cuba on his produce shipped in a Spanish vessel only \$2.25 per barrel, our Western agriculturists are excluded by a duty of \$5.49 per barrel. These duties, of course, curtail the consumption enormously. In 1874 Cuba consumed only 391,979 barrels of flour, of which less than 60,000 were American. These figures give to the population a per capita consumption of about 56 pounds. Were the absurd fetters which Spain imposes on Cuba and our own trade with her removed, she would furnish us a market for about 300,000 barrels of flour every year. However, as matters stand to-day, the balance of our trade with Cuba shows a loss to us of about \$62,000,000 every year.

In 1874 our imports were.....	\$84,337,842
And our exports to Cuba only.....	21,591,509

And this balance of.....	62,746,333
--------------------------	------------

We pay for in European goods instead of by a direct exchange of our products with those tropical countries that furnish the United States with sugar, molasses, and coffee. For these latter countries buy their imports from Europe with the proceeds of their exports to the United States. Therefore if this trade could be done by the United States upon terms of direct exchange in addition to this benefit, our Northern cities, principally New York, must become the commercial center from whence all letters of credit connected with this business must issue, and where all bills of exchange based upon this trade must be cleared, instead of at London, as now occurs.

Now, whatever may be said about tobacco and cigars, which in the foregoing table figure only for some \$8,000,000, sugar and molasses, which figure in it for over \$70,000,000, are indispensable requisites of life. And, as we have within the Union no tropical land adapted for sugar cultivation, Louisiana and Florida being north of the tropic, we are forced to supply our wants from abroad. But, that while we foster slavery and monarchical institutions in a neighboring island, we should be obliged to lose sixty-odd million gold dollars or gold bonds every year, without a chance to pay off our indebtedness with cotton, breadstuffs, dry goods, etc. or any of our leading staples,

is not only ruinous, but absurd. The evil, however, can be remedied by adopting either of the following methods:

First. By annexing tropical territory fit for sugar cultivation.
 Second. By reciprocity treaties with nations from which we draw our wants of tropical produce of such a nature as to insure us a market for our cereals, cotton, lumber, iron, coal, and manufactures proportionate to the extent of our imports from such countries.

The first of these, that of annexation of tropical countries, is sure to meet with so much opposition, is so remotely possible, as especially in the case of Cuba, not to be worth discussing. The second, that of obliging nations of whom we buy largely to become customers of ours, is perfectly feasible. Let us adopt our enemy's tactics. Let Congress enact a differential tariff based on Spain's Cuban tariff under which shall be collected 1 cent per pound extra import duty on all sugars and molasses imported from Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, and all other Spanish possessions.

This measure would produce about \$14,000,000 in gold additional revenue without materially increasing the retail price of the article. It would foster our sugar interests in Louisiana and possibly develop what good sugar lands there may be in Southwestern Florida, and every pound of this sugar would be, of course, exchanged for some other article produced by American labor and capital. It would develop the best root-sugar manufacture in the United States as well as in Europe, but all supplies which we might draw from France, Belgium, Russia, or Germany we should be enabled to pay for by correspondingly increased exports of our own productions.

It would ultimately benefit Cuba, because it would kill slavery and would, in the end, benefit Spain herself, because it would oblige her to give up a colony whose possession has long ceased to be profitable to her.

The latest statistics show a large falling off both in imports and exports; consequently the loss in the balance of trade to the United States amounts only to \$36,618,617.

In 1884 our imports were	\$57,181,49
And our exports to Cuba only	10,562,880
	36,618,617

What the writer in the Sun in 1876 so clearly stated in regard to this situation, has been and is being realized under the operations of the treaty which is now sought to be terminated. He seems to have written almost with the vision of a prophet. He could not, however, have foreseen that there should ever have been an attempt on the part of this Government to deliberately throw away all the benefits arising from a policy which he so strongly and ably advocated.

COMMERCE WITH PUERTO RICO.

The financial condition of Puerto Rico since the reciprocity agreement went into effect on the 1st of September, 1891, has not been favorable to an increase of trade. The sugar crop for the first year was a partial failure, which reduced the purchasing power of the people, and created a general depression throughout the colony, and the low price of silver was felt as much as anywhere else. The Mexican dollar, which is the standard of value in Puerto Rico, dropped from 79 to 56 cents. The importing merchant is required to pay gold prices for his goods in New York, but must sell them at silver prices to his customers in Puerto Rico, which is equivalent to a nominal advance of 20 or 25 per cent in the cost of everything entering into the consumption of the people, without any corresponding increase in the incomes of the rich or the wages of the poor.

Our commerce with Puerto Rico for the last twenty years has remained nearly stationary. Our imports from the colony vary from three to five millions a year, and our exports average annually about two millions; but notwithstanding the depressing conditions, there has been a slight increase in the exports from the United States since the reciprocity agreement went into effect, as will be shown by the following:

Statement of exports of principal articles from the United States to Puerto Rico for the years 1891, 1892, and 1893.

Articles.	1891.	1892.	1893.
Books and other printed matter	\$1,586	\$2,024	\$4,950
Bread and biscuit	27,806	38,787	22,768
Corn and cornmeal	31,479	57,848	57,679
Wheat flour	668,828	826,561	733,308
All other breadstuff	20,782	29,659	23,301
Chemicals, drugs, and medicines	53,894	68,392	52,571
Fish preserved	6,550	12,306	6,959
Glass and glassware	10,043	10,422	12,101
Machinery	18,987	20,023	56,389
Jewelry, etc	9,626	18,545	18,337
Malt liquors	5,193	8,638	8,254
Refined petroleum	8,966	64,219	40,927
Hams	27,617	60,164	99,754
Pickled pork	226,311	301,731	282,080
Lard	237,692	324,976	306,809
Stationery	5,037	5,528	7,319
Vegetables	12,357	80,343	23,625
Wood, and manufactures of, boards, deals, planks, etc	189,685	293,621	262,297
All other articles	60,554	104,097	111,603
Total	2,112,334	2,808,631	2,502,789

EXPORTS TO THE CENTRAL AMERICAN COUNTRIES.

The exports of merchandise from the United States to the five countries of Central America increased from \$5,296,478 in

1880 to \$6,813,316 in 1891, and \$6,122,046 in 1892, and to \$5,522,586 in 1893, although the revolutions in Nicaragua and Honduras caused a considerable falling off in our exports to those countries in 1892 and 1893, and the entire trade suffered severely from the low price of silver.

But the exports from Great Britain to those countries showed an even larger decrease, being \$6,027,445 in 1891 and only \$4,326,615 in 1892, a falling off of \$1,700,830.

The exports from Germany and France to Central America at the same time showed also a decided falling off.

RESULT OF THE TREATY WITH SANTO DOMINGO.

The condition in Santo Domingo for the two years since the commercial arrangement was negotiated has been worse than in any other country in the list. There have been short sugar crops, and the great scarcity of money and a general business depression in consequence, which was further increased by a general commercial crisis, which extended all over the island, resulting from imprudent speculation, which injured the credit and consequently the ability of some of the most prominent houses of Santo Domingo which had previously been the largest purchasers in our markets. But the falling off in the exports to that country from the United States was not nearly so great as from the countries in Europe, which demonstrates that the reciprocity treaty, notwithstanding the apparent decrease in trade, was beneficial and made the loss in our trade less in proportion to that suffered by other countries that did not have this advantage.

The exports of domestic merchandise in 1891, the year when the treaty went into effect, were valued at \$1,986,826. In 1892, the first year they were in force, they were \$984,188, while in 1893 they showed a small increase of \$1,108,733.

At the same time there was a decrease in the imports from Great Britain from \$2,641,775 in 1890 to \$1,239,855 in 1892. The returns for 1893 have not been received.

There was a decrease in the imports from France from 13,474,000 francs in 1891 to 8,791,000 francs in 1892, and the exports of Germany fell from 2,368,000 marks in 1891 to 1,433,000 marks in 1892, so that the United States fared very well in comparison with other countries, which is doubtless due to the favorable effect of the reciprocity agreement. What little increase there has been in our trade with Santo Domingo was in manufactured goods, chiefly wearing apparel, but there was some also in machinery, manufactures of iron and steel, paper and stationery, and in pork and other meat products.

EXPORTS TO THE BRITISH COLONIES.

The British Colonies in the West Indies have suffered severely from poor sugar crops and the low price of silver, and the exports from the United States show a small decrease, from \$9,779,138 in 1891, to \$8,044,846 in 1893, but Great Britain suffered more in her trade with her own colonies than did the United States, for her exports fell from \$15,510,230 in 1891, to \$11,521,745 in 1892. The exports from Germany to the British West Indies dropped from 1,653,000 marks to 1,099,900 marks during the same period. The falling off in the exports to the British West Indies was mostly in manufactured articles and machinery, there being an encouraging increase in nearly all agricultural products.

THE TREATY WITH BRITISH GUIANA.

There seems to have been a slight increase in our exports to British Guiana, the total value in 1891 being \$1,858,742, which increased in the year 1892 to \$1,933,299, and in 1893 to \$2,000,675. The principal increase was in agricultural products and lumber.

At the same time the exports from Great Britain to her own colony of British Guiana dropped from \$1,481,665 in 1891 to \$3,761,375 in 1892, a decrease of \$720,590.

THE TREATY WITH THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

In many respects the most important of the several commercial arrangements negotiated by the last Administration under the authority of the reciprocity section of the McKinley act was that with the German Empire. By this the embargo that had been placed upon American pork products in 1880 was removed, a number of agricultural products were admitted free, and many more at a greatly reduced rate of duty.

Bran, flax, hides, wool, and many other articles are now free. The duty on wheat and rye was reduced from 5 marks to 3.50 marks per 100 kilos; oats from 4 to 2.80 marks; corn from 2 to 1.60 marks; hops from 20 to 14 marks; butter and oleomargarine from 20 to 17 marks; pork from 20 to 17 marks, and all other kinds of meat from 20 to 15 marks; all forms of flour and other mill products from 10.50 to 7.30 marks; and so on through the list.

In exchange for this the United States agreed to admit the beet-root sugar of Germany into this country free of duty. The result has been a large increase in the exports to Ger-

many of the articles affected by the treaty, as the following table will show:

Articles.	1891.	1892.	1893.
Agricultural implements.....	\$233,781	\$292,020	\$377,735
Corn.....	2,042,404	7,461,125	2,794,689
Rye.....	116,664	3,759,584	217,782
Wheat.....	235,953	7,842,902	2,569,261
Wheat flour.....	41,039	226,519	1,011,385
Casings for sausages.....	235,575	336,419	537,526
Ingots of copper.....	399,876	902,217	580,007
Fertilizers.....	360,784	738,424	1,428,455
Dried apples.....	100,861	393,866	210,140
Oil cake.....	1,182,041	2,138,998	2,328,169
Cotton-seed oil.....	168,075	403,769	536,587
Beef, canned.....	593,034	476,381	823,652
Bacon and hams.....	578,408	1,512,286	825,455
Distilled spirits.....	189,305	763,134	1,495,557
Unmanufactured tobacco.....	3,757,770	3,947,405	4,694,012
Lumber:			
Boards, deals, planks, joist.....	262,088	297,390	343,702
Timber.....	560,422	466,244	627,418
All other articles.....	1,400,459	1,745,992	1,856,740

It should be remarked that the year 1892 was remarkable for the failure of corn and wheat crops in Europe, so that the increased exportation of those articles from the United States to Germany was unnatural.

THE RESULT OF ABROGATING THE TREATIES.

It is evident that the framers of this bill in their great haste to repeal Republican legislation have not stopped to consider all the results of their impetuosity. The commercial arrangements which were entered into by the United States under the authority of section 3 of what is familiarly known as the McKinley law, are solemn compacts between this and friendly nations which can not be carelessly kicked aside like a memorial from a legislature or an appeal from some domestic industry whose prosperity is threatened. They have the sanctity of formal treaties, and if they are to be terminated it should be done without national dishonor.

There must be good reasons to show why this Government desires to withdraw from such compacts, and asks to be released from its obligations. I take the liberty to suggest that the honor and the dignity of this country is too precious to be forfeited, and that if it be determined to withdraw from these arrangements, that the act be done according to custom of civilized nations, and that the bill be so amended as to authorize the President to give some good reason for the desire of the United States to terminate them. Such a method would preserve the honor of the nation, even if the act would be a serious blow to the commerce they have done so much to encourage and promote.

I can recall but one instance where a treaty between the United States and a foreign government was terminated or interfered with by legislation, and that was the passage of the exclusion law in violation of our treaty stipulations with China.

Such an offense as is proposed by this measure, as it came to the Senate, if committed by an individual or a corporation, would be followed by a suit for damages in court, but when committed by one nation against another the usual recourse is a declaration of war or commercial retaliation. It is impossible to predict what may occur should these arrangements be abrogated, but the result will certainly not enhance the credit of the United States among nations, nor promote our commercial welfare.

The commercial arrangements with Brazil and other republics of Central and South America were made by them as an expression of their friendly sympathy and desire for closer commercial relations, against a powerful influence exerted by the nations of Europe which had hitherto monopolized their trade, and in certain cases in the face of formal protests against the discrimination extended in favor of the imports of the United States. The arrangements with the British and Spanish colonies were initiated without the encouragement or approval of the home governments, who finally gave their indorsement with the greatest reluctance. Each agreement bears the stamp of favor which would not have been extended to any nation but the United States, and now we propose to reward this friendly disposition with an insolent indifference to their welfare as well as our own.

THE RESULT OF THE GERMAN TREATY.

The arrangement with Germany was the culmination of negotiations that extended over a long period of years by which we endeavored to secure the removal of an embargo that had been imposed upon one of our principal products; one for which the farmers of the Northwest feel the need of a foreign market as much as for any other commodity they produce. For more than ten years prior to the passage of the tariff act of 1890 American pork had been the object of the most unjust discrimination in

Europe, and on account of the prohibitive or severely restrictive laws it had been practically excluded from most of the countries of the Continent. Notwithstanding the earnest and repeated efforts of our diplomatic representatives to secure a repeal or modification of these unjust laws, at the date of the passage of the tariff act of 1890 they remained in full force, to the great detriment of the export trade in this important agricultural product.

The adoption of the reciprocity provision conferred upon the President such ample powers of discrimination in commerce that he was soon enabled through negotiation to not only secure a removal of the prohibition against the importation of pork, but to obtain important concessions for American agricultural and other products in some of the leading nations of Europe. The first of these was negotiated with the German Empire. This was followed by a reciprocity arrangement with Austria-Hungary by which American products are admitted to the same favors as those granted by the commercial treaties made with Germany, Italy, and other countries.

And we are now proposing to revoke and abrogate that arrangement without even saying "by your leave." But no member of the committee seems to have thought it of any importance to ask what Germany, or Austria, or Brazil, or Spain will think or do.

By this act we restore the duty upon sugar. That includes the beet sugar of Germany, which under the compact of February 1, 1892, we agreed to admit free to our ports. In 1892 we took 173,000,000 pounds of sugar from Germany, and in 1893 we took 325,000,000 pounds. Will Germany see that trade cut off without some form of retaliation? Will the embargo upon American pork be restored, and if so, how will this Congress excuse itself to the farmers of the Northwest for depriving them of a profitable market?

WHAT WILL GERMANY DO IN RETALIATION?

The Chicago Record of recent date contained an interview between the Washington correspondent of that paper and the Hon. John A. Kasson, formerly minister to Germany and Austria, who is recognized not only as one of the most learned students of international law, but also as one of the most experienced and skillful diplomatists in this country. Mr. Kasson was asked to explain in terms his views of the effect of the Wilson tariff bill as reported to the House upon the reciprocity arrangements made by the last Administration. He said:

"Section 56 of the Wilson bill repeals all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act. It also declares that the repeal of existing laws or modifications thereof 'shall not affect any act done or any right accruing or accrued' before the said repeal or modification, but all rights and liabilities shall continue as if the act had not been repealed. On the other hand, the Wilson report on the tariff bill declares the purpose of the bill to be 'to repeal in toto section 3 of the tariff act of October 1, 1890, called its reciprocity provision.'

"From these declarations it would appear that, so far as the Wilson act imposes duties upon articles made free under the McKinley act and in our commercial arrangements under section 3 of that act, it does operate to repeal not only the reciprocity clause of the McKinley act, but also to annul the arrangements made with foreign countries under it. Against this view, however, is the saving clause I have quoted from section 56, which is the repealing section of the Wilson bill.

"Taking the report and the provisions of section 56 together, they indicate some confusion in the minds of the framers of the bill, both as to what they can do and what they have done with the international arrangements established under the reciprocity clause of the McKinley act. Inasmuch as the commercial arrangements of reciprocity were 'acts done and rights accrued' prior to this repeal, it might be construed in court that it is the intention of the Wilson bill to exempt from repeal these reciprocal arrangements with foreign countries. It leaves an impression on my mind that the committee hardly knew what they embraced in the repeal and exemptions provided for in section 56."

"Is that the usual way of terminating a treaty or an arrangement with a foreign country?"

"No; very far from it. I know of no case in our history in which Congress has boldly trampled upon any international treaty of the United States and nullified it, except its discreditable conduct toward China. In every other instance throughout history, so far as I remember, treaties have been terminated in the manner provided for by their own provisions or through other regular diplomatic actions."

THE RIGHT TO TERMINATE TREATIES.

"Has Congress, under the Constitution, the right to terminate treaties in this way?"

"That represents a question which was finally solved by the Supreme Court of the United States—the question of reconciling the legislative power of Congress with the treaty-making power of the Executive and Senate. It was finally settled by the Supreme Court that treaties made in pursuance of the powers granted by the Constitution were the supreme law of the land, like constitutional acts of Congress. At the same time it was decided that Congress had the constitutional power, within the limits of constitutional action, to make provisions which might nullify the treaty. That is to say, in substance, that the latest exercise of power controls the former. If, however, a treaty is violated, the action of Congress in no manner exempts the Government from its responsibilities to a foreign nation. The foreign government has then its claim for damages and its right of war to satisfy its demands for violation of the treaty."

"What would be the impression conveyed to foreign governments if the United States should violate its treaties by such methods?"

"From the earliest times the violation of an international compact by one party to it has been considered an act of dishonor, and orators describe such insulting action by borrowing from the old Roman the term 'Punic faith.'"

"Would Germany and Austria be more likely to take offense at such action than China?"
 "Undoubtedly. That is to say, they would be likely to take more prompt action."
 "In retaliation?"
 "I should say yes, if the injury to their interests seemed to require it, but I am still not clear that the intention of the bill is to nullify these existing arrangements other than by the methods provided in the arrangements themselves."

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA WOULD ACT PROMPTLY.

"You are familiar with the commercial arrangements with Germany under which the removal of the embargo upon American pork, the decree of the German Government of March 6, 1883, was revoked as a consideration for our removal of the duty upon German sugar. What effect would the revocation of that commercial arrangement have upon our trade with Germany, speaking from your experience and knowledge of that country?"

"I can only say that both in Germany and Austria-Hungary there is widespread jealousy among the people of American agricultural products which compete with their own. As far back as fifteen years ago I was called upon at the legation in Vienna by a representative of the local press, who said to me that there was great alarm in a certain rural district of Austria over the report that the United States Government was about to establish an agency near them for the introduction of American pork and other food products. He added that there was great excitement on the subject, and desired me to inform him if there was any truth in the report. This same feeling of apprehension is so general in the two countries named that either government would be supported by popular sentiment in any action it would take for the embarrassment of our export trade in those articles, and that leads me to think that they would seize any provocation which might justify them in restoring their hostile enactments. The revocation of the decree prohibiting the importation of American pork into Germany was the consummation of many years' difficult diplomatic negotiations and could not have been secured without offering to Germany the important concessions in favor of beet sugar, which the reciprocity clause of the McKinley act enabled our Government to make."

THE TRADE OF GERMANY WITH OTHER AGRICULTURAL NATIONS.

A reciprocity treaty has recently been concluded between Germany and Roumania under which the agricultural products of the latter country are to be admitted into the empire at the rate of duty now imposed upon such products from the United States, and a similar treaty with Russia was recently ratified by the Reichstag.

Germany is not an agricultural country, but a great majority of the people are engaged in mechanical industries and must purchase the larger part of their food products abroad. The population is rapidly increasing, and with the most abundant harvests the supply of bread and meat will always be insufficient for the wants of the people.

Since the negotiation of the reciprocity arrangement with the United States efforts have been made, under the direction of the Agricultural Department, to introduce our cereal products into more extensive use among the people with encouraging success; but the United States will always be handicapped in her trade by the fact that Germany is surrounded by the largest grain-producing countries in Europe, which can get their products to her market without the expense of long ocean voyages and the several handlings at the ports of departure and arrival. The commercial relations between her people and her neighbors are of long standing, and their business methods are better understood than ours. This natural disadvantage can only be overcome by the most skillful diplomatic negotiations on the part of our Government and by the heartiest enterprise and energy of American exporters. But if the reciprocity arrangement now existing with Germany is revoked that market will be entirely destroyed.

The value of that market is shown by the fact that the exports of maize to Germany in the year 1891 were valued at \$2,042,404; in 1892, the first year after the treaty took effect, the exports were \$7,481,125, while for 1893 they were \$2,794,689.

At the same time the exports of maize from Belgium into Germany fell from \$171,493 in 1891 to \$59,222 in 1892, and from Russia from \$995,397 in 1891 to \$269,384 in 1892, while from Roumania the exports were \$608,102 in 1891 and \$620,915 in 1892.

In 1891 the United States furnished 28½ per cent of all the maize imported into Germany; in 1892 it furnished 62½ per cent.

In 1891 we furnished Germany \$7,048,606 worth of lard; in 1892, \$7,722,727, and in 1893, \$6,429,211 worth.

MEAT CATTLE.

The following statement shows the imports of meat cattle into Germany for the years 1891, 1892, and nine months of 1893:

From—	1891.	1892.	*1893.
Belgium.....	2,873	4,931	771
Denmark.....	11,788	7,492	12,718
France.....	3,385	891	998
Great Britain.....	10,270	4,175	4,739
Netherlands.....	14,870	3,486	5,516
Austria-Hungary.....	10,259	3,825	12,717
Russia.....	32,158	7,813	17,107
United States.....	82,581	121,430	60,407
Total.....	173,336	157,897	121,712

*Nine months.

Which shows that the share furnished by the United States sprang from 32 per cent in 1891 to 77 per cent in 1892.

IMPORTS OF WHEAT INTO GERMANY.

The importations of wheat into Germany from the United States have enormously increased. The following table will show the comparative exports of wheat from various countries into Germany for the years 1891 and 1892, and for the first nine months in 1893:

Exports of wheat from various countries into Germany.

From—	1891.	1892.	*1893.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
Belgium.....	377,148	250,165	53,679
Bulgaria.....	534,727	534,727	156,935
Netherlands.....	277,391	86,206	13,350
Austria-Hungary.....	751,581	456,730	192,950
Roumania.....	428,529	917,850	1,202,390
Russia.....	5,155,870	2,572,991	159,657
Servia.....		135,390	56,544
Turkey.....		202,781	34,074
British India (East).....	242,144	509,081	23,634
Argentine Republic.....	123,970	661,697	1,296,187
Brazil.....	13,471	1,514	
British North America.....		117,190	32,268
Chile.....		130,436	30,870
British Australia.....		8,713	2
United States.....	1,446,781	6,302,130	2,855,816
Total.....	9,067,610	12,962,126	6,125,525

*First nine months.

THE IMPORTS OF RYE INTO GERMANY.

The imports of rye into Germany show an increase. In 1891 the United States furnished only 7 per cent; in 1892 it furnished 25 per cent. There was a general falling off in imports from all the other nations, and a very large increase from the United States. The following table shows a comparison of exports of rye for the years 1891 and 1892:

From—	1891.	1892.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
Belgium.....	148,443	139,151
Bulgaria.....		274,279
France.....	182,967	460,080
Netherlands.....	189,511	48,258
Austria-Hungary.....	389,270	343,576
Roumania.....	233,000	268,176
Russia.....	6,187,775	1,233,774
Servia.....		93,525
Turkey.....		861,132
British North America.....		20,468
United States.....	642,222	1,361,291

RECIPROCITY THE POPULAR POLICY IN EUROPE.

The commercial policy of the leading nations of Europe has recently adopted reciprocity treaties as the most satisfactory and equitable method of regulating international trade, and promoting an interchange of peculiar products, but they were not general, in fact were almost unknown until the late President Arthur inaugurated the policy in the United States by the negotiation of such arrangements with Mexico, Santo Domingo, and with Spain for her colonies of Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Germany has made or is making treaties with all the countries with which she has commercial relations, for the purpose of extending her export trade in machinery and manufactured merchandise, and cheapening the cost of food to her people by a reduction of duties. She has reciprocity arrangements with Austria, Italy, Roumania, and other countries, besides the United States, and on the 11th of March, after a most exciting debate in the Reichstag a treaty with Russia, which will admit the wheat and flour of the latter Empire at the same rate of duty as that imposed upon similar articles from the United States. To abrogate our treaty with Germany, and restore her old duties upon wheat, corn, rye, barley from this country would stop instantly and for ever all exports of breadstuff and provisions from the United States, as it would forbid competition with the grain of Russia, Austria, Hungary, and Roumania.

In view of the treaty recently consummated between Russia and Germany, under the provisions of which the breadstuffs of Russia are to be imported into Germany on the same terms as are conceded to the United States under our present treaty relations, the situation in Germany will become more serious and embarrassing.

My attention has been called to the report of our consul-general, Mr. Frank H. Mason, at Frankfort, one of the most intelligent, thoughtful, and in every way valuable members in our whole consular service, in which he takes up this entire question of the Russian treaty and its effect upon importations from

the United States, to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate at this time, and which I will ask to have read.

AMERICAN BREADSTUFFS AND THE RUSSO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL TREATY.

The pending treaty of commerce between Germany and Russia was signed by the commissioners representing both governments and published on the 10th of February. Although it has yet to be debated and ratified by the German Parliament, the attitude of the Imperial Government and the popular expression of commercial sentiment are so strongly in its favor that its adoption in substantially its published form would seem so probable that it may be interesting to inquire what effect the new conditions are likely to have upon the future export of American products, and notably breadstuffs, to Germany.

The present situation has been repeatedly described in previous reports of this series, but for convenience of deduction the rates of duty on imported breadstuffs may be concisely stated.

Previous to February 1, 1892, German imports of American and Russian wheat and rye were subject to the same general rates of duty—\$1.19 per 100 kilograms, or \$11.90 per metric ton of 2,240 pounds. The duty on flour of wheat or rye from both countries was \$2.50 per 100 kilograms, or \$25 per ton.

But on the date just named the United States were placed by treaty with Germany in the class of most-favored nations, so that thenceforward the duties on American wheat and rye were reduced to \$8.33 and on flour to \$17.30 per ton. Meanwhile similar imports from Russia continued to pay the general or standard duties as above stated until the 1st of August, 1893, when, in consequence of disagreements between the two governments, the rates of duty on all imports from Russia into Germany were summarily raised 50 per cent and became, respectively, \$17.85 per ton on wheat and rye and \$37.50 per ton on flour. Since August last there have been in force, therefore, three rates of duty on wheat and flour imports to this country, viz, the minimum rate accorded to most-favored nations, the standard rate applicable to breadstuffs from countries which enjoy no special treaty privileges, and finally the retaliatory maximum rate applicable to imports of Russian origin.

The new commercial treaty between Germany and Russia sweeps away all these discriminations, secures to imports from Russia the minimum tariff conceded to most-favored nations, and thus puts that country on an equal footing with the United States in all that relates to their freedom of access to the markets of Germany. The effects of these changed conditions when applied to the whole list of imports are too remote and wide reaching to be yet estimated; but in respect to breadstuffs, the most important item of competition, there are certain results which may be already foreseen.

The basis for such a study is the record of German imports of wheat and rye during the past twenty-one years, a period which extends several years beyond the first enactment of grain duties in 1879 and includes the several changes and amendments to which those duties have been subject. The table following shows the total imports, in metric tons, of wheat and rye during each year since 1873, the average price in dollars per ton of each kind of grain in the Berlin market, and the various changes which have been made in the grain duties during the entire period.

A glance at these statistics will reveal several highly interesting facts: First, that there is in Germany, even during the years of most abundant harvests, a large deficit in breadstuffs which has to be filled by importation; second, that this deficit, although modified by various fluctuating influences, on the whole, increasing in close proportion to the growth of population; third, that the highest market values of wheat and rye at Berlin were in 1873, when both grains were imported free of duty, and the lowest values have been touched during the past year, when the highest duties were in force, so that the duties enacted at the demand of the agricultural class for the purpose of keeping up local values have failed to accomplish that result, for the obvious reason that the values of breadstuffs are governed in Germany, as elsewhere, by the world's grain market, and not by local conditions; fourth, that the highest total import—2,835,000 tons—was reached in 1879, the first year of the duty on wheat and rye, while the lowest was in 1893, when prices of both grains were considerably lower than in 1879; and finally, that, contrary to the rule of twenty years ago, the imports of wheat now far exceed in volume those of rye.

Years.	Total imports.		Average price per ton in Berlin.		Duty rate.
	Wheat.	Rye.	Wheat.	Rye.	
	Tons.	Tons.			
1873	395,000	790,000	\$32.83	\$45.69	Free.
1874	403,000	950,000	57.12	47.12	Do.
1875	499,000	700,000	45.64	39.50	Do.
1876	635,000	1,100,000	49.38	41.41	Do.
1877	940,000	1,190,000	54.74	42.12	Do.
1878	1,060,000	945,000	48.07	34.03	Do.
1879	915,000	1,470,000	49.26	34.51	\$2.38 per ton.
1880	227,600	689,600	54.02	46.41	Do.
1881	361,900	575,500	54.74	48.55	Do.
1882	637,200	658,300	51.64	38.79	Do.
1883	641,900	777,000	45.93	35.93	Do.
1884	754,500	961,600	41.88	35.70	Do.
1885	752,400	769,700	39.98	34.74	\$7.14 per ton.
1886	273,300	555,300	39.50	32.13	Do.
1887	547,300	638,500	40.69	30.22	\$11.90 per ton.
1888	339,800	652,800	42.84	32.60	Do.
1889	516,900	1,059,700	44.77	35.65	Do.
1890	887,952	875,200	46.88	39.93	Do.
1891	896,836	842,700	53.78	49.26	\$8.33 and \$11.90 per ton.
1892	1,271,951	548,600	45.22	39.50	Do.
1893	703,453	227,577	36.17	31.89	\$8.33, \$11.90, and \$17.85 per ton.

The principal opposition which the pending treaty with Russia has encountered in Germany has come from the agricultural classes, who assert that its adoption will be the final blow to the grain-growing interest in this country, and that, with the gates open to all principal grain-exporting countries at uniform and moderate rates of duty, the German farmers, with their high-priced land that must be constantly fertilized to remain productive, will no longer be able to maintain the competition.

However this may be, the fact seems obvious that under any conditions that are likely to prevail Germany will continue to need a large annual supply of imported cereals, and that these will continue to be furnished by the countries which have the most ready communications with Bremen, Hamburg, and Rotterdam, and which are able to produce and deliver wheat and rye most cheaply in the German markets. The interesting question is, where will the United States stand in this competition with Russia as an equally favored rival and with India, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic steadily

increasing their area of wheat culture and their surplus production? The imports of the year just ended, when the prices of wheat and rye have touched the lowest figures known during the present generation, have a pertinent interest in this connection.

Imports from—	Wheat.	Rye.	Flour.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Belgium	6,761	6,243	440
Bulgaria	17,975	18,968	
Denmark	1,206	356	
Great Britain	152		
France		5,715	
Netherlands	1,742	2,634	
Austria-Hungary	23,783	883	21,252
Roumania	143,577	52,740	
Russia	21,636	99,235	437
Servia	5,848	2,375	80
Turkey	3,407	19,374	
British India	2,716		
Portugal		158	
Argentine Republic	151,896		
British America	3,236	215	
Chile	3,548		
United States	314,928	18,194	4,196
Other countries	2,353	1,124	489
Total	703,453	227,577	20,894

During the past year, therefore, with Russia crippled during five months by an all but prohibitory tariff, the United States furnished nearly one-half of all the wheat, about one-twelfth of the rye, and about one-sixth of the flour imported to Germany from all countries.

The practical question is, how serious will be the competition of Russia in these and other staple products should the pending treaty restore her to commercial advantages equal to those of the United States? Russia will, from the day that the new treaty takes effect, resume her old position as the source of supply of nine-tenths of the foreign rye used by Germany. The same will be true, in a greater or less degree, of raw flax, certain kinds of lumber and timber, lubricating oils, barley, flaxseed, and a number of animal and mineral products, in all of which the fields, forests, and mines of Russia supplement naturally and irresistibly the manufactures of Germany. Rye is the principal bread material for the Russian as well as the German peasant, and in the production of that cereal Russia need fear no competition.

With regard to wheat, the problem is much more complicated, for the reason, among others, that not only Russia, but India, Australia, the Argentine Republic, and Uruguay will have to be taken into account. To raise and deliver a bushel of wheat in the United States costs, according to official estimates, about 50 cents. In India the cost per bushel is stated to be 35 cents, and the danger from that quarter is measured only by the limit to which the area of culture can be extended. In South America this point is not known to have been accurately determined, nor are the statistics of wheat export from Chile, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic generally accepted as trustworthy. But enough is known to warrant the belief that the wheat crop of India and South America is nearly, if not quite, equal to that of the United States, and in the Argentine Republic at least the area of cultivation is susceptible of indefinite extension.

In 1891, when wheat imports from Russia and the United States were subject to the same standard duty of \$11.90 per ton, the total importation of Russian wheat into Germany amounted to 515,587 tons, against 144,678 tons from the United States.

In 1892 the duty on American wheat was reduced from February 1 to \$8.33 per ton, and by reason of this advantage and less favorable crops in Russia, wheat imports from the United States to Germany rose to 630,213 tons, while those from Russia declined to 257,991 tons.

In 1893, as we have seen, the disadvantage of Russia was still further increased by the tariff war, which from the 1st of August raised the German import duty on Russian wheat to \$17.85 per ton, or more than double the duty rate on wheat from the United States. Austria-Hungary, Roumania, and other most favored nations. Under these conditions our country contributed 314,928 tons of wheat, and 4,196 tons of flour to Germany, while Russia furnished only 21,636 tons of wheat, and 437 tons of flour.

During these years American wheat has been introduced throughout a large portion of the German Empire, where its qualities are now well understood and generally liked. While the restoration of Russia to reciprocal advantages will create a new and strong competitor for the German market, America will still find here a fair field and equal favor. The result of the competition will be another example of "the survival of the fittest."

FRANK H. MASON,
Consul-General.

FRANKFURT, February 16, 1894.

The same result will follow the abrogation of the treaty with Spain in the Cuban trade, and if the treaty with Brazil is terminated the wheat and flour of Uruguay and the Argentine Republic will drive ours out of the market. But, as I have said, reciprocity is now considered the most practical and popular policy in Europe, and the statesmen of that continent are wondering at the shortsightedness of the present Administration of the United States in trying to destroy what its predecessors had been so successful in building up.

Great Britain has recently made an important treaty with Spain, under which Spanish wines and Cuban tobacco are to be admitted at reduced rates of duty into the ports of the United Kingdom and the colonies, in exchange for which Spain reduced her tariff upon a large variety of manufactured merchandise from England. They include every form of household articles of iron and steel, cotton and linen fabrics, and yarn of all kind; woolen and silk goods, hats, boots and shoes, watches and jewelry, agricultural machinery and implements, mining and mechanical machinery, railway supplies, condensed milk, various forms of preserved food products, rubber goods, etc.

Besides her treaty with Great Britain, Spain has also recently made reciprocity treaties with the Netherlands, Belgium,

Switzerland, and Sweden and Norway, and it is a common rumor among diplomatic circles of Europe that a similar treaty with Germany is now in progress of negotiation.

The treaty with Sweden and Norway is of the greatest importance to us, as it provides for the admission of codfish and lumber into Cuba and Puerto Rico under the same terms as if they came from the United States, and if our treaty with Spain be annulled we should lose this trade entirely.

Russia has also adopted the reciprocity policy, and in addition to the treaty with Germany, which is now pending ratification, has recently made one with France which will seriously affect the sale of our refined petroleum in the latter country, and Russia admits free and at a discriminating rate of duty all sorts of merchandise from France in exchange for this concession.

NO ONE HAS ASKED THE TERMINATION OF THE TREATIES.

But I have not learned, Mr. President, by any of the methods which public opinion is in the habit of expressing itself in this country, that there is any desire on the part of any person, or corporation, or community for the abrogation or termination of these reciprocity arrangements. I challenge any Senator upon this floor or any Representative of the people in the other House of Congress to produce or refer to any petition or memorial, or resolution, or even a private communication asking such legislation as is proposed.

On the contrary, the commercial organizations of the country, the manufacturing interests, and the mercantile houses which are engaged in the export trade are unanimous in their desire that the reciprocity policy be continued and extended to include all the nations for whose products we can exchange our agricultural and manufactured merchandise. If we are to reduce our duties upon imports from other lands, let us insist that the nations from which they come shall make corresponding reductions in favor of the articles they receive from us or let the reduction duties apply only to imports from such countries as are willing to do so.

Let us not have free trade, but fair trade. As we lessen the customs taxes that our people are required to pay let us increase the sales of their products by securing for them advantages in foreign markets. The reciprocity policy is the application of common commercial sense to foreign intercourse, and will prove as profitable to international commerce as it to private transaction between the citizens of the same community.

THOMAS JEFFERSON THE FATHER OF RECIPROCITY.

It may not be known to our friends on the other side of this Chamber, who are hastening with so much anxiety and so much folly to destroy the advantages that have been gained for the agriculturists and manufacturers of this country, that Thomas Jefferson, whom they honor with the paternity of their political organization and principles, was the father of reciprocity also. Mr. A. D. Anderson, in a recent communication to a local journal, has called attention to that interesting fact.

On the 16th of December, 1793, Thomas Jefferson, while Secretary of State, submitted a report to the House of Representatives, beginning as follows:

The Secretary of State, to whom was referred by the House of Representatives the report of a committee on the written message of the President of the United States on the 14th of February 1791, with instructions to report to the Congress the nature and extent of the privileges and restrictions of the commercial intercourse of the United States with foreign nations, and the measures which he should think proper to be adopted for the improvement of the commerce and navigation of the same, has had the same under consideration and thereupon makes the following report.

In the report, which was a very elaborate one and published in the American State papers, is the following:

Such being the restrictions on the commerce and navigation of the United States, the question is in what way they may be best removed, modified, or counteracted. As to the commerce two methods occur: First, by friendly arrangements with these several nations with whom these restrictions exist; or, second, by the separate act of our own Legislature for countervailing their effect.

There can be no doubt but that of these two friendly arrangement is the most eligible.

Instead of embarrassing commerce under piles of regulating laws, duties, and prohibitions, could it be relieved from all its shackles in all parts of the world, could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce, and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced by these things which contribute to human life and human happiness, the numbers of mankind would be increased, and their condition bettered.

Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free commerce, it would be advisable to begin it with that nation, since it is one by one only that it can be extended to all. Where the circumstances of either party render it expedient to levy a revenue, by way of impost or commerce, its freedom might be modified in that particular by mutual and equivalent measures, preserving it entire in all others.

But should any nation, contrary to our wishes, suppose it may better find its advantages by continuing its system of prohibition, duties, and regulations, it behooves us to protect our citizens, their commerce, and navigation by counter-prohibition, duties, and regulations also. Free commerce

and navigation are not to be given in exchange for restrictions and vexations, nor are they likely to produce a relaxation of them.

The following principles being founded in reciprocity, appear perfectly just, and to offer no cause of complaint to any nation. When a nation imposes high duties on our productions, or prohibits them altogether, it may be proper for us to do the same by theirs; first burdening or excluding those productions which they bring here in competition with our own of the same kind; selecting next such manufactures as we take from them in greatest quantity, and which at the same time we could the soonest furnish to ourselves or obtain from other countries imposing on them duties lighter at first, but heavier and heavier afterwards, as other channels of supply open. Such duties having the effect of indirect encouragement to domestic manufacturers of the same kind, may induce the manufacturer to come himself into these States, where cheaper subsistence, equal laws, and a vent of his wares, free of duty, may insure him the highest profits from his skill and industry.

DEMOCRATIC APPROVAL OF THE RECIPROCITY POLICY.

When this policy was first proposed by the late James G. Blaine it was received with enthusiastic favor by the public press without regard to party prejudices, and the only motive that can be ascribed to those who now propose to repudiate it is to deprive the party which embodied the suggestion in the statutes of the credit to which it was entitled.

The following extracts will show the sentiment of the Democratic newspapers at the time the reciprocity policy was first proposed:

[Boston Herald.]

We certainly hope that Congress will have the good sense to adopt a measure of this kind, for we feel convinced that its effect would be to revolutionize the narrow and prejudiced views which have so long dominated our national trade policy.

The course advocated by Mr. Blaine is not only sound in itself, it is proof of a sagacity in politics on his part which merits recognition.

This policy is so sound and meritorious, it is so far in keeping with all that has been said of late about the necessity of the United States securing control of the trade of this continent, that if it is repudiated the act will be a signal instance of political shortsightedness.

The course which Mr. Blaine proposed is eminently judicious and practicable.

[Boston Post.]

So far as it goes Mr. Blaine's scheme is to be commended, but for what it gives we may be thankful, and for the concession of the great principle which will not be long delayed in its universal application when once it is established among the nations of the American hemisphere.

[Boston Globe.]

No class of men will more profoundly sympathize with Mr. Blaine or rejoice more in his success than the tariff reformer. It is true that they desire to go further than he has yet prepared the way, but no further than he has indicated it. They desire to see reciprocity in healthy and world-wide operation instead of confining its beneficent functions to the American continent.

As long as we fail to give full recognition to the principle of reciprocity in our commercial dealings with the countries of the earth, so long must we expect to be commercially ostracized and outlived in the family of nations.

[Boston Pilot.]

The heavily burdened people of the United States do not desire further taxes, nor do they yearn for free trade. But if we are going to remove the tariff duties there would seem to be sound sense in Mr. Blaine's suggestion, that in doing so we secure material advantages for ourselves from the countries which will chiefly profit by that measure.

Blaine has a policy, and a good one, and if we mistake not a growing one.

[New York Evening Post.]

The Evening Post indorses Mr. Blaine's plan, and recommends it to the favorable consideration of Congress, not because reciprocity is ideally the right thing, but because it promotes international trade, and thereby increases wealth, because it removes ignorant prejudices, and because it leads inevitably to the breaking down of trade barriers erected by selfish interests for private greed.

[New York Times.]

If these are really the views of Mr. Blaine they reflect credit upon his good sense, and if the intentions attributed to him are really his they show that his courage has not entirely oozed out during his confinement in the State Department.

The recommendation (to insert a clause in the tariff bill) is a good one, as being in behalf of a removal of some of our restrictions upon trade and in the direction of freer and more profitable intercourse with foreign nations. Any step in that direction would be progress.

[New York Sun.]

The programme which he proposes or hints at is fascinating, and it will lose nothing in the public eye from the recommendation given by his engaging personality. The hope or the dream of the commercial, if not of the political union of this continent, is in the minds of all Americans. The first steps toward making it a reality may soon be taken. Public opinion is ripening for it.

[New York World.]

The sugar schedule as it stands in the tariff bill as amended by the Senate committee is wholly in the interest of the sugar trust. The raw material of the refiner is to be free, but sugar that compete with his product are taxed. It would be much better if Congress should adopt Mr. Blaine's suggestion to restore the duty on raw sugars, especially if such a course would enable him to negotiate treaties with the Pan-American Republics that would increase our trade with those countries.

As Mr. Blaine stated, reciprocity "would lead to the opening of new and profitable markets for the products of which we have so large a surplus, and thus invigorate every branch of agricultural and mechanical industry."

[New York Commercial Bulletin.]

No one can deny that the policy which Mr. Blaine outlined would be an exceedingly advantageous one for the country.

The wisdom of Mr. Blaine's plan of reciprocity between this country and the nations of the south is coming to be more and more appreciated by public men here the more it is considered.

[New York Herald.]

Harrison and Blaine, in their reciprocity policy, have come over to good old Democratic ground.

Mr. Blaine has dared to exhibit some common sense on matters which involve the welfare of sixty-five millions of people.

[New York Witness.]

All we have to say is that we are heartily in favor of that kind of policy, for it is the kind that will have the most favorable influence on our industries in general.

[New York Nation.]

We indorse Mr. Blaine's plan, and recommend it to the favorable consideration of Congress, not because reciprocity is ideally the right thing, but because it promotes international trade and thereby increases wealth, removes ignorant prejudices, and leads inevitably to the breaking down of trade barriers erected by selfish interests for private greed.

[New York Standard.]

Secretary Blaine recognized fully the value of reciprocal trade with our neighbors. We ought to control the whole trade of Mexico, Central and South America. There is nothing on earth, from a wooden clothespin to a mogul locomotive and the finest and most powerful dynamo which can not be made well in this country; made better than any goods can be made in Europe. Talk about trade. This avenue would open up cumulative manufacturing activity; open up more opportunities for labor; more opportunities for capital. These Spanish Americans have what we want. We have what they want. A mistaken view of trade and a narrow-minded policy have kept us from being masters of this Spanish-American trade.

Secretary Blaine sees the error, and he would have his countrymen take a new and profitable departure. This advice is sound and should be followed.

[New York Sunday News.]

There is a good deal to commend in Mr. Blaine's policy, and there is a good deal of sound sense in his argument.

[New York Christian Union.]

Believing as we do that the progress of civilization will be promoted by the gradual removal of all restrictions on trade, we welcome Mr. Blaine's advocacy of reciprocity.

[Harper's Weekly.]

Mr. Blaine's South American policy is reciprocity. It would admit the products of the southern republics free if they would admit ours upon the same terms. This would be free trade with South America, practically the same freedom of trade that prevails among the States of the Union. This is a simple and strong argument. Wherever markets can be opened for our redundant productions by a policy of reciprocity, upon the reasoning of Mr. Blaine's letter, that policy would be wise.

[Brooklyn Times.]

There is no doubt that the plans suggested by Mr. Blaine will prove effective.

[Brooklyn Eagle.]

To people of good common sense Mr. Blaine's suggestion appears to be a practical one. He does not believe in throwing away a magnificent opportunity to secure for American producers a splendid market for their wares.

[Brooklyn Citizen.]

Between the free countries on the north and south continents of America there is no danger of such injurious competition. Their staple products are those which can not be largely, if at all, produced in the United States, and for the manufactured goods which we produce so largely they are compelled to rely for their supply upon importations either from Europe or the United States. The same American doctrine of intelligent protection to home industry that impels us to raise barriers against the importation of cheap manufactured goods from Europe urges us to remove every barrier that obstructs trade between North and South America, and establish constant and cheap communication between the ports of the two continents.

[The Philadelphia Record.]

It must be said, however, in behalf of Mr. Blaine's policy of reciprocity, that it points in the direction of commercial freedom; and for this reason, if for no other, it deserves a friendly greeting from every friend of tariff reform.

By freely admitting the wool of South America, Secretary Blaine proposes to open in that region wider markets for the breadstuffs, provisions, and other exports of the United States, trade in which is now seriously obstructed by South American tariffs. Such a policy could not fail to afford some relief to the farmers of this country, and it should not be defeated by the exaggerated fears of a few wool merchants.

Thus far there is no material difference between the policy of the friends of tariff reform and that of Secretary Blaine. What he aims to accomplish in a limited degree through reciprocal tariff modifications, they would effect to a far wider extent by a general revision of the tariff, and especially by a removal of duties on all raw materials of industry from whatever quarter of the globe they might be drawn.

[Philadelphia Times.]

The emphatic utterances of Secretary Blaine regarding the McKinley bill in general and reciprocity in particular are attracting not a little attention, and there are many members of Congress, both Democratic and Republican, who believe that his scheme is not only a wise one, but that it should be adopted. Of course, the Democrats who think that way are more numerous than the Republicans.

[Baltimore Sun.]

The arguments which he advances in favor of reciprocity are good ones.

[Baltimore Herald.]

Mr. Blaine's letter to the President upon the general subject of trade with the Latin-American republics is a remarkable document. Indeed, it is doubtful whether any state paper submitted to Congress within the past decade equals this letter in interest and importance. It amounts to a revelation of existing trade conditions upon this continent, and is, besides, a significant statement concerning the influence of import duties upon commerce.

[Washington Post.]

It is a question that has come to stay; and the sooner it is settled on the plan suggested by Mr. Blaine the better for our people who have produce and goods to sell with no advantageous market for their disposal. It is doubtless a surprise and somewhat unpalatable, perhaps, in certain quarters to have this new issue projected into the tariff legislation of the present session, but it is an issue that can not be pooh-poohed out of sight, and Mr. Blaine is entitled to the thanks of the country for having brought it before Congress in such forcible and commanding shape.

Nothing is untimely or inopportune that is for the improved welfare of the people and the better development of their trade interests and, late though the Secretary of State may have been in calling public attention to the subject, it is still a living question. It may be overshadowed by the present Congress, but the issue is made, and it will not down until something has been done to put the commercial relations of the various countries of the western continent on a liberal reciprocal basis.

"Free sugar in the United States," however, as Mr. Blaine telegraphed to the millers' convention, "should be accompanied by free breadstuffs and provisions in Latin America." This is the key-note to the reciprocal system which he would bring about. Free wool in the United States would mean the removal of heavy duties upon other articles of export, the consumption of which in Latin America is now greatly restricted by the correspondingly increased price, and it is believed that the liberal policy thus indicated on the part of the United States would gradually lead to many concessions on the part of our southern neighbors, whose trade we seek to cultivate.

[Chicago Herald.]

As a believer in free and unfettered commerce, the Herald would welcome reciprocity or free trade with one nation, with ten nations, or with all nations.

That is strongly and concisely put, and it gives the American people something to think over. Heretofore their only idea with regard to a protective policy has been to protect American labor, and to that end they have adopted a general plan of exempting from duty articles not produced in this country. Mr. Blaine now shows them how a protective tariff may be used to encourage as well as protect American industry, by making it reciprocal with nations that may and should be good customers for our products.

Apparently, the immediate object of this letter is to dissuade Congress from putting sugar on the free list; but it also calls attention to the fact that we need a definite Pan-American policy, and that the present is exactly the time to formulate one. It is an opportunity that may not occur again.

But there is no prospect that Congress can find time for any such useful work at this session.

But Mr. Blaine, who has been studying the question of South American trade, evidently finds a condition that can not be cured by Government appropriations for steamship lines to South American ports. The remedy he believed is a Pan-American customs union under which the products of one country are admitted free of duty to another. No one will deny that this is an essential and important step.

[St. Louis Globe-Democrat.]

The proposition, it will be seen, is, in its broad features, as simple as it is practical and beneficent.

[Kansas City Times.]

Secretary James G. Blaine seems to be a pretty good sort of free trader himself. His reciprocity policy is only another name for just what the Democracy has been and is fighting for.

[New York World.]

Reciprocity with South America would naturally be the beginning of broader and more intimate relations with Europe. It would be the first step in the right direction. Protectionists who favor reciprocity, including Mr. Blaine probably, would not admit this, but the truth is that the movement is in obedience to the pressure upon home producers for a larger market, and the pressure will not be taken off until American producers and merchants are at liberty to sell and buy everywhere.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES THAT MIGHT BE MADE,

These extracts which might be multiplied until they would fill a volume, Mr. President, illustrate the sentiment of the people without reference to political preferences or prejudices, and I am sure an amendment to this bill would be received with almost unanimous popular favor which shall provide that the reduction of duties herein proposed shall apply only to articles imported from countries which make reciprocal concessions in favor of the products of the United States. That would be a double benefit. The consumers in this country would have the benefit of the reduction of duties upon imported goods they use, while the producers would have the advantage of reduced imposts upon their products in foreign lands. That would be fair trade.

RECIPROCITY WITH MEXICO.

It was only two years ago, Mr. President, that a Democratic committee of the House of Representatives made an excellent report pointing out in clear and concise language the great advantages the majority of the present Congress is trying to throw away. I refer, Mr. President, to the report of Mr. Andrew, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with regard to "Our trade relations with Mexico." It shows that every reason suggested by geographical location, similarity of institutions, and community of interests justifies all reasonable effort to promote commerce with our nearest neighbor, and what is true of our sister Republic on the south is even more true of the great colonies on our northern border, where much greater opportunities are being sacrificed without a single consideration that should and does enter the mind of every prudent and judicious man who studies commercial questions with the broad sense of securing the greatest good for the greatest number.

With a population of 12,000,000 of people and a foreign trade of nearly a hundred millions a year, with natural highways of commerce on both sides connecting our Pacific and Gulf ports with hers, with five great railways constructed at a cost of more than a hundred millions of American capital, and a fraternal desire for more intimate relations, Mexico affords one of the most profitable as well as one of the most natural markets for the agricultural and mechanical products of the United States, and offers

In return the staples of the tropics which are necessary to and are demanded by the welfare of our own people. In the report to which I have alluded, Mr. Andrew says:

If the United States does not possess a practical monopoly of the markets of Mexico, it must be due to conditions of trade or of tariff legislation which should be studied in order to be removed. The natural advantages of the United States in the proximity of her fertile grain fields and her great factories, aided by her absolute control of the highways of commerce on land and her substantial control of those by sea, should make the southern republic one of our most accessible and profitable markets.

The Mexican people themselves have come to the assistance of nature in opening their markets to the United States. Mexico has been until recently without a safe harbor on the eastern coast. The Government has recently built a system of jetties like those at the mouths of the Mississippi and created a harbor at the port of Tampico extending for 30 miles. It is the only harbor on the eastern coast of Mexico where a vessel can unload at the docks, and has been built under the charge of one of the officers who assisted Capt. Eads in the work at the mouths of the Mississippi. There is now 18 feet of water over a bar where formerly there was but 6 feet, and the depth will soon be considerably increased.

Tampico will inevitably become, within a short time, the great commercial center of the southern republic. It is situated halfway between the present roadstead of Vera Cruz and the American line, is only two days' sail from Mobile, and even nearer to New Orleans, and is almost at the gates of the growing port of Galveston. Two railroads now connect Tampico with the interior. One is the Mexican Central Railway, almost wholly owned by Americans, and the other is the Monterey and Mexican Gulf. Concessions have been granted by the Mexican Government and the surveys have been made for a third railroad from Tampico to the City of Mexico, which will shorten the running time by almost one-half.

MEXICO HAS OFFERED US VERY LIBERAL CONCESSIONS.

The Government and people of Mexico have offered their markets to us with a generosity that I regret to say has not been fully appreciated or returned. So long ago as 1882, at the invitation of the President of that Republic, two commissioners, one of them being no less a personage than Gen. Grant, were sent to Mexico by direction of President Arthur to negotiate a reciprocity treaty which was concluded and finally ratified by this Senate, but which from a shortsighted policy, almost as fatal in its folly as that which is now being pursued, the House of Representatives refused to enact the legislation necessary to carry its stipulations into effect.

That treaty provided for almost an absolute interchange of products, free of import dues, between the two nations, and but for our own folly it would doubtless have resulted in closing all the custom-houses upon the Rio Grande and given our merchants and manufacturers a monopoly of the Mexican trade. But as a consequence of our neglect to take advantage of what was then offered, the merchants of Mexico still purchase nearly two-thirds of their imports in Europe, and are likely to do so until we arrange for an interchange of products under discriminating duties that other nations may not enjoy or obtain.

It is still possible, if the pending bill does not become a law, to reclaim what we have neglected. Mexico is still willing and anxious to meet us with a friendly and liberal spirit in a commercial treaty that will enlarge her markets for our merchandise provided we will receive her staple products on the same terms that were given Brazil and Cuba in the arrangements negotiated by the late Administration.

THE ATTITUDE OF PRESIDENT DIAZ.

A correspondent of the New York Commercial Bulletin, in a recent communication on this subject, says:

President Diaz is an advocate of absolute free trade between the two great republics of the western hemisphere. He and other leaders of the Liberal party have been studying the effects of such a system for sometime. They realize that free trade along the Rio Grande would mean a loss of revenue which Mexico would have to meet by raising revenue elsewhere. They are prepared for this and are working upon a plan which will at once raise the necessary revenue and develop the agricultural resources of Mexico without pursuing the restrictive policy of a high tariff against the United States. The proposition is being seriously discussed to levy a heavy tax upon all uncultivated land. It is proposed to leave exempt from taxation the arable land under cultivation, and thereby offer a premium to the farmers.

Those Mexicans who have studied closely the industrial possibilities of their country believe that her greatest future development lies along the line of agriculture rather than of mining or raising stock. The mining they regard as largely a speculative enterprise, and the raising of stock as subject to limitations. Vast areas of fertile land lie uncultivated all over the Republic, and if brought under the plow would make Mexico one of the greatest farming countries of the world. The progressive leaders believe that in this field, along with a reasonable development of necessary manufactures, lies the future prosperity of Mexico.

MEXICO DESIRES RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Similar statements have recently appeared in Mexican publications, which indicate that the Government is willing to change her entire revenue system provided she can secure unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but the adoption of the pending measure in the statutes of this nation would make this entirely unnecessary, as we are about to give our neighbors that for which they have offered the most liberal concessions, without requiring the slightest consideration in return.

If this bill should pass there will be no further offers on the part of Mexico to admit our exports free of duty, or at rates below those imposed upon similar imports from other nations.

The inducement will no longer exist. Nearly every product for which she has sought concessions in the past is placed upon our free list, or will be admitted into our ports at a duty lower than she has ever asked.

And what do we receive in return? Nothing. The opportunity we have been seeking for the extension of our sales among her people is absolutely thrown away. We give for nothing that for which she has been willing to pay the highest price; and she will continue to exact exorbitant duties upon our exports while we admit her products free.

One can scarcely discuss this subject with patience. It seems incredible that a legislative body like this should so thoughtlessly abandon and betray the interests of a people they have sworn to serve.

In exchange for the free admission of their coffee and sugar, their fruits and fiber plants, their wool and hides, their silver and lead ore, their horses and cattle and sheep, the Mexican Government would willingly open its ports to nearly every product of our farms and forests, our fisheries, and mechanical industries; and particularly to those forms of manufactured merchandise for which we feel the greatest need of foreign markets, the surplus results of the labor and the genius of our artisans.

THE FOREIGN COMMERCE OF MEXICO.

The largest imports of Mexico, amounting to nearly fifty millions a year, and rapidly increasing in value, are cotton, woolen, and linen fabrics, glass and china, the myriad forms of manufactured iron and steel, including machinery and railway supplies, agricultural implements and machinery, lumber and furniture, glass and china, paper and stationery, drugs and medicines, and all sorts of articles that enter into household use. The greater portion of these imports come from Europe still, notwithstanding the construction of railway lines connecting the two republics and the introduction of American capital for the development of the natural resources of the country, the reason being that the wholesale merchants are mostly Europeans, who prefer to purchase their supplies in their own countries unless some inducement be offered to buy them elsewhere. A discriminating duty in favor of American goods, such as might be secured through a reciprocity treaty, would offer this inducement, and the trade would be diverted to the United States. The correspondent of the Bulletin continues:

The wealthier classes of Mexico are highly cultivated, luxurious in their tastes, and insist upon having the best of everything which ministers to the enjoyment of modern life. The poorer people of the country produce to a large extent what they need for themselves, but the introduction of railroads and of fine manufactured goods must inevitably raise the scale of living, even among the humblest, to the point of demanding as necessities many articles of manufacture which have been in the past in but little demand. The coarser grades of cotton cloths are already being manufactured on Mexican soil in Mexican mills. The market for the better grades of goods, now controlled by Great Britain, France, Germany, and Belgium, is, however, open to American manufacturers if they could obtain the advantage of discriminating duties. If, instead of discriminating duties, unrestricted reciprocity prevailed between this country and Mexico, there can be no doubt that the exercise of a little enterprise on the part of our manufacturers and our producers of food would soon give them almost absolute control of Mexican markets.

The cultivated classes of Mexico, however, will not be satisfied with inferior goods or a limited variety. It is the boast of Mexican merchants that they keep for sale everything which can be bought in London, Paris, or Berlin, and our merchants, in order to command absolutely Mexican trade, would have to meet the demands of a fastidious, cultivated, and wealthy people.

THE REASON WHY WE HAVE NO TREATY WITH MEXICO.

It may be asked why such a reciprocity arrangement as was negotiated with Brazil three years ago was not made with Mexico as well. The answer is found in what is known as the reciprocity section of the McKinley law, which was so limited in its scope as to forbid the Secretary of State to offer that nation the inducements it demanded as a consideration for concessions in favor of American goods. Mexico asked the repeal of the law recently enacted imposing a duty upon lead ores, and the free admission of her wools, which are of the coarser variety, used for the manufacture of carpets, and do not come in competition with the higher grades cultivated upon this side of the border. But by the present bill it is proposed to remove the duties from both these articles, which will afford the market Mexico has been seeking without requiring any concessions in our favor in return.

Mr. Ryan, the recent minister to Mexico, in a letter to the Secretary of State, said:

I trust I shall be pardoned for expressing the conviction, formed from such close and careful observation and study as I have been able to make since entering upon my duties here, that the people of the United States have very much to gain and little or nothing to lose by the most liberal trade relations with Mexico. If our Government agrees with me in this respect, then I beg to make the suggestion that the longer reciprocity negotiations are deferred the more difficult will be their consummation, because of the constant development of industries in this country that naturally create opposing interests.

INCREASE OF OUR EXPORTS TO MEXICO.

The statistics of our exports to Mexico furnish an interesting study and show a rapid increase notwithstanding the disadvantages under which commerce has been laboring:

	Fiscal year ending June 30—	
	1885.	1893.
Animals.....	\$388,265	\$469,814
Breadstuffs.....	1,561,378	4,727,384
Carrriages, horse cars, and cars for steam railways.....	32,377	291,563
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines.....	203,799	418,452
Coal.....	25,178	903,229
Cotton:		
Unmanufactured.....	613,251	1,890,461
Manufactures of.....	699,790	432,216
Glass and glassware.....	46,198	117,979
Gunpowder and other explosives.....	235,821	419,300
Iron and steel, and manufactures of.....	1,208,979	3,807,396
Malt liquors.....	88,423	226,767
Oils:		
Mineral.....	237,278	519,213
Other.....	21,172	309,769
Provisions, comprising meat and dairy products.....	298,962	594,874
Quicksilver.....	166,912	143,381
Tobacco.....	142,954	116,119
Wood, and manufactures of.....	317,475	1,198,380
All other articles.....	1,083,384	2,305,417
Total.....	7,370,599	18,891,714

EXPORTS FROM MEXICO FOR 1893.

The exports from Mexico during the last year (1893) of precious metals and merchandise were valued at \$87,509,221, an increase of \$12,041,506 over the previous year, which illustrates the remarkable development of the material resources of that country. There was a decrease in the value of the shipments of silver bullion, doubtless owing to the reduced price of that article, and also in the exports of tobacco, but in every other article there was a gain. The largest increase was in silver-bearing lead ores, which amounted to over \$4,000,000; the next was in coffee, of which \$2,050,000 more was exported than in 1892, and the next was in fiber plants, which show a gain of a million and a half.

COMPARATIVE EXPORTS OF MEXICO BY NATIONS.

The following is a comparative statement of exports from Mexico by nations for the fiscal years 1891-'92 and 1892-'93:

Nations.	Fiscal year—	
	1892-'93.	1891-'92.
United States.....	\$65,837,643	\$49,932,663
England.....	14,725,011	15,267,956
France.....	3,733,340	4,644,385
Germany.....	3,323,603	4,344,231
Belgium.....	915,272	340,660
Spain.....	601,294	661,850
Guatemala.....	255,956	143,740
Russia.....	53,660	26,200
Colombia.....	44,468	31,049
Salvador.....	8,731	3,519
Holland.....	3,258	49,998
Italy.....	3,025	4,733
Nicaragua.....	1,645	10,914
Brazil.....	1,280
Morocco.....	560
Costa Rica.....	320	1,050
China.....	99
Austria.....	55	15
Portugal.....	1
Honduras.....	4,400
Venezuela.....	250
Argentine Republic.....	100
Total.....	87,509,221	75,467,715

POSSIBILITIES OF TRADE WITH THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

During the session of the International American Conference, while the subject of reciprocity was under discussion the only opposition came from the delegates from Chile, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic, who recognized that the United States would not agree to admit their wools free of duty, no matter what might be offered in return. Secretary Blaine endeavored to have the coarse grades of wool included in the reciprocity amendment to the tariff act of 1890, as very little is raised in this country, and we require a great deal for the manufacture of carpets, but he failed because of the opposition of the wool men, who feared that it would be used to adulterate the finer grades in the manufacture of cheap clothing. And he especially urged a discriminating duty in favor of the wools of the Argentine Republic, which have always suffered unjustly under the tariff laws of the United States.

We tax wool by weight, and not by its value. The coarse wool raised in the Argentine Republic is much heavier than that from any other country, because it is saturated with grease and contains more dirt, and it also brings a lower price in the market, but the same duty has been imposed upon it as upon lighter, finer, and cleaner wools. The Argentines have regarded this as an injustice, and made it the subject of repeated complaints without relief. It would have injured no one to have admitted their wools at a lower rate of duty, nor would it have interfered with the domestic product to have admitted it free.

Feeling this as an injustice and a discrimination against their great staple, for the Argentine Republic has more sheep than any other country in the world, they have not encouraged trade with the United States, and some years 95 per cent of their enormous imports have been purchased in Europe. They have bought of us only such articles as they could not obtain as well elsewhere. But as a people and as a nation, they have always been ready to meet us half way in any equitable movement to improve the commercial relations between the two countries; and to-day they stand ready to negotiate a treaty that will be profitable to both, if it can be based upon the free admission of their wool.

OUR FORMER COMMERCE WITH ARGENTINE.

Forty years ago we had an important share in the foreign commerce of the Argentine Republic. The first importing house of any considerable capital was established at Buenos Ayres by a citizen of this country. An American built the first railroad there, and a monument has been erected to his honor. The first great sheep ranch was started by one of our countrymen, and for a time the merchants of New England controlled the trade of the Republic. But of late years the trade between the two countries, for the reasons I have cited, has been reduced to an annual average of less than 8 per cent of their foreign exchanges. In 1883 we furnished 6 per cent of their imports and took 5 per cent of their exports. In 1893 we furnished 8 per cent of their imports, and took only 4 per cent of their exports, while England, Germany, and France have shared their markets.

In a recent communication to the newspapers, Dr. Zeballos, the able statesman who now represents the Argentine Republic at this capital, says:

The Argentine Republic might purchase from 25 to 30 per cent of its considerable gross importations from the United States, but is deterred from doing so by lack of rapid communication, general commercial relations, and want of banking facilities. On this account it is that in general the commerce between the Argentine Republic and the United States is carried on via England. Therefore, when Argentine trade buys the products of North America, the ships that carry it do not get return cargoes, because the American trade does not take Argentine articles. The navigation, therefore, between the two countries must go out of its natural course.

In a single Argentine State, that of Santa Fe, at the last wheat harvest, December, 1893, to February, 1894, there were in use 1,300 thrashing machines from the United States. The taking off of the tariff upon the importation of foreign wools, which is provided for by the new American tariff bill, will soon make up for the sacrifice which it imposes upon the producers by the great and immediate advantages which the general economy of the United States will gain by the opening of one of the greatest kinds of industries. The trade of the Argentine Republic is constantly sought by all the manufacturing nations of Europe, because it is one of the growing countries of the age, which consumes more in proportion to the number of its inhabitants than any other, and this consumption is growing each year by the extraordinary increase of its population and by reason of its European immigration.

The population of the Argentine Republic has increased from 1,877,490 in 1869 to 5,124,300 in 1893. The cultivated area during that period has increased in a corresponding ratio. In 1878 but 31,243 tons of wheat were exported; in 1892 the exports were 1,395,294 tons. In 1878 the exports of corn were 193,996 tons; in 1892, 1,814,024 tons. During the last ten years the sheep have increased from seventy to one hundred millions; the cattle from sixteen to twenty-five millions, the horses from three to five millions, and the hogs from a nominal amount to three millions.

The immigrants arriving in 1883 were 73,210; in 1892 they were 385,554.

MAGNITUDE OF THE ARGENTINE FOREIGN TRADE.

The following table will show the magnitude of the foreign commerce of this remarkable nation:

Year.	Imports.	Exports.	Year.	Imports.	Exports.
1873.....	\$73,434,033	\$47,398,291	1884.....	\$94,056,144	\$68,029,636
1874.....	57,826,549	44,541,536	1885.....	92,221,969	83,879,100
1875.....	57,626,481	52,009,713	1886.....	95,406,745	69,894,841
1876.....	36,070,033	48,060,713	1887.....	117,352,125	84,421,893
1877.....	49,445,424	44,709,944	1888.....	128,412,110	100,111,900
1878.....	42,759,125	37,523,771	1889.....	164,569,894	90,145,535
1879.....	48,393,593	49,357,558	1890.....	142,240,812	100,818,993
1880.....	45,535,880	58,380,787	1891.....	67,207,780	99,723,221
1881.....	55,705,927	57,938,272	1892.....	91,481,163	113,870,337
1882.....	61,246,045	60,388,939			
1883.....	80,435,828	60,207,976	Total.....	1,600,425,645	1,370,942,396

CHARACTER OF THE PRINCIPAL IMPORTS.

The following statement will show the character of the principal imports, and the amount of each for the year 1892:

Live cattle	3885, 315
Paste substances, food	12, 683, 560
Wines and liquors	6, 040, 155
Tobacco	622, 039
Cottons	30, 618, 336
Ready-made clothing and furnishings	4, 302, 824
Chemicals and pharmaceutical productions	4, 026, 640
Lumber and its appliances	3, 712, 355
Paper and its appliances	2, 687, 956
Leather and its appliances	622, 112
Iron and its appliances	10, 339, 363
Construction materials	3, 545, 635
Metals and their appliances	1, 140, 753
Earthenware, glassware, and ceramic products	1, 618, 790
Fuel and lighting appliances	6, 095, 642
Manufactured articles	3, 000, 013

THE SHARE OF EACH NATION.

The following statement will show the share of imports furnished by each nation in 1893 compared with 1883:

	1883.	1893.
Germany	\$7, 028, 051	\$10, 676, 513
Belgium	3, 261, 077	6, 646, 838
Spain	3, 790, 760	2, 179, 259
United States	4, 933, 054	7, 376, 583
France*	15, 418, 917	10, 425, 865
Italy	3, 480, 321	8, 412, 941
England	30, 695, 963	35, 835, 492

* The French importation in 1889 was \$30,237,407. The year 1892 must be considered an exceptional one.

The railway system of the Republic now aggregates about 10,000 miles, which has been constructed at a cost of \$447,999,477.

The country has recently passed through a very serious financial depression, similar to that suffered by the United States in 1873, and due to similar causes—extravagance, speculation, and excessive enterprise. But its magnificent resources and the energy of its citizens are enabling it to recover its normal condition, and there is no land on earth which has greater promise for the future or a more solid foundation for national wealth and permanent prosperity.

ARGENTINE PRODUCTS, 1892.

The value of Argentine products in 1893 and the surplus for exportation were as follows:

	Exportation.	
	Product.	Gold.
Grain	\$54, 800, 000	\$24, 400, 000
Sundries	32, 200, 000	2, 400, 000
Total agricultural	87, 000, 000	26, 800, 000
Wool	35, 000, 000	34, 000, 000
Meat	21, 600, 000	9, 000, 000
Hides and skins	24, 000, 000	21, 000, 000
Tallow	4, 800, 000	4, 000, 000
Sundries	19, 600, 000	7, 200, 000
Total pastoral	105, 000, 000	75, 200, 000
Grand total	192, 000, 000	102, 000, 000

Col. Howard Vincent, M. P., who has recently made a journey through South America, was given a formal reception by the people of Sheffield, England, on his return, and in the course of his response to the address of welcome referred to the Argentine Republic as follows:

I have told you before of the vast prairies of Canada, of the great sheep farms of Australia. But I must honestly say that country for country, land for land, Argentina knows no rival. Over an area ten times the size of these islands, there is untold power of food production. For 600 miles from ocean to mountain there is not a hill, hardly a tree. Over these great grass plains range 22,000,000 of cattle, 75,000,000 of sheep, 4,000,000 of horses, all capable of transport hither at trifling cost, dead or alive. There are twenty-seven railways, nearly all British owned, and rapidly on both sides of the track grass lands are being laid down in wheat, garnered without fear of frost or wet, and poured down the wharves of the Central Argentina into ships to render British agriculture more and more difficult.

By the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty similar to that which now exists with Brazil, we might gain a fair share of the trade of the Argentine Republic, and as the distinguished minister from that country suggests, increase our exports from four millions to twenty-five or thirty million dollars annually. But if we place wool on the free list without asking any return, that opportunity will be lost forever.

POSSIBILITIES OF TRADE WITH URUGUAY.

The Republic of Uruguay resembles in every respect its greater neighbor across the Rio de la Plata. Its products, its industries, its condition, and its resources are similar, and its foreign commerce is even larger per capita of population. By the latest census, taken in 1888, there were 648,299, and at present there are probably 800,000 people in the Republic engaged almost exclusively in agricultural and pastoral pursuits.

The imports of Uruguay average about \$30,000,000 and the exports are usually valued about the same sum. They consist almost entirely of manufactured merchandise and include everything that enters into the consumption of a highly civilized country. Great Britain furnishes about 30 per cent, France and Germany about 15 per cent, and the United States only about 5 or 6 per cent annually. We send them little but lumber, petroleum, iron and steel, and agricultural implements. Their wearing apparel, their hardware, china, cutlery, machinery, and other goods are furnished by England and Germany and their luxuries by France.

The staple export of the country is wool, of which the greater part goes to Europe, and very little but their hides is sent here. The other exports are salted meat, tasajo, preserved meat, extracts of meat, tallow, horns, bones, hides, preserved and dried tongues, ostrich feathers, live stock, corn, flour, wheat, canary seed, hay, oats, bran, barley, flax, vermicelli, potatoes, stone, lime, granite, pavements, agate stone, etc.

The following table gives an idea of the exports and imports of the Republic from the year 1862 to the year 1891:

Years.	Imports.	Exports.	Total.
1862	\$8, 151, 862	\$8, 804, 442	\$16, 956, 304
1864	8, 384, 167	6, 334, 706	14, 718, 873
1865	14, 608, 091	10, 065, 040	24, 673, 131
1867	17, 657, 918	12, 077, 795	29, 735, 713
1868	16, 102, 475	12, 139, 720	28, 242, 195
1869	16, 830, 678	13, 930, 027	30, 760, 705
1870	15, 003, 342	12, 779, 051	27, 782, 393
1871	14, 864, 247	13, 334, 224	28, 198, 471
1872	18, 859, 724	15, 489, 532	34, 349, 256
1873	21, 075, 446	16, 301, 772	37, 377, 218
1874	17, 181, 672	15, 244, 783	32, 426, 455
1875	12, 431, 408	12, 095, 610	24, 527, 018
1876	12, 800, 000	13, 727, 000	26, 527, 000
1877	15, 045, 846	15, 899, 405	30, 945, 251
1878	15, 927, 974	17, 492, 159	33, 420, 133
1879	15, 949, 903	16, 645, 961	32, 595, 864
1880	19, 478, 888	19, 752, 201	39, 231, 089
1881	17, 918, 884	20, 229, 512	38, 148, 396
1882	18, 174, 800	22, 062, 934	40, 237, 734
1883	20, 322, 311	25, 221, 064	45, 543, 375
1884	24, 550, 074	24, 759, 485	49, 309, 559
1885	25, 275, 476	25, 253, 036	50, 528, 512
1886	20, 194, 655	23, 811, 986	44, 006, 641
1887	24, 615, 944	18, 671, 966	43, 287, 910
1888	29, 477, 448	28, 008, 254	57, 485, 702
1889	36, 823, 863	25, 954, 107	62, 777, 970
1890	32, 264, 627	20, 085, 519	52, 350, 146
1891	18, 978, 420	25, 998, 270	44, 976, 690

The participation every country had in the imports and exports of the country during the last five years is represented by the following figures:

From—	Imports.				
	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.
England	27.26	32.32	28.44	27.17	28.85
France	15.71	15.37	14.98	15.74	13.05
Brazil	7.42	8.06	6.80	7.64	8.88
Spain	8.73	7.49	7.10	6.71	2.63
Italy	6.89	8.14	8.86	8.12	10.31
United States	6.91	5.37	9.26	7.55	4.89
Germany	11.53	10.32	9.32	8.67	9.72
Belgium	4.86	5.41	4.42	4.59	3.85
Isle of Cuba	0.88	0.64	0.51	0.60	1.10
Argentine Republic	1.80	2.58	3.93	8.16	8.31
Chile	0.39	0.40	2.38	0.86	0.67
Holland	0.26	0.09	0.29	0.29	0.09
Paraguay	0.61	0.44	0.23	0.40	0.51
Sweden	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.13	0.13
Portugal	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.13	0.13
India	0.03	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
China	0.03	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
Japan	0.03	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
Peru and Ecuador	0.03	0.07	0.01	0.03	0.03
Switzerland	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03
Mauritius	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Austria	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Canary Island	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Russia	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Various ports	5.42	2.28	2.77	3.17	3.17
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Exports.

To—	1887.	1888.	1889.	1890.	1891.
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
England.....	20.09	18.17	13.69	13.56	18.37
France.....	13.29	16.27	20.13	21.04	23.27
Brazil.....	13.67	19.39	12.69	11.27	17.55
Belgium.....	17.95	12.25	15.84	10.80	13.25
United States.....	8.16	8.31	5.55	6.89	6.85
Cuba.....	5.12	2.22	0.96	0.81	1.29
Spain.....	0.82	0.82	1.41	0.83	0.84
Italy.....	1.69	1.32	1.47	1.23	2.08
Germany.....	1.72	4.44	5.01	3.51	5.45
Argentine Republic.....	6.00	7.34	8.82	8.77	9.16
Chile.....	0.76	1.39	1.66	1.22	0.62
Paraguay.....	0.03		0.03	0.11	
Reunion Island.....	0.08	0.11	0.02		
Peru.....	0.03	0.04			
Portugal.....	0.79	1.04	0.77	1.15	0.68
Maloina Island.....		0.06	0.01		
Canary Island.....					0.01
Mauritius.....				0.20	0.04
Carrabee Island.....				0.02	0.08
Barbado Island.....	0.03		0.01	0.01	0.01
various ports.....	7.67	6.83	11.93	18.58	0.45
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100

The trade and exterior commerce of the Republic in relation with its population has always been superior to that of the Argentine Republic and Chile.

The following table shows that out of the imported goods during the year 1891, there correspond to each inhabitant \$13.50 more than to each inhabitant of the Argentine Republic, and \$3.61 more than to each inhabitant of Chile. It shows also that each inhabitant exported \$10.19 more than each inhabitant of the first country, and \$14 more than each one of the second country:

	Value.	Per capita.
<i>Argentine Republic (1891).*</i>		
Imports.....	\$67,207,780	\$11.80
Exports.....	103,219,000	25.80
Total.....	170,426,790	37.66
<i>Chile (1891).†</i>		
Imports.....	65,090,013	21.69
Exports.....	65,963,100	21.99
Total.....	131,053,113	43.68
<i>Uruguay Republic (1891).‡</i>		
Imports.....	18,978,430	25.30
Exports.....	26,998,270	35.99
Total.....	45,976,690	61.29

*4,000,000 inhabitants. †3,000,000 inhabitants. ‡750,000 inhabitants.

Exports of domestic merchandise from the United States to Uruguay during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

Agricultural implements.....	\$102,862
Breadstuffs.....	3,254
Carriages, horse cars and parts of, and cars for steam railroads.....	197
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines.....	32,586
Cotton, manufactures of.....	120,121
Flax, hemp, and jute, manufactures of.....	37,275
Iron and steel, and manufactures of.....	32,956
Machinery, not elsewhere specified.....	2,569
Sewing machines, and parts of.....	34,226
All other.....	57,848
Naval stores.....	232,090
Oils, mineral, illuminating, and other.....	23,632
Provisions, comprising meat and dairy products.....	8,256
Tobacco, leaf.....	74,161
Wood, and manufactures of.....	41,464
Boards, deals, planks, joists, and scantlings.....	695
All other lumber.....	7,665
Timber.....	3,8287
Manufactures of.....	
All other articles.....	
Total domestic merchandise.....	902,144

No attempt has ever been made to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with Uruguay, but the Government and the people are very friendly in their disposition to the United States, and it might be possible to obtain valuable concessions in favor of our products if we would offer them an increased market for their wool.

THE COMMERCE OF CHILE.

Chile has been for years the most prosperous country in South America. Its chief resources and products are mineral, and have brought the people great wealth. The agricultural resources are limited, but have been highly improved, and for several years the wheat fields among the valleys of the Andes have furnished more flour than was necessary for the wants of the peo-

ple, and left a considerable surplus for export to the neighboring countries along the Pacific coast. But the rapid increase of population, and the more profitable inducements offered by the mines, have reduced the supply for export, and Chile will soon find it necessary to seek food products from the harvest fields of the Argentine Republic across the Andes.

The population of the country was 2,665,926 by an official census, but its accuracy has been denied, as many peons avoided enumeration for the purpose of escaping military duty, and the actual number of the people is believed to be nearer three millions.

The chief exports are copper, silver, nitrates, and wool. The deposits of copper are believed to be inexhaustible, but the development of the mines is rapid, and has been profitable. The nitrate beds are also inexhaustible, and from an export tax upon this product the Government derives the greater portion of its revenue.

The exports average annually about \$65,000,000, of which \$55,000,000 are minerals, nitrates, copper, and silver, and \$7,500,000 wool. The imports are usually about the same as the exports, and consist mainly of manufactured articles, wearing apparel, machinery, hardware, railway supplies, wines, and tobacco, drugs and medicines, etc. England has the greatest share of the trade, having furnished \$28,000,000 or about 45 per cent last year; Germany comes next with \$14,000,000; France \$9,000,000, while the United States usually sends between three and four millions worth of machinery and agricultural implements, lumber and furniture, petroleum, and sundry other articles.

Valparaiso is the commercial center from which a large portion of the merchandise imported is distributed to the ports on the coast and the towns in the interior. The principal British imports are: Printed, white and unbleached cotton goods; woolen manufactures, carpets, candles, tea, boots and shoes, beer, spirits, etc. The total value of the imports of the Republic for the year 1892 was \$61,752,500, as compared with \$50,417,000 in 1891, and with \$53,745,500 in 1890.

The total value of the exports from all ports in the Republic in 1892 was \$50,829,000, as compared with \$52,013,930 in 1891, and \$54,143,185 in 1890. These figures show that there was an excess of imports over exports in 1892 to the amount of \$10,923,500, as compared with an excess in favor of exports amounting to \$1,596,930 in 1891, and \$397,685 in 1890.

Export of domestic merchandise from the United States to Chile during the fiscal year 1893.

Agricultural implements.....	\$138,822
Books, maps, engravings, etc., and other printed matter.....	32,525
Breadstuffs.....	113,416
Carriages and horse cars and parts of.....	39,547
Cars, passenger and freight, for steam railroads.....	30,000
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines.....	109,836
Clocks and watches.....	23,054
Cotton, manufactures of.....	499,820
Fish.....	41,597
Flax, hemp, and jute, manufactures of.....	13,053
Glass and glassware.....	19,094
Gunpowder and other explosives.....	21,899
Instruments and apparatus for scientific purposes.....	61,639
Iron and steel, and manufactures of.....	636,592
Sewing machines and parts of.....	19,842
Steam engines and parts of.....	66,835
Naval stores.....	36,020
Oils, animal and mineral.....	235,519
Plated ware.....	40,765
Provisions, comprising meat and dairy products.....	43,371
Sugar, refined.....	20,325
Wood, and manufactures of.....	500,515
All other articles.....	228,665
Total exports of domestic merchandise.....	2,971,341

A POSSIBLE TREATY WITH AUSTRALASIA.

As far back as 1878 the British colonies of Australasia have been seeking commercial intimacy with the United States. In that year the chambers of commerce of Australia and New Zealand addressed a memorial to the Government of the United States, which in many respects is a most remarkable document, coming as it did from the subjects of another nation, with whom our own citizens had not intermingled to any degree, and from whom they could have received no inspiration or encouragement. It was a voluntary act on the part of a people who were then enjoying very much the same conditions that existed in the American colonies of Great Britain at the outbreak of the Revolutionary war.

This document is so peculiar, so significant, and so important that I may be pardoned for quoting a few extracts. The memorial was suggested by the experience of Australian visitors to the Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia, and it reads:

Australian visitors were encouraged to hope that similar progress might await their own country, and they anticipated intimate and increasing commercial relations between the two countries, to their national advantage; but, to insure this result, they were impressed with the absolute necessity for the same unrestricted mutual interchange of products of the respective countries as now exists betwixt the Australasian colonies and the mother country; and certainly, without such unrestricted interchange, it is impossible commerce can attain its full development. * * *

Trade can not attain its natural development unless it is conducted on a basis mutually satisfactory to the countries engaged in it, and it can not be mutually satisfactory if one of the countries finds its products excluded from the markets of the other. As we desire free, cordial, and extending commercial relations betwixt our respective countries, we venture to ask your cooperation in getting removed the restrictions on the introduction of our staple article—wool—into your market, believing that the repeal of the duties, which are now so heavy as to be virtually prohibitory, will prove of as much advantage to American interests as to those of the colonies. * * *

You are, no doubt, aware that our products are chiefly pastoral and mineral, and that only to a small extent do manufactories exist amongst us. While our population can employ themselves profitably in developing the natural resources of the country, there is little inducement to them to devote their attention to manufacturing; but if their products are excluded from other markets they must, perforce, manufacture for themselves and limit the import of manufactured goods. Whether this be so or not, we hope you will agree with us that the interests of both countries will be best advanced by abolishing every obstacle to free commercial relations; and we appeal to you, as peculiarly interested in promoting the commerce of the United States, and intimately conversant with it in all its relations, to give us your cordial assistance and cooperation to this end.

WHAT THEY WILL GIVE IN EXCHANGE FOR FREE WOOL.

This memorial was brought to the attention of Congress, but no action was taken upon it, and no reply was made, for the reason that it was deemed inexpedient at that time to remove the duties imposed upon imported wool. The same people have made similar advances since, repeatedly, and four years ago, when the reciprocity policy was under consideration, this Government was again approached with the hope that we might be willing to make an equitable exchange of concessions for the purpose of promoting trade between the Australasian colonies and the United States, but the disposition of Congress was not favorable to the removal or any reduction of the tariff on wool. But now that it is proposed to place wool upon the free list, it would not be unfriendly or unprofitable to offer the Australians an opportunity to make some concessions in favor of the agricultural and manufactured products of the United States, which I am advised would be received in the most cordial spirit, and result in consummation of a treaty that would extend our markets in a most profitable manner, and afford an opportunity for our manufacturers to dispose of a great portion of their surplus.

The Australasian colonies represent a population of 4,285,297 souls, engaged almost exclusively in pastoral pursuits, without manufacturing facilities. They possess great wealth, which has rapidly accumulated, and live in all the luxury that modern taste demands. The people are almost exclusively white, descended from English, Scotch, and Irish ancestry, and their requirements are similar to those of the people of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. There are seven colonies, and the following table shows their population and their foreign commerce according to the latest figures attainable:

Colonies.	Population.	1891.	
		Imports.	Exports.
New South Wales.....	132,234	£25,383,397	£25,944,020
New Zealand.....	626,658	5,503,849	9,566,397
Queensland.....	393,718	5,079,004	8,305,387
South Australia.....	320,431	9,956,542	10,512,049
Tasmania.....	146,667	2,051,964	1,440,418
Victoria.....	1,140,405	21,711,608	16,006,743
West Australia.....	49,782	1,280,093	799,466

VALUE OF THE AUSTRALASIAN COMMERCE.

The imports of New South Wales for 1891, the latest year available, were divided as follows: Great Britain, £10,580,230; the other Australasian colonies, £6,803,974; the United States, £1,277,032; other foreign countries, £1,632,001. The imports of New Zealand were divided as follows: England, £4,369,633; other Australasian colonies, £1,013,549; the United States, £361,795. The balance was from India, China, Japan.

The commerce of Queensland was divided about like that of the other colonies. Only about 5 per cent of the trade of South Australia is with foreign countries, the remainder is with Great Britain and the other Australian colonies. Tasmania had no imports except from Great Britain and other Australasian colonies. Of the imports into Victoria, £8,953,599 were from Great Britain; £785,602 from the United States. The principal articles of import were coal, cotton, woolen, and silk goods, wearing apparel, iron and steel, live stock, sugar and molasses, lumber, furniture, and household goods, hardware and cutlery, machinery, stationery, oil, railway supplies, and agricultural implements, all of which with be furnished by the United States. Great Britain furnished nearly all the imports into West Australia.

Taking the colony of New South Wales as an example of the seven, the statistics of commerce show a wonderful expansion. In 1871 the imports were \$48,045,000, the exports \$56,225,000, an aggregate commerce of \$104,270,000. Since then it has increased more than 150 per cent. In no other country in the world containing a population of about 1,000,000, or in any more populous

country, is commerce to be found so large, or proportionately so large. The commerce "per head" is several times as large as that of the United States, and if we cut off that portion of the New South Wales trade which is transacted with the other colonies, the statement is still true, though in a lesser degree.

The aggregate imports and exports of New South Wales in 1891 were fifty-one and a quarter million pounds sterling, of which twenty-two and three-quarter millions represented trade with Australasia, and twenty-eight and a half millions outside Australasia, the total imports being twenty-five and a quarter millions, and the total exports twenty-six millions. Naturally, the largest commerce is with Great Britain, but there is already a considerable trade with the United States.

So eager have the people been to promote their trade with us, that for the last twelve or fifteen years two of the Governments have paid an annual subsidy to an American steamship line to maintain communication between Sidney and other ports and San Francisco, although this Government has given that line no aid.

EXPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES TO THE AUSTRALASIAN COLONIES.

The following table shows the exports from the United States to the Australasian colonies during the last fiscal year:

Agricultural implements.....	\$294,429
Books, maps, engraving, etc.....	63,987
Breadstuffs:	
Barley.....	65
Wheat.....	2,100
Wheat flour.....	4,712
All other.....	37,988
Carriages, horse cars, and cars for steam railroads.....	258,479
Casings for sausages.....	95,020
Chemicals, dyes, and medicines.....	294,534
Clocks and watches, and parts of.....	85,369
Cotton, manufactures of.....	80,629
Fish:	
Canned salmon.....	170,428
All other.....	74,426
Fruits, including nuts.....	117,548
Glass and glassware.....	67,886
Gunpowder and other explosives.....	51,804
India-rubber and gutta-percha, manufactures of.....	34,236
Iron and steel, and manufactures of:	
Machinery.....	280,551
Saws and tools.....	258,056
Sewing machines, and parts of.....	73,174
Wire.....	47,443
All other.....	640,960
Lamps, chandeliers, etc.....	106,695
Leather, and manufactures of.....	208,220
Malt liquors, in bottles.....	3,579
Marble and stone, and manufactures of:	
Roofing slate.....	30,362
All other.....	37,233
Musical instruments, organs.....	39,973
Naval stores.....	112,417
Oils:	
Animal.....	16,785
Mineral, refined.....	1,058,586
Paper, and manufactures of.....	353,280
Plated ware.....	24,406
Provisions, comprising meat and dairy products:	
Beef, canned.....	65,388
All other.....	30,062
Stationery, except of paper.....	34,152
Tobacco:	
Unmanufactured.....	225,613
Manufactures of.....	1,075,881
Wood, and manufactures of:	
Boards, deals, and planks.....	366,139
Timber, sawed.....	31,437
Other lumber and timber.....	37,732
Manufactures of wood.....	230,940
All other articles.....	631,309
Total domestic merchandise.....	7,818,130

An examination of this table will show the extent and the character of the market that may be secured for the manufactures of the United States by extending the reciprocity policy to the Australasian colonies. But the pending bill, if it becomes a law, rejects and abandons that opportunity forever. It is not reasonable to expect that they will discriminate in their tariff laws, against their own mother country unless they have some inducement to do so, and that inducement is removed if wool is placed upon the free list without asking concessions in return.

Total exports of merchandise from Great Britain to Australasia.

	1890.	1891.	1892.
West Australia.....	£513,024	£266,288	£590,348
South Australia.....	2,252,689	2,620,158	1,907,130
Victoria.....	7,971,795	8,180,814	5,375,748
New South Wales.....	8,035,198	9,872,187	7,258,701
Queensland.....	2,826,460	2,423,585	1,977,081
Tasmania.....	651,539	697,217	513,514
New Zealand.....	3,705,428	3,778,394	3,884,829
Fiji Islands.....	14,061	24,267	20,577
Total.....	25,470,194	28,256,120	21,523,228

Total imports into United Kingdom from Australasia.

	1890.	1891.	1892.
West Australia	£530,591	£367,552	£249,965
South Australia	2,937,873	3,761,890	2,986,882
Victoria	5,968,062	5,612,129	5,974,418
New South Wales	8,791,239	10,187,746	9,932,716
Queensland	2,417,937	2,734,886	3,251,531
Tasmania	345,883	404,769	395,356
New Zealand	8,347,430	8,192,594	7,751,741
Fiji Islands	11,229	5	21
Total	29,350,844	31,231,571	30,542,030

COMMERCIAL RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

No government ever throw away a greater opportunity to promote its foreign trade and secure commercial advantages for its citizens than is being sacrificed by the pending bill. Not only are the reciprocity treaties that were made by the last Administration to be absolutely and peremptorily revoked without consulting the rights and wishes of the other parties to the agreements, but the duties upon a long list of imported merchandise are to be removed and reduced without even giving the countries which will enjoy the benefits a chance to offer us some concessions in return.

The Canadian Government has for years been trying to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States in order to secure a better market for her agricultural products. A commission came two years ago from Ottawa to confer with Mr. Blaine on this subject, and made some liberal offers as a basis for such an arrangement, but Mr. Blaine was compelled to inform them that under the McKinley law his authority was limited and that he could not promise to yield anything except the duties upon sugar, hides, rubber, coffee, and other tropical products, which, of course, had no interest for the Canadians. Nor was he willing to make a general commercial treaty, because he did not believe that the Senate would ratify any measure that permitted Nova Scotia's coal and lumber and Canadian hay, grain, poultry, vegetables, cheese, and other farm products to come over the border in direct competition with those raised in New England, New York, and the Northwestern States.

The Canadians were willing to offer almost anything to secure a market for their surplus "garden truck." They promised to reduce the tariff upon our cotton and woolen goods and other fabrics, our hardware and cutlery, and admit these and other manufactured articles at rates of duty that similar merchandise from Great Britain, their mother country, could not enjoy, so that the American manufacturers might almost monopolize the markets of between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 people. But while Mr. Blaine was himself in favor of making that sort of a trade, and believed that it would result in the greatest good to the greatest number, he was firm in his conviction that the negotiation of such a treaty would be useless, because the two-thirds of the Senators necessary for its ratification would never agree to remove the protective duty upon the New England hay and potatoes, the Vermont horses, the New York butter and cheese, the lumber of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Washington, and the wheat and barley of Minnesota, and Dakota.

WHAT THIS BILL GIVES TO THE CANADIAN FARMER.

But now the pending bill gives to the Canadian farmer, lumberman, and fisherman nearly everything their government sought for them two years ago, free of all conditions, and without demanding or expecting in return any of the concessions that the Dominion authorities were offering so freely and would still be so willing to give. In other words, the magnificent advantages that might be secured for our manufacturers in Canadian markets are simply thrown away. It is not strange that a Dominion paper said of the new tariff bill that "it could not have been better for the Canadian trade if it had been prepared in Ottawa instead of Washington."

The pending bill permits Canadian milk, fruits, beans, pease, bacon, beef, mutton, pork, lard, hams, fresh fish and fish for bait, sawed timber, logs, lumber, laths, shingles, staves, and all other kinds of lumber, plants, trees, vines, shrubs, salt, agricultural implements of all kinds, wool, buckwheat, corn, cornmeal, oats, rye, wheat, and wheat flour to come over the border entirely free of duty. It reduces the duties on potatoes, butter, cheese, poultry, barley, eggs, apples, and other articles to a rate which will permit the Canadian farmers to come into the markets of the United States and compete with our own.

There is immense rejoicing all over Canada because of this remarkable and unexpected generosity on the part of the United States. The Government organs are trying to repress this en-

thusiasm lest its significance may be realized by the American Congressmen and suggest to them what advantages are being thrown away, but they are so important to the commercial prosperity of Canada that if a clause should be added to the Wilson bill providing that these changes in our tariff shall not take place unless equivalent concessions are made in favor of our products there would be an agent of the Dominion government in Washington ready to sign an agreement in forty-eight hours.

SACRIFICE OF THE AMERICAN FISHING INTERESTS.

But the most important and improvident sacrifice of American interests made in the bill is the clause admitting fresh fish free of duty; and that will bring disaster upon the fishing fleets not only upon the Atlantic coast, but from one end of the Great Lakes to the other. For years the United States has been fighting to protect its fishermen. That was one of the issues involved in the war of 1812, and our ablest diplomacy has been engaged in the contest for the rights and privileges guaranteed them under our treaties with England. But by the Wilson bill the whole case is thrown away. Every inducement that we have had to persuade the Canadians to give our fishermen a show, every advantage that we have had over them is surrendered by the Wilson bill. The process of freezing fish in solid cakes of ice has caused the old methods of preserving them with salt to be abandoned, so that nothing but fresh fish now come to market.

Canada has persistently refused to permit our fishermen to enter her ports, even to buy bait of her own people, without having first paid a heavy license. She has prohibited them from landing in her harbors and shipping their fish across her territory in bond to the United States. She has done everything possible to prevent our fishermen from enjoying the use of neutral waters and to destroy their trade, and yet, in the light of all this, we throw open our ports to the Canadian fisherman, who can come and sell his fish in our markets just as freely as our own fishermen and just as freely as he can sell them at home.

With one-half of these concessions we could have secured from Canada entire freedom from all discrimination, and the same rights for our fishermen in her ports that her fishermen are to be given in ours. She would have been delighted to give them, for it would have been exchanging the market of 5,000,000 for the market of 65,000,000 people.

WHY NOT COMPLETE RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA?

All trade arrangements which have been made with Canada in past years—the reciprocity treaty of 1854 and subsequent attempts of a similar character—included only agricultural products which offered no advantages to us. Canada is an agricultural country, even more so than this, but its market for manufactured goods is of great value, and an arrangement of complete reciprocity would be of a decided advantage.

If in one hundred millions of imports purchased by Canada each year, the United States were able to furnish forty-five millions in that market in spite of the duties imposed upon them, competing with the English, who sold goods of nearly similar value, how much greater share of this trade would our people enjoy if they could send their merchandise into Canada as freely as they now do from one State to another, while the English manufacturers and merchants would have to submit to the tariff when they landed, amounting to from 25 to 40 per cent? But, Mr. President, the people of the United States should never permit any more one-sided arrangements under which we admit their products free while ours are taxed in their custom-houses. And the improvident policy of the pending bill will allow the Canadians to enjoy our markets while our manufacturers are practically excluded from theirs.

There is a paragraph in this bill which provides that all farm implements imported from any country which lays an import duty upon similar articles from the United States shall be subject to the duty existing prior to the passage of this act. That means Canada, and the proviso was inserted at the suggestion of the manufacturers of agricultural machinery. It would be a great benefit to all the farmers and manufacturers of the United States if that provision could be extended so as to cover all the schedules of the pending bill. It will be time enough to talk of free lumber, free salt, free fish, and free vegetables when Canada removes the duties she imposes upon those articles.

TENDENCY OF THE CANADIAN TRADE.

The laws of nature and the laws of trade require Canada to come to the markets of the United States to purchase what she requires and to sell what she has to dispose of, and in spite of the tremendous influences exercised by the officials and commercial organizations of England, in spite of the enormous amount of English capital invested in the Dominion, in spite of the

restraint that is placed upon the people by the Government, and in spite of the heavy duties they levy upon our products, nearly half of their trade is with us. Their exports usually reach the sum of \$100,000,000.

Of this Great Britain takes about one-half, the United States about 40 per cent, the West Indies 3 per cent, and the balance is divided between other countries in Europe. The imports, by the last returns, amounted to \$113,000,000. Of this the United States furnished \$55,000,000, Great Britain \$42,000,000, Germany \$3,000,000, France \$2,000,000, and so on. Can there be any question that, this market before us, it would be to the interest of our people to have free admission there for the sale of their goods in exchange for what we are now giving Canada without any consideration?

The price of labor in Canada is somewhat lower than in the United States, particularly in British Columbia, where Chinamen are employed to a considerable extent in the manufacture of lumber and in other industries, and it is said that our farmers and manufacturers might suffer by bringing the results of such labor into competition with our own, but that seems to me, sir, all the more reason why, if Congress proposes to remove our duties upon imports from Canada, that we should require something from them in return.

But as a matter of fact that population of Canada is small; the people are widely scattered; the capital is scarce; enterprise is not encouraged as it is in the United States; labor is not so well paid; the people are not so highly educated, and there has not been that steady prosperous growth that we have witnessed in our own agricultural districts, and if a commercial treaty on reciprocal concessions should be negotiated between Canada and the United States and bring greater degree of prosperity to our neighbors, it would have a direct result upon the extension of our commerce, and the ended and enlarged sales of our merchandise, as the prosperity of our Western farmers has enhanced the wealth of the manufacturers of the East. The opening of the great agricultural regions of Canada and the profitable market for their products will widen our market and give new regions for American enterprise and energy to conquer.

ENGLAND MUST CONSENT TO A TREATY.

There is no question that England will consent to any commercial arrangement that may be negotiated between the United States and Canada, although she will do it reluctantly, as she did in the case of her colonies in the West Indies. In 1874, when a reciprocity treaty was being negotiated by Sir Edward Thornton at Washington, the English Government instructed him to modify it at the suggestion of the Canadian ministry and make such additions as the Canadians desired. He did so, and made out a long list of articles manufactured in the United States which were to be received into Canada free of duty, so that it was practically free trade. Yet not one of those articles was to be received from England upon the same terms.

The draft of this treaty was sent to Lord Derby, who approved it, and the English Government established a valuable precedent by consenting to an arrangement under which American merchandise was admitted free to the British colony when a tariff from 25 to 50 per cent was imposed upon the same kind of merchandise coming from England. But even should the home government resist the proposition the reciprocity party in Canada is so strong and the desire for annexation to the United States is so eager that it would be compelled to make the concessions demanded rather than face a disappointed and resentful people.

Canada imposes a heavy duty upon the articles she received from the United States. She imposes a 35 per cent duty upon our agricultural implements, axes, popcorn, and other articles. She taxes coal 60 cents a ton; apples, 40 cents a barrel; barley, 15 cents a bushel; oats and rye, 10 cents; cornmeal, 40 cents a barrel; wheat flour, 75 cents a barrel; Indian corn, 7½ cents a bushel; eggs, 5 cents a dozen; hogs, 2 cents a pound; jams, jellies, and preserves, 5 cents a can; fresh fish, 1 cent a pound; salted fish, 50 cents a hundredweight; cheese, 3 cents a pound; cattle, sheep, and other animals, 30 per cent; vegetables 25 per cent; fruits and poultry 30 per cent; horses 20 per cent, and other articles that we are admitting free, at even higher rates.

Ever since the people of the United States achieved their independence, a hundred and eighteen years ago, there has been constant friction between them and their brethren across the northern border. It has always arisen from commercial jealousy and interference from one with the industrial pursuits of the other. My distinguished friend on the other side of the Chamber [Mr. MORGAN] has only recently returned from the performance of an honorable duty of adjusting one of the most serious and complicated of these differences, but I may suggest, Mr. President, that all further trouble can be avoided by a commercial arrangement with the colonies of the Dominion under

which the relations between these two people of the same blood and stock shall be as free as those between residents of our several States.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY AND ITS SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

The small share of New Orleans in the commerce between the United States and the Latin-American countries has always been the cause of surprise and comment. From the geographical situation of that city, in relation to the great producing and consuming section of the United States, as well as to the southern republics and colonies, one would suppose that the metropolis of the Gulf ought to command the greater part of both the export and the import trade. She lies only four days distant from the northern ports of Central and South America, less than one-half of the sailing time to New York, and enjoys communication by rail or water with every manufacturing and commercial center in the South and the West.

The distance from New York and Chicago, and New Orleans and Chicago is about the same; but the distance from Chicago to the isthmus, the great distributing point from the southern trade, via New Orleans, is only about half as great as via New York. Nevertheless, nine-tenths of the merchandise that is furnished by the Northwest to the Southern markets, both the agricultural and mechanical products, is shipped halfway across the continent by rail or lake to the Atlantic, and from New York southward, instead along the longitudinal line which nature has marked for man to follow.

The region tributary to New Orleans embraces over one-third of the total area of the United States, and furnishes 15,000 miles of navigable waters and is settled by nearly 30,000,000 people. It contains 70 per cent of the swine, nearly 60 per cent of the milch cows, 55 per cent of the cattle, and 40 per cent of the forest lands found in the entire country; producing, also, four-fifths of the corn and two-thirds of the wheat. The two crops mentioned are valued at \$800,000,000 annually, and the live stock has an average value of \$470,000,000.

The great cotton belt of the United States, in which is raised 3,500,000,000 pounds of raw material yearly, is naturally tributary to New Orleans, the chief outlet for the exports, amounting to 2,500,000,000 pounds, valued at \$250,000,000. Of late years, also the manufacture of cotton has taken a great leap in the Southern States, their mills, which now produce \$50,000,000 worth of goods annually, have trebled their capacity and the value of their products within a decade.

Ten years ago New England produced 70 per cent of the cotton goods, but the proportion is considerably less. Since 1880 the cotton mills of the South have increased from 180 to 230, and the spindles from 667,000 to 2,065,800, and the value of their products threefold.

ENORMOUS DEVELOPMENT IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY.

The coal fields of the Mississippi basin cover an area of 175,000 square miles, about one-fourth that of Mexico, and produce 85,000,000 tons of coal annually. In the Southern States iron and coal are generally found together in quantities, which fact is having too much to do with the astonishing increase of iron manufactures which has taken place in this section within the past decade. The Upper Lake region furnishes the Northern States with the bulk of the ore which they consume. In the production of pig iron Alabama now stands third in the United States; Illinois is fourth, Pennsylvania and Ohio first and second. Of the 9,500,000 tons produced throughout the country, the States of the Mississippi basin are credited with over 80 per cent.

In the manufacture of steel (including rails) Pennsylvania and Illinois alone produce four-fifths of the total output of 4,500,000 tons. Furthermore, the Mississippi basin is steadily advancing to supremacy formerly enjoyed by the more Eastern States as manufacturers.

Minneapolis is the greatest milling center in the world. Milwaukee, Chicago, and St. Louis are famous manufacturers. The breweries of Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis are the largest in the universe. Chicago is the grand center for the manufacture of machinery and agricultural implements. Michigan furniture has a world-wide fame.

Ten years ago of the \$5,300,000,000 which represented the total value of the country's manufactures, the Mississippi basin produced nearly two-thirds. The proportion now reaches 70 per cent. A decade ago it was producing three-fourths of the flour (valued at \$585,185,000), four-fifths of the agricultural implements and wagons (\$133,600,000), and about one-half of the malt liquor (\$101,000,000), while the lumber product (\$270,000,000) was a Northwestern and Southern monopoly. In 1890 these totals had been increased by fully 30 per cent, the country tributary to the Mississippi Valley earning three-fourths of the increase.

COMPARATIVE EXPORTS FROM THREE GREAT CITIES.

The following table will show a comparison of the exports to the southern countries from New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans:

Countries.	New York.	Philadel- phia.	New Orleans.
Cuba.....	\$19,791,282	\$1,669,383	\$212,127
Mexico.....	4,313,178	222,755	464,547
British Honduras.....	235,425	158,822
Central American States:			
Costa Rica.....	776,691	306,959
Guatemala.....	577,298	100,425
Honduras.....	256,580	135,206
Nicaragua.....	315,650	440,306
Salvador.....	476,880
South America:			
Argentine Republic.....	3,893,071
Bolivia.....	24,849
Brazil.....	8,525,608	1,113,008
Chile.....	2,208,969
Colombia.....	2,564,612	25,844	196,317
Guianas:			
British.....	1,659,556	13,888
Dutch.....	198,309
French.....
Peru.....	561,635
Uruguay.....	828,013
Venezuela.....	4,168,408	12,854
Ecuador.....	663,343

COMPARATIVE IMPORTS OF THREE GREAT CITIES.

The following table will show a comparison of the imports from the southern countries received at the ports of New York, Philadelphia, and New Orleans:

Countries.	New York.	Philadel- phia.	New Orleans.
Cuba.....	\$35,850,651	\$21,365,025	\$8,787,063
Mexico.....	13,551,423	271,106	2,644,099
British Honduras.....	28,500	121,407
Central American States:			
Costa Rica.....	1,856,560	10	128,759
Guatemala.....	1,130,196	100,425
Honduras.....	160,528	456,149
Nicaragua.....	494,575	560,837
Salvador.....	652,593
South America:			
Argentine Republic.....	1,941,940	117,128
Bolivia.....	5,476
Brazil.....	56,988,125	1,023,522	4,535,585
Chile.....	2,704,489	354,613
Colombia.....	3,030,884	43,488	359,359
Guianas:			
British.....	2,168,315	2,405,521
Dutch.....	373,557	217,973
French.....	9,315
Peru.....	802,622
Uruguay.....	984,032	26,678
Venezuela.....	3,595,749	100
Ecuador.....	822,824

THE CAUSE OF THE PHENOMENON.

This phenomenon is said to be due to the rigid quarantine regulations of New Orleans, which prohibit the entrance of steamers to the port from the southern countries during five or six months of the year without long and expensive delays. Several attempts have been made to secure modification of these regulations under a system of inspection at ports of departure, by which those vessels which bring clean bills of health from American inspectors may be able to land their cargoes without detention at quarantine, but the Louisiana State Board of Health declined to relax their rules even for the benefit of steamers that come from noninfected ports.

The Illinois Central and Southern Pacific Railways have been ready for several years to establish lines of steamships between New Orleans and the northern ports of Central and South America, provided such modifications could be secured, but have been compelled to abandon the projects, and let the trade go the other way.

THE TRADE OUGHT TO GO SOUTHWARD.

Two countries that draw a large proportion of their supplies from Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, Missouri, and Alabama, and which supply fully 50 per cent of the goods imported from Latin America to the same localities, there are several projects of great importance at present under consideration.

These are the railway across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, the completion of the railroad from Guatemala City to the Caribbean Sea, the Nicaragua Canal, and the completion of the railway across Costa Rica. Most of these projects are well under way toward completion, and it is not unlikely that the next year or two will see most of them completed. The successful building

of any one of these will mean the opening to the manufacturers of the Mississippi Valley of markets of the west coast of Mexico, Central America, and South America, which have been controlled for a great number of years by the merchants of Germany, Great Britain, France, and Italy, and while it would be too much to expect that all of its trade would be diverted to the United States upon the completion of one of these means of interoceanic transportation, at the same time the nearer the market the more possibility there is for the increase of business.

Under present conditions the west coast of South America is nearer commercially to Europe than it is to the markets of the United States, with the sole exception of the port of San Francisco. Lines of steamers are handling the freight from these ports around Cape Horn to Europe for less rates than are charged to bring these goods via the Isthmus of Panama to the United States. This state of affairs will be modified by the construction of any one of these means of communication, and a glance at the map will show that as a direct line from Chicago south will pass through Yucatan, Honduras, and Salvador, leaving to its eastward the Republics of Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and all of the west coast of South America, so the business of these countries eventually will reach its natural markets, the Mississippi Valley, and be distributed through the natural lines of transportation.

At the present time there are some 330 houses located in New York City engaged in commerce with the Latin-American countries. In New Orleans there are about 25 houses engaged in the same commerce with those countries. Taking into consideration the respective populations of the two cities it will be seen what the possibilities of increase of trade are in New Orleans and while the majority of the commission houses in New Orleans are not as powerful, as rich, nor do they do as large a business with the Latin-American countries, at the same time the probabilities seem to me far greater in favor of an increase in New Orleans with the whole Mississippi Valley to draw from than they are in the East.

Mr. President, this whole question of reciprocity broadens and deepens the more it is considered and discussed. The results of the adoption of this policy have, as I think I have shown, already been most gratifying and satisfactory, but slight as to what they may and will be under the direction of intelligent and permanent legislation and the impulse and guidance of wise and aggressive administration.

What has already taken place under this policy is but the forerunner of what must surely follow—the budding or blossom of a rich and abundant fruitage in the future.

Yet we are called upon to throw all to the winds, and with one fell swoop to destroy not only all that has been thus far accomplished, but to defer the hope of reëntering upon the same lines for a long time to come.

While other countries, and especially many of those to which we look for markets and trade, are adopting this policy among themselves as an advance in commerce and civilization, we are not only to abandon all but to place ourselves in an attitude where it can be recovered only under great difficulties.

This country, of all others, occupies the vantage ground in securing results growing from reciprocal relations with others. The phenomenal resources of the country, giving such great purchasing power and making us the largest consumers of and customers for the products, both in the way of luxuries and necessities, imported from other countries, places the key of the situation in the hands of our Government and enables it to almost absolutely dictate such terms as will secure for her people new and extended markets.

Yet it is now deliberately proposed to surrender this key and all the power that it represents.

Our free-trade friends, believing that there should be no restriction whatever placed upon commerce and trade with other countries, indulge in the illusive fallacy that the demand of European countries for our agricultural and food products is largely limited by the restrictions placed upon the importations of their manufactured goods.

In my judgment, there is absolutely nothing whatever in this proposition. Great Britain would not purchase a bushel of wheat, nor a barrel of flour, nor a pound of pork more from us if all tariff laws were stricken from our statutes. Great Britain buys whatever she requires where she can secure it at the lowest prices. The laws of commerce and trade are as rigid and unchangeable as "the laws of the Medes and Persians."

With the people of Great Britain, as other countries, it is not a matter of friendship, amity, or good neighborhood, but absolutely a cold-blooded business proposition. They take our wheat as against Russia, Austria-Hungary, India, or Australia, or other wheat-producing regions if they can secure it on better terms; and so with our pork, beef, butter, and cheese, and other products that we export so largely; and the same is true with Germany and France.

Germany for a long time refused to take our pork product upon the pretext that it was diseased, and continued to do so until they saw that its people were to be deprived of our market for their beet sugar. How long do you suppose that Germany will receive our pork under the present duties, with the duty on sugar restored by our Government? Who supposes for a moment that Germany will longer take our pork on present terms should the reciprocity provisions of the law of 1890 be repealed? Why, Mr. President, I learn that already a bill has been introduced into the German Reichstag, placing a heavy duty on our cotton-seed oil, large quantities of which we have been exporting to Germany without any restriction whatever. Our exports of cotton-seed oil in 1892 reached over a million of gallons, and in value about \$600,000.

Should the present treaty provisions with Germany remain intact, and the present law remain unrepealed, a remedy would be quickly found to relieve the exporters of cotton-seed oil to Germany.

France had hitherto placed a very high duty on wheat and flour, and other agricultural products, but in the very face of this proposed legislation, where the duties on many French importations are to be reduced, or still worse, put on the free list, the French Chamber of Deputies has recently increased the duty upon wheat exported into France from 5 to 7 francs per hectoliter, which will absolutely prevent the exportation of a bushel of wheat or a barrel of flour into France: showing again how absolutely idle is the claim that our foreign exportations are lessened on account of our tariff laws.

Even at the present time the French Government is so anxious to protect its own industries that it has placed a discriminating duty, as between flour and wheat, so that it is even now impossible to export a barrel of flour into France. Who for a moment supposes that in case the principle involved in the present reciprocity legislation is maintained our Government can not find a remedy for this discrimination against our agricultural products? Why should we not place restrictive duties on the wines, brandy, and silks, and the multitude of articles that we import from France until they accord to us fair play by the removal of restrictive duties on our agricultural products?

IN CONCLUSION.

Mr. President, I presume it is safe to assume that this remarkable bill, or something substantially like it, now pending in the Senate, will, with all its incongruities and inconsistencies, be enacted into law. The Wilson bill, as coming from the House, had the merit, at least, of responding to some extent to the declarations and the alleged principles of the Democratic party.

I presume there is no one who will have the hardihood even to claim that the bill now before the Senate does anything of the kind. The bill as reported from the Finance Committee, has not even this merit. It repudiates in every line and every paragraph almost, the declarations of the Chicago platform in favor of a tariff for revenue, as amplified by Democratic speakers in and out of Congress, and by the Democratic press, generally of the country.

But in the bill as coming from the House, and the one reported to the Senate from the Finance Committee, there is evidently the one common purpose, and that of prostrating and destroying the great industries of the country, without raising the revenue necessary for the support of the Government, or at least not raising it by means resorted to for raising such revenue hitherto invoked for that purpose.

It is fortunate, no doubt, for the Democratic party, if not for the country, that in both Houses of Congress it can stand on this common platform.

Mr. President, from what I learn, I imagine there will be no further attempt made by the party in either House of Congress to pass any bill having in view the vindication of Democratic declarations or principles, but to pass any kind of a bill upon which can be placed the Democratic coat of arms.

Therefore, Mr. President, I assume that this bill, with all its absurdities and enormities, is to become a law, and that necessary concessions are to be made to secure such a result.

The sugar trust and sugar refiners have been reconciled; the sugar producers have been stampeded from the position taken early in the session and cowed into submission; the whisky trust and the distillers are jubilant at their prospects, and a sop has been thrown to the coal and iron ore interests. So that those representing such interests are supposed to be in line.

And beyond all, the bill is to receive the support of the "solid South." Hence it is safe to assume that a bill akin to this, at least, will become a law.

But, Mr. President, as a lover of my country and a believer in its institutions and destiny, I look forward to this proposed legislation with apprehension and alarm. It can not bring good results; it can but prove disastrous to the best interests of the country.

I wish our friends on the other side might call a halt, that they might pause in their mad purpose and abandon the ill-advised course upon which they have entered. Let them not forget that "*Quos Deus vult perdere, prius dementat*," but even at this late hour let them reflect and consider that the interests of the country, and the whole country, are more sacred than those of any party or any section. But if they do not, as I fear they will not, they must not for a moment think that this is the end.

They can rest assured that the people of the country are not to stand by and see all their great industries wrecked and destroyed; their markets taken from them, and the doors closed to securing the new ones; labor degraded and civilization turned backward, without a determined protest.

Should you succeed in enacting this legislation, we must appeal to the people of the country, a higher tribunal than the Senate or Congress of the United States, and from which there is no appeal.

Of the ultimate result there can be no doubt. The premonitory mutterings as indicated in the elections throughout the country in the past few months are but a prelude to the storm that is gathering.

The firing on Fort Sumter united the Northern States in defense of the Union.

The passage of this bill in anything like its present form will again unite them in the protection of their industries and material interests; in preserving their markets, maintaining and elevating their standard of labor, and securing for the future the grandest civilization that has ever existed in the history of the world.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President—

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Oregon allow me one moment?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CALL. By permission of the Senator from Oregon, I wish to give notice that to-morrow morning at the conclusion of the routine morning business I shall ask the Senate to consider the fortifications appropriation bill.

Mr. DOLPH. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Florida, if he does not succeed in disposing of the bill during the morning hour, to continue with it during the day?

Mr. CALL. I certainly do not wish to antagonize any consent agreement which has been heretofore made.

Mr. DOLPH. I am asking the question because, while I am not very familiar with the provisions of the present bill, I have for some years, since I have been in the Senate, given some attention to the subject of fortifications, and should like to be present when the bill is considered and disposed of.

Mr. CALL. If it will suit the convenience of the Senate I shall call up the bill to-morrow morning.

Mr. McPHERSON. The Senator from Florida will take notice of the fact that the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] gave notice of his desire to address the Senate immediately after the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. I suppose the Senator from Florida simply refers to the morning hour and does not expect to occupy the time of the Senate after 1 o'clock.

Mr. CALL. Certainly not.

Mr. HARRIS. That will not interfere with the Senator from Texas or any other Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to say, with the permission of the two Senators who are on the floor, that I desire to submit some observations upon the fortifications appropriation bill, and I had requested that notice might be given me before it should be taken up. The Senator from Florida informed me that it had been decided to take up the bill to-morrow; but it did not then occur to me that under the unanimous agreement of the Senate to proceed from 1 o'clock to 5 o'clock with the tariff bill it would be possible to go on with the fortifications bill for any considerable length of time. I am certain, from what I know of the views I desire to submit to the Senate, that it will be impossible to make any progress with the bill before 1 o'clock to-morrow, and it will be a mere form to take it up, because I shall require more time than would be allowed to make a beginning in the suggestions I have to make on that bill, and, certainly, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] is not so much fatigued with the speech he is making on the tariff bill that he can not commence the discussion on the fortifications bill, its consideration will take the whole day. I suggest that there be consent kindly given by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] that a day may be given to the fortifications bill when it is taken up. It will be useless, I know, to take it up to-morrow between 12 and 1 o'clock.

Mr. QUAY. I merely ask for information whether there is not a special order for to-morrow for an executive session to con-

sider the contested Florida cases immediately after the morning business is closed? I have a recollection of that sort, but I am not certain. If that be the case, it seems to me it will interfere with the consideration of the appropriation bill mentioned by the senior Senator from Florida.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has no recollection of anything of that kind.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think there was any special order. I think there was a suggestion of postponing a matter in executive session until perhaps that day; but that does not make a special order to any extent or in anyway whatever.

Mr. PASCO. If it be proper to refer to the matter in open session, there was a unanimous agreement of the kind stated by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] entered into at one of the sessions last week. I should not myself have been the first to refer to it.

Mr. HARRIS. A unanimous agreement that the particular matter referred to should be considered at a given time?

Mr. PASCO. Yes, to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. CALL. I have given the notice, and will let the proceeding take its course.

THE REVENUE BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOLPH resumed the floor in continuation of the speech begun by him on the 20th instant. After having spoken twenty minutes—

Mr. QUAY (at 5 o'clock p. m.) Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the hour has arrived at which under the agreement the discussion of the pending bill is to terminate for the day.

Mr. DOLPH. I am right in the midst of a table, but I do not want to violate the agreement.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator to withdraw his remarks to the point where he began to read the table.

Mr. DOLPH. I shall do that. I will withdraw what I have said in stating the table and not print it in the RECORD. I shall not divide the table, but will repeat that portion of it when I resume my remarks.

[Mr. DOLPH'S speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.]

Mr. GRAY. I wish to say, what has been said before, that there is nothing in the agreement, in its letter or in its spirit, to prevent any Senator from continuing the debate after 5 o'clock. But it is perfectly apparent, of course, and it has been apparent here for two weeks, that the other side do not intend that the debate shall continue any longer than possible, and that the time shall be consumed and wasted.

Mr. QUAY. I know nothing as to the disposition on this side of the Chamber, but for myself I have conscientious scruples against continuing the debate after 5 o'clock.

Mr. GRAY. I believe the Senator has.

Mr. QUAY. And I understand, the other side of the Chamber desire an executive session.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from Delaware is very unkind to suggest that time should be wasted. He knows I gave him a great deal of time on Saturday, and that I was very liberal.

Mr. GRAY. I want to return the compliment by giving the Senator plenty of time this afternoon.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. GRAY. The object is too apparent on the other side in their manner of conducting this debate.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator from Oregon—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair had recognized the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me a moment?

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware. I do not think this side of the Chamber should be censured for confining the debate to the terms agreed upon. It was an amicable arrangement that the debate should proceed from 1 o'clock until 5; and now the Senator from Delaware seems to complain of the Senators on this side of the Chamber because they ask that the discussion may be confined each day to those hours. Whether it was in the language of the agreement or not, it was certainly perfectly well understood that the discussion would cease at 5 o'clock, and that the Senate would then proceed to the consideration of other business. Now the Senator from Delaware reproaches the Senators on this side of the Chamber because they are not willing to go on after 5 o'clock, and says that it is wasting time. Cer-

tainly there has never been any more time than has been needed after 5 o'clock for other business and for executive sessions.

Mr. GRAY. Nobody on this side misunderstands the Senator from New Hampshire, and the country does not misunderstand him. The tactics of the other side are perfectly apparent.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HARRIS. 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 twenty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23, 1894.

JUDGE OF PROBATE.

Warren N. Dusenberry, of Utah Territory, to be judge of probate in the county of Utah, in the Territory of Utah, vice Joseph D. Jones, resigned.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Assistant Engineer Solon Arnold, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from April 1, 1894, vice Passed Assistant Engineer James H. Perry, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 17, 1894.

POSTMASTERS.

Oscar D. Pocock, to be postmaster at Camden, in the county of Preble and State of Ohio.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 18, 1894.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

John E. Lynch, of Missouri, to be marshal of the United States for the eastern district of Missouri.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Lewis C. Vandegreft, of Delaware, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Delaware.

James F. O'Brien, of North Dakota, to be attorney of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

William H. Harries, of Minnesota, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Minnesota.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Aloysius Lynch, of Leadville, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Leadville, Colo.

Albert M. Avery, of Alabama, to be receiver of public moneys at Huntsville, Ala.

POSTMASTERS.

Theron L. Arnold, to be postmaster at Three Rivers, in the county of St. Josephs and State of Michigan.

James A. Lodge, to be postmaster at Montgomery, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

Percival B. Salisbury, to be postmaster at Theresa, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

August Bondi, to be postmaster at Salina, in the county of Saline and State of Kansas.

William Clardy, to be postmaster at Purcell, in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

Bushnell Danforth, to be postmaster at Williamstown, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

A. H. Jacob, to be postmaster at Larned, in the county of Pawnee and State of Kansas.

Henry C. Maxwell, to be postmaster at Harper, in the county of Harper and State of Kansas.

John H. Meyer, to be postmaster at Hiawatha, in the county of Brown and State of Kansas.

Frank W. Cutsinger, to be postmaster at Edinburg, in the county of Johnson and State of Indiana.

William H. McEwen, to be postmaster at Albion, in the county of Noble and State of Indiana.

Thomas A. Fairchild, to be postmaster at Holton, in the county of Jackson and State of Kansas.

Henry H. Hollberg, to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Jackson and State of Ohio.

J. W. Shipley, to be postmaster at Piqua, in the county of Miami and State of Ohio.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 23, 1894.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commodore Francis M. Ramsay, to be a rear-admiral.
 Capt. Thomas O. Selfridge, to be a commodore.
 Commander Philip H. Cooper, to be a captain.
 Commodore Joseph S. Skerrett, to be a rear-admiral.
 Capt. Joseph N. Miller, to be a commodore.

POSTMASTERS.

Hugh H. Gouchenour, to be postmaster at Greeneville, in the county of Greene and State of Tennessee.
 Edgar J. Knowlton, to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.
 Thomas Loftus, to be postmaster at West Union, in the county of Fayette and State of Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 23, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read.
 The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the Journal as read will be approved.
 Mr. HEPBURN. I interpose an objection.
 The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa objects. The question then is on approving the Journal.
 The question being taken; there were, on a division (called for by Mr. HEPBURN)—ayes 66, noes 3.
 Mr. HEPBURN. No quorum.
 Mr. SAYERS. I call for the yeas and nays.
 The yeas and nays were ordered.
 The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers to act during the call of the yeas and nays the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STORER].
 Mr. STORER. The point of order, or objection, was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].
 The SPEAKER. The Chair has no objection to appointing the gentleman from Iowa.
 Mr. STORER. I have no objection to serving; but I thought the Speaker might be under a misapprehension as to who made the point.
 The SPEAKER. Not at all. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will please act as one of the tellers.
 Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee and Mr. HEPBURN having taken their places at the desk as tellers, the question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 0, answered "present" 6, not voting 135; as follows:

YEAS—212.

Abbott,	Cogswell,	Grady,	Lynch,
Aitken,	Compton,	Gresham,	Maddox,
Alderson,	Conn,	Grout,	Maguire,
Aldrich,	Coombs,	Grow,	Mahon,
Alexander,	Cooper, Fla.	Hager,	Mallory,
Avery,	Cooper, Ind.	Hammond,	Martin, Ind.
Babcock,	Cooper, Tex.	Hare,	Marvin, N. Y.
Bailey,	Cooper, Wis.	Harmer,	McCall,
Baker, Kans.	Cox,	Harter,	McCleary, Minn.
Baldwin,	Crain,	Hatch,	McCreary, Ky.
Bankhead,	Curtis, Kans.	Hayes,	McDannold,
Barnes,	Curtis, N. Y.	Heard,	McDearmon,
Bartholdt,	Daniels,	Heiner,	McDowell,
Barwig,	Davey,	Henderson, N. C.	McGann,
Belden,	Davis,	Hermann,	McKalg,
Bell, Colo.	De Armond,	Holman,	McKelghan,
Berry,	De Forest,	Hopkins, Ill.	McLaurin,
Black, Ga.	Denson,	Hopkins, Pa.	McNagny,
Bland,	Dingley,	Hudson,	McKee,
Boen,	Dinsmore,	Hull,	Meklejohn,
Bower, N. C.	Dockery,	Hunter,	Mercer,
Bowers, Cal.	Dolliver,	Hutcheson,	Meredith,
Branch,	Doolittle,	Ikirt,	Meyer,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Draper,	Izlar,	Money,
Bretz,	Dunn,	Johnson, Ind.	Montgomery,
Broderick,	Dunphy,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Moses,
Brookshire,	Durborow,	Johnson, Ohio	Mutcher,
Bundy,	Edmunds,	Jones,	Neill,
Bunn,	Ellis, Ky.	Kem,	Northway,
Bynum,	Ellis, Oregon	Kiefer,	O'Neil, Mass.
Cabaniss,	English, N. J.	Kilgore,	Patterson,
Cadmus,	Enloe,	Kribbs,	Payne,
Campbell,	Epes,	Kyle,	Paynter,
Cannon, Cal.	Erdman,	Laue,	Pearson,
Cannon, Ill.	Everett,	Lapham,	Pence,
Caruth,	Fletcher,	Latimer,	Pendleton, Tex.
Catchings,	Funk,	Lawson,	Pendleton, W. Va.
Causey,	Gear,	Lefever,	Perkins,
Clark, Mo.	Geary,	Linton,	Pickler,
Cobb, Ala.	Geissenhainer,	Livinston,	Quigg,
Cobb, Mo.	Gillett, Mass.	Loud,	Reyburn,
Cockrell,	Goodnight,	Lucas,	Richards, Ohio.
Coffeen,	Gorman,		Richardson, Mich.

Richardson, Tenn.	Sperry,	Talbot, Md.	Updegraff,
Ritche,	Springer,	Tate,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Robbins,	Stallings,	Taylor, Ind.	Warner,
Robertson, La.	Stephenson,	Taylor, Tenn.	Wells,
Russell, Ga.	Stone, W. A.	Thomas,	Whiting,
Sayers,	Stone, Ky.	Tracey,	Williams, Miss.
Scranton,	Storer,	Tucker,	Wilson, Ohio
Shaw,	Strait,	Turner, Ga.	Wilson, Wash.
Shell,	Swanson,	Turner, Va.	Woomer,
Somers,	Talbert, S. C.	Tyler,	Wright, Mass.

NAYS—0.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Dalzell,	Hepburn,	Marsh,	Wever,
Haugen,	Houk,		

NOT VOTING—135.

Adams, Ky.	Culberson,	Loudenslager,	Sherman,
Adams, Pa.	Cummings,	Magner,	Sibley,
Allen,	Donovan,	Marshall,	Sickles,
Apsley,	English, Cal.	McAleer,	Simpson,
Arnold,	Fielder,	McCulloch,	Sipe,
Baker, N. H.	Fithian,	McEtrick,	Smith,
Bartlett,	Forman,	McMillin,	Snodgrass,
Bell, Tex.	Funston,	Milliken,	Stevens,
Beltzhoover,	Fyan,	Moon,	Stockdale,
Bingham,	Gardner,	Morgan,	Stone, C. W.
Black, Ill.	Gillet, N. Y.	Morse,	Straus,
Blair,	Goldzier,	Murray,	Sweet,
Boatner,	Graham,	Newlands,	Tarsney,
Boutelle,	Griffin,	Oates,	Tawney,
Brattan,	Grosvenor,	O'Neill, Mo.	Terry,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hainer,	Outhwaite,	Turpin,
Brickner,	Haines,	Page,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Brosius,	Hall, Minn.	Paschal,	Wadsworth,
Brown,	Hall, Mo.	Phillips,	Walker,
Bryan,	Harris,	Pigott,	Wanger,
Burnes,	Hartman,	Post,	Washington,
Burrows,	Henderson, Ill.	Powers,	Waugh,
Caldwell,	Henderson, Iowa	Price,	Weadock,
Caminetti,	Hendrix,	Randall,	Wheeler, Ala.
Capohart,	Hicks,	Ray,	Wheeler, Ill.
Chickering,	Hines,	Rayner,	White,
Childs,	Hitt,	Reed,	Williams, Ill.
Clancy,	Hooker, Miss.	Reilly,	Wilson, W. Va.
Clarke, Ala.	Hooker, N. Y.	Robinson, Pa.	Wise,
Cockran,	Hullick,	Rusk,	Wolverton,
Cornish,	Lacey,	Russell, Conn.	Woodard,
Cookins,	Layton,	Ryan,	Wright, Pa.
Covert,	Lisle,	Schermerhorn,	
Crawford,	Lockwood,	Settle,	

So the Journal was approved.
 Before the result of the vote was announced—
 Mr. MARVIN of New York. My colleague from New York, Mr. CHICKERING, desires to be excused for to-day on account of sickness.
 There being no objection, Mr. CHICKERING was excused.
 Mr. BAILEY. I ask that my colleague, Mr. CULBERSON, be excused indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.
 There being no objection, indefinite leave of absence was granted.
 Mr. HEARD. I ask that the leave of absence of my colleague, Mr. HALL, be extended for ten days. I am in receipt of a telegram from him advising me that it will be impossible for him to be in attendance at the House for ten days. I therefore ask that his leave be extended.
 A MEMBER. On account of sickness?
 Mr. HEARD. On account of important business.
 The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's leave will be extended ten days.
 There was no objection.
 Mr. PAYNE. I ask that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] be excused indefinitely, on account of sickness.
 There being no objection, Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa was excused.
 The following pairs were announced:
 Mr. WILSON of West Virginia with Mr. DALZELL.
 Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. GROSVENOR.
 Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. BURROWS.
 Mr. ALLEN with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.
 Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. SWEET.
 Mr. ARNOLD with Mr. WHEELER of Illinois.
 Mr. CLARKE of Alabama with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.
 Mr. LISLE with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. BELTZHOOVER with Mr. TAWNEY.
 Mr. FORMAN with Mr. SMITH of Illinois.
 Mr. HALL of Missouri with Mr. CHICKERING.
 Mr. BRICKNER with Mr. ADAMS of Kentucky.
 Mr. OATES with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. BROWN with Mr. MORSE.
 Mr. SNODGRASS with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. McETRICK with Mr. HOOKER of New York.
 Mr. PAGE with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.
 Mr. SCHERMERHORN with Mr. WADSWORTH.
 Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. HICKS.
 Mr. SPERRY with Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. PAGE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my name recorded.