

bill in the interest of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Br. Mr. HERMANN: Memorial from the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oregon, for lighting the entrance to Columbia River, in Oregon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial to Congress adopted by the Preachers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Churches of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the employment of clergymen to act as chaplains at all army posts where there is no regular chaplain—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Remonstrance of Lutheran churches at Otto and Little Valley, N. Y., against proposed amendment to preamble of the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTON: Petition of the Saginaw Ministerial Association, favoring the appointment of a chaplain at each military post of the United States, and asking that clergymen be so employed at a salary not to exceed \$1,500 per annum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: Resolutions of the Wholesale Grocers' Association, in favor of the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of the officers of the Boston Five-Cent Savings Bank, against a tax of 2 per cent on the capital stock of savings banks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition from Madison, Clarks, and Hooper, Nebr., against the income tax of the Wilson bill on incomes of mutual loan and building associations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of R. J. Long, editor of the American Citizen, Boston, Mass., protesting against increasing the rate of postage on books published in serial form—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Boston Wholesale Grocers' Association, asking for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTHWAY: Three petitions: Of Curtis Koon, H. Martin, and Frank Corl, and 85 others, of Mogadore, Summit County; J. W. Gould and 39 others, of Andover, Ashtabula County, and A. F. Spettler and 143 others, of Green Township, Summit County, all of Ohio, praying for the passage of Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE'S bill, H. R. 5246—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIPE: Petition of 100 citizens of West Elizabeth and vicinity, Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage of the bills known as the Coxe bills, relating to the construction of roads throughout the United States and the issuing of noninterest-bearing United States notes—to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. WISE: Two petitions of citizens of Virginia, to authorize the reception in the mails as second-class matter of periodical publications issued by benevolent or fraternal societies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 16, 1894.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. TELLER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

### HEIRS OF ELIZABETH TOWNSEND.

The bill (H. R. 6975) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth Townsend was read twice by its title.

Mr. TELLER. That is an exact duplicate of a bill which passed the Senate a few days ago. It is a House bill, and I ask the unanimous consent that it may be considered.

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. TELLER. I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1983) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth Townsend, deceased.

The motion was agreed to.

### DES MOINES RIVER LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of the sundry civil appropriation act of March 3, 1893, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain what persons made entry of lands within the limits of the

so-called Des Moines River land grant for the improvement of the navigation of the Des Moines River, Iowa, the date of such entry, etc., a report on this work by Special Agent Robert L. Berner.

Mr. ALLISON. That is an important communication locally to the people of Iowa. I move that the letter of the Secretary of the Interior and accompanying papers be printed and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

### FENDERS ON DISTRICT STREET RAILWAYS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 11th instant, giving as their opinion that all street railway companies in the District of Columbia, propelled by cable and electric power, should be required to equip their cars with the best available fenders, and stating that a comprehensive report on the subject of car fenders and safety appliances on street cars, has been prepared by them and forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia; which was read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it is a matter of extreme gratification to me, as I am sure it is to the Senate, and will be to the people of the District of Columbia, that the Commissioners have so promptly answered the inquiry of the Senate, and have so frankly stated that in their opinion the street-car companies should be required to do what the resolution intimated they ought to be compelled to do. I trust that a way will be found by the Senate, if these companies continue to neglect their duty in this respect, to compel them at a very early day to perform it.

I move that the communication be printed, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Baltimore Corn and Flour Exchange, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of George McLane Wood, of Washington, D. C., praying for the location of the new Government Printing Office on the old Armory site, corner Sixth and B streets southwest; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of 15 citizens of Richland County, South Carolina, praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. VOORHEES presented a memorial of the Eagle Cotton Mills, of Madison, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Fulton Lodge, No. 30, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Shelbyville; of Schiller Lodge, No. 4, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Terre Haute; of Lodge No. 48, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Stewartville, and of sundry citizens of Huntington, Shelbyville, and Terre Haute, all in the State of Indiana, 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.

Mr. HUNTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dinwiddie County, Va., praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented a joint petition of the Board of Trade, the Commercial Exchange, the Maritime Exchange, the Drug Exchange, the Grocers and Importers' Exchange, the Vessel Owners and Captains' Association, the Wardens of the Port, the Traders' League, and the Manufacturers' Club, all of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made for continuing the improvement of the Delaware River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the petition of W. M. Stephens and 21 other citizens of Williamsport, Pa., praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY. While I am upon the floor I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to call up and put upon its passage the bill (S. 886) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Wightman, deceased.

Mr. MANDERSON. Let the morning business be concluded.

Mr. BATE. We are not yet through with the morning business?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is not yet concluded.

Mr. BATE. I object until after it is concluded.

Mr. QUAY. This is a bill which was partially considered the other morning.

Mr. BATE. I make no particular objection to the bill the Senator desires to call up, but I object to anything being taken up until the morning business is concluded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. I shall ask for the consideration of the bill when the morning business is concluded.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lebanon, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of local Union No. 316, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of McSherrytown, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed Chinese treaty; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the West Chester Building and Loan Association, of West Chester, Pa., praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provisions of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Printing Pressmen's Union, No. 64, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 4737, creating the position of foreman of presswork, etc., in the Government Printing Office; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of Encampment No. 65, Union Veteran Legion, of York, Pa., remonstrating against the transfer of the management of the national soldiers' homes to the War Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HIGGINS presented a memorial of the Woman's Indian Association, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the proposed action of the Appropriations Committee in omitting the usual appropriation to defray the expenses of the Board of Indian Commissioners; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PASCO presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Jacksonville, Fla., praying that an appropriation be made for a national exhibit at the Cotton States and International Exposition to be held at Atlanta, Ga., during the fall of 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1703) to provide for the disposal of the interest on the Virginia indemnity fund, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself March 12, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, providing for an appropriation to enable the Secretary of State to purchase from John H. Haswell, chief of the Bureau of Indexes and Archives in the Department of State, the manuscript of the chronologic history of the Department of State, and the foreign relations of the Government from September 5, 1774, to July 1, 1885, etc., reported it favorably, with an amendment, and moved that it be printed, and with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4720) to pension Lucy Brown, dependent foster mother, reported it without amendment and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report an amendment intended to be proposed to the army appropriation bill. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations without printing, as it is already in print as a bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and now upon the Calendar. I call the attention of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the proposed amendment. It provides for the detailing of retired officers of the Army to institutions of learning under the general provisions of law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be referred, without printing, to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2020) supplementary to an act approved April 6, 1894, for the execution of the award rendered at Paris August 15, 1893, by the Tribunal of Arbitration constituted under the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, concluded at Washington, February 29, 1892, in rela-

tion to the preservation of the fur seal, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1308) for the relief of Simeon Motz, Nathaniel Robbins, and William J. Sloan, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 2024) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the Industrial Exhibition held at Melbourne, Australia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAMERON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2025) providing for the equalization of all retired medical directors of the United States Navy with the relative rank of commodore; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2026) granting a pension to David Levy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2027) granting a pension to William H. Lane; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 2028) making an appropriation for a light-ship at the mouth of the Columbia River; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BATE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Military Academy appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SQUIRE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER. If I can do so without interfering with the morning business, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1919) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Yuma Indians in California for the cession of their surplus lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. BATE. I dislike to object, but I understand that the morning business is not yet concluded.

Mr. TELLER. I do not desire to interfere with morning business, but I thought it was closed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is not yet concluded.

Mr. TELLER. I yield to morning business.

#### PROPOSED SENATORIAL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Whereas it has been stated in the Sun, a newspaper published in New York, that bribes have been offered to certain Senators to induce them to vote against the pending tariff bill; and

Whereas it has also been stated in a signed article in the Press, a newspaper published in Philadelphia, that the sugar schedule has been made up as it now stands in the proposed amendment in consideration of large sums of money paid for campaign purposes of the Democratic party:

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed to investigate these charges, and with power to send for persons and papers.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What action does the Senator from Massachusetts ask upon the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

#### 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 the bill (S. 1215) for the relief of Lennes A. Jackson.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5771) authorizing the Texarkana and Shreveport Railroad Company to bridge Sulphur River, in the State of Arkansas.

The message further announced that the House had furnished

the Senate, in compliance with its request, duplicate engrossed copies of the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 6720) providing for the resurvey of Grant and Hooker Counties, in the State of Nebraska; and

A bill (H. R. 6956) to grant to railroad companies in the Indian Territory additional powers to secure right of way, depot grounds, etc.

**PERSONS ENGAGED IN PROTECTED INDUSTRIES.**

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] coming over from a previous day.

The SECRETARY. A resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to inform the Senate of the total number of persons engaged in protected industries in the United States whose wages are or may be claimed to be affected by the proposed tariff legislation, etc.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have the resolution read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

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

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the total number of persons engaged in protected industries in the United States whose wages are, or may be claimed to be affected by tariff legislation; the total number of persons engaged in such industries whose wages are not, or will not be affected by tariff legislation, and the proportion of the population of the United States who depend upon the foreign market for the sale of their products, classifying such industries respectively. Such information to be based on the census of 1890.

Also, that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed and required to inform the Senate of the total number of such persons who are native-born citizens of the United States of America; the total number who are naturalized citizens, and the total number of such persons who are aliens; and at what ratio, if any, alien mechanics and laborers have been taking the places of native and naturalized citizens of the United States in the protected industries of the United States.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I simply desire to state that in 1886 the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a commission, consisting of Mr. Worthington C. Ford, E. B. Elliott, and Simon Newcomb, who were required to furnish the Treasury Department information based upon the census of 1880, such as is called for in this resolution. The reports of those persons, who I think are now in the employment of the Government, classify the industries of the United States, showing the persons who were affected by tariff legislation; classified the industries that were not affected by tariff legislation, and state the class of laborers whose wages were not affected in any way by it. This resolution does no more than call upon the Treasury Department for like information based upon the census of 1890—information that it is highly important for us to have before the tariff discussion is concluded.

The resolution perhaps goes a little further in the second part of it, because I deem it highly important to know the number of native-born citizens and naturalized citizens who are engaged in protected industries to-day, and to what extent, if any, those persons are being pushed out of employment and their places taken by imported laborers from foreign countries. All this information, I understand, is in the possession of the Treasury Department, or at least it is accessible to that Department.

This is all I desire to say at this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I do not think the resolution ought to pass unless it is materially modified. There surely can be no objection to obtaining for the guidance of the Senator from Nebraska, and the other Senators in the discussion of the tariff bill, all the statistics that exist in the Department of the Treasury or which may be procured by reasonable inquiry. But certainly I do not think there is any precedent for this resolution. The Senator's resolution asks information from the Secretary of the Treasury as to—

The total number of persons engaged in protected industries in the United States whose wages are, or may be claimed to be, affected by tariff legislation.

How does the Secretary of the Treasury know that fact? How does he know what persons there are engaged in labor whose wages may be claimed to be affected by tariff legislation? That is a matter of opinion, and it is demanding of the Secretary of the Treasury his opinion on the subject.

A Senator near me suggests that we have a tariff on wheat. How does the Secretary of the Treasury know how many persons are engaged in raising wheat? How does the Secretary of the Treasury know whether it may or may not be claimed by Senators upon this floor that the wages of the wheat-grower are affected by tariff legislation?

The next call is—

The total number of persons engaged in such industries whose wages are not or will not be affected by tariff legislation.

There is a demand upon the Secretary of the Treasury to classify the persons engaged in protected industries. What are protected industries? It does not follow, according to the

argument of Senators on the other side of the Chamber, that because there is a duty on an article, that article is protected. It may be only a tariff for revenue and afford no protection, either incidental or otherwise. How is the Secretary of the Treasury, I ask the Senator from Nebraska, to determine, for the purpose of answering this statistical inquiry, whether the wages of persons engaged in various industries will or will not be affected by tariff legislation? That is a matter of opinion; that is a matter on which the Senator from Nebraska might discourse learnedly for hours, but as to which the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury is worth no more than the opinion of anyone else.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me, I desire to say to him that this whole question was settled by the Treasury Department making such a statement in 1886, based upon the census of 1880.

Mr. HOAR. Has the Senator got here the resolution to which he refers.

Mr. ALLEN. I have not the report, but I have just sent for it, which was made by Messrs. Ford, Elliott, and Newcomb. The matter is in the possession of the Treasury Department, from which this information can be had, and a reasonably safe and correct estimate can be made by the Treasury Department. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire recognize that as an important factor in the discussion of the tariff bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska has a precedent for this resolution I hope he will produce it. I can understand that there might be a foundation for the resolution if the Secretary of the Treasury had set on foot an inquiry by experts covering these points, and there was a report on file in the Treasury Department which undertook to make this classification, and the resolution was only intended to call for an existing report. I should not object then, but there is no evidence that there is any such report. The Senator says there was such a report ten years ago. If there is another report of the same character, I have no objection to the Senator calling for that report, but I do not think it would be proper to pass a resolution here directing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint some experts and set them to making a similar inquiry. We have no power to do that. That can only be done by an act of Congress. I do not understand, therefore, that the Secretary of the Treasury has any such information as the Senator calls for as to what workmen of this country will have, or may be claimed to have, their wages affected by tariff legislation.

Mr. ALLEN. I simply desire to say that I am informed—how true it may be I do not know—that the Treasury Department, or some branch of it, is engaged in making this inquiry at this time, and engaged in compiling proper data on this identical question; and it is for the purpose of reaching the data being compiled by the Department that this resolution was introduced.

Mr. CHANDLER. I go on further, Mr. President. The resolution also asks:

The proportion of the population of the United States who depend upon the foreign market for the sale of their products.

Who knows that? The Senator says such information should be based upon the census of 1890. If the Secretary of the Treasury has had anyone make a paper of that sort, I certainly would not object to calling for that paper.

The objection I make to the resolution is that in the absence of any such statistics, the Senator seems to me to be seeking to compel the Secretary of the Treasury to go to work and make inquiries and investigations and form opinions, either by himself or by experts, in order that they may be sent to the Senate. I am opposed to any such proceeding as that.

Looking further, to the second clause of the Senator's resolution, he asks—after requiring certain statistics which are to be found in the census, of course—

At what ratio, if any, alien mechanics and laborers have been taking the places of native and naturalized citizens of the United States in the protected industries of the United States?

Has the Senator any information that there is any such compilation in existence? Has the Senator any information that there are statistics on that point? If there are reliable statistics, of course there is no objection to having them furnished to the Senate; but, as the resolution stands, it is a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to go to work and prepare a statement that can only be made up by careful investigation, and which is no part of the existing statistics, showing the extent to which in protected industries—and there is the same difficulty as to what is a protected industry that I have already alluded to—aliens have taken the place of native born or naturalized citizens.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether his objection is to the investigation to procure

the information sought, or whether his objection is simply that it is not a proper request to make of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have no objection to procuring any existing information that is to be found anywhere.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, why does the Senator object to the resolution?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the information is wanted as to what the census shows, I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I think he should ask the Secretary of the Interior for it. That would seem to be the natural method. If there is no such information in existence and the Senator wishes an expression of opinion, if he wishes to have the Secretary of the Treasury to make a guess as to how many aliens have superseded native citizens in protected industries and as to how many persons there are whose wages may be claimed to be affected by tariff legislation, I do not think it worth while to delay the passage of the pending tariff bill, which Senators on the other side are so anxious to go on with; I do not think it worth while to delay this bill, which we are all anxious to get on with and which we must begin to go on with at 12 o'clock and work on until 6—I do not think we ought to delay that process by asking the Secretary of the Treasury to go to work and, either by himself or by other people, make certain guesses, the result of which the Senator from Nebraska may conceive will aid him in determining what his final vote will be upon the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thought my questions were sufficiently direct to bring forth at least a reasonably direct answer. I ask the Senator whether his objection to the adoption of the resolution is to eliciting this particular kind of information, or whether his objection is that it is asking something of the Secretary of the Treasury which ought not to be asked of that officer.

I desire to state to the Senator, while on the floor, that some two years ago a committee of this body, at whose head I believe was the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], was charged with the duty of inquiring about what effect the tariff act of 1890 had upon the wages of labor throughout the country, as to whether wages had been increased or whether they had been diminished in the different departments of industry. The report of that committee is quite voluminous, going through all the different departments of industry, and I believe the conclusion of one of the volumes of the report, at least, was that about one-sixth of 1 per cent increase in the wages of labor had taken place by reason of one year's operation of the McKinley act.

Mr. President, this resolution of the Senator from Nebraska is a very important one. It asks for information which will be procured in some way, I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire, and if it can not be procured from the Treasury Department it will be procured in some other way. The people want to know what this resolution asks, the people have a right to know, and the people will learn just what they are asking for. If the Secretary of the Treasury is not able to furnish the information desired, he is very capable of saying so. Only a few days ago a report from that officer was laid upon our tables, in which he stated very clearly that the Department was not able, without a great deal of expense, to procure the information which was asked by the Senate—I do not now recall what the particular matter was; but, at any rate, the able Secretary of the Treasury is quite competent to state to the Senate whether he can or whether he can not furnish the desired information. I hope, therefore, the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators will withdraw their objection, and let us have the information.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to know if he does not think that the wages of every person in this country engaged in any industry, whether he calls it a protected industry or not, is not directly or indirectly affected by tariff legislation?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not believe it.

Mr. HOAR. I do.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not believe that the wages of carpenters and bricklayers and stonemasons and printers and engravers and persons of that class are affected by tariff legislation.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me to ask him a question, suppose there were five thousand men employed in a particular manufacturing town in what the Senator from Nebraska calls a protected industry; the protection ceases; that industry stops, and there were five thousand other men employed not in a protected industry, would not the first five thousand seek employment in the other industry and reduce the wages in that employment?

Mr. PEPPER. It would depend entirely on circumstances.

Mr. HOAR. If there are circumstances which would bring that to pass, then certainly the industry affected by the tariff

ought not to be alone inquired into, but we ought to inquire as to the effect upon these other men.

Mr. PEPPER. The resolution is a very broad one.

Mr. HOAR. It is not broad enough to cover them, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it is.

Mr. HOAR. I wish the Senator would read that part of the resolution which includes them.

Mr. PEPPER. I think it includes them. The people are very much interested in acquiring this particular class of information. I think that when it is learned what persons are affected in their wage receipts by tariff duties, as compared with the people whose wages are not so affected, it will be found that the former is very small comparatively. Take the farm hands; take the farmers themselves, who are just as much laborers and wage-workers as the hands whom they employ; take all the men who are engaged in the building trade, all the clerks, all the persons engaged in clerical and professional service, and I have no doubt that the proportion is fully 4 or 5 to 1 whose wages are not affected in any way, either directly or indirectly, by reason of tariff duties. The protection which is given to persons engaged in manufacturing industries is not grudged to them by the other classes of persons to whom I have referred; but when it comes to a time that a particular party—and that is the party represented on this side of the Chamber—insists on protection beyond that which is reasonable, beyond that which is necessary, beyond that which covers the difference in wages in this country and wages in other countries, it is time that the rest of us ask for such information as the Senator from Nebraska wants; and I do hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will consent to it.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, this resolution embraces a subject which has long been more or less under the consideration of the Finance Committee of the Senate. It seems to me that, if the resolution is to pass, it should be broadened and made more definite in some respects. I therefore move that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to know—

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the motion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the Senator from Vermont moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope it will not be done.

Mr. ALLEN. Before that is done, I now have the report to which I referred some time ago—

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Nebraska have the resolution read under which that inquiry was made?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will again be read.

Mr. HOAR. I do not ask for the reading of the resolution before the Senate, but for the resolution the Senator from Nebraska refers to under which the inquiry was made.

Mr. ALLEN. I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that this was an inquiry directed to be made by Daniel Manning, Secretary of the Treasury, and it was made by Worthington C. Ford, E. B. Elliott, and Simon Newcomb. It forms Appendix D of the Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year 1886. The report of Mr. Ford shows, after some elaboration, that 16,564,914 laborers in this country were persons whose labor was not subject to competition by foreign labor, while the number whose labor was subject to such competition was 827,184. Table A of Mr. Ford's report classifies the industries in which persons are engaged not subject to foreign competition, beginning with agricultural implements, giving the number of persons, and running down to stave, shoo, and heading, showing a very great number of industries in which the laborers' wages are not subject to competition by foreign laborers. Table B classifies the industries that are partially subject to foreign competition, beginning with artificial flower making, giving the number of persons engaged in that industry, and so on down to woolen mills. He concludes with the statement that the percentage of laborers whose wages are affected by foreign competition is 4.7 of the laboring population of the country.

The report of Mr. Elliott is in substance the same as that of Mr. Ford, classifying the competitive and noncompetitive industries, and he fixes the percentage of persons whose wages may be affected by foreign competition at 5 per cent as against 95 per cent whose wages are not affected. He goes into the details of it at some length. Mr. Newcomb's report is in substance the same thing, and he estimates the number of persons whose wages are affected by competition at from 6 to 7 per cent.

Now these tables, in my judgment, are full of valuable information. I know of no reason why the Senate should not be informed upon this precise subject, based upon the census of 1890. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is simply plowing in the rocks when he says that the resolution calls for

an opinion. The data and information are in the possession of the Treasury Department or accessible to it, based upon the census of 1890, and there is no reason why the Senate should not have this valuable information before it finally votes upon the tariff bill. It is valuable information.

Upon the other branch of the resolution the Senator from New Hampshire seems to assume that no person is informed upon the subject of the importation of foreign laborers into this country and into the factories of this country. It is notorious, and has been for years, that the law against the importation of contract labor is being daily and weekly and monthly violated, and that men are brought here from abroad to take the place of native and naturalized labor. Now, the census, I understand, will disclose to some extent the percentage of persons who were brought here to take the place of American labor, native and naturalized, and if we can discover by the passage of the resolution or by any other step that the men who stand in this Chamber and howl for the laboring men of this country are displacing the native and naturalized labor by laborers from Hungary and other portions of Europe who come here to labor for a time and then go away, and that they are using the foreigners as the men upon whom the blessings of protection are to fall, it is important to the country to know that fact. I have no desire to go any further into a discussion of the resolution or its importance.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Nebraska misunderstood, I think, the purpose of my inquiry. I understood the Senator to say yesterday and this morning that a resolution similar to the one pending had been passed in a former Congress; and I asked the Senator to let us have that resolution, for I wanted to hear the terms of it. Now, I understand the Senator to state that it was not a resolution, but a direction from the Secretary of the Treasury. I should like to get the direction under which those reports were made, to see if the language which the Senator from Nebraska has used in the resolution will accomplish what he says and thinks was then accomplished. I am not dealing with the question whether it is a proper resolution, but I wish merely to know whether the language is such as should be used.

I am in favor of getting from any source from which it can be obtained the information as to the number of alien workmen in our manufacturing or other industries. If there is any fact showing that they have supplanted or turned out of employment American workmen I should like to get it, and I should like to join the Senator from Nebraska in affording any proper relief; but in regard to the first part of the resolution, it seems to me that it opens for debate in the mind of the official who is to exercise authority under it, great questions about which men differ. I suppose, speaking for only one, that wherever there is a protective duty under which an American industry grows or is continued, which would not exist without it, or under which the wages paid laborers in an American industry are increased to a point which they would not reach without it, it affects necessarily and inevitably every wage-earner in the country.

You can not have two mills side by side pay different wages; you can not have a bricklayer, who receives \$2.50 or \$3 a day, protected only by the fact that he is building a structure which can not be made abroad and brought over here, working side by side with a weaver in a cotton or woolen mill. If the weaver's wages are more than the bricklayer's, the bricklayer will seek employment in the mill, and *vice versa*. If you have 5,000 men in a town or a county engaged in what the Senator from Nebraska calls a protected industry, and 5,000 men engaged in another industry which has no foreign competition, wages will find their level in the two, and to take off the protection from one is just as much an injury to the other as if the protection were not put on it.

Perhaps the Secretary of the Treasury takes a different view on this subject. This is my opinion, and it is the opinion of many other persons. I do not think, therefore, that the Senator ought to confine his inquiry to one class of industries alone.

Then, there is another question, if I can have the attention of my honorable friend from Nebraska for a moment, and that is, what are protected industries? If he is correctly reported (I do not know that he is, but it affords an illustration of what I am saying), the President of the United States said the other day to a delegation of persons from Louisiana engaged in the sugar industry, that they might be assured that they would have adequate protection on sugar. I do not quote that as verifying it; it is a mere newspaper report which may or may not be true. But there are persons who think that the proposed sugar duty is an adequate protection to the sugar industry.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Let me just state the point I am on, and then I will yield. On the other hand, I suppose Senators on the other side of the Chamber would rise up with great indignation and say all they would consent to on sugar is a revenue duty; that

they are not in the least proposing to help anybody engaged in raising sugar. That is going on all the time. The few pages of the tariff bill that we have gone over disclose that what is regarded by one Senator as a high protective duty on an industry is regarded by a Senator on the other side as a compensatory duty because an internal-revenue tax has been placed on the material, or for some other reason.

The Secretary of the Treasury, an able, clear-headed, and excellent man, as we all know, is a man of very decided theories and opinions. He has been debating these debatable questions all his life, and it does not seem to me that it is a fair or proper way in getting official statistical information, so to frame your resolve that at the foundation of the whole answer must be the particular theory which the official who answers the question entertains on a great and debated economic question.

If the Senator will specify the industries, if he will make the resolution applicable to all industries, I am with him, and I should like to have the information; but the resolution, I will not say designedly, but as drawn up, differs altogether from what the Senator quoted. The Senator quotes some reports of Mr. Worthington C. Ford, Mr. Elliott, and Mr. Newcomb. They do not use any such language as the Senator uses. They use a precise and specific phrase.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. It is now almost 12 o'clock. Is the Senator willing that we shall take a vote on the resolution before the morning hour expires?

Mr. HOAR. I do not propose to have a vote taken on the resolution until it is put into what I think are proper and reasonable terms.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Is it not a fact that there is a classification in the Census reports of what are designated protected industries?

Mr. HOAR. If that be so, let the Senator from Nebraska describe it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I think it is so.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not accept the Senator's reasoning at all.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to state that if the Senator from Nebraska, without putting into the resolution partisan views of economic theories, or debated views of economic theories, whether partisan or not, will ask for a specific fact, I will join him and vote for the resolution. The last part of the resolution I should like very much to have answered, but I do not wish to ask for a lot of statistics which when they come in will leave the question more mixed and foggy than before.

Now, let the Senator refer the resolution to the Committee on Finance; let him refer it to a Democratic steering committee; let him sit down with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] or any other Senator who is familiar with these things, and get the phraseology which will exactly describe what I suppose the Senator wants, and I do not think he will have any difficulty. But as the resolution is drawn, I think a large part of the information will be either useless or a delusion and a snare.

Mr. ALLEN. Probably the latter.

Mr. HOAR. I do not impute that motive to the Senator, but it will have that effect.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being House bill 4864.

#### 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.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read paragraph 29 of the bill, as follows:

29. Flaxseed or linseed and poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, 15 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds weight.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to offer an amendment to the paragraph just read?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert "twenty," so as to make the paragraph read:

Flaxseed, or linseed, and poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, 20 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds weight.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH], in a speech which he delivered in the Senate December 18, 1893, made a valuable contribution to the history of tariff legislation in the United States, and other Senators have shed much light on the same subject, but in no speech to which I have listened has a complete and exhaustive treatment of that important question been undertaken. As it is a subject of transcendent importance to the people of this country, I propose to undertake the task of giving, as briefly as may be, an accurate historical analysis of American legislation on this subject since the day the Pilgrims placed foot on Plymouth Rock to the present time. In this work I am under great obligations to the American Protective Tariff League for material prepared for me under their direction by Hon. D. G. Harriman, a close student of economic questions, whose patient research and learning were utilized in the arrangement of the subject-matter.

This historical contribution to the tariff discussion is made primarily with the view of endeavoring to persuade the Democratic side of the Chamber to unite with the Republican Senators against the pending bill, but chiefly for the purpose of acquainting the people of this country with the great fact that impartial history teaches that high tariffs have always brought prosperity to the people of the United States, while low tariffs have invariably disturbed business, prostrated industries, and brought suffering and want to the laboring masses of our people. There can be no escape from this conclusion. It is written on every page of American history, and the terrible results of low tariffs have been literally burned into the souls of the men and women who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. In this day of agitation of so-called tariff reform it is well that the truths of history be summoned to sweep away the sophistries and idle theories of educated doctrinaires and free-trade Congressmen.

#### REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC POLICIES CONTRASTED.

The New York Sun is the ablest Democratic newspaper in the United States, and is intensely partisan on nearly all political subjects; but in its issue of July 12, 1893, the following discriminating article appeared, and as it comes from an undoubted Democratic source and states the difference of the two parties so fairly and impartially, it is proper to quote it for the benefit of the doubtful and for the encouragement of protectionists:

Respecting Federal taxation, we will now state the position of the Democracy as defined by the Chicago platform, upon which the overwhelming victory of 1892 was gained. Ascertain the value of the goods to be imported. Ascertain the amount of revenue to be raised from imports for the expenses of the Government honestly administered. Fix the rate and collect it without discrimination, preference, or partiality. Anything else is unjustifiable. Anything else is unconstitutional. Anything else invades the rights of the citizen, and is unlawful as well as undemocratic. That is clear and comprehensive. That is what the Chicago platform declared and what the people approved.

The Republican position is diametrically different. Tariff duties, say the Republicans, should not be levied for the mere purpose of revenue, but largely with a view of promoting American manufactures and labor, and relieving farmers and mechanics from unfavorable foreign competition. The Republicans say that it is one of the powers and duties of a government to protect the people who maintain it from unfair foreign competition, as well as from hostile foreign invasion. The people, through their representatives, impose the taxes on goods entering into American ports from other countries, and they have the right (and it is natural that they should exercise it) so as to impose those duties that the interests of Americans will be favored and the interests of foreign rivals in the same industries or pursuits discriminated against. That is the Republican doctrine.

Between the two systems—Democratic, for revenue only; Republican, of discriminating taxes to foster and protect certain interests—there is no possible concordance. One is bluntly opposed to the other. If one is right, the other necessarily must be wrong.

#### SOME DEFINITIONS.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding relative to the meaning of certain terms and phrases, it may be well to define them.

A tariff is a system of duties imposed by the government of a country upon goods imported or exported. In the United States there is no duty on exports.

There are but two kinds of tariff in the United States:

1. A free-trade tariff.
2. A protective tariff.

A free-trade tariff is simply a tariff for revenue only; and revenue derived therefrom is intended for governmental expenses exclusively. It is the system which is in operation in England. Since it is designed for revenue only, its duties are nearly all levied upon articles (except luxuries) that are in great and certain demand. It so happens that the articles thus levied upon (except luxuries) are constantly required by the common people in their household economy, and that they can not be raised or produced profitably at home, such as tea, coffee, etc., and therefore can not come into competition with home productions.

A protective tariff not only provides revenue for the expenses of the Government, but also so discriminates its duties that they are levied principally upon imported articles that come in

direct competition with home industries, and so adjusts the rates that such competing foreign productions can not be placed upon the home markets at prices less than the fair and reasonable home-market price.

By this means the high wages of our home laborers are maintained, and need not be reduced to the low level of cheap foreign labor; and under this tariff, articles of necessity for the common people in their household economy, and which can not be raised or produced profitably at home, are admitted free of duty, such as tea, coffee, sugar, etc.

Duties are the specific sums of moneys or the rate per cent that is levied upon the goods passing through the custom-house. (Many use the term "tariff" synonymously with "duty," but incorrectly.)

There are two kinds of duties:

1. Specific; 2. Ad valorem.

A specific duty is a fixed sum of money to be paid upon each yard, ton, hundred, etc. Illustration: Wheat pays a specific duty of 25 cents a bushel, without reference to its market value.

An ad valorem duty is a stated per cent that is levied upon the value of the goods imported. Illustration: The duty on certain manufactures of silk is 50 per cent of their foreign value.

A very strong objection to an ad valorem duty is the opportunity it opens to fraud and dishonesty by undervaluation of the goods imported.

Both of these duties are sometimes combined on the same article.

Illustration: Wilton carpets pay a specific duty of 60 cents a square yard and an ad valorem of 40 per cent on their value.

Protection is that economic system which requires that its sufficient duties shall be levied only upon such commodities (beside mere luxuries) as we are capable of producing in economy and quantity to regulate prices in the home market (D. H. Rice).

Prior to 1883 we imported all our steel wire nails; the duty was 1 cent a pound, and the nails cost us 7 to 8 cents a pound. In 1883 the duty was raised to 4 cents a pound and in 1891 we made over 4,000,000 kegs, and exported them to all parts of the world; and our people could buy them at about 2 cents a pound.

Free trade is a dream, a vagary, a theory which, if it could be materialized, would abolish all tariff duties and remove all custom-houses from our frontiers, and let every nation into our markets as freely as the air comes in; but such a system has never been used or adopted between or among civilized nations.

It is taught nowhere except in colleges, by theorists and doctrinaires, and is absolutely impracticable.

Bounties are gifts or rewards from the General Government for services which are or will be for the public benefit, and without which assistance certain industries and lines of business could not otherwise be established.

Illustration: Under the McKinley tariff the duty on sugar, which had been about 2 cents a pound, was all taken off, and sugar was admitted free, a gain to the country of over \$60,000,000. By that act we should have utterly destroyed all the sugar planters of the country if the law had not provided a bounty of 2 cents a pound on all their production, amounting to \$9,000,000. We thus saved a large and growing industry, and after paying the bounty, had a net gain of \$51,000,000.

Subsidies are similar gifts to enable our people to build and operate steamships and other vessels, and so carry our own mails and our own merchandise, instead of relying upon other nations to do it for us, to our great loss and disadvantage.

Reciprocity is an arrangement or agreement between our own nation and another nation by which we agree to admit, free of duty, certain articles which we need, but which we can not raise or produce here; and in return the other nation admits to its ports, free of duty, certain articles which we produce, and which they need, but can not produce in their own land.

Illustration: Brazil produces great quantities of coffee and rubber, but does not produce flour nor machinery. We can not produce coffee and rubber, but we have a surplus of flour and machinery. We admit free of duty their coffee and rubber, and they admit free of duty our flour and machinery, and both nations are benefited, their home productions are greatly increased, their markets enlarged, and the laborers of each country find additional work and improved wages at home.

Germany has a large surplus of beet sugar which we need; and we have a large surplus of pork which they need. Each remitting the duty, we take their sugar and they take our pork, and both nations are richer.

From the very nature of the case, the parties who thus reciprocate must do so on differing productions. If we could raise good coffee, there would be no gain in reciprocity with Brazil on coffee; and if we could raise all the sugar we need, there would be no advantage in exchanging pork for sugar with Germany.

It will thus be seen that reciprocity is impossible with those nations whose productions are similar to our own. The opponents of

protection denounce reciprocity as a "fraud" and a "humbug," and ask "if reciprocity is desirable with South America and with Germany, why not with Great Britain?" The answer is plain and ready: The productions of Great Britain and our own are nearly all of similar kinds, and there is therefore no opportunity for reciprocity.

English laborers receive only half as much wages as our laborers are paid; and to admit the productions of Great Britain (similar to our own) to our markets free, when they cost only about half as much in wages as ours, would give our markets to Great Britain, stop our own mills and factories, and turn our laborers into the streets. Even so sturdy a Briton as Lord Salisbury admits this, and in his celebrated speech at Hastings, in May, 1892, frankly declared that England had no productions for which she could ask us to reciprocate.

Among other things, Lord Salisbury said:

Forty or fifty years ago everybody believed that free trade had conquered the world, and they prophesied that every nation would follow the example of England and give itself up to absolute free trade. The results are not exactly what they prophesied, but the more adverse the results were the more the devoted prophets of free trade declared that all would come right at last.

The worse the tariffs of foreign countries became the more confident were the prophecies of an early victory, but we see now, after many years' experience that explain it, how many foreign nations are raising, one after another, a wall—a brazen wall of protection—around their shores, which excludes us from their markets, and, so far as they are concerned, do their best to kill our trade, and this state of things does not get better. On the contrary, it constantly seems to get worse.

We live in an age of a war of tariffs. Every nation is trying how it can, by agreement with its neighbor, get the greatest possible protection for its own industries, and at the same time the greatest possible access to the markets of its neighbors.

The weapon with which they all fight is admission to their own markets—that is to say, A says to B, "If you will make your duties such that I can sell in your markets I will make my duties such that you can sell in my market." But we begin by saying we will levy no duties on anybody, and we declare that it would be contrary and disloyal to the glorious and sacred doctrine of free trade to levy any duty on anybody for the sake of what we can get by it. [Cheers.]

It may be noble, but it is not business. [Loud cheers.]—*New York World*.

#### WAGES AND WAGE-EARNERS.

The question of wages is of the highest importance, for wages are more quickly and powerfully influenced by tariff changes than even capital. Here is a fact that can not be refuted nor truthfully denied: that under protection wages in the United States have always been high and increasing, and have also had a greater purchasing power; while under a free tariff they have always been lower and decreasing, and have had a smaller purchasing power. In all the many changes or threatened changes of our tariff policy since 1783, this rule has been absolutely invariable; so that we have a right to claim, and do claim, that this important fact prevails because of the change in tariff policy, and for no other reason.

And the explanation of it is not difficult to find. Under a low tariff, importations are much larger than when duties are high; and consequently the demand for home productions falls off, the manufacture is decreased, and workmen are either discharged or their wages are reduced; while the exact reverse of this happens under a high tariff.

Two undisputed facts will help to make this matter clearer, and show how necessary protection is for the maintenance of high wages.

First. The English laborer receives but half, or less than half, as much wages as does the American laborer for the same kinds of work.

Second. From 75 to 90 per cent of the cost of production (except the commonest menial work) is labor; and it will now be easy to see that the English manufacturer can turn out his productions at much less cost than can the American manufacturer.

Illustration: Suppose some article of production which is in general use costs the American manufacturer \$20 when placed upon the market. This sum includes the labor (90 per cent), the materials, and a fair profit to the maker. From the fact that the English manufacturer pays only half as much for his labor, he can produce just as good an article for about half as much, or say \$11. To this sum let us add a large profit and freightage, say \$4; and if there is no tariff duty, the Englishman can place his article upon our market and sell for \$15; and when placed side by side with the American product, the Englishman has a clear advantage of \$5 over the American; and, other things being equal, the Englishman will control the market; nay, he must do so, for customers, as a rule, will not pay an extra \$5 for the sake of a sentiment.

There are in such cases but two possible results: First, the American must stop manufacturing; or, second, he must reduce the wages of his workmen to the English level.

#### HOW PROTECTION PROTECTS.

But right here Republicans come forward with their protective tariff, and under its beneficent action the American is not obliged to stop manufacturing, nor to reduce the wages of his

employés; nor after competition is established does the consumer pay more than the English price for the article.

We say to English and other foreign manufacturers, through our National Government: If you choose to have your laborers work for starvation wages; if you prefer to keep them in such a state of industrial vassalage, that "what they eat to-day they must earn to-morrow;" if you think it right that the great mass of your laborers, men and women, should spend all their lives simply to obtain an insufficient supply of inferior food and clothing, and to wear out their weary lives "vainly striving bread to win," that is your own matter and we can not prevent it if we would. But we say to you distinctly and positively, that American laborers are not paid any more than fair and reasonable wages; that we will neither permit our manufacturers to stop work, nor the wages of our workmen to be degraded to the English level of your cheap labor; and for these reasons we will levy duties upon all your productions that compete with our own, so that you can not bring them here and put them upon our markets at prices less than our own, nor undersell our goods of the same classes, unless you do it at a loss to yourselves. Bring up your wages to the American level and we will then take our chances against you, but not otherwise.

#### THE TARIFF AND WAGES; SOME IMPORTANT OPINIONS.

James G. Blaine years ago said:

The tariff question is essentially a question of wages.

THOMAS B. REED'S opinion on the question of wages, as stated in his great speech against the Wilson bill in the House of Representatives on February 1, 1894, is pertinent and is in part as follows:

I confess to you that this question of wages is to me the vital question. To insure our growth in civilization and wealth, we must not only have wages as high as they now are, but constantly and steadily increasing. In my judgment, upon wages and the consequent distribution of consumable wealth are based all our hopes of the future and all the possible increase of our civilization. The progress of this nation is dependent upon the progress of all. The fact that in this country all the workers have been getting better wages than elsewhere is the very reason why our market is the best in the world, and why all the nations of the world are trying to break into it.

J. G. CANNON of Illinois, in the same discussion, said:

Wages are higher here than abroad. Prove it? Yes. The 500,000 to 700,000 who cross the ocean annually come here to find homes. Why? Because they better their condition; because their wages are better. If the cheaper labor of the Old World sends its products to the United States free and sells them in our markets in competition with like products of our better paid labor, this would not elevate their labor, but would pull down our labor. If the Old World wants free trade with us, let it elevate its labor to an equality with our own; and until this is done let us protect our own.

J. F. LACEY of Iowa, said:

The question of protection is one of wages. Employers cut wages and their workmen strike. A political party cuts wages by legislation, and it must expect the workingmen of the country to return the blow with interest at more than 5 per cent.

#### FIFTY YEARS OF FREE-TRADE TARIFF IN GREAT BRITAIN.

What has it done and what is it doing for her toiling millions? England collects annually from customs duties on articles which she does not produce but which her wage-earners regard as necessities of life, the sum of \$100,000,000. The laborers of England pay more than three-fourths of this sum. They pay a duty of 75 cents or more a pound on tobacco; on coffee, 3 to 4 cents a pound; on tea, 12 cents, and other things in proportion. Then look at the places they call "homes." In Manchester great numbers of houses have but one small room, and this is used for all purposes by the family because they have no other. In London over 60,000 families are similarly situated. It is no better in Dundee. In Glasgow 45,000 families live each in a single room. In Scotland one-third of the laboring families live each in a single room. It is not unusual to find in these single rooms all over Great Britain families numbering from six to nine persons of all ages and both sexes.

Is such life, living; or is it herding? In one year, the public authorities furnished relief to English laborers: In Yorkshire to 50,000; in London to 500,000; and in Great Britain to 922,000 persons. In London, the wealthiest city of the world, one out of every nine died in the workhouse, and in Great Britain one out of every seven died in the workhouse. The paupers of England number nearly 1,000,000, or one to every thirty-six persons, and her pauperism and consequent crime cost her over \$80,000,000. A house-owner among workingmen is seldom found. Land is going out of cultivation, and already 2,500,000 acres have been abandoned to foxes and birds. In ten years, 1871 to 1881, sheep decreased in number 6,000,000; and farms and farmers, 10 per cent; and the number of those engaged in gainful occupations decreased about 3,000,000. Women and girls by tens of thousands are obliged to work in coal mines, in coal-yards, in brick-yards, in nail-shops, and in other degrading places, at the merest pittance of wages. As black as is this picture of England's laborers, much more could be added if we had the time for it; but with all of these discomforts and disadvantages, what one advantage do they have that our workingmen are deprived of?

## SOME ENGLISH OPINIONS.

Lest it might be thought that this description of the English laborers was the prejudiced opinion of an American protectionist, I will briefly quote from a few Englishmen of high standing:

**John Ruskin:**

Though England is deafened with spinning wheels, her people have not clothes; though she is black with the digging of fuel, they die of cold; and though she has sold her soul for gain, they die of hunger.

**John Bright:**

Nearly one-third of the whole people dwell in homes of only one room; and more than two-thirds of the people of Scotland dwell in homes of more than two rooms. We find poverty and misery. What does it mean? It means more than I can describe and more than I will attempt to describe; and as need begets need, so poverty and misery beget poverty and misery. In fact, in looking at the past, to me it is a melancholy thing to look at, there is much of it which excites in me not astonishment but horror. The fact is there passes before my eyes a vision of millions of families—not individuals, but families—fathers, mothers, children—passing, ghastly, sorrow-stricken, in never-ending procession from their cradles to their graves.

**Bennet Burleigh:**

There is no gainsaying the existence, rich and potent as the British Empire is, of widespread privation among the working classes of Great Britain. This distress has now become a constant, an aggravated quantity. Men, women, and children, by hundreds of thousands, miserably half clad, have to face the chill English winter, hibernating as best they can in dark, frowsy abodes, from which they emerge but to plead for bread.

**Joseph Chamberlain:**

The class of agricultural laborers of this country (Great Britain) are never able to do more than make both ends meet, and have to look forward in times of illness, or on the approach of old age, to the workhouse as the one inevitable refuge against starvation. The ordinary conditions of life among the large proportion of the population are such that common decency is absolutely impossible; and all this goes on in sight of the mansions of the rich.

**John Morley:**

It is an awful fact—it is really not short of awful—that in this country (Great Britain), with all its wealth, all its vast resources, all its power, 45 per cent—that is to say, nearly one-half—of the persons who reach the age of 60 are or have been paupers. I say it is a most tremendous fact, and I can not conceive any subject more worthy of the attention of the Legislature, more worthy of the attention of all.

**Thomas Carlyle:**

British industrial existence seems fast becoming one huge poison swamp of reckless pestilence—physical and moral—a hideous living Golgotha of souls and bodies buried alive. Thirty thousand outcast needewomen working themselves swiftly to death. Three million paupers rotting in forced idleness, and these are but items in the sad ledger of despair.

**Prof. Huxley:**

A population whose labor is insufficiently remunerated must become physically and morally unhealthy and socially unstable; and though it may succeed for awhile in industrial competition, by reason of the cheapness of its produce, it must in the end fall, through hideous misery and degradation to utter ruin.

And yet this British free-trade tariff, the parent of most of the poverty and degradation above referred to, is the one free traders here would have us adopt.

## AN INVARIABLE RULE.

**Mr. D. H. Mason says:**

All the prosperity enjoyed by the American people—absolutely all the prosperity without any reservation whatever—from the foundation of the United States Government down to the present time, has been under the reign of protective principles; and all the hard times suffered by the American people in the same period have been preceded, either by a heavy reduction of duties on imports (or by a threat of such reduction) or by insufficient protection; thus refuting all free-trade theories on the subject.

The truth or falsity of this declaration will be established by the historical facts of our colonial and national experiences. Let us examine these facts, and let them determine which is true.

## FIRST FREE TRADE PERIOD, 1620-1789—1. UNDER THE COLONIAL GOVERNMENT—2. UNDER THE CONFEDERACY.

Since 1620, and through our colonial history, but especially since the treaty of 1783, by which the Revolutionary war was closed and our Independence established, we have tried and thoroughly tested all the different phases of this economic question, from extreme free trade, under the Confederacy (1783 to 1789), to the high protective tariff under the rule of the Republican party since 1861.

## FREE TRADE UNDER THE CONFEDERACY.

It is a historical fact, though comparatively few of our people seem to be aware of it, that during the Confederacy, the period preceding the adoption of our Constitution, we made for the first and only time in our history a full and fair trial of free trade of practically unrestricted imports.

England boasts of being the great free-trade nation of the world, but she has never had a free-trade system that approaches the one we "enjoyed" from 1783 to 1789. How much we enjoyed it appears hereafter.

## CONGRESS UNDER THE CONFEDERACY.

Under the Confederacy, the States were held together by a rope of sand. The powers of Congress were exceedingly limited, especially on this question. It had no authority to enact a general tariff on imports without the consent of every one of the thirteen States, and such consent was never given.

The States thought that they were individually competent to manage those matters for themselves, and that they could protect their separate rights better than Congress could do it for them. Each State had the right to regulate its own trade, and each imposed upon foreign products and upon the products of the other States such duties as it deemed best. Each strove to secure trade for itself without regard to the interests of any other State.

## JEALOUSY OF THE STATES.

Jealousy of each other seems to have been the underlying motive of their unfortunate actions. Pennsylvania established a duty of 2½ per cent, but even this was an ineffectual remedy; for New Jersey opened a free port at Burlington, where the Pennsylvania merchants entered their goods and took them clandestinely across the river to Pennsylvania without paying any duty.

New Jersey voted to allow Congress to impose a general tariff, while New York, on account of her situation relative to Connecticut and New Jersey, and the advantages this situation gave her in the matter of importations, refused to do so. New Jersey thereupon withdrew her consent and, in order to annoy New York, established a free port at Paulus Hook, opposite New York City, and New York merchants repeated the tactics of Philadelphia, and got their goods free of duty.

Hamilton urged upon the States the necessity of stopping this suicidal policy and of vesting Congress with full power to regulate trade, and he contrasted the "prospect of a number of petty States, jarring, jealous, and perverse, fluctuating and unhappy at home, and weak by their dissensions in the eyes of other nations," with a "noble and magnificent perspective of a great republic;" but it was years before he and others could persuade the States to do this. As just stated, Congress had no power in itself to lay duties or to regulate trade, and as the States would not agree upon a uniform rate of duty, each sought its own advantage at the expense of its neighbors, and, as a necessary consequence, the country at large fell an easy prey to foreign nations, which lost no time in passing such laws as they judged most likely to destroy our commerce and extend their own.

## GREAT BRITAIN'S BARBAROUS POLICY.

Especially was this true of Great Britain, then as now, the most selfish and grasping commercial power on the earth. And her conduct during this period of the Confederacy was in conformity with the policy she has always maintained.

## HOW GREAT BRITAIN TREATED THE COLONIES.

In 1699 Parliament decreed that "after the 1st day of December, 1699, no wool, yarn, cloth, or woollen manufactures of the English plantations in America shall be shipped from any of said plantations, or otherwise laden, in order to be transported thence to any place whatsoever, under a penalty of forfeiting both ship and cargo, and £500 (\$2,500) for each offense."

In 1732 Parliament prohibited the exportation of hats from province to province, and limited the number of apprentices to be taken by hatters. In 1750, the erection of any mill or engine for splitting or rolling iron was prohibited under a penalty of \$1,000 for each offense; but pig-iron could be exported to England, duty free, in order that it might be manufactured there and returned to the colonies. Later, Lord Chatham declared that he would not permit the colonists to make even a hob-nail or a horseshoe for themselves, and his views were subsequently carried into effect by the absolute prohibition in 1765 of the export of artisans; in 1781, of woollen machinery; in 1782, of cotton machinery and artificers in cotton; in 1785 (when the States most needed them), of iron and steel making machinery, and workmen in those departments of trade; and in 1799, by the prohibition of the export of colliers, lest other countries should acquire the art of mining coal.

England's object was to keep the colonists all farmers, so as to supply her home people, engaged mostly in manufacturing, with food and raw materials, and to compel the colonists to take from her in return her manufactured products; also to pay profit both ways; in other words, to compel them to sell to England all they had to sell—their agricultural surplus—and to buy from her all they were obliged to purchase—all manufactured articles of any importance. This process was pleasing and remunerative to British manufacturers and capitalists; but it kept the colonists poor, and almost ruined them. For, as has been shown, they were forbidden to manufacture anything themselves, and they were never able to raise an agricultural surplus sufficient to pay for what they had to import.

With no tariff on imports at home, but subject to such burdens on our exports abroad as was pleasing to those to whom we were obliged to sell, the imports of the colonists in 1771 exceeded their exports by \$13,750,000—an enormous sum in those days.

Is it any wonder that our forefathers rebelled? And not satisfied with these measures to prevent and repress all manufacturing enterprise in the States, she also attempted to destroy all

our commerce by enforcing most barbarously their iniquitous laws with respect to navigation.

By the navigation act Great Britain decreed that "no goods or commodities whatever, of the growth, production, or manufacture of Europe, Africa, or America, shall be imported into England or Ireland, or into any of the plantations (American colonies) except in ships belonging to English subjects, of which the master and the greater number of the crew shall also be English."

Our trade with her West Indian colonies was prohibited; and by the enforcement of these navigation acts our commerce was nearly destroyed. As we had no tariff, foreign vessels and goods were freely admitted into our States; while our vessels and goods were burdened with heavy rates and duties in foreign ports. It thus happened that the prices of goods imported and the prices of our exports were subject to the will of foreigners. They demanded their own prices for their imports, and we had to pay them; and they offered us their own prices for our goods, and we had to take them; for, being without a national tariff, we were absolutely at their mercy.

Before this navigation act was passed, the colonists had sent their trading ships to all the known ports of the world, and their commerce had become considerable and valuable to them, but by that act it was annihilated at a blow. Even Burke declared in Parliament that "by it the commerce of the colonies was not only tied, but strangled." Is it not true that England was and is the most selfish of nations? Her object will be stated further on.

#### HOW THE STATES WERE AFFECTED.

In the comparative condition of the United States and Great Britain, after the close of the Revolutionary war, not a hatter, a boot or shoe maker, a saddler, or a brass-founder here could carry on his business, except in the coarsest and most ordinary production, under the pressure of this foreign dictation. Thus was presented the extraordinary and calamitous spectacle of a successful revolution wholly failing of its ultimate object. The people of America had gone to war not for names, but for things; to redress their own grievances, to improve their own condition, and to throw off the burden which the colonial system had laid on their industry. To attain these objects they had endured incredible hardships, and borne and suffered almost beyond the measure of humanity.

And when their independence was attained, they found that, by the ungenerous, uncivilized, and unchristian legislation and action of Great Britain, it was merely a piece of parchment. The industry which had been burdened in the colonies had been crushed in the free States, and the mechanics and manufacturers of the country found themselves, in the bitterness of their hearts, independent and ruined.

Daniel Webster, in a speech on the 8th of July, 1833, affirmed the truth of the foregoing statements when he said:

From the close of the war of the Revolution there came a period of depression and distress on the Atlantic coast such as the people had hardly felt during the sharpest crisis of the war itself. Shipowners, shipbuilders, mechanics, artisans, all were destitute of employment, and some of them destitute of bread. British ships came freely and British ships came plentifully, while to American ships and American products, there was neither protection on the one side nor the equivalent of reciprocal free trade on the other. The cheaper labor of England supplied the inhabitants of the Atlantic shores with everything. Ready-made clothes, among the rest, from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet, were for sale in every city. All these things came free from any general system of imposts. Some of the States attempted to establish their own partial systems, but they failed.

George Bancroft, on page 432, volume 1, History of the Constitution, paints the picture of this period (1785) even a darker shade when he says:

It is certain that the English have the trade of these States almost wholly in their hands, whereby their influence must increase; and a constantly increasing scarcity of money begins to be felt, since no ship sails hence to England without large sums of money on board, especially the English packet boats, which monthly take with them between forty and fifty thousand pounds sterling.

Again, on page 439, we find this:

The scarcity of money makes the produce of the country cheap, to the disappointment of the farmers and the discouragement of husbandry. Thus the two classes, merchants and farmers, that divide nearly all America, are discontented and distressed.

#### GREEDY SELFISHNESS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

It may be remarked in passing that it has always been the leading object of Great Britain to manufacture for the world, to monopolize the bulk of reproductive power, and, if possible, to keep all other countries in a state of industrial vassalage, by means of her great capital, her cheap labor, her skill, and her mercantile marine. Her policy has been, and is, to force all other countries to compete in her home markets for the sale of their raw materials. Why? To enable her to fix the price of what she buys. It has also been, and is, her policy to force all other nations to compete in her home markets for the purchase of her finished products. Why? To enable her to fix the price of what she sells. Of course, that is business; and if England

can enforce such policies she will, indeed, become the mistress of the world. This policy she enforced upon us under the Confederacy.

In proof that this selfish policy has prevailed in England, many of her ablest public men might be quoted; but two or three will suffice at this time.

Years ago Lord Goderich publicly declared in the English Parliament:

Other nations know that what we English mean by free trade is nothing more nor less than by means of the great advantages we enjoy, to get the monopoly of all the markets of other nations for our manufactures; and to prevent them (the foreign nations), one and all, from ever becoming manufacturing nations.

David Syme, another prominent English free trader and member of Parliament, openly said:

In any quarter of the globe, where competition shows itself as likely to interfere with English monopoly, immediately the capital of her manufacturers is massed in that particular quarter; and goods are exported there in large quantities, and sold at such price that outside competition is effectually counted out. English manufacturers have been known to export goods to a distant market and sell them under cost for years, with a view of getting the market into their own hands again, and keep that foreign market, and step in for the whole when prices revive.

No comment is called for at this time; but historical facts establish the accuracy of the statement as to the selfishness of Great Britain beyond all question, and her conduct toward this country after the close of the war of the Revolution as well as after the close of our second war with Great Britain will be found instructive.

#### RESULTS OF SUCH A POLICY.

And so the years from 1783 to 1789 were lovely, halcyon days for the merchants and statesmen of Great Britain. In about three years' time nearly all the money of the country had passed into the pockets of British merchants and manufacturers, and we were left "poor indeed;" for not only did they take from us our money, but they took also our good name for integrity, independence, and common sense, which we had won in the Revolutionary war.

As there was no tariff to prevent, foreign nations literally poured in upon us their products of every kind and description in such quantities and at such prices that our people could not compete with them.

Our domestic industries were suspended. The weaver, the shoemaker, the hatter, the saddler, the rope-maker, and many others were reduced to bankruptcy; our markets were glutted with foreign products; prices fell; our manufacturers generally were ruined; our laborers beggared; our artisans without employment; our merchants insolvent, and our farmers necessarily followed all these classes into the vortex of general financial destruction.

Depreciation seized upon every species of property. Legal pressure to enforce payment of debts caused alarming sacrifices of both personal and real estate; spread distress far and wide among the masses of the people; aroused in the hearts of the sufferers the bitterest feelings against lawyers, the courts, and the whole creditor class; led to a popular clamor for stay laws and various other radical measures of supposed relief, and finally filled the whole land with excitement, apprehension, and sense of weakness and a tendency to despair of the Republic. Inability to pay even necessary taxes became general, and often these could be collected only by levy and sale of the homestead.—Mason.

Such were the ruinous results that necessarily followed the adoption of a free-trade policy under the Confederacy.

A writer of that period says:

We are poor, with a profusion of material wealth in our possession. That we are poor needs no other proof than our prisons, bankruptcies, judgments, executions, auctions, mortgages, etc., and the shameless quantity of business in our courts of law.

Hildreth's History, page 465, 468, volume 3, speaking of this period, has this true but terrible indictment:

The large importation of foreign goods, subject to little or no duty and sold at peace prices, was proving ruinous to all those domestic manufactures and mechanical employments which the nonconsumption agreements and the war had created and fostered. Immediately after the peace, the country had been flooded with imported goods, and debts had been unwarily contracted, for which there was no means to pay.

Our imports from Great Britain alone were \$30,000,000 in 1784-'85, while our exports to her were only \$9,000,000, a frightful balance on the wrong side. They drained us of our last dollar and left us for a circulating medium only orders on State tax collectors and depreciated certificates of State and Federal debt, themselves worthless.

#### OTHER CALAMITOUS RESULTS.

The distress became universal and calamitous. In the district of Maine a convention was held for the purpose of revolting from the State of Massachusetts. In New Hampshire the people surrounded the building where the Legislature was in session and declared that it should not adjourn till it had passed measures to abolish debt, or to relieve the people in some other way.

In Massachusetts fully one-third of the population joined in Shays's rebellion on account of the abject poverty and distress of

the people, and nothing less than military force was able to repress all these lawless demonstrations and revolts.

Among the causes that led to Shays's rebellion Hildreth mentions—

The want of a certain and remunerative market for the produce of the farmer, and the depression of domestic manufactures by competition from abroad.

The French minister at that period, after relating the foregoing disturbances, adds:

It must be agreed that these insurrections are, in a great part, due to the scarcity of specie.

In Connecticut more than five hundred farms were offered for sale for arrears of taxes, which the owners were too poor to pay; and in Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and South Carolina matters were scarcely any better.

There was no market for real estate, and debtors, who were compelled to sell their lands, were ruined, without paying one-fourth of the demands against them.

Men universally distrusted each other. The bonds of men whose competency should have been unquestioned could not be negotiated, except at a discount of 30, 40, or even 50 per cent.

#### FREE TRADE THE REAL CAUSE OF THESE EVILS.

It was generally understood and agreed, by the writers and statesmen of that distressful period, that the widespread and almost universal ruin which then involved the States in general disorder, revolt, and rebellion were in great part, if not wholly, due to the scarcity of specie, or good money.

In his History of the Insurrection, Minot regards as one of the leading causes that led to those troubles—

The loss of many markets to which Americans had formerly resorted with their produce. Thus was the usual means of remittance by articles of the growth of the country almost annihilated, and little else than specie remained to answer the demands incurred by importations. The money, of course, was drawn off, and this being inadequate to the purpose of discharging the whole amount of foreign contracts, the rest was chiefly sunk by the bankruptcies of the importers. The scarcity of specie, arising principally from this cause, was attended with evident consequences; it checked commercial intercourse through the community, and furnished reluctant debtors with an apology for withholding their dues both from individuals and the public.

But the scarcity of specie, or money, was due, as has already been shown, to the free-trade policy of that period, which allowed and encouraged such enormous excess of imports over exports, and thus necessitated the withdrawal of the gold and silver from the country to pay such excess.

Had there been no free trade, there would have been no inundation of foreign goods; had there been no inundation of foreign goods, there would have been no drain of specie; had there been no drain of specie, there would have been no lack of a circulating medium; had there been no such distress, there would have been no impulse toward insubordination to the State.—*Mason.*

Consequently, it follows legitimately, that free trade was the principal source or cause of the widespread discontent, distress, and the demoralization of that period.

#### A SUMMARY OF THESE EVIL RESULTS.

Free trade was the starting point. It was quickly followed by imports largely in excess of exports; then by a glut of foreign productions; then by suspension of our own manufactures of all kinds; then by a gradual, but complete, loss of all our specie; then by the necessary stoppage of most of our business; then by the enforced idleness of our laborers and artisans; then by universal debt; then by a crushing depreciation of real estate; then by a positive inability on the part of nearly everybody to pay their debts; then by general distress and financial ruin; and finally by insurrections and rebellions which threatened destruction to the life and liberties of the nation.

As this was the closest approach to absolute free trade ever tried by this country, so there was the largest harvest of dangers and calamities ever experienced by the American people.—*Mason.*

For this reason I have dwelt more at length upon the period of the Confederacy, and for the further reason that the causes of the terrible sufferings and disasters of our forefathers, under the free-trade policy of that period, are so little understood and appreciated.

#### THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH TEACHINGS.

Lured on by these false doctrines of political economy, our people had been drawing closer and closer to the brink of individual and national bankruptcy and consequent political annihilation; and at last they stood where another step in that direction was impossible without plunging into that bottomless abyss. If they would survive as a nation, there was but one thing for them to do, or that they could do, and that was to turn away from free trade and lay hold on protection.

Our forefathers were not fools, though they acted very foolishly. They had been educated, as just stated; in the false doctrines of political economy as taught in England—the most swinishly selfish system ever formulated by man; and these doctrines had been so firmly established in their minds that nothing less than the bitter school of adversity could correct and eradicate them.

But standing there upon that brink of sure destruction they had the good sense to see the truth, and to declare that while they were willing to give up everything, even to life itself, to maintain liberty and national independence, they could not see any good reason why they should sacrifice themselves to maintain a doctrine (free trade) that had brought to them only distress, misery, and financial ruin.

#### DEMAND FOR A NATIONAL CONSTITUTION.

And now, having discovered their impending danger and the cause of it; having been convinced of the false and ruinous commercial policy of England toward them—the policy of practical free trade—and having comprehended the fact that a home market and home protection affords the only real safety for the American people, they took immediate steps to convene a Constitutional Convention, to draft a Constitution which should secure these great blessings, with others, to them and their posterity forever. They had learned that a strong central power was necessary, and that many rights, then reserved to the States, must be delegated to this central power.

#### THE LEADING QUESTION.

There were other great questions to be discussed and settled, but the leading question was: "How shall we secure protection to home industries?"

The people of this country demanded a Union stronger than the Confederation, for the very purpose of shielding home industries from the prostrating assaults of foreign competition, through the regulation of commerce with other nations, so as to check or to prohibit the importation of commodities that interfered with the growth and prosperity of domestic manufactures; and so as to give native productions an impetus which would develop all the resources inherent within the boundaries of the nation, essential for the supply and consumption of the population at all times. No fact is more securely established than is this.—*Mason.*

In the debate on the first tariff bill in 1789, Fisher Ames, one of the ablest men in that Congress, said:

I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than by any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest, and to advance our commerce, was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote our general welfare.

The historian Bancroft says:

The necessity for regulating commerce (*i. e.* for providing a proper tariff) gave the immediate impulse to a more perfect Constitution. (Volume 1, page 146.)

Daniel Webster, historically known as "the Great Expounder of the Constitution," in a speech at Buffalo, June, 1833, declared:

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

Years later Mr. Webster repeated this idea, but much clearer and stronger in a speech at Albany, in August, 1844, when he said:

In colonial times and during the time of the Convention the idea was held up that domestic industry could not prosper, manufactures and the mechanic arts could not advance, the condition of the common country could not be carried up to any considerable elevation, unless there should be one government to lay one rate of duty upon imports throughout the Union; regard to be had in laying this duty to the protection of American labor and industry.

I defy the man in any degree conversant with the history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, to say that protection of American labor and industry was not a leading, I might almost say the leading, motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted.

Another remarkable man who made a careful study of this matter (Rufus Choate) declared:

A whole people, a whole generation of our fathers, had in view, as one grand end and purpose of their new Government, the acquisition of the means of restraining, by governmental action, the importation of foreign manufactures, for the encouragement of manufactures and of labor at home; and desired and meant to do this by clothing the new Government with this specific power of regulating commerce. This whole country, with one voice, demanded to have inserted in the Constitution the power to enact protective legislation, a power which they held as another declaration of independence—a power by which we are able to protect all our children of labor. This power must not be surrendered, must not sleep, until the Union flag shall be hauled down from the last masthead—a sight which I trust neither we nor our children to the thousandth generation are doomed to see.

This position could be fortified with other quotations from Fisher Ames, Edward Everett, James Madison, and many others, but they must be omitted at this time.

The convention was held; the Constitution was drafted, accepted, and adopted. The First Congress was elected under its provisions, and by this Congress the splendid machinery of the Constitution was set in motion.

#### FIRST PROTECTION PERIOD, 1789 TO 1816—1789: THE TARIFF THE FIRST QUESTION.

The tariff question was the very first subject discussed by the First Congress; and for more than one hundred years has been the one subject that has never been finally settled.

Nullification, secession, banks, slavery, and reconstruction have had their times of fierce discussion, and have all been for-

ever settled, but the tariff was never a more vital question than it is to-day.

The first act of the First Congress regulated the form of the oath to be taken by officials, and was merely formal, but the first act of that Congress affecting the country was the act establishing a protective tariff, passed and signed by George Washington, July 4, 1789.

The discussion was long and earnest. It was participated in by such men as James Madison, R. H. Lee, Charles Carroll, Rufus King, Oliver Ellsworth, Fisher Ames, Roger Sherman, J. Trumbull, and others; and a Congress composed of such men passed a tariff act in the interest of protection and not for "revenue only," for in the preamble to the act occur these words:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debt of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on imported goods, etc.: Therefore, be it enacted, etc.

It may be remarked in passing that a large majority of that First Congress were farmers; but they saw the necessity of encouraging and protecting manufactures, in order that they might be free from servile and dangerous dependence upon foreign nations for the arms, the implements of farming, and other machinery needed for their own safety, protection, and independence.

It is thus seen that the doctrine of protection to home manufactures—to home products—was coeval with our national organization. It had its enemies even then; and then, as now, the most conspicuous were either Englishmen or men imbued with English ideas; but all of the leading men—the men whose actions and legislation made the Revolution a success, the men who formulated our glorious Constitution and secured its adoption by the several States—all voted for the protective tariff bill, and rejoiced greatly when it became a law.

#### OPINIONS OF PRESIDENTS.

Five of these leading men became Presidents while the law of 1789 remained on our statute book, and it may not be uninteresting nor unprofitable to learn right here what these great men thought of protection to home manufactures.

George Washington, in his first annual message, speaking of our nation as "a free people," said:

Their safety and interest require that they promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials, particularly military supplies.

In his seventh annual message he shows that—

Our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures prosper beyond example (under the tariff of 1789). Every part of the Union displays indications of rapid and various improvement, and with burdens so light as scarcely to be perceived. Is it too much to say that our country exhibits a spectacle of national happiness never surpassed, if ever before equaled?

In his eighth and last annual message Washington said:

Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible.

John Adams, our second President, in his last annual message referred to our economical system, and congratulated the country upon the great prosperity then existing, and added:

I observe, with much satisfaction, that the product of the revenue during the present year has been more considerable than during any former period.

This result affords conclusive evidence of the great resources of the country, and of the wisdom and efficiency of the measures which have been adopted by Congress for the protection of commerce and preservation of the public credit.

Thomas Jefferson, our third President, often referred to as the founder of the Democratic party, in his second annual message, in enumerating the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings, mentions the following as one of the most prominent:

To protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances.

Our protective system, under the tariff act of 1789, had produced results far greater and more satisfactory than had been anticipated; and in 1803 Mr. Jefferson found that there was likely to be a considerable surplus after paying all the public debt called for by our contracts; and in his sixth annual message he thus presents his views to the country as to the best method of disposing of that surplus:

Shall we—

He asks—

suppress the imposts (duties) and give that advantage to foreign over our domestic manufactures? On a few articles of more general and necessary use, the suppression in due season will doubtless be right; but the great mass of the articles on which imposts are laid are foreign luxuries, purchased by those only who are rich enough to afford themselves the use of them.

Again he wrote:

The general inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He therefore who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in caves and

dens. I am proud to say I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comforts.

The prohibiting duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with the patriotic determination of every good citizen to use no foreign article which can be made within ourselves, without regard to difference of price, secures us against a relapse into foreign dependency.

In his letter to Humphrey, 1809, he wrote:

My own idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw materials.

In 1817, after the close of the second war with Great Britain, in accepting an election to membership in a "Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufactures," Jefferson wrote:

The history of the last twenty years has been a significant lesson for us all to depend for necessities on ourselves alone; and I hope twenty years more will place the American hemisphere under a system of its own, essentially peaceable and industrious and not needing to extract its comforts out of the eternal fires raging in the Old World.

James Madison, our fourth President, recognized as the "Father of the Constitution," in a special message to Congress May 23, 1809, said:

It will be worthy of the just and provident care of Congress to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens.

Again, in a special message, February 20, 1815, Mr. Madison said:

But there is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress than a consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and obtained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress.

James Monroe, our fifth President, in his inaugural, said:

Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing, as we do, all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend in the degree we have done on supplies from other countries. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets.

In his seventh annual message he says:

Having formerly communicated my views to Congress respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures, and the principle on which it should be founded, I have only to add that those views remain unchanged. I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture, or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country.

Here, then, are the views in brief of our first five Presidents, and the foremost men of the years in which the tariff act of 1789 was a law. We find no hint of dissatisfaction with protection, no suggestion of a repeal of the law, and no intimation of a modification of the tariff laws, except to give them "a prompt and constant guardianship" and "additional protection to those articles we are prepared to manufacture," etc.

Let us now return to our "Historical Statement," and learn, if we may, what were some of the resulting benefits from the new tariff law.

#### BENEFITS OF THE TARIFF OF 1789.

Agriculture became more extensive and prosperous; commerce increased with wonderful rapidity; old industries were revived, and many new ones were established in all parts of the country; our merchant navy was revived and multiplied; all branches of domestic trade were prosperous; our revenue soon became sufficient to pay the expenses of the Government, and give relief to its creditors; the people again became contented and industrious; and the whole country seemed to be, and was, on the high road to great national wealth and prosperity.

No material changes in the law of 1789 were enacted till 1812, and the general prosperity above indicated continued through that period.

#### 1808.—EMBARGO ACT.

This act has no relation whatever to the tariff act; neither was it a tariff act; but, as in tracing the history of the tariff from 1789, free traders often refer to this act as "tariff legislation prohibiting all importation, followed by universal disaster," it may be well to see just what the truth is about it.

They (the free traders) intend to convey the impression that this absolute prohibition of importations in 1803 was passed in the interest of protection; than which nothing could be further from the truth.

This "prohibition" was the celebrated "embargo act" of 1808, and grew out of the war between Great Britain and France.

Each of these countries had prohibited all commerce with the other, established blockades, and authorized the search of neutral vessels. So outrageous was their conduct that President Jefferson wrote that "England was a den of pirates and France a den of thieves;" and at his suggestion Congress passed the embargo act as a measure of retaliation against these nations. But as

our home productions were then quite limited, it was soon found that the embargo act was more hurtful to us than to our enemies; and within a year, at Jefferson's suggestion, it was repealed. But in all the discussion that led to its enactment or repeal, nothing was said about "tariff" or "protection." But even that act was not without its compensation; for it gave a great stimulus to the establishment of new industries and manufactures for making those articles which formerly were imported, but which under that prohibition had to be made here or not at all.

#### 1812—THE TARIFF DUTIES RAISED.

In 1812, as a measure to raise money to carry on the war with England, the tariff duties were nearly doubled, greatly to the benefit of the country and of its home industries—the increase to be taken off after the close of the war.

This was the period of our second war with Great Britain; and of course our importations were very small, as England would sell us nothing, and, with her war vessels, strove to destroy all our importations from other countries.

The very fact that our importations were thus all stopped, or nearly so, compelled us to erect factories and foundries of our own, and start new industries to supply our necessities; and notwithstanding this tremendous strain and demand upon our resources, caused by the three years' war from 1812, we made rapid progress in national wealth and manufacturing ability during this period. Of course, there was much of distress and hard times, war always produces these. New England shipping was somewhat disturbed, but New England was more than compensated by the great increase that came to her manufactures during this period. In a special message President Madison earnestly asked of Congress "deliberate consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and attained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars."

#### SECOND FREE-TRADE PERIOD, 1816-1824—1816: REPEAL OF THE TARIFF.

But in 1816, by one of those inexplicable changes in public opinion, probably a mere desire for a change similar to those of 1884 and 1892, there was a decided reaction from the high tariff rates of 1812 and in favor of the Democratic party and its economic ideas, which have always leaned toward free trade or very low tariff rates. The law of 1789 and the amendment of 1812 were repealed, and lower duties substituted therefor. And while there were some protective features retained in the act of 1816, it was nevertheless a very wide and disastrous departure from the tariff rates of 1812, and at the best was only "moderately protective."

#### WHY THE TARIFF OF 1816 FAILED.

But there were some extraordinary reasons why the tariff of 1816 was a failure and why its rates were insufficient.

At the close of the war between the United States and Great Britain, England and English manufacturers made two discoveries which were very startling and disagreeable to them. First, that having been deprived of the American markets by the embargo act and the subsequent war, the British manufacturers found their warehouses at the close of the war full of bursting with unsold productions of various kinds, for which they were very anxious but unable to find a market. Second, that the Americans, compelled by the same reasons to rely upon themselves instead of the English manufacturers for their supplies during this period, had established successfully a large number of home industries, and were by this means able to a great degree to supply their own market.

In this dilemma England saw that she must act promptly and crush out these young American industries or her American market would be forever lost and her manufacturing industries permanently crippled. So she resolved to flood this country with her goods then on hand, many of which were old and out of fashion, far below cost. It was a matter of so much importance that it was discussed in Parliament, and Mr. (afterwards Lord) Brougham declared in the House of Commons in 1816:

It is well worth while to incur a loss upon the first exportation, in order, by the glut, to stifle in the cradle those infant manufactures in the United States which the war has forced into existence.

This policy was decided upon, and Great Britain poured her fabrics and accumulated stocks of goods into our markets in an overwhelming torrent and far below cost. The tariff of 1816 was intended as a barrier against inundation, and under ordinary circumstances would have proved such. But it was a matter of life or death with the English manufacturers, and so they continued to pour in their goods upon us at prices far lower than we could make them; and true to British custom they persevered in this policy till our own industries were very nearly ruined.

The foreign goods imported at this period were more than

twice the quantity that could be consumed. Niles in his history says:

It is notorious that great sums of money were expended by the British to destroy our flocks of sheep that they might thereby ruin our manufactures. They bought up and immediately slaughtered great numbers of sheep; they bought our best machinery and sent it off to England, and hired our best mechanics and most skillful workmen to go to England, simply to get them out of this country, and so hinder and destroy our existing and prospective manufactures.

#### RESULTS OF THE REPEAL.

Then great depression in all branches of business at once followed. Bankruptcy soon became general, and financial ruin was everywhere present. It could not be otherwise. Carey, Greeley, Clay, Benton, and others show that this was one of the most distressful periods of our national existence. Mr. Benton gave this picture of the condition of the times:

No price for property; no sales except those of the sheriff and the marshal; no purchasers at execution sales except the creditor, or some hoarder of money; no employment for industry; no demand for labor; no sale for the products of the farm; no sound of the hammer, except that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Distress was the universal cry of the people; relief, the universal demand, was thundered at the doors of all Legislatures, State and Federal.

Horace Greeley said of this period:

At the close of the second war with England, peace found this country dotted with furnaces and factories which had sprung up under the precarious shelter of embargo and war. These not yet firmly established found themselves suddenly exposed to a relentless and determined foreign competition. Great Britain poured her fabrics, far below cost, upon our markets in a perfect deluge. Our manufactures went down like grass before the mower, and our agriculture and the wages of labor speedily followed. Financial prostration was general, and the presence of debt was universal. In New England fully one-fourth of the property went through the sheriff's mill, and the prostration was scarcely less general elsewhere. In Kentucky the presence of debt was simply intolerable. In New York the leading merchants, in 1817, united in a memorial to Congress to save our commerce as well as our manufactures from utter ruin, by increasing the tariff duties.

Henry Clay declared that the average depression in the value of property, under that state of things, was not less than 50 per cent.

1818.—The tariff act of 1818 was simply an amendment by which tariff duty was imposed upon a few articles which prior thereto were free.

It thus appears that the tariff acts of 1816 and 1818 were no exception to the rule that protective tariffs conduce to national prosperity, and very low tariff rates to national adversity; for though they were "moderately protective" in name, yet, under the outrageous and disgracefully selfish policy of Great Britain—a policy which we could not then have anticipated—those tariffs afforded insufficient protection; and insufficient protection is practically as bad as tariff for revenue only.

#### SECOND PROTECTION PERIOD, 1824-1833.—1824: PROTECTION AGAIN RESTORED.

The disastrous state of affairs already described continued for several years, until our people, with a mighty effort, resolved to endure it no longer; and in 1824 Congress gave us a new tariff, far in advance of that of 1789, and it was the first protective tariff that gave us real protection.

This tariff was passed in response to a general demand of the country, and upon the urgent recommendation of President Monroe to give "additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture," etc. Everybody, except a few free traders, had become disgusted with a tariff that was nominally "moderately protective," while in fact it afforded no real protection; and the Congress of that year was largely in favor of a strong protective tariff in fact as well as in name.

The advocates of this tariff act insisted upon its passage in order to give to the country that strength and power which arise from possessing within itself the means of defense and to rescue it from the dangers and disgrace of habitual dependence upon foreign nations for the common daily necessities of life.

The enemies of the bill were no less determined in their opposition. No denunciation of it could be too severe; no prophecy of evil to come from it could be too doleful.

Soon after the tariff bill of 1824 was reported, the New York Evening Post, now, as then, one of the ablest and most uncompromising advocates of free trade, said editorially:

Pass the tariff as reported by the committee and you palsy the nation. Pass it, and where will you any longer find occupants for your costly piles of stores and dwelling houses? Pass it, and who will be exempt from its grinding operation?

The poorer classes especially must feel its effect in paying an additional price for every article of clothing they and their families wear, and every mouthful they eat or drink, save cold water, and to that will they ere long be reduced.

Maj. McKinley, commenting on this, says:

None of these awful prophecies were fulfilled; none of these dire results ensued. The nation was not palsied, but quickened into new life. The merchants did not move out of their costly piles of stores and dwelling houses, they remained only to require larger and finer and more costly ones; the poorer classes were not driven to cold water as their only food and diet, but their labor was in greater demand and their wages advanced in price. The entire country under the tariff moved on to higher triumphs in industrial progress, and to a higher and better destiny for all of its people.

John Randolph, one of the ablest of Democrats, fiercely opposed the bill, and in a speech in Congress, after showing the great advantages of Great Britain in manufacturing, added:

It is in such a climate only that the human animal can bear, without exasperation, the corrupted air, the noisome exhalations, the incessant labor of these accursed manufactories. Yes, sir, accursed, for I say it is an accursed thing. We should have the yellow fever from June to January, and January to June. The climate of this country alone, were there no other natural obstacles to it, says aloud, You shall not manufacture.

One of its strongest advocates and supporters was Andrew Jackson, then United States Senator, and now the patron saint of the Democratic party. Let us see what he thought of protection in 1824:

Providence—

Said he—

has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with lead, iron, and copper—and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the greatest materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential in war. We have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own, or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy (that under tariff of 1816), we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves. It is my opinion, therefore, that a careful and judicious tariff is much wanted.

#### RESULTS QUICK AND HELPFUL.

The bill was passed, and again, and at once, an era of great financial prosperity set in. So marked and helpful was the improvement that in 1828 the duties were raised still higher; and yet business improved; new industries were started, and prosperity gladdened the people.

Hear what President Andrew Jackson said in his annual message, in December, 1832, concerning the results and benefits of eight years of protection under the tariffs of 1824 and 1828:

Our country presents, on every side, marks of prosperity and happiness, unequalled, perhaps, in any other portion of the world.

The relief to the country, attained through these tariffs of 1824 and 1828—

was profound and general, reaching all classes—the farmer, the manufacturer, the shipowner, the mechanic, and the day laborer. The change was as great as was wrought when Hamilton smote the rock of public credit and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth.—*Webster.*

Henry Clay, speaking in the United States Senate in 1832 about this period, said:

On a general survey we behold cultivation extended; the arts flourishing; the face of the country improved; our people fully and profitably employed; the public countenance exhibiting tranquility, contentment and happiness; its public debt of two years nearly redeemed; and, to crown all, the public Treasury overflowing. If the term of seven years were to be selected of the greatest prosperity which this people has enjoyed since the establishment of their present Constitution, it would be exactly that period of seven years which immediately followed the passage of the tariff of 1824.

This view is sustained by the best writers concerning that period, who all agree that our manufactures were flourishing, that our currency was good, our crops abundant, and our commerce prosperous. These combined influences invariably enhance the demand for labor, increase its value, establish a general prosperity for the country, and contentment for the people.

President John Quincy Adams, who succeeded Mr. Monroe, was also a strong friend of protection, and in his fourth annual message discusses at some length our agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests, and shows that "all these interests are alike under the protecting power of the legislative authority," and proceeds to make himself clear and explicit in his defense of the principles of protection.

#### 1832.—TARIFF OF 1828 AMENDED.

The tariff act of 1832 was really nothing but some slight amendments to the act of 1828. Southern feeling against the tariff of 1828 was exceedingly bitter, and they were determined to have actual free trade if possible. They demanded, through the Committee of Ways and Means, that the protective system be "utterly and absolutely abandoned;" and declared that "Congress should adopt no half-way measures, no temporary expedients, but 'reform it altogether.'"

But the country, as a whole, had never been so prosperous as under the policy of the tariff of 1828, and they were in no mood to yield to this foolish demand of the South. But, for the sake of peace and of conciliating the South they were willing to make some concessions to this free-trade prejudice, and therefore, certain coarse wools were put upon the free list, and some reduction was granted upon articles made from those wools. But the protective principle of the act of 1828 was still retained on the expressed ground that it was necessary for building up and sustaining our own manufactures as one of the essential means of increasing and maintaining our national greatness.

#### THIRD FREE-TRADE PERIOD, 1813-1842.—1833: FREE TRADE AGAIN.

But in 1833, the year following that in which Jackson used the words just quoted, the enemies of protection, led by the Democratic party, rallied their forces and again secured control of

Congress; through a disgraceful compromise with Southern nullifiers, protection was abandoned; the protective tariff acts of 1824 and 1828 were repealed, and duties too low to afford any real protection to home industries were established by that Congress.

The tariff act of 1833 was intended as a compromise and conciliatory measure. The South was on the verge of open rebellion, so determined were they not to submit to the protective system. Mr. Clay and Congress did not intend to give up the protective principle of the act of 1828; but, like all such compromise measures, it yielded just enough to completely destroy its efficiency, as was subsequently learned to our sorrow. It provided that by a sliding scale of one-tenth biannually all duties in excess of 20 per cent should be abolished within a period of ten years. In its results and effects it was really an abandonment of the protective principle; for the reductions allowed were soon found to afford "insufficient protection," which is practically no protection; as was so terribly proved under the tariff of 1816. Industry and trade soon declined, and again foreign goods poured like an inundation into our markets.

#### RESULTS OF THIS REPEAL.

Again financial depression followed; assignments and bankruptcies resulted everywhere; manufacturers suspended operation, and business grew worse and worse till the culmination was reached in the financial crash of 1837, one of the most appalling and disastrous financial revulsions ever known—severer even than that which followed the repeal of the first tariff in 1816.

The revulsion of 1837 produced a far greater havoc than was experienced in the period above mentioned. The ruin came quickly and fearfully. There were few that could save themselves. Property of every description was parted with at prices that were astounding, and as for the currency, there was scarcely any at all.

In some parts of Pennsylvania the people were obliged to divide bank notes into halves, quarters, eighths, and so on, and agree from necessity to use them as money. In Ohio, with all her abundance, it was hard to get money to pay taxes. The sheriff of Muskingum County, as stated by the *Guernsey Times*, in the summer of 1842, sold at auction one four-horse wagon at \$5.50; ten hogs at 6½ cents each; two horses (said to be worth \$50 to \$75 each) at \$3 each; two cows at \$1 each; a barrel of sugar at \$1.50, and a store of goods at that rate. In Pike County, Mo., as stated by the *Hannibal Journal*, the sheriff sold three horses at \$1.50 each; one large ox at 12½ cents; five cows, two steers, and one calf, the lot at \$3.25; twenty sheep at 13½ cents each; twenty-four hogs, the lot, at 25 cents; one eight-day clock at \$2.50; lot of tobacco, seven or eight hogheads, at \$5; three stacks of hay, each, at 25 cents, and one stack of fodder at 25 cents. (Colton's life of Henry Clay, vol. 1.)

The whole country went into liquidation; bank loans and discounts fell off more than one-half; the money loss to the country was not less than \$1,000,000,000, to say nothing of the tremendous strain upon the moral sense of the people.

All prices fell off ruinously; production was greatly diminished, and in many departments practically ceased; thousands of workmen were idle, with no hope of employment, and their families suffering from want. Our farmers were without markets; their products rotted in their barns; their lands, teeming with rich harvests, were sold by the sheriff for debts and taxes. The tariff which robbed our industries of protection failed to supply the Government with necessary revenues. The national Treasury in consequence was bankrupt, and the credit of the nation very low. In the first six years after 1834 the revenue fell off 25 per cent, and the Government was obliged to borrow money at high rates of interest to pay current expenses.

1837.—President Martin Van Buren, in 1837, succeeded Gen. Jackson; but Mr. Van Buren was so ambitious for office, so reckless of principle in obtaining it, so timid and abject before Southern politicians in soliciting it, that, so far as I can ascertain, he dared not express himself officially upon the subject of protection.

He is believed to have been personally in favor of protection; but he and President Pierce, alone of all the Presidents, hold the unenviable distinction of having lacked the moral courage to state their opinions. So far as is known, officially, Van Buren was neither for nor against; and, like a scripture party, because he was neither hot nor cold, in 1840 the people spewed him out of politics into inglorious retirement.

1840.—The Democratic national convention condemned protection and indorsed practically free trade in its platform of 1840.

1841.—President William H. Harrison, a Whig and a strong protectionist, succeeded Mr. Van Buren, but he lived only a month after his inauguration and had no opportunity to make his opinion felt.

Vice-President John Tyler succeeded Harrison, and while he was professedly a protectionist, his Southern training and associations had made him one of a very mild type.

Fortunately, however, for the country a strong Whig and protectionist majority then had control of Congress, and soon made itself felt.

## THIRD PROTECTION PERIOD, 1842-1846.—1842: PROTECTION ONCE MORE.

The state of things as set forth under the tariff of 1833, continued till 1842, when the Whigs came back to power. They found the country completely exhausted by misrule and free trade, but quickly turned the tide by passing another highly protective tariff.

It was too high, indeed, to suit President Tyler, and he vetoed it, but the country by this time had become so earnest and determined in this matter that Congress dared not yield to him, and so passed it over his veto.

## RESULTS.

No sooner was this done than the financial gloom began to pass away; the sun of prosperity shone forth; business revived everywhere, and factories and other industries sprang up on every hand throughout the North. Confidence was restored, and customs receipts increased the first year (1843) 75 per cent over the last year of the compromise tariff of 1833.

After four years of real prosperity under this tariff of 1842, how great was the change! Labor was everywhere in demand. Planters had large crops, and the domestic market was growing with a rapidity that promised better prices. The produce of the farm was in demand, and prices had risen. The consumption of coal, iron, wool, and cotton and woolen cloth was immense and rapidly increasing, while prices were falling because of the rapidly improving character of the machinery of production. Production of every kind was immense, and commerce, internal and external, was growing with unexampled rapidity. Shipping was in demand, and its quantity was being augmented at a rate never before known. Roads and canals were productive. Corporations had been resuscitated, and States had recommended payment, and the credit of the Union was so high that the same persons who had vilified the people and the Government of the Union—under the compromise tariff of 1833—were now anxious to secure their custom on almost any terms.—*Carey*.

So very positive and decided was the improvement that President Polk, another Democrat, and a free trader, in his annual message of December, 1846, was constrained to say:

Labor in all its branches is receiving an ample reward; while education, science, and the arts are rapidly enlarging the means of social happiness. The progress of our country in her career of greatness, not only in the vast extension of her territorial limits, and in the rapid increase of our population, but in resources and wealth, and in the happy condition of our people, is without an example in the history of nations.

Compare this condition with those of the previous free-trade periods, already described, and closing in 1789, 1824, and 1842 respectively, and decide which system, in your opinion, is the better for our country.

## THE SOUTH OPPOSED TO PROTECTION.

But by this time (1842-'43) the slave power of the South had gained complete ascendancy in the Democratic party. It saw at once that this new and surprising prosperity in the North, secured as it was by means of protection to their home industries under the new tariff, would speedily checkmate and finally lead to the overthrow of their political domination in the control of the Government.

Previous to this time the South had been favorable to protection, and its greatest statesman, John C. Calhoun, was one of the staunchest defenders of a high-protective tariff. In March, 1816, Mr. Calhoun made a strong speech in favor of a protective tariff, and, among other things, said:

When our manufactures are grown to a certain perfection, as they will under the fostering care of government, the farmer will find a ready market for his surplus product, and what is of almost equal consequence, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants. His prosperity will diffuse itself to every class in the community. It (a protective tariff) is calculated to bind together more closely our widespread Republic, and give greater nerve to the arm of Government.

But no sooner did Mr. Calhoun and other Southern leaders see their "peculiar institution" (slavery) and their political ascendancy menaced by it than they decided to throw all their political power against a protective tariff. So terrible, however, had been the late financial disaster of 1837 to 1842 under free trade, especially in the North, that they were compelled to resort to political fraud and deception if they would surely win.

In 1844 the Democratic national convention reaffirmed in their platform their opposition to protection and their indorsement of practical free trade.

## FRAUDULENT CAMPAIGN OF 1844.

In 1844, as the opponent of Henry Clay, the Whig candidate and the champion of protection, the Democratic party nominated James K. Polk for President. He was a good man personally, but weak, and he at once became the pliant tool of the slave oligarchy.

Col. Benton, in his *Thirty Years* (volume 2, page 591), tells us of the private and personal intrigue made by Mr. Polk in person with the Southern leaders, by which he thoroughly satisfied them that he would be with them in matters relating to tariff, slavery extension, etc.; and Benton denounces this "intrigue" as "one of the most elaborate, complex, and daring ever practiced in an intelligent country." Of course, this "intrigue" was not generally known, but was confined to a few managers in the South. They knew their man, however, and trusted him. He had voted against the tariff of 1828, which was favored by

Jackson, he announced himself as steadily opposed to a protective policy; declared himself against the tariff of 1842, and required its repeal and the restoration of the act of 1833.

Why should not the South favor his election?

But Mr. Polk could not be elected without the electoral vote of Pennsylvania; and Pennsylvania was strongly protectionist. The protectionist supporters of Gen. Jackson must be made to believe that the tariff of 1842 would not be disturbed in case of Mr. Polk's election, or he could never get their votes. How was it possible to arrange this difficult matter?

## A DOUBLE-FACED CANDIDATE.

To be a "free trader" in the South, and satisfy them of his sincerity and trustworthiness, and an undoubted protectionist in Pennsylvania, was indeed difficult and dangerous, and at the same time execrably dishonest; but it must be attempted, or Mr. Clay would certainly be elected. He therefore wrote his celebrated "Kane letter," occupying forty days in the process; and never were "words used to conceal ideas" more skillfully or dishonorably than in this letter. His effort and intention were to convey the impression to Pennsylvanians that he was a protectionist; to appear to say this, but in fact to say nothing of the kind. His effort was entirely successful. To help on this fraud George M. Dallas, of Pennsylvania, a professed protectionist, was nominated with Mr. Polk for Vice-President, to awaken State local pride.

In order to be entirely consistent, the friends of Polk insidiously circulated all through Pennsylvania the rumor that Mr. Clay was unsound on protection; that if elected he would use all his power to repeal the tariff of 1842, and that the only way to insure the continuance of the tariff of 1842 was to elect Mr. Polk. And so the battle went on. In the South the rallying cry was "Polk, Texas, and free trade." In the North it was "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of '42."

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I wish to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire whether he has stated the fact that after Mr. Dallas made that campaign and was elected Vice-President he gave, as Vice-President, the casting vote to repeal the tariff act of 1842?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I am obliged to him for calling attention to this interesting historical fact, which appears later on in this discussion.

It may now seem incredible that such double-dealing could have succeeded, but it must be remembered that in those days the telegraph was comparatively new and undeveloped, and that the daily newspaper had not become the tremendous and omnipresent power which it now is; that the news was disseminated mainly by the easy-going weeklies, whose circulation was generally confined to limited areas, and were delivered by country stages, instead of swiftly running railway trains; hence, that scandalous duplicity, which now would be exposed in every hamlet of the nation within twenty-four hours and cause instant political death to its author, brought victory to Polk. Of course, one of the sections was most grossly and intentionally deceived, but it was not the South.

## POLK SEVERELY CENSURED.

Years afterward, Chace, a personal friend of Mr. Polk, wrote a *History of Mr. Polk's Administration*, and referring to Polk's connection with this letter, said:

If the principles which Mr. Polk really entertained were misunderstood, owing to the phraseology of the Kane letter, he was not himself altogether blameless. The voters in the North were deceived by the use of language which had the effect of obscuring, instead of more clearly defining his position. The statement that he was "not in favor of a tariff for protection merely" should have been transposed to read that he was in favor of a tariff for revenue merely.

After the election, and when Dallas was presiding in the Senate, Daniel Webster characterized this deception in the severest terms; and Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, excoriated Dallas in presence of the Senate by accusing him of being a consenting party to the fraud; and closed his remarks by declaring that "in the entire history of our party struggles—in all the agitations of the political elements—in all our conflicts for power, during every former period of the Government—never had there existed such absolute, open, and vile deception as had been practiced by the Democratic leaders and politicians on confiding Pennsylvania."

## DEMOCRATIC INDORSEMENT OF POLK.

The sentiments of Webster and Johnson were very generally approved by the country when the facts became known; but under the lead of the free-trade Democracy of the South the Democratic party in its national convention in 1848—

*Resolved*, That the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844, which elected James K. Polk and George M. Dallas, have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union, in the noble impulse given to the cause of free trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842, and the creation of the more equal, honest, and productive tariff of 1846; that the confidence of the Democracy of the Union in the principles, capacity, firmness, and integrity of James K. Polk manifested by his nomination and election in 1844, has been signally justified by the strictness of his adherence to sound Democratic doctrine.

We have already seen how "his nomination and election" were brought about, and what his personal and political friend and biographer, as well as prominent Senators, thought of Polk's conduct in that campaign; and now we see in this resolution how free-trade Democracy regarded it. The country can form its own opinion from the recorded facts.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do. Mr. President, having now come to a discussion of the fourth free-trade period in the United States, that from 1846 to 1861, I shall be glad of an opportunity to suspend my remarks and resume them at some future convenient time.

Mr. ALDRICH. As the discussion of the next paragraph will be one of considerable interest, in regard to which a large number of Senators have opinions which they may desire to express, I suggest the want of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The want of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Jarvis,	Peffer,
Allen,	Dubois,	Jones, Ark.	Perkins,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Power,
Blackburn,	Frye,	Lodge,	Pugh,
Brice,	Gallinger,	McLaurin,	Roach,
Butler,	George,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Caffery,	Gibson,	Martin,	Teller,
Camden,	Hale,	Mills,	Turpie,
Cameron,	Harris,	Mitchell, Oregon	Vest,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Voorhees.
Coke,	Higgins,	Murphy,	
Davis,	Hunton,	Palmer,	
Dixon,	Irby,	Pasco,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I notice that cotton-seed oil is stricken from the dutiable list by this bill and placed upon the free list. As this is very largely a Southern industry, I suppose it is done at the suggestion and on the request of persons engaged in the manufacture of cotton-seed oil. I find in Bulletin No. 3 replies from eleven different establishments, situated in South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Texas, in regard to this matter. They oppose placing the articles on the free list.

I would suggest, in this connection, that a slight change in conditions between the United States and Egypt or Great Britain in the production of cotton-seed oil might bring a large quantity to the United States; but I do not propose to offer an amendment or to press the matter upon the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I have no great desire to make a speech upon the pending measure. If a genuine effort had been made by the Democratic party to carry out the plain and unmistakable pledges contained in the platform on which it came into power, if its representatives had framed and presented to us and the country a bill which was honestly and sincerely a "tariff for revenue only" measure, if they had united on a bill which meant and showed on its face that "protection was a fraud," was unconstitutional, and was to be destroyed, a full, fair, and interesting discussion could have been had as to the respective advantages to our entire country of the policies of free trade or protection as questions of economics and principles. From the utterances of the leaders of the Democratic party during the recent campaigns, and particularly during the last Presidential contest, and from the language in their platform, the country was prepared to see the issue fairly joined as between tariff for revenue only or free trade and protection for the sake of protection to American industries.

The Democratic party had and still has the opportunity to make the fight squarely, pass a bill which will present their system to the people so that they may make choice and settle this vexed tariff question for years to come. It will be manly and patriotic in them to do this and will gain for them the credit and respect which always accompanies honesty and sincerity.

I should be glad to discuss such a bill. Many Senators who will sit silently in their seats during this entire debate would be pleased to contribute their thoughts in the discussion of these great and opposing principles. As we find ourselves now, however, the discussion is dwarfed. We hardly know what we are debating. At first we had the "Wilson bill," which was crude, inconsistent, and represented nothing but the desire to reduce the revenues of the Government. We then had the "Voorhees bill," which was less crude, equally inconsistent, and represented chiefly a desire to increase the revenues of the Government.

We then had the committee amendments to the Voorhees bill, which made it more symmetrical, but left it equally inconsistent and illogical. We now have the "Gorman bill," which does not cure the defects of the previous measures and represents the individual wishes and interests of the constituents of the individual Senators upon the Democratic side. All of these measures are protective, pure and simple.

The "protection" has been transferred from some localities to others. It has been modified, lessened in degree, in some instances; in others, instead of "specific" protection we have "ad valorem" protection. The principle of protection is as fully recognized in the bill before us as in the McKinley act. The marked difference in the two measures is that the pending bill is unequal and unjust, and is designed to favor individuals and sections, while the other extended the principle of protection to every portion of our country.

Inasmuch as the principle of protection is fully recognized by the dominant party, and they have completely abandoned the platform and pledges upon which they came into power, there is nothing left for us to quarrel and contend about except the various schedules. As the dominant party has now, and it is to be hoped for the last time, arranged these schedules, and as in this last compromise they have protected the industries in the States of the different Democratic Senators sufficiently to satisfy the demands of those Senators, I take it the measure is now perfected and will pass or be defeated as it stands.

I feel that great wrong has been done the State which I have the honor to in part represent, in the framing of this bill. Of all the great so-called raw materials, wool and lumber alone are put on the free list. This is an invidious, unjust, illogical, and indefensible distinction. It will cause great loss to young States, which have already suffered much through illy advised legislation. The inconsistency of the wool schedule is shown by the fact that while the raw material is placed on the free list, all the manufactured products of wool are made dutiable. In every other instance in this bill, I think, where the manufactured article is protected the raw material from which it is made is also protected. Your bill will destroy the wool industry in the far West without corresponding benefit to any class of people. I am fully aware that I can not stop you, for our section of country is not the section in whose interest you are legislating.

You were more consistent in regard to lead ore, and I desire to return my thanks for the consideration with which you have treated this, the greatest product of my State. While the protection of three-fourths of a cent per pound on lead ore is hardly sufficient to enable us to compete with Mexico, British Columbia, and Spain, which is evidenced by the fact that under the present duty of 1½ cents per pound great quantities of lead ore were shipped in from Mexico, still as you reduced the duties on white lead, pig lead, and the various manufactured products of lead ore one-half in each instance, thus making no unjust discrimination against lead ore, we have no particular cause for complaint in regard to this industry. We contend that nobody will be benefited by this reduction and that many will be injured, but as you meted out to us the same relative measure of protection that you gave the "white lead trust" and the "smelting combine," we are thankful for the favor and grateful for the consideration.

Our complaint, so far as lead ore is concerned, is against the manner and methods used in the construction of the entire bill. As you have presented a bill which is designed to protect various industries the lead schedule should not have been changed. No one will reap any benefit from the lower duties. I trust the protection accorded lead ore will keep our miners employed at good wages, and make profitable business for the thousands of farmers, merchants, mechanics, and other industrious citizens whose prosperity depends almost entirely upon the continued operation of the lead-silver mines.

The Government has been cheated and robbed of much of the duty it should receive on lead ore through improper sampling at ports of entry. By this robbery of the Government as much lead ore is smuggled in free as pays duty. I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to prevent this smuggling and will hope for the support of the Finance Committee and Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I will reserve any further remarks in explanation until the lead schedule is reached.

In discussing a bill like the one before us, which is not a free-trade or tariff-for-revenue-only measure, but which is confessedly a bill for the protection of American industries, although following no well-defined lines, yet protecting here and there in spots, as the necessity for securing votes for its passage demands, the fact is developed and made plain that in our young and growing country, which is matchless in its resources, the policy of consistent and logical protection must be followed for many years to come. Our people, whether native or foreign born, demand and are entitled to steady employment and good wages. They expect and should receive sufficient recompense

for their labor to enable them to live well and to properly clothe and educate their children. It is our boast that under our institutions the avenues are open to all, and that anyone may travel them to the highest point of distinction in any calling. Our laws should be so framed that the minds and bodies of the children of our laboring classes should not be ill fed. They should be given a fair start and chance in the race of life.

The Democratic party has, by presenting the pending bill, admitted that labor can not be fairly dealt with under a free-trade or tariff-for-revenue-only policy, but to save itself from the humiliation of utterly repudiating the hollow and insincere pretenses by which it confused the minds of the people and came into power, it offers the bill with the lame explanation that it is a step in the right direction. The measure is a protective one, as I have said, yet it is so illogical that great harm must result from its passage. It is so framed as to strike a blow at our manufacturing centers and to our raw materials. The laborers will be the ones to suffer.

I am a firm believer in the policy of protection. I think our laborers and manufacturers should be protected against the laborers and manufacturers of foreign countries. I believe they should not be made to compete with them on equal terms and brought to their level. I think the greatest prosperity has come to our country under the protective system, and that it will remain with us only under that system. While so believing, and while I shall so vote, it is equally clear to me that no matter what tariff bill you pass or whether you pass any, there can be no permanent prosperity for us until you reform your financial system. It will be equally fruitless to pass this bill or to defeat it and to allow the McKinley act to remain the law.

Until your mints are open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver as well as gold, falling prices, stagnation in business, lack of employment, distress, and misery must remain with us. I think the passage of the pending bill or any bill will temporarily relieve the present most lamentable condition of affairs. I believe if this bill were defeated and the present law allowed to remain there would be greater activity in business and more employment for capital and labor at better prices. Either the passage or defeat of the pending measure will be quickly followed by a return of business to a greater or less extent. The settlement of this question now and the adjournment of Congress will bring some relief to the country and employment to thousands of honest men and women who are willing and anxious to work and who are now in actual distress.

We have reached the lowest ebb. Action of any kind, so that it is final, will be a welcome relief. The millions of invested capital will no longer remain idle. It will start the thousands of various industries so soon as it knows what it can depend upon. This returned prosperity will be short lived, however. Within a brief period, two or three months, many enterprises will be abandoned, while in the others a reduction in the wages and in the force will be inaugurated, to become permanent and settled. Believing as I do that the chief trouble with our country is the contraction of our currency, the depreciation of silver and commodities, and the appreciation of gold, I can see no hope for returned and fixed prosperity until we abandon our gold standard and return to bimetalism.

The Republican party will win the elections this fall on the tariff issue. As a purely political proposition I would advise the speedy passage of the pending bill, in order that the temporary prosperity which will follow a settlement of the question may subside and the country settle down to the condition of low wages and contracted business, which must come after the passing relief has expended itself.

By the time the Presidential campaign of '96 arrives, however, the country will understand that it is not a question of tariff rates which hurts, but that currency contraction and an appreciation of our money standard precludes all hope of restored and permanent prosperity.

I believe it is the duty of the Senate in this great industrial crisis, when hundreds of thousands of honest and capable citizens are suffering for the necessities of life and are asking for employment, to pass whatever legislation we intend to enact with such promptness as is commensurate with a fair discussion of the various schedules. The quicker action is had the better it will be for the country, in my judgment.

I do not mean by this that I will favor unusual methods to limit debate. Discussion in this body should be free and untrammelled, but we should bear in mind at all times that any action, so that it is final, will bring work and bread to numbers of deserving people who must remain idle and hungry until our verdict is rendered. Speedy action now will the quicker sweep away the clouds and mist which obscures the vision of the people and enable them to perceive with clearness and accuracy that it is our monetary and not our revenue laws which bring distress and want and falling prices. When it is made plain to

them that this bill brings no relief, that the unfortunate condition in which we find ourselves, with idle mills and mines and capital and men, continues, with no hope or prospect of a change for the better, they will so fully understand the necessity for an enlarging currency and will so thoroughly appreciate the fact that there can be no prosperity for us under a gold standard, that their demand for bimetalism, for the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at a ratio of 15 to 1 or 16 to 1 will be made with such force and earnestness that it will not and can not be ignored.

Viewing the present situation from every point, taking into consideration every circumstance, it is to me obvious that both temporary and permanent happiness and prosperity will the sooner return to our land by a speedy action on the bill before us.

I will close by repeating again that I am a firm believer in and advocate of a logical and consistent system of protection. The highest and most stable prosperity will come to us, however, when we unite protection with bimetalism, and not before.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

**MR. ALDRICH.** What is the pending amendment?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Secretary will state the pending amendment for the information of the Senate.

**THE SECRETARY.** In line 15, paragraph 29, strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty," so as to read:

Flaxseed or linseed and poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxidized, 20 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds weight.

**MR. ALLISON.** Mr. President, I desire to say a few words respecting the amendment. The duty on linseed oil is a matter of great moment to the Northwestern States, especially in view of the large production of flaxseed, and unless a proper relation is maintained between the duty on flaxseed and the duty upon the oil either the flaxseed will be imported or the oil will be imported. In the existing tariff there is a difference of 2 cents between the duty upon oil and the duty upon flaxseed; that is to say, the duty is 2 cents a gallon more on oil than is the duty upon flaxseed per bushel, and I should have been glad if the Senator from Arkansas could have seen his way clear to maintain that distinction in the pending bill. I think it would more nearly insure the production of both the seed and the oil in our own country than will the provision inserted in the bill. I should have been glad also to have had a duty of at least 25 cents a bushel upon flaxseed, the present rate being 30 cents.

**MR. CHANDLER.** What does the Senator from Iowa say is the present duty on flaxseed or linseed oil?

**MR. ALLISON.** It is 30 cents per bushel on flaxseed.

**MR. CHANDLER.** How much is the duty on the oil per gallon?

**MR. ALLISON.** The duty is 32 cents per gallon upon linseed oil.

**MR. CHANDLER.** The present amendment provides for a duty of 20 cents a gallon instead of 32 cents a gallon.

**MR. ALLISON.** Twenty cents a gallon, and the House rate is 20 cents a bushel on flaxseed. The rate is 20 cents on each. The importations of flaxseed, or linseed, in past years were quite large. In recent years the importations have not been so large. Canada produces a large amount of flaxseed, and until the duty of 30 cents a bushel was placed upon flaxseed by the act of 1890, there were large importations of the article from Canada.

I very much fear that the duty proposed in the bill will have the effect to encourage largely importation of flaxseed from the Dominion of Canada. Therefore, I should have been very glad to have had a higher rate of duty upon flaxseed, which would require a corresponding additional rate upon linseed oil. But I do not care to offer an amendment. I merely wish to say that as the bill came from the other House it would have been destructive of the industry of manufacturing linseed oil as it would have been alike destructive of the interest of those who are engaged in the production of flaxseed in the Northwestern States.

**MR. CHANDLER.** I should like to ask the Senator who last spoke whether it is his intention to move to increase the duty from 20 cents per gallon to 32 cents per gallon, the present rate. It seems to me there ought to be more duty on flaxseed or linseed oil than is proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. Of course I am not able, not being an expert on these subjects, nor an expert in the construction of tariff bills, to determine exactly what should be the relation of the duty on flaxseed to the duty on linseed oil, and there was so much noise in the Chamber that I was unable to hear exactly what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] said. But this much seems to me to be certain, that unless the duty on flaxseed is reduced very largely, in which event the agricultural industry of raising flaxseed will be injured, the duty on flaxseed oil ought to be very much more than the Senator from Arkansas is willing to give.

Now, I insensibly recur to the principle upon which the Senator from Arkansas is supposed to be acting; that is to say, allowing a duty which will permit the industry to survive. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that there can be no half survival in this case. If a duty is sufficiently protective to allow the industry to survive, well and good; the industry does survive. But if the duty is carried down so low that it is not profitable to manufacture the article in this country in competition with the foreign product, the industry dies just as quickly, just as surely, just as completely as if the article were placed upon the free list.

Under the law of 1883 the duty on flaxseed oil or linseed oil was only 25 cents a gallon. In 1890 it was made 32 cents a gallon. The House of Representatives now allows a duty of 15 cents a gallon and the Senator from Arkansas proposes 20 cents a gallon; that is to say, 12 cents less per gallon than the present law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Rhode Island desires to correct any statement that I am making, I will yield to him with pleasure. If not, I prefer to illustrate my point and make my argument, and after I finish have him make his argument, whether it coincides with mine or not. Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish to correct me?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to correct what seems to be a misapprehension on the part of the Senator from New Hampshire as to the character of the duty.

Mr. CHANDLER. To that proposition I wish to yield, because I feel that I am very liable to fall into error, and I wish to be corrected on the spot.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that the rate suggested by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] upon this article, which we have frequently been informed by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber is entirely in the hands of a great trust, is 60 per cent ad valorem upon the present foreign price of linseed oil; and in view of the treatment which is accorded to other industries and other oils I should say that the rate is not a very low one, as the Senator from New Hampshire seems to think.

Mr. CHANDLER. The explanation is not quite convincing to my mind if indeed I comprehend what the Senator says. I have a memorandum of the imports, quantity and value, of flaxseed or linseed oil; that is to say, that which is not boiled or oxidized; I suppose raw.

Imports, quantity and value, of flaxseed or linseed oil.

	Gallons.	Value.	Duty.	Per gallon, duty paid.
1890	11,562.16	\$5,528.40	\$2,890.55	\$0.726
1891	8,348.08	3,945.07	2,087.01	.72
1892				
1893				

There the importation of raw linseed oil seems to have stopped.

Mr. ALLISON. At what date?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have the importations of flaxseed or linseed oil in 1890 and 1891, showing no importation of the raw material in 1892 and 1893. The argument that I make is that the increased duty, from 25 cents per gallon to 32 cents per gallon, caused the entire cessation of the importation of the crude article, and there has been no importation of the raw oil since. I have another table showing the importations of flaxseed or linseed oil, boiled or oxidized:

Flaxseed or linseed oil, boiled or oxidized.

	Gallons.	Value.	Duty.	Per gallon, duty paid.
1891	7,003.92	\$4,627.00	\$2,733.22	\$0.968
1892	4,669.33	2,770.00	1,494.19	.913
1893	5,457.37	3,212.00	1,746.38	.908

This table shows that under the operation of the duty of 32 cents per gallon not only did the importations of flaxseed or linseed oil, raw, wholly cease, but the importations of refined or manufactured oil began to go steadily down; and the result was that the policy of the McKinley act of protection to this product did its perfect work. It resulted in creating a home industry and in giving to the United States substantially the whole product.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state to the Senator from New Hampshire, if he will allow me, that the duty upon oil prior to the McKinley act was 25 cents a gallon, and the importations were small during those years.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the 25 cents per gallon duty?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; and a difference of 2 cents a gallon between the raw oil, so called, and the boiled or oxidized oil is the rule. The process is not a difficult one.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, I do not quickly comprehend the force of the fact which the Senator states. I take it the Senator understands my point, that this high duty has domesticated the industry, so that the American farmer produces the whole of the flaxseed that makes flaxseed oil or linseed oil in this country.

Mr. ALLISON. That is a pertinent and proper observation. It is absolutely true.

Mr. CHANDLER. I read from the argument of Mr. Edmund A. Whitman, of Boston, January 4, 1890, in which he says:

The crop for 1885, the last year for which I have the figures, was estimated at 12,000,000 bushels, valued at \$13,500,000.

I say upon the face of these papers this is an extremely profitable industry to the agriculturists of this country. Flaxseed is not raised in New Hampshire; it is not raised in New England to any extent that I know of. It is raised in the border States, in the Western States, in the Southern States, and it ought to be protected. The process of giving the raising of flaxseed and the manufacture of linseed oil to the American farmer and the American producer, which has been so auspiciously begun under the operation of the McKinley law, ought to be allowed to go on and the party exigency of the Democratic party which makes its leaders think it necessary is to cut down the duties on protected industries and yet at the same time give protection which is contrary to the repudiated plank of the Democratic platform of 1892, ought to be arrested, and we ought to stand by the higher rate of duty, and one that will be sufficiently protective to secure this industry to America and Americans. Therefore it seems to me that the duty of 32 cents a gallon ought to be retained upon this product.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the rate of duty proposed, but simply to call attention again to the methods employed in the construction of this bill, and to the gross favoritism shown in levying duties upon various industries. Here is an industry which we have been reminded time after time is in the hands of a trust, a great combination, and that is somewhat true, I imagine. The duty which is proposed to be levied is equal to 60 per cent of the foreign cost of this article. But that is not the worst feature of it. I have been and I am in favor of levying a duty upon these various articles that will equalize the difference in the cost of production between this country and abroad.

Now, what are the facts in regard to this particular item? The foreign price is about 35 or 34 or 33 cents a gallon. It has been sold in the United States in the last year at 32 cents a gallon, and its present price is I think not exceeding 40 cents a gallon, or a price in this country which is about the same as the price abroad, there being not over 5 cents a gallon difference. Yet upon this one item the Senators on the other side propose to levy a specific duty of 20 cents a gallon.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator want to reduce this duty?

Mr. ALDRICH. I say I do not want it reduced because I think it is a proper rate of duty, but I desire to have the Senate understand the gross favoritism which is shown in the preparation of this bill as regards certain industries and certain articles.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator objects, let the amendment be rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not object to it at all. I am only stating the facts.

Mr. VEST. The Senator's argument is very convincing to me.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am stating facts; that is all.

Mr. VEST. It is very convincing, and if my colleague on the committee agrees I am willing to go back to the former duty proposed.

Mr. CHANDLER. It seems to me if this debate is to continue the Senator from Arkansas ought to withdraw his amendment. That seems to be the policy of the other side of the Chamber; if a duty is proposed that is likely to protect an American industry and it is supported on this side of the Chamber it is withdrawn. I think that would be quite the right thing for the Senator from Arkansas to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

- 30. Fusel oil, or amylic alcohol, 10 per cent ad valorem.
- 31. Hemp-seed oil and rape-seed oil, 10 cents per gallon.

Mr. ALDRICH. I believe that is the McKinley rate on hemp-seed oil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

32. Olive oil, fit for salad purposes, 35 cents per gallon.

The Committee on Finance reported to amend the paragraph by striking out in line 22 "35 cents per gallon" and inserting in lieu thereof "25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The committee withdraws that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the committee is withdrawn.

Mr. ALDRICH. The effect of that will be to leave the rate of the act of 1890 stand.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Thirty-five cents a gallon is the House provision.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the existing rate, I believe.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, it is the existing rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read as follows:

33. Peppermint oil, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The Committee on Finance reported to amend the paragraph by striking out in line 23 "25," and inserting in lieu thereof "20," so as to read "20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amendment of the committee is withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. PERKINS. I appeal to the Senator from Arkansas not to reconsider the action proposed. I had looked upon it as the olive branch held out to this side of the Chamber, and as a Californian—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. We are discussing peppermint oil now, not olive oil.

Mr. PERKINS. I beg pardon. I thought—

Mr. ALDRICH. We have passed paragraph 32. I hope, however, the Senator from Arkansas will allow the Senator from California to make any remark he was about to make upon that item.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly, I have no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. I only wish to speak upon what affects California's interest more particularly. That is about all I can attend to. I wanted to thank my friend from Arkansas on olive oil. I understood that to be the item under consideration a moment ago.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Does the Senator from California desire to have the tariff on olive oil reduced?

Mr. PERKINS. No, sir; I want to thank you. I understood that you had withdrawn the proposed amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, I want to urge the Senator—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I withdrew the proposed amendment of the committee which leaves the tariff at 35 cents as the bill came from the other House, and as the law now is.

Mr. PERKINS. I misunderstood the Senator from Arkansas. I want to thank him for pursuing that course.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator from California not to thank him too profusely. If he does he may renew the amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say then that California is, I think, the only State—

Mr. CHANDLER. I warn the Senator from California. If he loses this concession I do not want him to say that I did not warn him.

Mr. PERKINS. Then I will profit by the experience of the Senator from New Hampshire, and say nothing but second the motion of the Senator from Arkansas in withdrawing the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next paragraph of the bill will be read.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

34. Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem. Cod oil, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment reported from the Committee on Finance was to strike out "twenty-five" before "per cent" and insert "twenty;" and to strike out the words "cod oil, 15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That amendment is withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection the amendment of the committee will be withdrawn.

Mr. FRYE. I may desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph. I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to page 107 of the bill, line 8, where "spermaceti, whale, and other fish oils of American fisheries, and all fish and other products of such fisheries" are placed on the free list. I should like to have

the Senator from Arkansas explain how it is that here on seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil there is a proposed duty, while on page 107 all those articles are put on the free list. Which is the proposition of the committee?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This, I understand, is the present law, just as it stands. The products of the American fisheries come in free, whereas the oils coming from foreign countries are taxed.

Mr. ALLISON. What is the paragraph?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The paragraph in the present law is in the same language, with the words "fish, and other products" added. That is the only amendment. In the free list it stands just as it does in the present law.

Mr. FRYE. Just as it is in the McKinley law?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRYE. So that the Senator understands that that applies to the oils which are secured from American fisheries in foreign waters and brought into this country?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. FRYE. And those oils are on the free list?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the duty proposed in the pending bill is 25 per cent ad valorem and that the duty on linseed oil is 60 per cent ad valorem, while on the linseed oil it is made specific, and on this the duty is made ad valorem.

As I understand, there is much more difficulty in maintaining an ad valorem duty on seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil than there is on linseed oil. Our competitors in this kind of oil are the Japanese, the Chinese, and the British possessions. Our most serious competitors, perhaps, to-day are the Japanese and the Chinese; and they fix up their fish oil and send it to this country to compete with ours, many kinds of it not worth half as much as ours; none worth any more. In undertaking to put an ad valorem duty, we are to be confronted with those cheap oils from China and Japan. I think the duty has always been specific; and I see no reason why it should be changed now, and why linseed oil should be treated any better than this product.

I think the old duty was 8 cents a gallon, which was on the average about 33 per cent ad valorem. Whale oil is worth about 40 cents a gallon; seal oil, about 30 cents; whale oil not specially provided for, 40 cents, and fish oil not specially provided for is worth only about 25 cents. The old duty of 8 cents was satisfactory, though when the bill which contained it was under consideration, the National Fishery Association did its very best to obtain a duty of 10 cents a gallon instead of 8 cents. Finally the committee allowed them 8 cents. That 8 cents would average, if it were specific, about 30 or 33 per cent ad valorem. If it is changed to ad valorem it will not amount to anywhere near 33 per cent; it will not amount to anywhere near the ad valorem, which is placed upon it now, because, taking the oils from Japan and China, they will be reduced to the very lowest point.

It seems to me that of all the people on earth, the fishermen are the very last whom any Senator should desire to punish by a reduction of duties. There is about as laborious a business and as dangerous a one as there is in the world. They are being fast driven out of their business. Our New England fishermen are decreasing in numbers every year, and it seems to me where their business is attacked, it should be done with great care. Certainly they are entitled to as much protection as the farmers whose raise flaxseed and make linseed oil; they are exposed all the time, and the farmer is not exposed at all.

The only allusion I find in Bulletin No. 3 to this matter, is on page 115, from the Miles Fertilizer and Oil Company, of Milford, Conn., where they say:

We run only half the time, owing to some States making laws preventing the catch of fish in their waters.

Those are the poggy fishermen, so called—

Migratory fish come on the coast in spring and leave in the fall, and do nobody any good unless caught. Oil also has been very low, owing to the same oil coming in at a low duty in competition from Japan.

So that they call 8 cents a gallon a low duty.

We can not get enough out of the product to pay first-class fishermen and sailors such wages as they demand, and good men sailors are leaving the business.

It is very important to our business that the present duty on oil is retained, otherwise the business will be ruined unless the Government pays a bounty to fishermen.

We can not reduce the cost of production. Men will abandon the business and leave off following the water.

We desire the duty on oil be retained or we will have to quit the business. We do not prepare as much guano, because we were barred from catching fish in New York State and Massachusetts waters.

Wages of fishermen are \$40 per month and board; captains, mates, cooks, and engineers from \$60 to \$85 per month and board.

The wages in Japan and China, their competitors, are not one-fifth what they are in this country.

I find, when the matter was under consideration, I think in the revision of 1883, the National Fishery Association presented its views to the committee having the bill in charge. They said:

We ask that the word "ten" be substituted for the word "eight."

That is, the duty should be 10 cents a gallon instead of 8 cents a gallon.

The reason we give for this is that under this section large quantities of various kinds of fish oil which have a close resemblance to each other in appearance, and which can be imported to this country from Japan and China as well as from the British Possessions at this very low rate of duty, and being produced by cheap labor, and having many other advantages which our fish oil producing industries do not have, creates a competition in our own markets which would tend to embarrass our own manufacturers.

While, to be sure, that is only one element of the fishery business, it is an important one, and ought not to be disturbed. I can not see any earthly reason why a present should be made to China, or to Japan, or Canada. These oils are cheaper now than they ever were before, so cheap indeed that even the fishermen are declining to engage in that business. They are engaged all along our coast and the Jersey coast, and I think they ought to be considered. Therefore, I move to amend the committee's amendment—or did the committee retire from its amendment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRYE. I move, then, to amend the paragraph by striking out "25 per cent ad valorem" and inserting "8 cents per gallon."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 2, after the word "act," it is proposed to strike out "25 per cent ad valorem," and insert "8 cents per gallon;" so as to read:

Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil not specially provided for in this act, 8 cents per gallon.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Maine what would be the equivalent ad valorem rate?

Mr. FRYE. The equivalent ad valorem rate of 8 cents a gallon?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRYE. It would be from 25 to 33 per cent.

Mr. PEPPER. Then that would be a slight increase?

Mr. FRYE. A slight increase over the proposition contained in the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. How would it conform with the existing law?

Mr. FRYE. The amendment I propose is the same as the existing law.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The higher rate of taxation on linseed oil than on fish oils is easily explained when you consider that there is a tax of 20 cents a bushel on the flaxseed out of which flaxseed oil is made. That tax, of course, the flaxseed must pay before it is made into oil. This was recognized in the McKinley law, for which the Senator from Maine voted, where there was a tax equivalent to 95 per cent imposed upon linseed oil, whereas there was a tax of 32 per cent imposed on fish oil, equivalent to 95 per cent on linseed oil, and 32 per cent on fish oil, making a difference of 63 per cent between the two.

The proposed tariff, which is presented to the Senate by the committee amendment, is a tax of 60 per cent on linseed oil and a tax of 25 per cent on fish oil, being a reduction from the tax on linseed oil of more than 35 per cent, perhaps 40, while not more than half that proportion, I should say 22 per cent, is placed on the fish oil. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that fish oil has been reasonably treated.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator does not reply to the main point which I made. The duty placed here on linseed oil is specific. I ask that the duty shall be made specific on fish oil, whale oil, etc., and I ask whether or not the Senator can give any answer why the one should be fish and the other should be flesh?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There are different kinds of oil which come in under the head of "fish oil," having different values, and it seems but just that a high-priced oil and a low-priced oil should not be taxed at the same rate, but that they should pay in proportion to their value. For that reason, these oils differing in value, it would be better to have them taxed on the ad valorem basis than to have them taxed by specific duties; whereas as to linseed oil there is but one kind of oil, and a specific tax is less objectionable in that case than it would be in the case of fish oil.

Mr. FRYE. Would the Senator be willing to accept a specific duty of 6 cents, instead of the rate proposed, 25 per cent ad valorem? [A pause.] Mr. President, I will insist on my amendment making the rate 8 cents a gallon.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the argument used by the Senator from Arkansas in regard to the treatment of these two oils is certainly very ingenious. He undertakes to show that

this rate is or may be justifiable by taking the reduction from the act of 1890 in each case, showing that a greater reduction had been made in linseed oil than there has been in fish oil.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did that to illustrate the Senator's position.

Mr. ALDRICH. It only illustrates my position to this extent: I voted for the provisions in regard to the duties on oils in the act of 1890, and at that time gave my support to this proposition; but now we have two distinct sets of propositions coming here from the committee, not with reference, I take it, to the act of 1890, but with reference to existing conditions, because I take it for granted that Senators on the other side of the Chamber are not engaged in making a certain mathematical reduction from the act of 1890 without regard to the change in conditions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. No, we are not.

Mr. ALDRICH. If that is what they are after, we might as well have a horizontal reduction of 15 or 20 per cent, as the case may be, and get rid of all this talk and have action upon this bill. I supposed that Senators were undertaking to legislate for conditions as they find them in regard to all these industries, I have shown that they have levied a duty of 20 cents per gallon on linseed oil, when there is only 5 cents difference between the price of linseed oil abroad and in the United States. Here is a large and valuable product of the American fisheries, to which they propose to give a rate of duty of 25 per cent as against 60 per cent upon linseed oil and 90 per cent upon castor oil. Is there any fairness or justice in this relative treatment of these two industries?

It is true the present rates upon linseed oil are larger than these, but there are no importations whatever. The act is entirely prohibitory, as the rate now proposed by the committee will be prohibitory, and nobody knows that better than the Senator from Arkansas. Under the present rate of 8 cents a gallon on fish oil the importations of foreign oil last year were valued at \$200,000.

If you propose to keep out linseed oil for the benefit of the linseed-oil trust, why should you not keep out fish oil for the benefit of the American fishermen, where there can be no combination and there is no possibility of the formation of trusts? If 60 per cent is a fair rate upon linseed oil and if 90 per cent is a fair rate upon castor oil, why not give a decent protection at least to the fishermen engaged in the production of fish oil, because—and I think the Senator from Maine will agree with me—in certain classes of fisheries now maintained in our Eastern waters, oil is the main product of the fishery? That is entirely true of one large and important fishing industry in my own State.

Mr. FRYE. And in the menhaden fisheries entirely.

Mr. ALDRICH. In the menhaden fisheries the oil is the entire product of the industry.

Mr. FRYE. They use some of the refuse as a fertilizer.

Mr. ALDRICH. That industry employs hundreds and perhaps thousands of men, and certainly there can be no reason why they should not be accorded fair treatment in the pending bill. I hope, therefore, the Senator from Arkansas will consent to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as to this particular amendment, the only point which I care to make is as to the change from an ad valorem to a specific duty. If a bill is constructed upon the "revenue-only" plan, the fairer way, the more honest way, all things considered, is to adopt the ad valorem rule; but where protection is the object specific duties are more in harmony with that idea. The amendments presented by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] have satisfied me that the majority in this Chamber have concluded to transform the bill into a protective measure. That being true, it seems to me that wherever a change can be made from an ad valorem rate to a specific rate without increasing the duty, which the committee propose, it will be better. For that reason, inasmuch as the proposed rise is slight, I take it the amendment of the Senator from Maine ought to be adopted, to make the rate specific. The duty is more easily collected under that system, and it is simpler in every way, protection being the object, as evidently it is the object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. DANIEL. I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]; but I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] and vote "nay."

Mr. DIXON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN].

Mr. FRYE (when Mr. GRAY'S was called). The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is paired with the senior Senator

from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. He desired me to make that announcement, both Senators being absent from the city.

Mr. HUNTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. I shall not vote unless my vote be necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], but I make the same transfer of pairs I have previously made, transferring the pair of the Senator from New York to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and then the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] and I can vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. VEST (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], but I have made an arrangement with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] to transfer his pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] to the Senator from New Jersey, so that the Senator from Illinois and I may vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DANIEL (after having voted in the negative). The Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] is absent, and being paired with him, I beg leave to withdraw my vote.

Mr. HIGGINS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON], and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. VEST. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN], and vote "nay."

Mr. DIXON. I had supposed that I was paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN]; but as the Senator from Missouri has arranged to pair him with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 33; as follows:

YEAS—26.

Aldrich,	Dubois,	McMillan.	Power,
Allison,	Frye,	Manderson,	Quay,
Cameron,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Sherman,
Chandler,	Hale,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Davis,	Hawley,	Patton,	Teller.
Dixon,	Hoar,	Peffer,	
Dolph,	Lodge,	Perkins,	

NAYS—33.

Allen,	Camden,	Jones, Ark.	Ransom,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Berry,	Coke,	Martin,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Mills,	Vest,
Blanchard,	George,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Brice,	Gibson,	Murphy,	Voorhees.
Butler,	Harris,	Palmer,	
Caffery,	Irby,	Pasco,	
Call,	Jarvis,	Pugh,	

NOT VOTING—26.

Carey,	Higgins,	Mitchell, Wis.	Walsh,
Cullom,	Hill,	Pettigrew,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Hunton,	Platt,	White,
Gordon,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	Wilson,
Gorman,	Kyle,	Smith,	Wolcott.
Gray,	McLaurin,	Squire,	
Hansbrough,	McPherson,	Stewart,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRYE. I deem it so important to these fishermen that the duty shall be specific, instead of an ad valorem duty, that I think I ought to make one more effort. I move to strike out "25 per cent ad valorem," and insert "7 cents per gallon."

Mr. ALLISON. How will 7 cents per gallon compare with 25 per cent?

Mr. FRYE. It will be just about 25 per cent ad valorem, as I figure it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 2, paragraph 34, strike out "25 per cent ad valorem," and insert "7 cents per gallon;" so as to read:

34. Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil not specially provided for in this act, 7 cents per gallon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. LODGE. On that question let us have a division.

Mr. FAULKNER. I demand the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER]. However, I have a right to vote to make a quorum.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I announce the pair of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH]. I vote "yea."

Mr. FRYE (when Mr. GRAY's name was called). The senior

Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. PALMER (when his name was called). I understand from the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] that the arrangement made a few minutes ago still exists, and I vote "nay."

Mr. VEST (when his name was called). I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MCLAURIN], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HIGGINS. I will announce for the day my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON].

Mr. HUNTON. I beg to announce for the day that I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], and that I shall not vote, unless it is necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to state that I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE]. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 31; as follows:

YEAS—24.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Lodge,	Peffer,
Allison,	Dubois,	McMillan,	Perkins,
Cameron,	Frye,	Manderson,	Quay,
Chandler,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Sherman,
Davis,	Hale,	Morrill,	Shoup,
Dixon,	Hoar,	Patton,	Teller.

NAYS—31.

Allen,	Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,
Bate,	Coke,	Lindsay,	Ransom,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Martin,	Roach,
Blackburn,	George,	Mills,	Turpie,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Vest,
Butler,	Harris,	Murphy,	Vilas,
Call,	Irby,	Palmer,	Voorhees.
Camden,	Jarvis,	Pasco,	

NOT VOTING—30.

Brice,	Hansbrough,	McPherson,	Stewart,
Caffery,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Wis.	Walsh,
Carey,	Higgins,	Pettigrew,	Washburn,
Cullom,	Hill,	Platt,	White,
Daniel,	Hunton,	Power,	Wilson,
Gordon,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	Wolcott.
Gorman,	Kyle,	Smith,	
Gray,	McLaurin,	Squire,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to know whether "cod, 15 per cent ad valorem," is stricken out in the paragraph?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the Secretary did not read that part of the paragraph. I move to strike out those words.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a part of the House provision?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is a part of the House provision, and I move to strike it out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 2, paragraph 34, strike out "cod oil, 15 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary read the next paragraph of the bill, as follows:

35. Opium, aqueous extract of, for medicinal uses, and tincture of, as laudanum, and all other liquid preparations of opium, not specially provided for in this act, 25 percent ad valorem.

The Committee on Finance reported to amend the paragraph in line 6, by striking out "twenty-five," and inserting "twenty."

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to have the committee explain why this change is made. It seems to me that the reduction of these extracts of opium from 40 per cent ad valorem, which is the present law, to 20 per cent ad valorem would be very injurious to the production of opium extracts in the United States, and I can not see any good reason for making the reduction.

Mr. VEST and Mr. MILLS. Question!

Mr. ALDRICH. I supposed there might be some explanation vouchsafed from the Senators upon the committee for this reduction.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There was practically none of this article introduced under the old law, and it seemed there should be some reduction as the rate that was in force under the law was absolutely prohibitory, or almost so. Practically none of the article came into the United States, and the committee were of opinion that the reduction of the tariff might allow the importation of some of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course the production of aqueous extracts of opium is not a very large industry at the best; but if the Senator from Arkansas will look at the tables before him he will find there were \$116 in value of this article imported in 1893, at 40 per cent ad valorem. Therefore the rate is not prohibitory. I do not see any reason in the suggestion made by the Senator from Arkansas that the reduction should be made simply because there were no importations.

Mr. FRYE. In order to have an importation.

Mr. ALDRICH. And in order to have importations. I do not understand that to be the present policy of Senators on the other side, whatever it may have been in the past. If it is to be the policy, it must be adopted in rather a jerky and uncertain way, first upon one article, and then it is ignored entirely upon the next. It seems to me that there should be some decent regard paid for consistency in this matter. By the bill all medicinal preparations not otherwise provided for are made 25 per cent ad valorem. All chemical compounds of every nature and description are made dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, and here is a single article or group of articles taken for different treatment and the duty reduced to 20 per cent ad valorem, which is a way below the average of the whole chemical schedule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLISON. My understanding is that the House made the rate 25 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. They did.

Mr. ALLISON. That rate is in accord with the other medicinal articles of a chemical character, and I do not see why it should be reduced. I hope the committee amendment will be withdrawn by the Senator from Arkansas and that the House provision will be allowed to stand. I am appealing to the Senator from Arkansas. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that he let the House provision respecting this matter stand, and then the rate would be in accord with the other ad valorem provisions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The committee after discussion were of opinion that 20 per cent is a sufficient tax on this article. I do not see any reason for changing it. I stated a few minutes ago that the rate was practically prohibitory which was in force under the McKinley law, and it seems to us that 20 per cent is a fair rate. I should be glad to have a vote on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I ask for a division.

Mr. FAULKNER. I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I will announce for the day a pair between the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], and I vote "yea."

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], whose name will shortly be called, is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DANIEL. I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE]. Otherwise I should vote "yea."

Mr. CALL. I announce the pair of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 22; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Allen,	Camden,	Jones, Ark.	Pugh,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Ransom,
Berry,	Coke,	Martin,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Mills,	Vest,
Blanchard,	George,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Brice,	Gibson,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Harris,	Palmer,	White.
Caffery,	Irby,	Pasco,	
Call,	Jarvis,	Peffer,	

NAYS—22.

Aldrich,	Dubois,	McMillan,	Power,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Manderson,	Quay,
Cameron,	Hale,	Mitchell, Oregon	Shoup,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Teller.
Dixon,	Hoar,	Patton,	
Doiph,	Lodge,	Perkins,	

NOT VOTING—29.

Carey,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Wis.	Stewart,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Pettigrew,	Walsh,
Daniels,	Hill,	Platt,	Washburn,
Davis,	Hunton,	Proctor,	Wilson.
Frye,	Jones, Nev.	Roach,	Wolcott.
Gordon,	Kyle,	Sherman,	
Gorman,	McLaurin,	Smith,	
Gray,	McPherson,	Squire,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

36. Opium, crude or unmanufactured, and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent and over of morphia, \$1 per pound; opium containing less than 9 per cent of morphia, and opium prepared for smoking, \$6 per pound; but opium prepared for smoking and other preparations of opium deposited in bonded warehouse shall not be removed therefrom without payment of duties, and such duties shall not be refunded.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out the first clause of the paragraph, in the following words:

Opium, crude or unmanufactured, and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent and over of morphia, \$1 per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PALMER. I would be obliged to the Senator from Arkansas to explain to me the exact meaning of the provision which I understand he proposes to strike out:

Opium, crude or unmanufactured, and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent and over of morphia, \$1 per pound.

I understand that is to be stricken out.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is to go to the free list, where it is now and has been under the McKinley law.

Mr. PALMER. I should prefer, if I could find language to express it, the absolute prohibition of the importation of this damnable drug.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is the drug from which the medicine is made. I presume the Senator from Illinois does not wish to exclude that.

Mr. PALMER. No, I recognize the necessity—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Smoking opium is provided for later. There is a tax of \$6 a pound on that. I propose to leave that part of the paragraph in the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I must confess that I am surprised at this reduction in the duty on opium. The rate is \$12 a pound under the McKinley act. It is worth from seven to eight dollars a pound, I believe, in the market, so that it bears a duty of about 150 per cent at \$12 a pound. I think the figure I have stated is about the price.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is \$7 a pound.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is \$7 a pound. We tax ourselves on whiskey and spirits manufactured in this country about 400 per cent. We tax various kinds of imported whiskies, brandies, and wines anywhere between 1 and 200 per cent. We tax everything of that kind which is a matter of luxury. Now, opium is considered the most deleterious and dangerous drug in the whole arena of medicine. It is a vile drug, destructive in its use. It is no doubt useful occasionally as a medicine, when it is very much reduced. It seems to me that a duty of \$12 a pound is not an unreasonable duty. It yielded us \$900,000 last year. Why the rate should be reduced I can not imagine. I should feel rather like the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER], that it ought to be prohibited; but as opium in some form is a valuable element in medicine, while the rate might be reduced it should have a very high rate. Where it is introduced for the purpose of smoking, I do not know any rate that might be named that I would not vote for. I do not wish to interfere with our friends on the other side, but they ought to be able to give us some good reason for this reduction.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the duty should either be much less than \$6 a pound, so as to prevent smuggling, which would be the result, or else it should be absolutely prohibitive.

Mr. SHERMAN. As a matter of course, when this article is worth so much a pound, say \$7, it will be smuggled more or less. Probably a great deal more is smuggled than pays duty, but we can collect \$12 a pound on it just as well as \$8.

Mr. ALDRICH. It yielded in revenue nearly a million dollars in 1892.

Mr. SHERMAN. Over \$900,000. We have collected for years a large sum of money from this very deleterious article. Unless Senators on the other side can give some good reason for the proposed reduction, I shall be disposed to vote against it and to call for the yeas and nays. I think it is indefensible.

Mr. MORRILL. I feel disposed to contribute a single item of information in relation to opium. It is well known that it is seldom smuggled through our larger ports, but usually on the borders of our country, where there are small custom-houses; and there the owners are quite willing that the opium should be seized, and when it is sold there are very few persons who can get more than three or four or five dollars a pound for it. So they can buy it back and pay for it at that rate, instead of paying a duty of \$12 a pound.

Mr. VEST. The reason why the committee came to the conclusion that this duty ought to be reduced was upon information furnished us by the Treasury Department. The officers who collect the duties at the ports upon the Pacific Slope said that the present duty gives rise to a large amount of smuggling. With our enormous coast in Alaska it is almost impossible to prevent smuggling with a duty of \$12 a pound. It is just exactly the old argument which I have heard the Senator from Ohio make with great force on former tariff bills in regard to diamonds. There is no subject that is so prolific of discussion as the duty upon diamonds, and members of Congress vie with each other in putting up the rate to fabulous amounts because it is a

pure, simple article of luxury. Yet, as I have heard the Senator from Ohio say, very properly, over and over again, it is very bad policy to follow any such idea as that.

Mr. SHERMAN. As to diamonds, a hundred thousand dollars' worth could be carried in the hand or in the vest pocket. That is quite a different thing from this article, which after all at \$12 a pound is not so valuable as fine cloths or things of that kind. I do not think there is any similitude between opium and diamonds in point of value or in facility of smuggling.

Mr. VEST. I did not make any analogy between the substances, but I did make an analogy as to the argument. If you put up the duty on diamonds enormously it increases the smuggling. If you put up this duty upon opium it increases the smuggling. I was in Alaska some years ago with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], and just before we reached there a whole cargo of opium had been smuggled in upon that coast, and we were informed by the officers of the Government that it was simply impossible to prevent it. If you put down the duty to a reasonable amount less opium will really come in, as the Government officials think, and you collect some revenue; but if you put it up more opium will come in, because it is smuggled in on account of the inducement. That is the reason why we thought it was good policy to reduce the rate of duty.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the case of smuggling to which he refers was of prepared opium for smoking purposes, not crude opium, I understand.

Mr. VEST. Of course. There was \$800,000 collected last year.

Mr. LODGE. It was not crude opium. It was prepared for smoking purposes.

Mr. VEST. It was prepared opium, which has a special classification under the tariff.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I understand.

Mr. VEST. The duties collected vary very much, as will be seen by reference to the report on import duties, page 114.

Mr. PALMER. I have no desire to oppose this provision, except to relieve my own feelings. If I had control of this traffic I would punish the importer with death, whether he was a smuggler or otherwise. This may be the best way of disposing of the matter. I do not suppose I shall ask the Senate to adopt my specific, which would be death, but I should like to see somewhere some authority exercise the power to take the life of any man who imports opium into this country. I think I would kill a smuggler certainly. I understand this is the best disposition we can make of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. It seems to be the desire of a majority of the Senate to have some reduction on opium as well as everything else. I move that \$10 be substituted instead of \$6 as the rate of duty.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Ohio permit me?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am through. I have submitted my motion to amend.

Mr. WHITE. I have necessarily been to some extent brought in contact with various facts which have convinced me that the statements made by the Treasury officials from time to time, especially, I think, in 1891, with reference to the smuggling of opium, are well founded. Upon the Pacific coast this business is carried on to such an extent that there have been times when opium was for sale upon the streets of San Francisco at a price very little higher than the duty itself. Sometimes it was sold in San Francisco as low as ten and eleven dollars a pound when the duty was \$12 a pound. Smuggling has been carried on to a great extent, especially from British Columbia.

While, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] says, perhaps it would be a good idea to kill smugglers, it is very difficult to place your finger upon them, to say nothing of the law itself. The traffic is carried on all over the coast. For instance, there are small vessels going up and down at different times and opium is landed in places all along the coast where such landing can be effected. In the city of San Francisco the Treasury officials are eternally at work trying to catch the smugglers, and they sometimes succeed. At other times they do not. Very often, for instance, in coming in through the Golden Gate articles containing opium have been thrown off a vessel and boats manned by smugglers have passed along and picked up the article containing the material designed to be smuggled. This has become such a practice that the Treasury officials, the shrewdest and most correct in every regard, officials who have been sent out to the coast to examine the matter, have determined that it is not only impossible to prevent smuggling, but that when there is such a premium, as it were, offered as the high tariff of \$12 discloses, the practice will not only never be broken up but it will rather augment.

Trials which have taken place in United States courts for smuggling have disclosed a most astonishing condition of affairs from time to time. When the tariff was raised to \$10 first, and

afterwards to \$12, the business in British Columbia increased enormously. There is, if I am right, a duty of \$1 a pound imposed upon the importation to British Columbia; and the business there immediately took an upward tendency when the duty in the United States was placed at \$10. Afterwards, when it was placed at \$12, it ran up until now it is simply enormous. It is out of the question to prevent smuggling when the inducement is so exceedingly large, and this article therefore virtually gets into the United States in this manner. At least 3 pounds are smuggled to 1 pound that is imported and on which duty is paid of the amount that passes into use in this country. Those 3 pounds come in here and are distributed without any tariff imposition at all.

Placing a duty of \$6 a pound upon the commodity will, in my judgment, make smuggling not only infrequent, but not desirable. The cupidity of man always suggests a method of evading the law in such cases, and opium is not so bulky as to make it difficult of concealment. I am satisfied that those of us who reside upon the coast agree upon this proposition. We know how much trouble the Federal officials have had, and how absolutely impotent their exertions have been. Grindstones were used for quite awhile as a method of smuggling in opium. The Federal officials found grindstones hollowed out with opium inside. Then all sorts of articles were utilized on shipboard, and finally, as I have stated, as far as the ships were concerned, they resorted to the method I have before described of throwing the article over the ship contained in some device that floated around in the water and was taken up.

But small vessels are plying up and down the coast of California engaged in smuggling, and then on the Mexican line smuggling is going on to a great extent. The practice is becoming so notorious that I think everybody connected with the revenue service upon the Pacific coast, whether Democrat or Republican, has for some years been in favor of changing the law as suggested by the committee. As I have stated, the letter of the special agent of the Treasury of 1891 goes into the matter very elaborately and is exceedingly significant. Of course individually I do not know that I would be in favor of taking off the duty upon the first article named in the paragraph, but still there is a difference of opinion regarding the matter, and I intend to vote with the committee upon the whole proposition.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lines 8, 9, and 10, on page 6, strike out: Opium, crude or unmanufactured, and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent and over of morphia, \$1 per pound.

Mr. FRYE. Was not there an amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio is to the subsequent part of the paragraph.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is to a subsequent part of the paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, in line 12, before the word "dollars," strike out "six" and insert "ten," so as to read:

Opium containing less than 9 per cent of morphia, and opium prepared for smoking, \$10 per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN].

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

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

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. I will state that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. MITCHEL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. PALMER (when his name was called). I am paired on this question, I believe, and I am glad of it.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. RANSOM. Has the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. RANSOM. I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and withhold my vote.

Mr. DUBOIS. I announce my pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 31; as follows:

YEAS—20.			
Aldrich,	Dolph,	McMillan,	Power,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Manderson,	Quay,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Oregon	Sherman,
Davis,	Hoar,	Patton,	Shoup,
Dixon,	Lodge,	Peffer,	Teller.
NAYS—31.			
Allen,	Camden,	Jarvis,	Pugh,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,
Berry,	Coke,	Lindsay,	Turpie,
B Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Mills,	Vest,
Blanchard,	George,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Butler,	Gibson,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Caffery,	Harris,	Pasco,	White.
Cáll,	Irby,	Perkins,	
NOT VOTING—34.			
Brice,	Gray,	McPherson,	Smith,
Cameron,	Hale,	Martin,	Squire,
Carey,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Wis.	Stewart,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Morrill,	Walsh,
Daniel,	Hill,	Palmer,	Washburn,
Dubois,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	Wilson,
Frye,	Jones, Nev.	Platt,	Wolcott.
Gordon,	Kyle,	Proctor,	
Gorman,	McLaurin,	Ransom,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary read the next paragraph of the bill, as follows:

37. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, manufactured, \$3 per ton.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment, in line 18 to strike out "\$3 per ton," and insert "25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to move an amendment to paragraph 37. I move to strike out "\$3" and insert "\$6.72." That is the rate provided by the existing law. I do not know but that some duty less than the existing rate would be sufficient, but I am quite sure that the reduction which is proposed by the House will be injurious to an industry of no inconsiderable importance. The present duties are \$6.72 per ton on manufactured barytes and \$1.12 a ton on crude barytes. The House provision, as will be seen, proposes a duty of \$3 a ton on the manufactured article and puts the crude article on the free list.

I think I ought not to appeal unsuccessfully to the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber in behalf of the production of barytes, which is almost entirely, so far as the mineral is concerned, a Southern production, and very largely the manufacture is Southern. Placing the crude article on the free list will result ultimately in placing the entire business, so far as it is conducted on the seaboard, into the hands of the grinders of the crude article in New York City and vicinity. These grinders, in common with all who advocate free raw materials from an entirely selfish standpoint, undoubtedly sincerely advocate the removal of the duty from the crude article while a certain duty is retained on the manufactured product for the sole purpose of putting the control of the business in the hands of the New York manufacturers.

This industry is one of peculiar interest to the Senators from Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, in which Southern States is mined to-day nearly all the mineral that is converted into barytes and used by the Eastern paint men. If duties are to be applied where they are to be the least burdensome, then a duty should be retained on crude barytes; and a very considerable duty should be retained, for the reason that its removal or any reduction will not result in benefit to anyone, directly or indirectly, aside from the very few parties advocating it.

The manufactured article is used principally in paint making. There is some dispute about its value as a pigment, but there is no dispute that its value, whatever it may be, is obtained only from its very fine preparation. There is an intense rivalry between the manufacturers in the Eastern States and in the West, and some of the largest manufacturers of barytes are in the State of Missouri. The rivalry has resulted in the production of such qualities as are used to a very small extent, if used at all, by the European paint makers. When the article is finely prepared, as it now is by the American manufacturers, the successful cheapening of paint may be accomplished. That is to say, even anyone who will deny its value as a pigment, will admit that, comparatively speaking, it is harmless when fine; while in its ordinary state of preparation it is a harmful adulterant.

Senators will understand that there is a dispute as to whether barytes is an adulterant in the manufacture of paint, or whether it is a beneficial admixture. It has to be admitted that when it is coarse, when it is not prepared finely, it is an injurious adulterant, and it is only when it is prepared with great care and finely ground that it has to be admitted that it is either harmless or to a certain extent beneficial.

The barytes is a mineral gathered in this country largely by people whose ordinary occupation is that of agriculture. In seasons when not occupied with farm labors, the time of the cultivators of the soil is devoted to the collection or the mining of this mineral from their property and disposing of it to neighboring merchants or mills. This class of citizens can not readily make themselves heard here, and in ignoring them Senators are, unintentionally without doubt, sacrificing them to parties whose aim is to monopolize the business by reason of their New York location, and the use of material brought to this country as ballast and mined by the cheapest labor.

That is an important point to consider, as this in its natural state is a mere rock. It can be mined by the cheapest labor, it can be put on ships as ballast and brought to this country and to the wharves at our seaports at a comparatively insignificant cost, and therefore a duty upon the crude article is necessary if the mines of baryta in North Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee are to be kept open. The use of the foreign article is a direct abstraction of labor from American citizens, without compensation of any kind whatever. It is the sacrificing of the interests of humble citizens, who can not afford to present the status of their affairs to their Representatives, and their interests are sacrificed in favor of monopolies only.

The useful bulletins which have been placed upon our desks contain much matter on this subject. By reference to Bulletin No. 4, page 43, it will be seen that a statement is made that the crude article can not be brought into this country at a cost compared with that at which the Southern article can be delivered at the port of New York. This statement may be very seriously questioned. The Mineral Resources of the United States in 1885, printed in 1886, page 524, gives the New York market value of the imported crude article at \$7 to \$8 per ton, while the United States customs figures for 1885 show an importation of 9,622,822 pounds, valued at \$1,334, equal to \$2.78 per ton. This shows very clearly that baryta can not be mined in the interior of this country and taken to New York City and sold, to be manufactured at the price at which the foreign baryta can be taken from the hold of the ships, sold at New York, and manufactured.

The bulletins fail to show any direct request from a consumer of this article for any reduction in duty, or any change of duty. On the contrary, the bulletins show that the majority of the paint men request that no changes be made; and it is well to note in this connection that the general protection given to the paint industry has resulted in the establishment of a number of plants in the South, where it would be supposed that this class of manufacture would not be established. For instance, in Bulletin No. 4, page 8, is a reply from a manufacturing concern in New Orleans, where the opportunity of importing foreign raw material, so-called, is particularly good, and this concern states:

We desire no change whatever.

On page 65, of the same bulletin, is the reply of a paint manufacturing establishment in Atlanta, Ga., and this party requests Congress to put on "a duty that will let the American laborers live and will pay the manufacturers reasonable interest on their investments." These paint concerns consume barytes. They do not ask that the crude article shall be placed upon the free list or that there shall be any change whatever in the duty.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that because barytes is a simple mineral from which this large manufacture of an ingredient of paint has grown up that the industry will not be sacrificed, but that the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber will treat a simple product of this kind, which has started quite a mining industry in the Southern States I have named, as entitled to reasonable protection. When, two years ago, I was at Hot Springs, N. C., I found the only industry in the place was a factory for grinding barytes, and I saw that it was a growing industry. I saw that the quality of the barytes was good and the factory at that place was, I thought, grinding the rock with sufficient fineness to make the article all that can be desired, if any such article is desired in the manufacture of paint, and I felt that that little industry thus being developed in the mountains of North Carolina ought to be protected. The moment the pending bill passes that little factory will be closed. It can not manufacture the barytes and transport the product to the paint factories at the rate of duty which is proposed by the bill. I therefore make an appeal on broad national ground for protection to this Southern industry, and I hope it will not be stricken down by the ruinous reduction of duty which is proposed by the House bill.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he would not be willing to modify his amendment so as to put a duty on crude baryta or—

Mr. ALDRICH. I was called from the Chamber temporarily. I was about to make a motion to take crude baryta from the free list.

Mr. LODGE. The reason I make the suggestion is because

the rate proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is a rate predicated upon a duty on crude baryta. It seems to me that they properly go together, so as to make the paragraph read:

Baryta, crude, \$1 per ton; baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, manufactured, \$3 per ton.

Mr. CHANDLER. I intended to ask the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to suggest what would be the appropriate duties, both upon the crude article and the manufactured article, for the purpose of stating this case in favor of barytes. I moved in place of the House duty of \$3 a ton on manufactured barytes the present duty \$6.72, assuming that if that were adopted crude barytes would have the duty of \$1.12 a ton. If the Senator from Rhode Island will indicate the amount that ought to be moved on manufactured baryta, I will accept that sum or a motion may be made by the Senator, which would suit me just as well, covering crude barytes and manufactured barytes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that an attempt be made first to fix the rate upon crude baryta.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I withdraw my amendment for the present.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to amend the paragraph so that it will read:

Baryta, carbonate of, or witherite, and baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, manufactured, including barytes earth—

This being paragraph 500 of the free list—  
\$1 per ton.

Making the rate \$1 per ton.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Does the Senator from Rhode Island intend to make the article which is on the free list under the McKinley law taxable now? Is that his proposition?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the effect of his amendment. "Baryta, carbonate of, or witherite" is free under the McKinley law. It is on the free list.

Mr. LODGE. The present law is:

Baryta, sulphate of, \* \* \* \$1.12 per ton.

Carbonate is not mentioned in the paragraph, and I understood the Senator from Rhode Island to say that he was moving the present law.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I say baryta, carbonate of, is on the free list now.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. ALDRICH. My intention is to make the articles now dutiable at \$1.12 dutiable at \$1 a ton. I shall modify my amendment so as to make it conform to the present law in phraseology.

□ Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, \$1 per ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of paragraph 37 the following:

Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, \$1 per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right. It is represented to me that there are three thousand people in Virginia employed in collecting baryta, and I can not see any good reason for placing it upon the free list. Baryta is largely used as an adulterant for paint. It is found in large quantities in various parts of the world, and I can not see why the people of Virginia, engaged in the collection of this article, are not entitled to a certain amount of protection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. ALDRICH. I call for a division.

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

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

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I will announce that, with the consent of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] are paired. I vote "yea."

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to state that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is detained from the Chamber by reason of

illness in his family, and that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY].

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 31; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Allison,	Dubois,	Manderson,	Squire,
Cameron,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Teller.
Chandler,	Hawley,	Patton,	
Davis,	Hoar,	Perkins,	
Dixon,	Lodge,	Quay,	

NAYS—31.

Allen,	Camden,	Martin,	Roach,
Bate,	Cockrell,	Mills,	Turpie,
Berry,	Coke,	Morgan,	Vest,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Murphy,	Vilas,
Blanchard,	George,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Harris,	Pasco,	Walsh,
Butler,	Jones, Ark.	Peffer,	White.
Call,	Lindsay,	Pugh,	

NOT VOTING—33.

Caffery,	Hale,	McLaurin,	Sherman
Carey,	Hansbrough,	McPherson,	Smith,
Cullom,	Higgins,	Mitchell, Wis.	Stewart,
Daniel,	Hill,	Morrill,	Washburn,
Frye,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	Wilson,
Gibson,	Irby,	Platt,	Wolcott.
Gordon,	Jarvis,	Power,	
Gorman,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	
Gray,	Kyle,	Ransom,	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LODGE. In paragraph 37, before the word "dollars," I move to strike out "three" and insert "five." The Senate having decided to put no duty upon crude baryta, I propose an amendment putting on the manufactured article a duty which conforms to that which, according to all the evidence we have, is required to enable the manufacture to continue. I have here the reply of Page & Krausse, of St. Louis, Mo., manufacturers of barytes, with an invested capital of \$200,000. They are Democrats and their testimony is given in great fullness and is very carefully arranged. They say:

The present rate of duty on barytes, namely, crude \$1.12 per ton and manufactured \$6.72 per ton, is not more than enough to place domestic products on an equal footing with foreign products. The proposed reduction, \$1.12 on crude and \$3.75 on manufactured, is (investigate, and you will verify this)—

A piece of advice which apparently was misplaced—more than the present profit on domestic crude and manufactured barytes. We are now paying our workmen, average, \$1.97 per day, or two or three times as much as foreign workmen in the same industry are paid.

We pay our hands well, average \$1.97 per day, and have not reduced wages for fifteen years until now. When we stopped, December 20, 1893, we notified our hands that when we started up again it would be on reduction of 15 per cent in wages.

The adjustment of industry to tariff—

They say—

has been gradual during one-third of a century.

The writer is a Democrat, and I assume a tariff reformer, and this is his idea of the way in which the reform should take place:

Say a reduction of 5 per cent per annum on all duties as they now stand in the tariff act of 1890, to take effect annually, on the 1st of July every year. This would reach free trade in twenty years. Meanwhile no disturbance would be felt; and in, say, five or ten years the people and statesmen of the United States would learn by experience, and without serious harm, just what is best for all. The writer is a lifelong Democrat and an advocate of free trade.

Then this advocate of free trade goes on to say:

We propose to meet reduction of duty by reducing wages. The cost of our raw material will not bear reduction. Same as to all other expenses.

Then the firm say further:

All our raw material is mined largely by farmers. The United States Geological Survey reports as follows (volume for 1891, printed in 1893, "Barytes," page 599):

"In the first place, the greater part of the mining is performed by farmers at seasons of the year when they and their employes and teams would otherwise be idle. In some instances the product is shipped to St. Louis or other points by the miners; at other times it is taken to local merchants and exchanged for merchandise, and by the merchants shipped to the manufacturer."

Volume for 1892, printed in 1893, "Barytes," page 821:

"The barytes is usually mined in off seasons by farmers, taken to the stores and exchanged for supplies or cash, the dealer shipping to St. Louis as the trade demands."

Yes—

This life-long Democrat and free trader goes on to say—

Yes; we need a customs duty. Without duty no barytes manufactory in the United States could run. The Wilson tariff reduction will permanently stop fully 60 per cent of the present domestic manufacture.

The testimony of George H. Burgess, of New Haven, Conn., is to exactly similar effect. He says:

A rate of duty not less than one-fourth of a cent per pound on manufactured sulphate barytes.

That is the rate which I move—\$5 per ton.

At a lower rate than this German manufactured barytes can be brought into this country and delivered at the port of New York (which place I take as a basis for comparison for the cost of goods) at a lower price than American manufacturers can produce the goods and make the same delivery. A duty of one-fourth of a cent per pound brings the foreign in competition with American production.

We desire a specific duty because on the manufactured the duty has always been a specific one, and the values on this article on the other side differ very materially.

As the labor is the principal expense in the manufacture of my production, the difference in the cost to meet competition must be met by a reduction in wages.

With raw material free to meet foreign competition it would be necessary to have a duty of not less than one-fourth of a cent per pound on manufactured sulphate barytes.

We recommend unmanufactured sulphate barytes free, as proposed by the Wilson bill, and on sulphate barytes manufactured a duty of one-fourth of a cent per pound.

"Sulphate barytes, unmanufactured, if placed on the free list," he thinks, "is not an injury to any domestic miner or manufacturer."

Now, there is the testimony of these two firms, one of them in St. Louis, which says that the duty proposed by the committee will close up 60 per cent of the manufactories in the United States. The firm who give that testimony are Democrats and free traders. They employ 106 men and have a capital of \$200,000. Closing 60 per cent of the manufactories means a cessation of the demand for the barytes, which are supplied largely by farmers in certain States at times when they would otherwise be idle, and reducing the demand means a blow to that portion of the agricultural interest, small perhaps, but still as valuable to those engaged in it as the great industries are to the persons who promote them. Therefore I move to make the duty \$5 per ton instead of \$3 per ton.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is perhaps fairer and better than the old rate of \$3.72 per ton; but in consideration of the previous vote, by which crude barytes has been placed upon the free list and that production in the United States is destroyed, before the Senate proceeds further with the consideration of this heading, "Paints, colors, and varnishes," I desire to call attention to some important suggestions that are made in the replies which have been received on that subject. I venture to read them, although I regret that so few Senators are in their seats to hear these important contributions to the discussion of this great question.

In Bulletin No. 3, which is Senate Report No. 370 of the present Congress, page 117, is the reply of Harrison Bros. & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., manufacturers of white lead, colors, paints, etc., whose establishment, starting in 1793, now has a capital of \$2,700,000, and whose total sales in 1892 were \$1,999,915 and in 1893 \$1,709,873, the decrease being felt entirely in the last half of the year. They say:

We ran with steadily increasing output until the uncertainties produced in all industries by the threatened radical tariff changes. A computation, made for the Department of Labor, showed that our working people made just one-half of the number of hours in February, 1894, as in February, 1893, there being a steady comparative decline, month to month, 1892-'93 to 1893-'94.

Duties are necessary on all our products sufficient to cover the greater cost of plant and greater cost of labor. The only exceptions are the few cases where the products are not readily transportable by sea, and that acting, in a measure, as a protection against the cheaper foreign article; but in sulphuric acid, for instance, which it is proposed to place on the free list, the dangerous competition is from Canada, which at the present time levies a duty that would prevent our entering its market in competition with its manufacturers, while ours is freely opened to its surplus.

Duties on all our products should be specific, and the specific duties should be based on the value of the highest class of product. Duties should be specific because of the impracticability on the part of appraisers to readily estimate values and prevent undervaluations, as, for instance, acetic acid: two samples may be equally clear, of the same strength, and equally free of organic impurities, yet there may be a great difference in the contents of organic impurities, and one may be worth five times as much as the other; the actual difference in value could be determined only by a careful and tedious chemical analysis, which would require the best chemical talent to determine. This rule holds good with dyestuffs and colors.

Again, they say:

We are continuing all our lines, and would have added many new ones, but for the expressed intention of opening up our markets to foreign producers, which would leave open to American enterprise only those operations that may be of the character of a monopoly, extended through the operations of the patent laws or some local franchise, as the purchase of a gasworks or something of that kind.

Wages, tendency downward—only because of uncertainty of employment; with us, shortened hours and lessened number of employed have reduced the earnings of our labor nearly 50 per cent.

They further say:

Our skilled labor amounts from 40 to 50 per cent, most of it trained in our own works. We have a large number of employes who have been in our

service for periods ranging from fifteen to thirty years and more, and their average pay is over \$3 per diem. \* \* \*

To meet reduction of duty will be only by a contest with labor.

Referring to the question of exports they say:

We do not export; all the markets of Europe, if we could get them, would not more than equal our own, and the rest of the world is worth but little, if any, consideration.

They also add as to price:

Our selling prices have decreased.

Messrs. John Lucas & Co., of Gibbsboro, Camden County, N. J., manufacturers of paints, colors, and varnishes, with a business established in 1848, and now having a capital of \$2,000,000, say their prices have declined:

The decline has been gradual but continuous from year to year; the extremes of 1884 and 1894 running, on dry colors, from 20 to 30 per cent; on ordinary paints, from 10 to 15 per cent; on varnishes, 15 to 25 per cent.

Competition, through the increased domestic manufacture in the main, is accountable for those reductions in price, assisted, until the adoption of the present law, by the foreign manufacturers, who had grown very aggressive, and with the opportunities for fraud presented by the greater prevalence of ad valorem duties under the law prior to the adoption of the present duties, the return to which, or extension of the ad valorem system, we regard as one of the greatest calamities and detrimental alike to the moral, business, and manufacturing interests of the country; in fact, in our estimation, it would not be necessary to alter the present duties other than to make them ad valorem, and change a few of the administrative features of the present law, to have what would be practically free trade.

Our business had steadily increased until the present unfortunate conditions (forced upon the country through the tampering with the present law), as we pursued a very aggressive policy.

They then proceed to speak of their wages and the condition of their employes. They say:

Wages we have not as yet changed, having advanced them in 1892, as we are heartily in favor of the American standard of wages, living, dressing, etc., and deprecate the tendency to reduce that standard to the foreign level, regarding it simply as a retrograde movement.

The condition of our employes is that of perfect contentment, being well dressed, enjoying some of the luxuries of life (common to the United States), viz, painted houses, carpeted floors, musical instruments, and through their accumulations of eight or ten years of steady employment purchasing their own homes, which we assist them in doing by loans at low rates of interest, payable at their convenience.

Having stated the condition of their workmen, Lucas & Co. undertake to show what will follow as the result of the reduction of duties by the passage of the pending bill. They say:

Reductions in duty will be met by closing our works and importing, or reducing the labor cost in the item of wages.

Then they say:

The exports are immaterial. The demand in countries to which we might export is but limited, as they have not the money to pay for paint, having hardly reached the "whitewash" age.

They also undertake to state how little benefit would result, so far as wages are concerned, by what is called free raw material. They say:

If all our raw materials were free we should have to reduce our wages to the basis prevailing in the foreign arcadias for workingmen, plus the slight difference in freight, say 5 per cent, an actual difference in wages to the recipient of fully 50 per cent, as proven by United States consular reports.

The Heath & Milligan Manufacturing Company, of Chicago, manufacturers of paints and colors, who were established in 1851 and have a capital invested of \$500,000, say:

We shut our factory down to three-quarters time last August 1, for the first time in forty-two years in that season.

They proceed to say:

If the rate of duty were reduced one-third we should be compelled to reduce the cost of the product one-third. If lowering wages would not meet this reduction we would be forced out of the business.

As to the quantity which they are producing, they say:

We are not producing over 75 per cent the amount of goods so far this year that we produced during a corresponding time in 1892.

The Heath & Milligan Manufacturing Company give us the information called for in reference to some of their employes, and say:

The tendency of wages during the past twelve months, we think, has been downward, although, individually, we have nearly kept them up.

Following are the names of three employes taken at random, with a description of their income and their success in life:

Charles Hallenburg, residing at Austin, a suburb. Wages, \$3 per day; family of eight, with one deaf-mute child, for whom he pays \$10 per month for schooling; other children all in school. From his wages of \$3 per day he has been able to support his family, has invested \$10 a month in a building and loan association, and has accumulated enough in the past three years to build a home of his own, with the assistance of the building association.

Frank Tarm, No. 736 Western avenue, Chicago. Wages, \$2 per day; family of three, a wife and one child. Just manages to live, and saves nothing.

Fred Fogelsburg, No. 25 Whiting street, Chicago. Wages, \$2.25 per day. Has a wife and four children; rents his house. Has been saving \$2.50 a week for some time to buy himself a home.

These three Chicago employes will either have to be turned out of their employment, if this bill passes, or they will have to subject themselves to such a reduction in wages that Mr. Charles Hallenburg, with a deaf-mute child, for whose schooling he is now, with his present wages, paying \$10 a month, will be obliged to take him out of school.

Mr. President, I do not really believe that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] wants to turn out Charles Hallenburg from profitable employment by the Heath & Milligan Manufac-

turing Company; I do not believe the Senator wants that man's deaf-mute child taken away from school; I do not believe the Senator wants a man, who has just begun to pay for his house in a building and loan association, to lose his house, to lose his home; and yet that is the direct tendency of the free-trade system to which the Senator from Illinois has committed himself.

The Heath & Milligan Manufacturing Company state the reasons which they believe caused the present distress, as follows:

In our opinion, the cause of the present depression is due almost entirely to a threatened change of the tariff law, with a tendency of the party in power towards free trade, necessitating the reorganization of business on a new basis.

There it is—the threatened change of the tariff law made by the Democratic leaders, with the tendency of the party in power towards free trade. That is the tendency of the Senator from Illinois, which he restrains in order that this may be made a moderately protective tariff law. At the same time these people say that if there is a reduction of the duties on the goods which they manufacture, their "only recourse is to reduce wages," and they conclude with a recommendation to Congress, which they are fully entitled to make, when we consider the high wages they are paying their employes:

We would recommend that there be no radical change made in the duties on paints and paint products, and above all, that an ad valorem duty be not substituted for a specific.

And right in the face of this plaintive appeal the Senator from Illinois goes on and votes for ad valorem duties when somebody says he must, and he votes for specific duties when somebody allows that he may.

Here are Longman & Martinez, of Brooklyn, N. Y., manufacturers of paints. They established their concern in 1864, and have a capital invested of \$300,000. They say:

We are running on three-fourths time from September, 1893, to January. Cause, Wilson bill.

Here is their condition:

- Prices on all paints are lower in 1892 than ever before.
- Domestic competition increasing every year.
- We desire specific duty; prevents undervaluation.
- Not producing 70 per cent of goods as in 1892. Cause, Wilson bill.
- There is decreasing tendency in wages.

Present cause of depression, the Wilson bill. Remedy: Postpone consideration until after November, 1894.

I wish we might get the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber, especially the New York Senators, to favor the postponement of this bill. Here is the firm of Longman & Martinez, of Brooklyn, who state what they want, and say:

Postpone consideration until after November, 1894. We recommend no change in customs at present; give the people a chance in November to say.

That is just what we want. Senators upon the other side of the Chamber are going on here with this ruinous bill because they say that was the verdict of the people in 1892, and they are not willing to take the verdict of the people in 1893. In the spirit of honorable compromise, Mr. President, I say let us take the verdict of the people in 1894, and in December next, if the people have reversed the Republican victories of last year and have gone back to the political attitude of 1892, then we will pass a moderate tariff bill here and adjourn on the 4th of March next, and those of us who resign or who are not reelected will go home to our constituents feeling that we have done well. But here we now are in a strait between two elections, the election of 1892, which spoke one way, so Senators say, and the election of 1893, which spoke another way.

We are in a strait between the two, and we can send this question just where these poor paint manufacturers in Brooklyn, N. Y., ask to have it sent; we can send it to the people in 1894. I have no doubt that if we do this and come back here next December we can come a great deal nearer an agreement upon this subject than we are reaching now.

I hope the Senators from New York and the Senators from some other States will follow the recommendation of Longman & Martinez, of Brooklyn, postpone the consideration of the tariff until November, 1894, and give the people a chance in November to render their verdict.

Mr. President, I conclude these interesting exhibits, which are only brief extracts from these marvelously valuable returns, by reading from the reply of the Acme White Lead and Color Works, of Detroit, Mich., manufacturers of paints and colors, established in 1884, with a capital invested of \$300,000.

Their general answers are all the same; they want specific duties. They say:

As to output of goods now, compared with 1892, too many people either gone, going, or will be forced into bankruptcy on account of the panic caused by tariff legislation.

Men, skilled, would gladly work at 40 cents a day if they could get it.

Up to 1893 we had a fairly uniform market. You can not force the sale of goods now at any price, since the tariff legislation began. No changes in rates of duty or in customs laws.

Mr. President, we are taking up for consideration the schedule concerning paints, colors, and varnishes, and here is the universal, the unanimous testimony of everyone who answered the circulars sent out by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES]. Those circulars were sent out for some purpose. Why does not some one of the recipients of the circulars say to us, "Go on and reduce duties and adopt ad valorem duties instead of specific"? The testimony from the individuals engaged in this trade is all one way, and yet Senators upon the other side of the Chamber, with a subtlety and persistency that is terribly destructive to the prosperity of this country, are marching on to the effort to put this abominable bill upon the statute book.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask to have the amendment stated from the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 17, before the word "dollars" it is proposed to strike out "three" and insert "five;" so as to make the paragraph read:

Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, manufactured, \$5 per ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. FRYE (when Mr. GRAY'S name was called). The senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] is paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

Mr. HIGGINS (when his name was called). I have transferred my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], who is absent and unpaired; and I vote "yea."

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BUTLER. I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. RANSOM (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and withdraw my vote.

Mr. PUGH. I am paired with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], with the right reserved to vote if my vote be necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. GEORGE (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH], and voted to make a quorum. I see that I can now withdraw my vote, a quorum having voted, and I withdraw it.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—19.

Aldrich,	Dubois,	Manderson,	Quay,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Shoup,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Patton,	Squire,
Davis,	Higgins,	Perkins,	Teller.
Dixon,	McMillan,	Proctor,	

NAYS—30.

Allen,	Cockrell,	Martin,	Turpie,
Bate,	Coke,	Mills,	Vest,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Bianchard,	Harris,	Palmer,	Walsh,
Brice,	Jarvis,	Pasco,	White.
Call,	Jones, Ark.	Peffer,	
Camden,	Lindsay,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—33.

Butler,	Gordon,	Jones, Nev.	Power,
Caffery,	Gorman,	Kyle,	Pugh,
Cameron,	Gray,	Lodge,	Ransom,
Carey,	Hale,	McLaurin,	Sherman,
Cullom,	Hansbrough	MCPHERSON,	Smith,
Daniel,	Hill,	Mitchell, Wis	Stewart,
Dolph,	Hoar,	Morrill,	Washburn,
Frye,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	Wilson,
George,	Irby,	Platt,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

33. Blues, such as Berlin, Prussian, Chinese, and all others, containing ferrocyanide of iron, dry or ground in or mixed with oil, 6 cents per pound; in pulp or mixed with water, 6 cents per pound on the material contained therein when dry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the Committee on Finance will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 23, before the words "in pulp," the committee propose to insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, and read paragraph 39 as follows:

39. Blanc-fixe, or satin white, or artificial sulphate of barytes, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In line 2, I move to insert after the word "barytes," the words "and artificial sulphate of lime."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.  
The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 2, after the word "barytes," it is proposed to insert "and artificial sulphate of lime," so as to read:

39. Blanc-fixe, or satin white, or artificial sulphate of barytes, and artificial sulphate of lime, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that the phraseology of the paragraph should be changed so as to read:

Blanc-fixe, or artificial sulphate of barytes and satin white, or artificial sulphate of lime, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. We accept the suggestion.  
The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the paragraph so as to read:

39. Blanc-fixe, or artificial sulphate of barytes and satin white, or artificial sulphate of lime, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.  
Mr. ALDRICH. Now, I move to strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and insert "three-fourths of 1 cent per pound," which is substantially the present law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.  
The SECRETARY. In line 2, after the word "lime," it is proposed to strike out "25 per cent ad valorem," and insert "three-fourths of 1 cent per pound."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PUGH called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Before the roll is called, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island how his proposed amendment will affect the ad valorem rate?

Mr. ALDRICH. It would increase the ad valorem rate on satin white and decrease it on blanc-fixe.

Mr. HIGGINS. How much would it decrease it?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should say that the rates, taken together, would be a little higher than the rate suggested by the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator's amendment would raise them somewhat?

Mr. ALDRICH. It raises them somewhat.  
The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. HIGGINS (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and vote "yea."

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

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

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 31; as follows:

YEAS—18.			
Aldrich,	Dubois,	Manderson,	Shoup,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Squire,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Patton,	Teller.
Davis,	Higgins,	Perkins,	
Dixon,	McMillan,	Quay,	
NAYS—31.			
Allen,	Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Bate,	Coke,	Martin,	Turpie,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Mills,	Vest,
Blackburn,	George,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Harris,	Palmer,	Walsh,
Call,	Jarvis,	Pasco,	White.
Camden,	Jones, Ark.	Petfer,	
NOT VOTING—36.			
Butler,	Gorman,	Kyle,	Proctor,
Caffery,	Gray,	Lodge,	Pugh,
Cameron,	Hale,	McLaurin,	Ransom,
Carey,	Hansbrough,	McPherson,	Sherman,
Cullom,	Hill,	Mitchell, Wis.	Smith,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Dolph,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	Washburn,
Frye,	Irby,	Platt,	Wilson,
Gordon,	Jones, Nev.	Power,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary read as follows:

40. Black, made from bone, ivory, or vegetable, under whatever name known, including bone black and lamblack, dry or ground in oil or water, 20 per cent ad valorem.

41. Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are component parts, dry or ground in or mixed with oil, or in pulp or mixed with water, 2½ cents per pound on the material contained therein when dry.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "two and one-quarter" and insert "three."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.  
The SECRETARY. In line 12, before the word "cents," it is proposed to strike out "two and one-quarter" and insert "three."

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to strike out "three" and insert "four and a half."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment by striking out "three" and inserting "four and one-half;" so as to read:

41. Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are component parts, dry or ground in or mixed with oil, or in pulp or mixed with water, 4½ cents per pound on the material contained therein when dry.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. President, before the question is put on the pending amendment, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to one letter I find here from manufacturers of white lead and colors in the South. It is No. 277, found on page 8, of Bulletin No. 4, of the Replies to Tariff Inquiries. It is the reply of the American White Lead and Color Works, of New Orleans, La., manufacturers of white lead and colors; which was established in 1889 with a capital invested of \$100,000.

This business concern, Mr. President, is one of the representatives of the new South, of the Southern manufacturers, about which the entire country has such hope, the interest in which is not confined to the people of the South, but which have well-wishers in every citizen of the North and in every member of the Republican party. It is well, I think, for us to know and for the country to know how a Southern representative of this interest feels as to the reduction of the present duty as proposed by the pending bill. They say:

We produce \$200,000 worth of all kinds of paints.  
We have been running overtime.  
In regard to reducing the rates of duty one-third, make highest rate possible to insure use of American-made paints.  
Reducing the rates of duty one-third would mean discharge of labor and we turn importers.  
We have had domestic competition for the past four years.  
Which is ever since they have been in existence.  
We desire specific duty; easier to figure upon.  
We are not producing so many goods this year on account of Wilson bill agitation.  
Wages have come down on account of Wilson bill agitation.  
The price of living is about the same.  
The present depression is owing to the success of the Democracy and their desire to radically change everything.  
Seventy per cent of our material is raw.

\* \* \* \* \*  
Seventy-five per cent of our labor is skilled.  
Reduction of duty on goods must be met by discharging our employes or cut their wages proportionately.  
We have fifty employes and pay \$2 to \$3.  
\* \* \* \* \*  
Fifty per cent of our goods is exported.  
Cost of production since 1883 has increased. Labor is higher.  
There has been a reduction of about 80 per cent in our selling prices.  
Many articles of the agricultural production of the country are consumed on which we pay specific duty.  
We desire no change whatever. In other words, the tariff is correct now, and any change whatever is bad. We request the defeat of the Wilson bill, and have sent petitions signed by every employe to that effect to the Senate.

There are several interesting results which are made apparent by this communication. One is the value of these bulletins and these answers as testimony on this subject; yet we see the extraordinary fact that the bill framed by the Finance Committee was framed without their ever looking at any of these letters. Notwithstanding the questions had been sent out to elicit the answers as though the information produced would be used by the committee in framing their measure, they framed it in serene disregard of the testimony, evidence, and facts for which they have sought.

Another matter, as I have said already, is that this is testimony from a Southern manufacturing concern. It is evidence of a fact of enormous significance to the people of the South—a matter upon which I want to submit some remarks to the Senate hereafter before this bill is passed—that the protective system is sending manufacturing concerns into the South, giving to it and to its people employment at good wages, contributing to its prosperity; and when, in the language of the Senator from Missouri

[Mr. VEST], in part in charge of this measure, this measure goes through leveled at the Northeastern section of this country, it will be like the guns of Cornwallis at Guilford Court House, it will sweep down friends and foes. It can not take the life of Northern industry without cutting the throat of Southern Senators on the other side, and thus reduce the welfare of this industry in New Orleans, La., against the evidence and against the protest of the representative of the paint interest there.

There is still another interesting fact to be drawn from this letter. It is that labor is higher, and that there has been a reduction of about 80 per cent in our selling prices. So far from the McKinley act and the rates of duty established by it having increased the prices at which these goods are sold, they have been reduced to the enormous extent, according to these people, of 80 per cent.

But beyond that you have the further fact that 50 per cent of our goods is exported. Here you have an industry upon which the duty is lowered, upon the idea—I will not say pretense—that by lowering the duty you can lower the price; yet here the price has already been reduced 80 per cent; that it is necessary to lower the duty in order to get into the markets of the world, and yet 50 per cent of the product is exported. So we see how this measure is being conducted and what will be its result. It is being projected without reference to the testimony which was elicited by the committee, and every theory upon which it goes is confounded by the facts in our experience under the present duty, as shown by this testimony.

I think that this is reason enough, Mr. President, why we should vote against any further reduction, and should vote to leave the duty where it now is.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the duty of 4½ cents a pound inserted in the act of 1890 on this article was then supposed and believed to be equivalent to 25 per cent ad valorem on the better quality of the colors covered by the paragraph. The duty, as shown by the imports, is about 30 per cent ad valorem upon the foreign value of the goods imported.

Among the amendments suggested by the Senator from Arkansas is one which fixes a duty upon bichromate of potash, one of the principal ingredients of these colors, at 25 per cent ad valorem, and the rate now suggested by the committee upon the finished colors is less than the duty upon the material from which they are made, namely, bichromate of potash.

I have here a very clear statement, made by one of the largest manufacturers of this article, which I shall take the liberty of reading, as it presents the question in a very lucid and concise manner:

"Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other colors in which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are component parts."

The articles covered by this paragraph are made in varying qualities, and the necessity of making the duty on these goods specific is recognized by the committee when presenting their bill to the House, because in the original draft an ad valorem rate was fixed.

In paints and colors generally, which are articles that may be grossly adulterated (and generally are, and yet the adulteration is not readily detected), it is very desirable that the importation of only the highest grades be stimulated, as that not only insures a higher general standard for the consumer, but makes a better standard for the general quality of the home product.

The duty of 4½ cents per pound was estimated to be about 25 per cent on the average price of the highest grades of these articles for the years preceding the framing of the act of 1890. Prior to the operation of this act there were no detailed statistics of the importation of these articles kept, so that no comparison can be made of the importations from year to year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892 (the first full fiscal year under the operation of the act of 1890), the quantity imported was 154,000 pounds, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, nearly 173,000 pounds, showing a large increase and showing that the duty of 4½ cents per pound was in no sense a prohibitory duty, but largely a revenue duty; and furthermore, the importations under this specific duty were necessarily of good quality.

Within the past few years the intense competition of the manufacturers of these colors at home and abroad, coupled with the extreme depression in business abroad in these lines, has reduced prices very much; so that under present conditions, the rate recommended in the bill would be entirely inadequate, badly crippling, if not destroying, the industry here.

The principal articles covered by this paragraph are the colors known as chrome yellow and chrome green; and it would necessarily cover chromium oxide and any pigment material that would have chromium as a constituent.

Color-making is essentially a chemical industry, and of a very complex order; and it requires much technical knowledge so to fix the duties as to establish proper relations to the industries (themselves also belonging to the great domain of chemical manufacture) which provide, after complex manipulations, the materials which are, to the color-maker, his fundamentals, though, as said, the product frequently of the highest development of scientific industry.

All previous efforts at fixing this schedule, where in any sense it has been harmonious, have, as a rule, been based on the assumption that the fundamentals of color-making, *per se*, should be taken at European instead of American costs; and, as a result of this, the industry in this country has developed only against great odds.

Chrome yellow is essentially a combination of chromium acid with lead. Chrome green is usually considered by chemists and scientists to be green oxide of chromium; but the ordinary mercantile chrome green is a combination of chrome yellow (chromate of lead) with a blue, usually Prussian. The production of the various shades of yellow and blue involves the use of an extended range of chemicals, as, for instance, bichromate of potash, bichromate of soda, sulphuric, nitric, muriatic, acetic, oxalic, tartaric, and citric acids, prussiate of potash, glauber salts, copperas, chlorate of potash, chloride of lime, nitrate of iron, white lead, the oxides of lead, white sugar of lead, brown sugar of lead, nitrate of lead, caustic potash, caustic soda;

and for the production of the cheaper grades, barytes, terra alba, kaolin, whiting, Paris white, clay, and other materials are used.

This enumeration of chemicals that are used in the production of two articles of supposedly simple chemical formula, serves to illustrate strongly the complexity of this subject and the exact knowledge and great care required in making tariff rates on articles on the chemical schedule.

It appears to be definitely settled that the lead interests of the country are to be properly cared for; and aslead products (as oxides, white lead, or soluble lead salts) are fundamentals of color-making, the duties on the products of the color-maker must be adjusted cumulatively, with all the operations from the primary ones of mining through all the various stages of smelting and manufacturing.

The clause "on the material contained therein when dry" should be omitted from this paragraph, for the reason that while theoretically proper, it is not practically operative. It is difficult to determine frequently what is merely mechanical moisture and combined water; but in actual practice it has been made to underestimate materially the actual dry weight of color, and in that way evade the payment of duty.

The manufacture of articles of this kind not only effects the well-being of the chemical industry generally and the lead-producing industries, but other mining and mineral interests producing barytes, clay, gypsum, etc.

From the nature of the manufacture as above described, it is evident that ordinary labor can not be employed in conducting and supervising the operations. Skill and experience are required for the combination of the chemicals. To insure proper temperature, right proportions, and to observe properly the chemical reactions, much technical skill is required, and therefore the pay will range from \$2 to \$10 per day, with little opportunity of employing unskilled and cheap labor to average down the general cost. These are more than double the rates paid, on the average, by European color-makers.

The duty should be maintained specific; should be not less than 4½ cents per pound, and should be levied upon the actual weight of the color imported, whether dry or moist, or ground in oil. The paragraph should read:

"Chrome yellow, chrome green and all other chromium colors in which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are components of manufacture, dry or ground in or mixed with oil, or in pulp or mixed with water, 4½ cents per pound."

The rates in the amendment which I have suggested, as stated in this paper, are not prohibitive; indeed, they are fairly protective, and under them a large increase of importations will be had. I hope the majority of the members of the committee will consent to the amendment which I have offered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. VEST. I call for the 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 transfer the pair I have with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], which will enable me to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. RANSOM (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HIGGINS. I again announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—17.

Aldrich,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Shoup,
Allison,	Hawley,	Patton,	Teller,
Chandler,	Higgins,	Perkins,	
Dixon,	McMillan,	Proctor,	
Dubois,	Manderson,	Quay,	

NAYS—30.

Bate,	Coke,	Mills,	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Vest,
Blanchard,	George,	Murphy,	Vilas,
Brice,	Gibson,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Butler,	Harris,	Pasco,	Walsh,
Call,	Jarvis,	Peffer,	White,
Camden,	Jones, Ark.	Ransom,	
Cockrell,	Lindsay,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—38.

Allen,	Gordon,	Kyle,	Pugh,
Berry,	Gorman,	Lodge,	Sherman,
Caffery,	Gray,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Cameron,	Hale,	McPherson,	Squire,
Carey,	Hansbrough,	Martin,	Stewart,
Cullom,	Hill,	Mitchell, Wis.	Washburn,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Morrill,	Wilson,
Davis,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	Wolcott,
Dolph,	Irby,	Platt,	
Frye,	Jones, Nev.	Power,	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary read as follows:

42. Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths, ground in oil, one and one-fourth of one cent per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amendment reported by the Committee of Finance to that paragraph is withdrawn.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to insert after the word "earths," in line 16, the words "not specially provided for in this act, dry, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 16, after the word "earths," it is proposed to insert:

Not specially provided for in this act, dry, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. These earths are found in a large number of the Southern States and are now dutiable. If they are placed upon the free list they will be placed in competition at once with the foreign products which come from England, Germany, Austria, France, Cyprus, Greece, and various other foreign countries. The product in the United States is a very large one, and the removal of this duty means a great loss to a large number of people throughout the Southern States, who can ill afford to incur the loss.

The great products of the South, sugar, rice, and coal, are, thanks to their representatives on the floor of the Senate, very well taken care of in the bill; but the small products of the South, as well as the small products of the North, especially the small products of the agriculturists all over the country, are thoroughly neglected or incontinently destroyed by this measure. Georgia, Alabama, and in fact all the Southern States, are greatly interested in maintaining this small duty upon these various earths; and I hope that in this particular case some of the Senators upon the other side, representing some of the Southern States, may break away from this iron-bound caucus rule and vote for one thing which they believe in, and not submit their consciences entirely to the keeping of the Senator from Arkansas; but once a day, at least, merely for a change, that they shall vote for amendments or suggestions which commend themselves to their judgment, and which are in the interests of the people whom they represent.

Mr. BUTLER. So much filibustering does not give us an opportunity.

Mr. VEST. After that passionate appeal to the Southern heart, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not necessary. You can get a vote upon it.

Mr. VEST. That is our motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH. On that I call for a division.

Mr. HARRIS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BUTLER (when Mr. ALLEN'S name was called). The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. RANSOM (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], but I transfer my pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. WILSON] is absent from the Senate temporarily on account of illness, and is paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. HIGGINS. I wish in respect to this vote and for the remaining votes of the session to-day, to announce the transfer of my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES].

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to announce a pair between myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH]. I should vote "yea" if he were present.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 15; as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bate,	Coke,	Mills,	Vest,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Harris,	Pasco,	Walsh,
Butler,	Jarvis,	Ransom,	White.
Call,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,	
Camden,	Lindsay,	Teller,	
Cockrell,	Martin,	Turpie,	

NAYS—15.

Aldrich,	Gallinger,	Manderson,	Proctor,
Allison,	Hawley,	Patton,	Quay,
Dixon,	Higgins,	Peffer,	Shoup.
Dubois,	McMillan,	Perkins,	

NOT VOTING—41.

Allen,	George,	Kyle,	Pugh,
Berry,	Gordon,	Lodge,	Sherman,
Caffery,	Gorman,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Cameron,	Gray,	MCPHERSON,	Squire,
Carey,	Hale,	Mitchell, Oregon	Stewart,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Wis.	Washburn,
Cullom,	Hill,	Morrill,	Wilson,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Murphy,	Wolcott.
Davis,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	
Dolph,	Irby,	Platt,	
Frye,	Jones, Nev.	Power,	

So the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. In paragraph 42, I move to insert, "one and one-eighth of one cent per pound," instead of "one and one-fourth of one cent per pound."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lines 16 and 17, paragraph 42, strike out "one and one-fourth of one cent per pound" and insert "one and one-eighth of one cent per pound;" so as to read:

42. Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths, ground in oil, one and one-eighth of one cent per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am satisfied that is not the amendment which the Senator from New Hampshire intended to move. He intended to renew the amendment moved by me making the rate one and one-eighth, instead of one and one-quarter.

Mr. CHANDLER. What was the vote taken on?

Mr. ALDRICH. On laying on the table the amendment moved by me fixing the rate.

Mr. CHANDLER. My intention was to increase the amount, but my only object is to make a few remarks. It is not material what the amendment is.

Mr. VEST. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BUTLER. To kill time and industries.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thought I overheard an intimation from the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] that there was some disposition to unduly delay the passage of the bill, and if I mistake not, the Senator from South Carolina joined in the suggestion.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir; I have made it repeatedly.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is sometimes difficult to hear what the Senator from South Carolina says, but I gathered something of that sort and I rose to defend this widely-spread industry, an American industry. It does seem as if we ought to protect our own dirt and not consume too much English and foreign dirt. The principle of protection is a very beneficent principle as Republicans desire to apply it. It falls like the rain from heaven upon the just and unjust alike. One peculiarity of duties that are adopted under a system of protection is that they benefit alike the Republican producer and the Democratic producer. They benefit alike the Northerner and Southerner, the protectionist and the free trader. All the duties which Republicans insist upon widely distribute their benefits over the whole Union.

Here is an industry, the production of colors from the natural product of earth, that needs protection and that should not be blotted out and destroyed by the rates of duty, whether ad valorem or specific, which Senators upon the other side of the Chamber are proposing. I have here and propose to read a statement of the case in favor of a duty on ocher and ochery earths which was prepared for presentation to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, but for reasons which I will not give it was not presented. It seems that the Senate committee are willing to give a slight duty upon ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths, ground in oil; but they place paragraph 566 of the bill, "ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths, not specially provided for in this act, dry," upon the free list. This paper states that:

These articles are not raw materials, and to so consider and treat them as such would be equivalent to considering and treating steel rails as raw material. The preparation of dry ocher, umber, and sienna for the market is a distinct industry involving a long series of mechanical operations and manipulations, the resultant product of which is no more a raw material than is pig iron.

The raw material used in the manufacture of these goods is iron ore, which is, of course, the basic substance from which all iron and steel are produced. Therefore, starting with the raw material as a base, and putting the ore through the various processes, to be described hereafter, the finished product is finally arrived at, but only after a great expense has been entailed, a very large proportion of which expense is represented by the wages paid for labor, as in the case of production of iron and steel.

The process of manufacture is substantially as follows: The ore is mined from the earth with special care, the admixture of foreign substances with the ore being carefully avoided as far as possible; as such foreign substances are most detrimental to the success of subsequent processes of manufacture, and hurtful to the sale and use of the finished product. The ore as mined is transported to available points for the washing out of sand and such other foreign substances as can not be readily separated from the ore in mining.

In this washing process fully 50 per cent of the ore, as mined, is lost. After washing, the ore is allowed to remain in the vats for months, in order that the excess of moisture may be eliminated. When the mass has become sufficiently hardened to admit of handling, it is taken to drying rooms, where it is subjected to a high degree of heat, in order to thoroughly dry it and put it into condition to be milled. It is then ground and packed into barrels.

From this brief but accurate description of the processes necessarily employed in preparing ocher, umber, and sienna for the market, it will be readily understood that from the very beginning, starting with the mining of the ore, to the final packing of the finished product, the cost is practically all for labor. The cost of coal, which is one of the most important items of expense, apart from labor, is greater to the American than to the foreign manufacturer, and the latter also has the advantage in the matter of cost of packages.

But in the chief item of expense, that of labor, the balance is largely against the American manufacturer. To the miners of his ores he pays wages averaging \$1.25 per day; his millers are paid \$2.50 to \$3 per day; while the wages of ordinary laborers average \$1 per day. The foreign manufacturer pays his miners an average of 65 cents per day; his millers \$1 per day, and common

laborers 40 to 50 cents per day. He presses into use the services of women and children, a class of labor which is not utilized here.

This is a comparative statement of the relative cost of mining and milling.

In the matter of transportation the foreign manufacturers are on an equal footing with the American manufacturer, whose plant is conveniently located for the transportation to the market, but in many instances the cost of such transportation is so high as to place the American manufacturer at a serious disadvantage, even present duty considered. The duty imposed on ocher and ochery earths, umber and umber earths, sienna and sienna earths dry, and not otherwise provided for prior to the tariff act of 1890, was one-half of 1 cent per pound, while the tariff of 1890, which has been in force for only about two years, made a reduction of fully 50 per cent in the rate of duty; so that at present the protection afforded to American manufacturers is but one-quarter of 1 cent per pound, which is scarcely adequate to cover the difference in the cost of labor, and puts at a disadvantage the manufacturers in some of the Southern and Western States, who are entirely shut out from the principal markets by reason of the high cost of transportation by the only available means—the railroads.

As France practically has the control of the production of and trade in foreign ocher, while Italy monopolizes the trade in foreign siennas and umber, it is safe to assume that the unrestricted opening of American markets to the foreign manufacturers of these articles would result in a material advance in their cost to the consumer. The reverse has been the case under the moderate protection afforded to American producers by previous tariff acts. Every step made in the development of these American industries has been followed by a reduction in the market prices of those commodities.

I take occasion to say that as I understand the operation of the protective system, that has been the case with every protected industry which has ever been developed in this country. Whatever may have been the immediate effect of imposing a duty upon an article not previously dutiable, if it was an article that could be produced in this country when the industry has been developed in this country and the American enterprise has taken hold of it, invariably home competition has brought down the price.

Before the pioneer American manufacturer of the better grades of ocher developed its Virginia mines in 1873, the average market price for grades of French ochers similar in quality to that produced by this company was \$70 per ton. Competition with the American ocher brought the price down to \$30 per ton, at which time the American was offered at \$25 per ton.

As the prejudice against the latter, which is characteristic of the experience of nearly all new American products which enter into competition with foreign goods that have long held the market, disappeared, the American ocher steadily displaced the foreign ocher, the price of the latter declining until under the present duty French ocher which formerly cost consumers \$70 per ton now sells, landed on dock in New York, at \$22 per ton, while a grade of American ocher similar in quality and tintorial properties is quoted at \$20 per ton.

This appears to have had precisely the effect that a duty upon steel rails has had.

The American manufacturers, by persistently keeping their product before American consumers, by exercising the utmost care in its preparation for the market, and by selling it at a price which admits of only a fair margin of profit over the cost of production, have succeeded in almost entirely overcoming the prejudice in favor of foreign ochers, and the merits of American ocher having become understood and appreciated by the consumer, he is quite willing to pay for it prices within one or two dollars per ton of the price charged for French ocher of a similar grade.

I pause to say that I can not understand the state of mind in Senators upon the other side of the Chamber who will in spite of this argument persist in pursuing a course that results in the consumption in this country of French ochers instead of ochers taken from the State of Virginia, the mother of Presidents, who, all of them, were in favor of protective duties.

The claim is made that the fine qualities of French ochers, such as were displaced by the cheaper American article, can not be duplicated by the product of American mines and mills. This is disproved by the fact that large quantities of American ocher are persistently substituted for the similar grade of French by dealers and manufacturers of paints, and sold as French, both dry and ground in oil, without protest from the American consumer, and the presumption is therefore warranted that he is unable to distinguish the difference, if any difference exists, between the two.

Mr. President, there is a question of morals raised that I take occasion to make a remark or two about. In reading this paper prepared by these manufacturers, as I have done, I do not wish to be understood as approving of this deception any more than I approve of the manufacture and sale in Maine of sardines as French sardines when they are caught in the Maine and Nova Scotia waters and put up at Eastport. But that is a mere question of commercial ethics and not a question that is applicable alone to protection upon ochers.

The foreign ocher, sienna, and umber interests are contracted within narrow limits and are monopolistic in character. The French ocher of various grades comes from the departments of Cher, Nièvre, and Yonne, France, within a comparatively small area. The umber and umber earths come from the island of Cyprus, and the sienna and sienna earths from Sienna, in Tuscany, Italy, the entire region not being as large as one of the counties in New York State.

Contrast this with the extent and character of the American industry. It would require too much time and space to enumerate all of the localities in the United States in which are situated productive mines. Those which are of chief consequence and contribute principally to the supply of American ocher, umber, and sienna are located in the States of Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Massachusetts, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, and California. Thus every division of the country is represented by important and productive ocher, umber, and sienna mines, which in many instances furnish the only means of employment and support to the people of the region in which they are located.

To remove the duty of one-quarter of 1 cent per pound means the elimination of all profit to the American manufacturers, the cessation of mining and

milling operations, the consequent loss of employment to those who are now in the enjoyment of remunerative wages from this source, poverty and affliction to many happy and prosperous communities; in short, the complete destruction of a rapidly growing and important American industry with all that such destruction entails. The growth of this industry can be traced with tolerable accuracy from 1889 only, prior to which year no record of the production had been kept, although for many years it had been an increasingly important business. Those statistics now available for purposes of comparison are only approximately correct, as owing to the diversity of interests represented, the number of small manufacturers engaged in the business, and the constant discovery and application of new and valuable sources of supply of these products, it is impossible to obtain close figures in every instance.

In the following table showing the production of American ocher for a series of years, in comparison with the importations of French ocher, there is good ground for believing that figures representing the output of the American manufacturers are based on estimates, and are below rather than on a par with the actual figures. They are taken from the Mineral Resources of the United States for 1891. The statement is as follows:

Years.	American production.	Imports of French ocher.
	<i>Pounds.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>
1889 .....	30,316,000	5,540,267
1890 .....	35,110,000	6,450,000
1891 .....	36,588,000	6,246,890

It will be seen that while the American production had, in 1891, reached 33,500,000 pounds, and probably 50,000,000 pounds, if the amount of the total output could be obtained the importation of French ocher, which thirty years ago or less was the only kind available to American consumers, and sold to them at a cost 300 per cent above the present market price of a similar grade of American ocher, has shrunk to a little over 6,000,000 pounds.

It is now proposed in the removal of the existing small degree of protection accorded to American manufacturers, to reverse this result; to repay with destructive legislation their enterprise and ability in developing one of the important natural resources of the country, and furnishing remunerative employment to a class of people whose modes of existence prior to the introduction of this growing industry were limited to the primitive facilities presented by a wild and often barren country. It is proposed to brush this all aside, and to what purpose? That the consumer of ocher, the farmer who paints his house or barn with one of the best natural wood preservatives shall have the theoretical benefit of the slight saving represented by the present duty of one-quarter of 1 cent per pound. That duty, which is of such necessity to the continuation of the American industry, works no hardship to the consumer, for it is split into such extremely small portions as to have no appreciable effect upon the prices at which paints in which ocher is a minor, or even the principal, ingredient, are retailed. On the other hand, it affords to the American laborer a protection under which he obtains average wages amounting to double those paid to the foreign laborer in the same fields of work.

The removal of the duty of one quarter of 1 cent per pound on ocher, umber, and sienna, would not only destroy an existing industry and deprive American labor of employment, but would prevent the development of resources that are rapidly being utilized, under the impetus given to capital and enterprise by freedom from ruinous competition with poorly paid labor, the tendency of which development is to extend the use of a natural product made valuable by manufacturing processes, to the benefit of the country at large.

There are in the United States, in addition to the valuable mines now being worked, rich deposits of ore, from which may be obtained according to expert testimony, earth colors equal and in some instances superior in quality to the very finest grades produced in Europe. These deposits are in process of development, and in course of time will be made available to American consumers at a cost very far below the present price of the similar foreign product.

It will be necessary to encourage capital to invest in the enterprise of getting out and preparing these ores for market, and to insure to the railroads a sufficient freighting patronage to warrant them in making a rate low enough to enable the cheap marketing of the product. If the slight restrictions placed on similar foreign products, but which are sufficient to warrant the American manufacturers to undertake the expensive work of developing these deposits, are entirely removed, as it is now proposed to do, the American consumers will receive no benefit, and American labor will lose the opportunity for increased employment.

To recapitulate the facts above set forth: American capital and enterprise under the benign influence of moderate protection, have developed natural resources of the country that otherwise might have lain idle for an indefinite period. They have given employment to labor that before had no adequate market. They have built up thriving settlements in heretofore wild districts.

The removal of the duty will be of no advantage to anyone but the foreign manufacturer, and will work incalculable injury to American industries. We therefore respectfully reiterate, any reduction of duty would be unwise, injurious, and unjust to the American manufacturer and laborer, and be productive of no practical benefits to the consumer.

Mr. President, this argument seems to me to be so entirely conclusive that it can not be possible the Senate will insist upon keeping these articles upon the free list, and therefore I wish to move a rate of duty upon these earths, when dry, different from that which has been rejected by the Senate. I move to insert after line 13:

Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths, not specially provided for in this act, dry, one-eighth of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. VEST. What is the amendment now?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Insert after the word "earths," in line 16—Not specially provided for in this act, dry, one-eighth of 1 cent per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. VEST. I move to lay the amendment on the table, for fear that we might have another bulletin read.

Mr. HIGGINS. On that I ask for a division.

Mr. COKE. I demand the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] has been called from the Chamber, and I have paired with him, with the right to vote if my vote is necessary to make a quorum. For the present I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I inquire if the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am paired with that Senator, and shall not vote unless my vote is necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I desire to inquire if the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Then I withhold my vote unless it is necessary to make a quorum.

The Secretary recapitulated the vote.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I understand there is not a quorum voting, and I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BLACKBURN. Under the circumstances I will vote "yea."

Mr. PASCO. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER. I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY], but we both reserved the right to vote to make a quorum. Therefore I will take the liberty of voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. CAFFERY. I vote "yea."

Mr. RANSOM. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 10; as follows.

YEAS—33.

Bate,	Cockrell,	Martin,	Turpie,
Berry,	Coke,	Mills,	Vest,
Blackburn,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Vilas,
Blanchard,	George,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Brice,	Gibson,	Pasco,	Walsh,
Butler,	Harris,	Peffer,	White.
Caffery,	Jarvis,	Perkins,	
Call,	Jones, Ark.	Ransom,	
Camden,	Lindsay,	Roach,	

NAYS—10.

Aldrich,	Gallinger,	Quay,	eller.
Allison,	Patton,	Squire,	
Chandler,	Pettigrew,	Stewart,	

NOT VOTING—42.

Allen,	Gorman,	Kyle,	ower,
Cameron,	Gray,	Lodge,	Proctor,
Carey,	Hale,	McLaurin,	Pugh,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	McMillan,	Sherman,
Daniel,	Hawley,	McPherson,	Shoup,
Davis,	Higgins,	Manderson,	Smith,
Dixon,	Hill,	Mitchell, Oregon,	Washburn,
Dolph,	Hoar,	Mitchell, Wis.	Wilson,
Dubois,	Hunton,	Morrill,	Wolcott.
Frye,	Irby,	Murphy,	
Gordon,	Jones, Nev.	Platt,	

So the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. HIGGINS. I move an amendment to paragraph 42. In line 16, after the word "earths," I move to insert the words "dry, one-tenth of one cent per pound."

Mr. QUAY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will withdraw that motion. I propose to move a brief executive session.

Mr. QUAY. I withdraw the motion, Mr. President.

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 ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 17, 1894, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1894.*

MARSHALS.

Buchanan Schley, of Maryland, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Maryland.

Nicholas A. Covarrubias, of California, to be marshal of the United States for the southern district of California.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

*Ordinance Department.*

Capt. John E. Greer to be major.

Second Lieut. Odus C. Horney, Seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Charles H. Adams, of Seward, Nebr., to be register of the land office at Broken Bow, Nebr.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Andrew J. Robertson, of Broken Bow, Nebr., to be receiver of public moneys at Broken Bow, Nebr.

Elmer Williams, of Atkinson, Nebr., to be receiver of public moneys at O'Neill, Nebr.

POSTMASTERS.

Richard S. Breece, to be postmaster at Three Oaks, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

Lebbens Belford, to be postmaster at Caldwell, in the county of Noble and State of Ohio.

John H. Clune, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

James Lally, jr., to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

John J. Molter, to be postmaster at Sandusky, in the county of Erie and State of Ohio.

William F. Stirling, to be postmaster at Eaton Rapids, in the county of Eaton and State of Michigan.

David Matteson, to be postmaster at Middleville, in the county of Barry and State of Michigan.

L. E. Norris, to be postmaster at Aiken, in the county of Aiken and State of South Carolina.

John S. Flanders, to be postmaster at Sturgis, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Michigan.

George D. McKay, to be postmaster at Oscoda, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

John Holland, to be postmaster at Monongahela, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania.

James M. Neal, to be postmaster at Danville, in the county of Pittsylvania and State of Virginia.

William P. Huffman, to be postmaster at Hickory, in the county of Catawba and State of North Carolina.

William F. Metts, to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Greenville and State of South Carolina.

A. H. Snow, to be postmaster at Box Elder, in the county of Box Elder and Territory of Utah.

William T. Beans, to be postmaster at Glenwood Springs, in the county of Garfield and State of Colorado.

William B. Gere, to be postmaster at Bessemer, in the county of Jefferson and State of Alabama.

George B. Ogle, to be postmaster at Sheboygan Falls, in the county of Sheboygan and State of Wisconsin.

Andrew J. Amend, to be postmaster at Ripon, in the county of Fond du Lac and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 16, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RETURN OF BILLS TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will lay before the House at this time a Senate resolution, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to furnish to the Senate duplicate engrossed copies of the bills (H. R. 6720) "providing for the resurvey of Grant and Hooker Counties, in the State of Nebraska," and (H. R. 6956) "to grant to railroad companies in the Indian Territory additional powers to secure rights of way, depot grounds, etc.," the originals having been mislaid.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection this request will be complied with.

There was no objection.

TEXARKANA AND SHREVEPORT RAILROAD COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5771) authorizing the Texarkana and Shreveport Railroad Company to bridge Sulphur River in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. MCRAE. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read and concurred in.  
On motion of Mr. MCRAE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LENNES A. JACKSON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 1215) for the relief of Lennes A. Jackson.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill. It involves \$270 only.

I will state that a bill precisely like it was reported favorably and passed by the House in October last. It went to the Senate, but the Senate instead of passing the House bill passed their own bill, which is in the exact form of this one.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection. The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the sum of \$270 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to refund in full to Lennes A. Jackson the amount paid to James H. Stone, collector internal revenue, Detroit, Mich., which amount was stolen from the vaults of the Coldwater National Bank, at Coldwater, Mich., on March 2, 1892.

There being no objection, the bill was considered and ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

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

#### REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS.

Senate bills of the following titles were severally laid before the House and referred as indicated, namely:

A bill (S. 117) for the relief of W. L. Adams, of Oregon—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 198) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of the legal representatives of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union Agency, Indian Territory, for services and expenses—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 288) for the relief of Clara A. Graves, Lewis Smith Lee, Florence P. Lee, Mary S. Sheldon, and Elizabeth Smith, heirs of Lewis Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 812) for the relief of William R. Steinmetz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1063) for the relief of the legal representatives of George K. Otis, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1209) to regulate enlistments in the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1325) for the relief of A. P. H. Stewart—to the Committee on Claims.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:  
To Mr. SICKLES, indefinitely, on account of sickness.  
To Mr. EVERETT, for this day, on account of sickness.  
To Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, for four days, on account of sickness in his family.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. BYNUM to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of John L. Hines, Fifty-first Congress, there being no adverse report.

#### VALIDATION OF CERTAIN AFFIDAVITS.

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6719) to provide for the validation of affidavits made before United States commissioners in all land entries.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all entries under the homestead, preemption, timber-culture, or desert-land law made between May 26, 1890, and the date of approval of this resolution, and which are based on affidavits made before a United States court commissioner, instead of a United States circuit court commissioner, as provided by the act of May 26, 1890 (26 Statutes, 121), are hereby validated, if no other objection exists; and all final proofs on entries of the classes mentioned made before a United States court commissioner, not a United States circuit court commissioner, between the dates aforesaid will be adjudicated in the same manner as if said proofs were made before an officer authorized by law to take such testimony.

SEC. 2. That all entries under the homestead, preemption, timber-culture, or desert-land law, based on affidavits made before any officer authorized to administer oaths in the State or Territory in which such entries were made, and where such affidavits were made in accordance with the regulations and decisions of the General Land Office prior to the passage of the act of May 26, 1890, are hereby validated, if no other objection exists.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. NEILL. There is the report accompanying the bill, which fully sets forth the facts in the case, and if desired that can be read as explaining the provisions of the bill.

Mr. PICKLER. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. NEILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolutions (H. Res. 136 and 137) "to provide for the validation of affidavits made before United States commissioners in all land entries," have had the same under consideration, and report them back with the recommendation that they be laid on the table, and that the accompanying bill, in lieu thereof, be passed.

The following Department letters are made a part of this report:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Washington, April 14, 1894.

SIR: I transmit herewith a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office on joint resolution (H. Res. No. 136) "to provide for the validation of affidavits made before United States commissioners in all land entries," and joint resolution (H. Res. No. 137) "providing that all entries under the homestead, preemption, and timber-culture or desert-land law made between May 26, 1890, and the date of the approval, etc., are hereby validated."

I concur in the views of the Commissioner that the relief proposed by said resolution should be granted. But I would suggest that it be so amended as to provide:

"That all entries under the homestead, preemption, timber-culture, or desert-land law, based on affidavits made before any officer authorized to administer oaths in the State or Territory in which such entries were made, and where such affidavits were made in accordance with the regulations and decisions of the General Land Office prior to the passage of the act of May 26, 1890, are hereby validated, if no other objection exists."

This amendment would cover entries in all cases where the affidavits were made before notaries public, which was authorized prior to the passage of the act of May 26, 1890. This act provided:

"That the proof of settlement, residence, occupation, cultivation, irrigation, of reclamation, the affidavit of nonalienation, the oath of allegiance, and all other affidavits required to be made under the homestead, preemption, timber-culture, and desert-land laws, may be made before any commissioner of the United States circuit court, or before the judge or clerk of any court of record of the county or parish in which the lands are situated."

The land office, however, continued to permit timber-culture affidavits to be made before notaries public, until the decision of the Department in *Rhodes vs. Crocker* (15 L. D., 249), in which it was held that under the provisions of the act of May 26, 1890, the preliminary affidavit required of the timber-culture applicant can not be made before a notary public.

Very respectfully,

HOKE SMITH, Secretary.

Hon. T. C. MCRAE,

Chairman Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives.

Mr. NEILL. This embodies, Mr. Speaker, the substance of the report. There is an additional communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, which I suppose it is not necessary to read.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not know that it is necessary; but I wish to ask the gentleman a question or two with reference to this matter. Suppose that there were contests existing prior to the passage of this bill, what would its effect upon them be?

Mr. NEILL. It would have no effect, I think.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not a particle. It validates proofs taken before these notaries, and that is all.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to know definitely as to the effect of it. We have had a good deal of controversy as to the effect of a similar bill.

Mr. MCRAE. If the gentleman will allow me I will state that I do not think that this bill could affect contests. If it or some other measure does not pass, the homestead applicants or entry men will be put to the extra expense of making their final proofs before another officer who was authorized to do so. In the cases involved they made it before United States commissioners and not before commissioners of the circuit court of the United States, as was required by the act of May 26, 1890.

Mr. REED. What is the difference?

Mr. MCRAE. The difference is that in the Territories we have United States commissioners for the Territorial courts, and in the States we have commissioners of the United States circuit courts. And in framing the original bill no authority was given the United States commissioners to take such; but under the directions of the local land officers they have taken and certified such proof.

Mr. REED. Supposing they were the same as commissioners of the United States circuit court.

Mr. MCRAE. Yes; and now this seeks to validate that proof. It can do no harm to anybody, and will save many settlers the expense of making the proof of the same witnesses again.

Mr. PICKLER. My question is, Suppose that one of the grounds of contest was that the affidavit was improperly made. This undertakes to cure those affidavits. Would that interfere with such a contest?

Mr. NEILL. Even if it did, I submit to the gentleman that it would be right. These homesteaders when they went in, in good faith, were misled by the error of local land officers.

Mr. PICKLER. My sympathy is always with the homesteader; but it is not the business of Congress to interfere with lawsuits or contests that are already pending. We got into a great trouble on the other bill on that line. Another question: How does this affect affidavits in the future, by these officers? In other words, can an affidavit be made before a notary public and be valid?

Mr. MCRAE. Not under this bill; but we have passed a bill to amend the law, however, allowing United States commissioners in the Territories to take this proof; so this bill can not af-

fect any cases in future. It only relates to cases heretofore initiated.

Mr. PICKLER. This does not narrow the settler's opportunity to make his proof or his affidavit?

Mr. MORAÉ. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Not a bit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6, strike out the word "resolution" and insert the word "act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

#### CAUSE OF THE PRESENT INDUSTRIAL DEPRESSION.

Mr. MCGANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. R. 176) providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate and report the causes of the present industrial depression.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of his joint resolution?

Mr. DINGLEY. I think that appointing a committee of six members of Congress with well-known diametrical views to undertake to determine in thirty days the cause of the industrial depression and propose any remedy therefor otherwise than on lines as well known now as without this committee is rather a hopeless undertaking. I think it would be better to have the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine objects. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

The committees were called for reports.

#### BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER, YANKTON, S. DAK.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported a bill (S. 1808) to amend the act of June 22, 1892, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at the city of Yankton, S. Dak.;" which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed and referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. DURBOROW. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to request the discharge of that committee from the further consideration of the three bills which I send to the Clerk's desk, and that they be referred to the Committee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the titles of the bills.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 398) to limit the regulations of commerce between the several States, and with foreign nations, in certain cases.

A bill (H. R. 5313) to regulate the sale and transportation of prison-made goods.

A bill (H. R. 5307) for the protection of honest industries from unjust and ruinous competition of convict-made goods, transported from one State or Territory into another.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be discharged from the consideration of these bills; and they will be referred to the Committee on Labor.

There was no objection.

#### STATE BANK CIRCULATION.

Mr. SPRINGER. I had announced that to-day the bill in relation to the taxing of State banking institutions would be called up, but by arrangement with all parties it will not be taken up until after the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is determined, perhaps early next week.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

And then, on motion of Mr. HATCH, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6937) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 2, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, the Chair will undoubtedly recollect that I had made a point of order. In lieu of the amendment just read I want to say to the chairman of the commit-

tee that after looking at that proviso as it stands—can you hear me?

Mr. HATCH. I can not.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order, then.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen in front of the Chair will please cease conversation or retire to the cloak room.

Mr. RAY. If it would be in order I would like to suggest an amendment to that proviso as it stands, and withdraw the point of order; because I think there are many things about this that are preferable to the law as it now stands. If the gentleman from Missouri will give me his attention for a moment I will suggest those amendments, and see if he will have any objection to them. If the gentleman has the bill before him he will observe the connection.

Mr. HATCH. I have.

Mr. RAY. In line 2 of the proviso strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman means where the word "may" appears the second time in the line.

Mr. RAY. I mean where it appears the second time, in order that it may be made the duty of the Secretary to do this work. Then again, it occurs to me, although I would not insist upon it, that it would be very proper and a good thing to have a tabulation of this data apply to horses, cattle, sheep, and swine as well as agricultural products. However, if the chairman has any particular objection to that, I will not insist upon it.

Mr. HATCH. I think that will be a duplication of work already done in connection with the taking of the census, and other statistical information already in the Department and published from time to time. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman to strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. RAY. If the second amendment that I suggested is a duplication, then, of course, I would not ask it. It merely occurred to me it would be a good thing. The next amendment I will read. On page 7—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman had better dispose of the first amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The first amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is to strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. RAY. But the point of order is reserved, to see if we can agree. If we can not agree, I shall have to insist upon the point of order.

Now, the other amendment is this: After the word "prices," which is the last word in the first proviso, insert the following:

And such data, when collected and tabulated, shall as fast as practicable, or at least twice in each year, be published and distributed the same as other farmers' bulletins, and so far as practicable such tabulation shall be made and given by States and subdivisions of a State.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection in the world to that.

Mr. RAY. Very well; with that understanding, I withdraw the point of order, so far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will please reduce his amendments to writing, and send them to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. DINGLEY. I renew the point of order. I simply desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to an omission, it seems to me, of very important data, if this subject is to be investigated. The cost of production and the market price are two elements. Now, there is, in addition to these, an equally important element—the cost of transportation.

The cost of production is to be at the farm; the market price will be at the distant market. Now, there has been a large reduction in the cost of transportation, and that is an element that we ought to have some data upon. I suppose the gentleman will have no objection to inserting the cost of transportation each year from the place of production to the market or markets at which prices are quoted. That will give the three elements of cost.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to that, because it is already done by the Department.

Mr. DINGLEY. The cost of transportation from the farm to the market ought to be taken in connection with the other data year by year. We have no statistics of cost of transportation except for a few years.

Mr. HATCH. It is given in the different reports in summing up.

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I am very much interested in this debate, and it is impossible to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The Chair will direct gentlemen to suspend until order is restored on the floor. Gentlemen will please cease conversation or retire to the cloak room. It is impossible for the Chair to hear.

Mr. QUIGG. If the gentleman from Maine is proposing in any way to alter the phraseology of this paragraph I should like to understand it.

Mr. DINGLEY. If we are to collect the data referring to the cost of production and market prices, I want to add information as to the cost of transportation from the farm to the market, which, of course, furnishes the third element of cost, and without which the other statistics would be of little value. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MARSH. I renew it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. MARSH. I suppose that the same range of discussion can be enjoyed by me as by the gentlemen who have preceded me.

There are some things in this paragraph that I desire information about. Or, perhaps, instead of soliciting that information upon the pending point of order, I had better wait until a subsequent period in the consideration of this bill, or at least until after this point of order has been decided. There are some observations that I desire to make upon this paragraph, and there is some information that I desire to obtain from the honorable gentleman in charge of this bill. I will not withdraw the point of order, but will submit it to the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman? I have not heard it stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not heard it stated. It was merely stated that the point of order would be reserved. There is no point of order pending. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 2, strike out the word "may," where it occurs the second time, and insert "shall."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 7, line 6, after the word "prices," insert the following: "And such data, when collected and tabulated shall, as often as practicable, and at least twice a year, be published and distributed, the same as any other farmers' bulletin; and, so far as practicable, such tabulation shall be made and given by States and subdivisions of a State."

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the impracticability of having this information furnished twice a year. It seems to me that it would require a whole year to collect such extensive data as this calls for, and if the words "as often as practicable" are used, I think they will be sufficient.

Mr. HATCH. I was going to suggest to the gentleman from New York that he strike out the word "twice" and insert "once."

Mr. DINGLEY. Why not just say "as often as practicable?"

Mr. RAY. I did not see that there would be any objection to publishing frequently in the form of a bulletin such information as they had.

Mr. DINGLEY. But it would necessarily be incomplete?

Mr. RAY. Of course it would be incomplete. I have no objection to modifying the amendment as suggested.

Mr. HATCH. Let the gentleman modify it then by striking out "twice" and inserting "once."

Mr. RAY. I will make that modification, Mr. Chairman, if it will accomplish the purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York as modified by him.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition to expend the public money for the purpose of ascertaining how much it cost to produce an acre of corn, or an acre of wheat in 1791, in 1800, in 1810, and so on. Now, who cares for that information? Who is to be benefited by information of that kind? What object can anybody have in expending the public money for the purpose of ascertaining how much it cost to raise a bushel of wheat or a bushel of corn or a bushel of potatoes away back in the last century? I understand that this Department of Agriculture, and the appropriations made for its support, are intended for the purpose of benefiting the great agricultural industry of the country.

Perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will be able to inform this House and the country wherein his constituency in Missouri, or the great agricultural constituency of this whole country are to be benefited in any degree by the annual expenditure of a large sum of money for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of producing a hog, a bushel of wheat, a bushel of corn, or a bushel of peanuts in 1790 or 1791. If the gentleman can show any good reason for this, if he can show wherein the great agricultural interest of this country will be benefited, then I will not object; but this looks to me like appropriating public money to give employment to a lot of high-priced clerks who are here seeking employment in this Department; seeking such employment at the public expense at a time when the annual revenues of this Government are very largely below

the necessary annual expenditure; seeking such employment and payment from the public crib when this Administration is in the market borrowing money by the fifty and odd millions for the purpose of paying the ordinary expenses of the Government. And, Mr. Chairman, I can see no object to be accomplished. I would be glad to be informed of the great purpose that this committee has in view. I can see no benefit that is to be derived from these reports, either by the agricultural classes of this country or by any other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARSH. Well, I am through. [Laughter.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. RAY, it was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will now be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the first proviso by inserting after the word "production," in line 6, the following: "cost of transportation each year from the place of production to the market or markets at which prices are quoted."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the clause commencing at line 17, page 6, and ending at line 14, page 7. In offering this amendment I have two purposes. There are some things provided for in this clause that are desirable and which I am in favor of. There are some things provided for which I think are not desirable and which I am opposed to. I want to find out, if I can from my neighbor, the chairman of this committee, who resides across the great water from where I live—I want some information from him. Under this clause the Secretary of Agriculture gathers statistics of the products of the farm and publishes those statistics to the world every month. His agents come upon my farm and measure the amount of wheat that is in my bin, the amount of corn that is in my crib. They measure the number of acres of land that I have sown in wheat. And those agents send their reports here to Washington to the Secretary of Agriculture; and those reports, with similar reports from all over the country, are compiled at that Department and published to the world, giving information of the exact amount, so near as it can be ascertained, of wheat, corn, and other products of the farm that are still in the hands of the farmer.

But the matter does not stop there. The agent of this Department not only measures the number of acres of wheat scattered all over this country and of oats and of corn, but every month these emissaries of that Bureau send estimates to Washington as to the probable amount of wheat that this or that farmer and all the farmers in the country will raise, and the amount of corn and other supplies; and this information is compiled here by the gentleman at the head of this Agricultural Department; and on the 10th of each month the information is given to the world. It goes to Liverpool; it goes to every market where American farm produce finds customers.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MARSH. I hope, Mr. Chairman, I may be allowed a little more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes.

Mr. MARSH. I may want a little more than five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state how much time he desires?

Mr. MARSH. Well, say fifteen minutes. I will not occupy more than five minutes if I do not need the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time be extended fifteen minutes longer. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MARSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, wherein are the agriculturists of this country benefited by this information being sent to the markets of the world? Who is it that asks and demands this information? On the 10th of each month when this information goes out to the country and the world from the Agricultural Department the prices of farm products are affected immediately upon the great boards of trade. Who is it that looks forward to those reports? Is it the farmer? No, sir; it is the speculator in the products of the farmer. And I wish to say here, it has seemed to me, and it has seemed to a great many farmers of this country, that this information which is being collected and collated at the expense of the people is gathered in the interest of the speculators in farm products, not in the interest of the thirty millions of producers in the land.

Mr. QUIGG. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MARSH. Oh, yes.

Mr. QUIGG. I simply want to know whether the gentleman desires the wicked speculator to pay more money for farm products than they are worth?

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York has no right to apply the word "wicked" to a specu-

lator. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, take for instance the product of cotton—

Mr. QUIGG. Is that all the answer the gentleman is going to give me?

Mr. MARSH. That is all the answer your question, in my opinion, is entitled to. [Laughter.]

Mr. QUIGG. All right.

Mr. MARSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, take the product of cotton; and I refer to this product because when this great staple is mentioned on this floor it arrests the attention of a large number of gentlemen here. Take the product of cotton. These emissaries of the Agricultural Department go into your country, gentlemen; they go upon your farms; they go to your gin houses; and every month they report to the markets in Liverpool and everywhere else what amount of cotton you have on hand, or as near as they are able to guess it, thereby informing the English purchaser just what he can expect. Not only that; they examine your cotton fields; and every month they report to Liverpool through these gentlemen down here at the Agricultural Department just how much cotton they expect that you will produce and place upon the market next year; and the cotton consumers and cotton speculators across the water and on this side the water are thus enabled to control and bear down the prices of your product.

And what is true of cotton is also true of every other product of the farm in this country, which is the subject-matter of investigation by the emissaries of this Department. Is there a gentleman on this floor, is there a gentleman within the sound of my voice, who has ever seen one of these local reporters for the Department? Do any of you know who they are, North or South, or have you ever seen one of these reporters who make these reports of your affairs to the Agricultural Bureau? I have never in the course of my experience been able to find one. Who they are, what they are, of what character they are, what means for observation they have, or what their capacity is for the work intrusted to them, I do not know and you do not know. But one thing I do know, and this country knows, that the monthly communications from this Agricultural Department have been misleading if not largely false, but unquestionably misleading.

Now, sir, that power which is invested in the Secretary of Agriculture to put forth these reports every month is a power for weal or for woe greater than is possessed by any Government official throughout the land. A variation, only a slight one, a false statement, an incorrect estimate made in the Department as to the probable amount of the crop for the coming year will affect the values of the farmers' crops millions of dollars in twenty-four hours. And there is not a report that has come from that Department during the last ten years that I have not given pretty close attention, because during that time I have been in a humble way engaged in agriculture myself, and I say here that there has not been a report, a monthly report made by that Department during the last ten years that has not been seized upon by the bears on the boards of trade and the bucket shops throughout the country to depress the prices of agricultural products.

It is the one great powerful engine that this Government is furnishing and supplying to the speculators of the country with which to depreciate the prices of the agricultural products of the land. I have been unable after ten years of careful observation and careful study of the reports and their effects—I have been unable to find wherein the agriculturist has derived the slightest benefit; and, Mr. Chairman, I say here that it is too dangerous a power to place in the hands of any one man.

Why, sir, if it is desirable to spend the public money for the purpose of ascertaining how much wheat or corn or cotton the farmers of this country have this day on hand, and if it is desirable to ascertain how much they are likely to produce this coming year, why is it not equally desirable to ascertain the number of boots and shoes that are in the various factories and in the various stores throughout the country, as well as the number of boots and shoes that the manufacturers of the country are likely to produce and put on the market during the next twelve months? The same is true with every other class of products that we use or produce in this land.

Why not ascertain the number of bolts of calico, the number of bolts of cotton cloth, or the number of suits of clothing that are in the hands of the dealers of the country, that are in the hands of the manufacturer, or that the manufacturers are liable within the next twelve months to place upon the market? Why not give the speculators an opportunity to know these facts as well as the facts you propose furnishing them with reference to the agricultural products of the country?

Mr. Chairman, I do not know just where by an amendment to reach this thing that I believe to be an abuse that has crept up in this Department; this dangerous power that has been con-

fided to the hands of one man I do not care who he is. I have no accusation to make against the present occupant of the Department.

But there should be a change of this power. I do not care where these reports come from, under this provision all of them are submitted to the revision and approval of one man; and I want to say to you that that one man, by the stroke of his pen, can change in twenty-four hours the values of the farm products of this country to the amount of many millions of dollars and put that money into the pockets of the bear on one side or the bull on the other.

Now, in the incipency of this legislation it had my support. I believed fifteen, sixteen, twelve, fourteen, and ten years ago that this information, in some way, was to be of benefit to the agricultural interests of the country; but I have been forced to the conclusion, from my own observation and close attention to the workings of the system, that there has been no legislation in this land in the last fifteen years that has done so much towards the depression of the price of farm products as the issuance of this bulletin of monthly information to the gamblers and speculators of this country and of Europe, as to the amount of produce the farmers had on hand in their granaries and the probable amount they would produce during the coming year.

Just one moment more and I will conclude. In all fairness and in the interest of the great agricultural interests of the country, one of the districts of which is represented by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I hope he will give to this House some information showing to the committee and the country wherein this information, which has been monthly gathered and spread broadcast to the world, has been of any benefit to his constituency and to the agricultural interests of the country at large.

I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I move to strike out the last word. The suggestions which have been made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] with reference to the accuracy of the monthly and annual bulletins of the Bureau of Agriculture on wheat production should certainly receive some careful attention and consideration at the hands of Congress.

A year ago a statement was put forth from the Department of Agriculture that there would be a probable shortage of 50,000,000 of bushels of wheat for the crop year 1893. The last report that has been submitted shows that 69,000,000 bushels remained March 1 available for exportation, showing an error of 119,000,000 bushels in the estimate one year ago, as compared with the recent estimate.

Mr. MARSH. Right in that connection, notwithstanding that the Department missed the facts by 119,000,000 bushels, the report of the Department had its influence upon the boards of trade in this country and across the water, and affected the price of that product.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. MARSH. In other words, a lie emanating from the Department had its effect, as well as if it had been the truth.

Mr. ENLOE. I should like to ask the gentleman from Maine one question.

Mr. DINGLEY. Very well.

Mr. ENLOE. I want to know if the gentleman can state what statistician prepared the statistics published at that time?

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, I know nothing about that. I am not seeking to criticize anyone. I am simply calling attention to facts as they exist.

Mr. ENLOE. The complaint you make in regard to these statistics is similar to one that was made a year or two ago in regard to the statistics relating to the tobacco crop, which very seriously affected the tobacco interests in our State.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, in a recent report submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Agriculture, in reply to a resolution of inquiry adopted by that body calling for information that would account for this discrepancy of 119,000,000 bushels, the Secretary of Agriculture affirmed that the discrepancy arose wholly from misinformation of his predecessor as to the amount of wheat in farmers' hands on the 1st day of March, 1893, thus reaffirming the correctness of his own estimate of the wheat crop of 1893. According to the report submitted by Secretary Rusk on the 1st of March, 1893, the amount of wheat in farmers' hands in this country was stated to be 135,000,000 bushels. The present Secretary of Agriculture states that this was a mistake, and that the amount actually in the hands of farmers on the 1st day of March, 1893, was (according to his revised statement) 254,000,000 bushels.

It is obvious that it could not be possible that 254,000,000 bushels of wheat, or two-thirds of the crop of the previous year, were in the hands of farmers on the 1st of March, 1893. The discrepancy between the two crop reports to which I have referred is undoubtedly to be found first in an underestimate by

Secretary Morton, as it is affirmed by statisticians who have examined this subject and who have a thorough knowledge of the whole field, of not far from 64,000,000 bushels of the crop of 1893, and in an underestimate of the supply in farmers' hands by Secretary Rusk of 50,000,000 bushels. These are the two sources of error, the error of Secretary Morton having been the larger one. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture ascribes the whole discrepancy to a mistake of his predecessor as to the crops in farmers' hands on the 1st day of March, which obviously can not be so.

Now, there is in statistics of this nature obviously a large element of uncertainty. At the best the yield of the growing crop and the supply in farmers' hands are only approximate estimates. Only one factor can be practically determined with reasonable certainty, and that is the "visible supply" of wheat.

Mr. MARSH. That which is in the public elevators.

Mr. DINGLEY. That can be determined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask that I may be allowed to proceed for ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. The amount that is in the hands of farmers can be determined only approximately by the observers who are scattered throughout the country as agents of the Department of Agriculture, who make inquiries and estimates. These gentlemen, scattered throughout the various States, are not trained experts and statisticians. Obviously their reports both as to supply in farmers' hands, and also as to the probable yield of the growing wheat crop, are exceedingly uncertain. These men give probabilities in percentages. That is, they state in their monthly reports that from the appearance of the growing crop about them, the yield will be 90 per cent of the previous crop, or 5 per cent more than the previous crop, as it may be.

Now, the accuracy of all such estimates, while of course they are only approximate, is yet dependent upon the character and training of the observers. I think the difficulty with respect to the collection of statistics by the Department of Agriculture has been in the fact that they could not obtain trained observers at the various points from which this information is obtained. Hence there have been two elements of error, first, in the probable crop, and, secondly, in the stocks in the hands of farmers.

Now, I agree entirely with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] that these monthly and quarterly and annual bulletins, while they are intended for good—

Mr. MARSH. For whose good?

Mr. DINGLEY. For the good of the whole community, the farmer as well as every other class in the community, provided the estimates are approximately correct. The difficulty lies largely, undoubtedly, in the fact that these local agents are to a large extent not trained statisticians and observers.

Mr. LOUD. Is it not in the system of selection?

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not know what correction there can be except a change of the method. Now, what is the method pursued by that statistical bureau of the Government whose statistics are relied upon, namely, the Department of Labor. Carroll D. Wright is a trained statistician. He has the qualities, training, equipment, and habits of a good statistician. He knows how to observe, analyze, and classify; and he gathers around him a body of trained men, whom he personally directs, and sends out to gather information at various points with their trained minds. Such statistics as those are valuable. They are accurate. Statistics obtained indiscriminately, in the way our crop reports are, can not be accurate in the nature of the case; and the fact that the statistics were 119,000,000 bushels of wheat out of the way or 1893 shows some of the difficulties that exist in this matter.

There is another element, it seems to me, that has not been taken account of in making up our crop reports, the absence of which makes the statistics published more or less misleading, and, I fear, prejudicial to farmers, and having a tendency to depress the price of the crop. There is no attempt made to deduct any portion of the crop that is permanently held by farmers, and that portion permanently held by dealers which, in the ordinary course of trade, can not be drawn to the last extent. Gentlemen who thoroughly know this whole business tell me that in any event, whatever the price may be, there are at any time, at least 20,000,000 bushels of wheat that can not be withdrawn from the farmers and sent to market. It is held in small quantities, by each farmer, for possible future needs; and he will not sell it. Then there is estimated to be 20,000,000 bushels always found in the elevators or in the hands of middlemen. Now, if that be the case, in estimating the surplus crop available for export, 40,000,000 bushels should be deducted from the report sent by Secretary Morton to the Senate stating that 60,000,000 bushels of wheat were available for export on the 1st day of March.

I would not have said anything on this subject if my friend

from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] had not brought it to the attention of the House; but it seems to me, in the face of the great error in the estimates of the wheat crops and wheat supply of the past year, it is well for us to understand that these bulletins can not be accurate so long as the officials of the Department have to depend upon untrained observers for their estimates and facts.

Without taking the time to have read the communication and bulletins I will print these in the RECORD in connection with my observations.

On February 12 Senator PETTIGREW introduced a resolution in the United States Senate directing the Secretary of Agriculture to send to that body certain data relative to wheat supplies and consumption at his earliest convenience, and the same was adopted. The 1st of April being reached without a report, the Senate further directed that it should be made within three days. Thereupon the Secretary of Agriculture submitted the following, under date April 3, which was received by the Senate on April 4 and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1894.

SIR: In obedience to a resolution of the United States Senate, calling for a statement of the visible and invisible supply of wheat in the United States on March 1, 1893, together with the actual and probable supply and distribution of wheat from that day to July 1, 1894, I have the honor to submit the following:

It is impossible to make a statement of the invisible supply of wheat. It is equally impossible to state the quantity of wheat constantly in the transition state—from the elevator to the gristmill, from the gristmill to the baker, and from the baker to the consumer. In all computations of supply and distribution, this undetermined quantity has been neglected as undefinable, unmeasurable, and noncomputable. Therefore, consumption has made it stationary as to quantity from year to year. This may be an approximation to the truth, if the streams into this amount of wheat and out from the same volume of wheat are nearly equally balanced under all circumstances.

The financial stringency, however, prevailing throughout the United States during the past year, it seems reasonable to assume, caused this volume of wheat to be more heavily drawn upon than it would be with the country in a normal monetary condition. Because of the stringency the invisible supply of wheat—that is, the supply of wheat and flour in the hands of small elevators, millers, wholesale and retail dealers, and consumers—must have been considerably smaller on March 1, 1894, than it was on March 1, 1893. Logically this indicates that a portion of the annual consumption, which is generally charged to the visible source of supply, should during the past year be correctly charged to the invisible supply. This charging to the visible supply diminishes the actual amount distributed, which must be subtracted from the total supply. There is no estimate of the decrease in the invisible supply available and perfectly credible. Therefore the following statement is presented upon the theory of an annual per capita consumption in the United States of 4½ bushels of wheat. This is the annual consumption and figure heretofore used in the United States Department of Agriculture in making estimates.

Respectfully, yours,

J. STERLING MORTON, Secretary.

HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,  
Vice-President of the United States.

	Bushels.
Visible supply March 1, 1893	79,000,000
In farmers' hands March 1, 1893	135,000,000
Crops of 1893	396,000,000
<b>Total supply</b>	<b>610,000,000</b>
Exports March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1894	176,000,000
Consumption March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1894:	
Food	314,000,000
Seed	49,000,000
Consumption March 1, 1894, to July 1, 1894:	
Food	105,000,000
Seed	16,000,000

Total amount distributed and available for distribution	660,000,000
Apparent shortage of supply	50,000,000

The preceding statement has been made strictly in accordance with the requirements of the resolution, but I have the honor to call attention to a second statement of supply and distribution, which will definitely present the surplus available for exportation up to July 1:

	Bushels.
Visible supply March 1, 1893	79,000,000
In farmers' hands March 1, 1893	135,000,000
Production 1893	396,000,000
<b>Total supply</b>	<b>610,000,000</b>
Exports March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1894	176,000,000
Consumption March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1894:	
Food	314,000,000
Seed	49,000,000
In farmers' hands March 1, 1894	114,000,000
Visible supply March 1, 1894	76,000,000

Total amount distributed and available for distribution	729,000,000
Apparent discrepancy	119,000,000
Supply on hand March 1, 1894	190,000,000
Probable consumption March 1, 1894, to July 1, 1894:	
Food	105,000,000
Seed	16,000,000
<b>Total probable consumption</b>	<b>121,000,000</b>

Amount available for exportation March 1, 1894, to July 1, 1894... 69,000,000  
The discrepancy of 119,000,000 bushels between the amount of supply and the quantity distributed may be charged to an underestimate of the reserve stock which farmers held on March 1, 1893. That abnormal stock held by farmers resulted from the two enormous crops of 1891 and 1892.

J. S. M.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the paragraph. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The Chairman proceeded to put the question.

Mr. MARSH. I have another motion. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a motion pending to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MARSH. I move to amend that motion by moving to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOCKERY. That motion is pending.

Mr. MARSH. I am frank to say, Mr. Chairman, that my only object is to get the floor for a minute, and if the Chair will tell me what motion to make to accomplish that purpose, I will make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can proceed if he wishes to speak for a moment.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the gentleman from Missouri, in charge of this bill, would give to this committee and to the country some information wherefrom we might draw the conclusion that this practice going on and which he proposes to continue has been of some advantage to the farmers of the country. I think from what has been said on the floor so far that there is no intimation here of any good ground for the continuation of the gathering together and the monthly publication of these statistics. The gentleman from Missouri may have heard some one of his farmer constituents state wherein these reports have been of benefit to him. If so, I wish he would give the House the benefit of that information. If there is one farmer in his district, if there is one man who cultivates the soil in his State of Missouri, who has ever told him that the farmers gained any advantage from the gathering and publication of those statistics, I hope he will give the House the benefit of that information.

Now, I say here what I did not care to say in the beginning, if the chairman of the committee will not defend this proposition, if there is no man on this floor who is prepared to defend it, I am prepared to denounce it as a fraud and wrong perpetrated upon 30,000,000 people of this country, and in the sole interest of the speculators in farm products. That is the conclusion that the farmers of my country and my State are coming to, and it is one that is forced upon me; and when no man on this floor is prepared to rise and defend this proposition, in the interest of the 30,000,000 agriculturists of the country, I hope the House will vote for my amendment and strike this proposed legislation out of the bill. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

What right has the Government to invade my premises by its agents and investigate my private business while it lets yours alone? What right has it through its emissaries to measure the amount of wheat or of corn in my granaries when it pays no attention to the amount of calico, or to the amount of textile fabric, or to the amount of boots and shoes and lumber, or coal or iron produced in other industries? Why, I ask the chairman of this committee, why does he select the great agricultural industry to level this death blow at? Is he not satisfied to let the farmers of this country alone, to work out their own salvation, and keep his secret spies and emissaries from prying into their private business and reporting upon it? This Government has no more right to know how many acres of wheat I sow than it has to know the number of pairs of boots that a manufacturer proposes to manufacture next year. I deny the propriety of this sort of inquiry. I deny the right of the Government to invade the homes of the farmers and filch this information and give it broadcast to the country, for the benefit, and only for the benefit of speculators in agricultural products, to enable them to depress prices.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH], and I hope he will accept the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. WANGER. And I propose, as a substitute, to move to strike out a portion of it.

The amendment of Mr. WANGER was read, as follows:

Strike out all of the paragraph after the words "provided further" in line 7, page 7, and insert "that the publication of monthly crop reports shall be discontinued."

Mr. MARSH. If the gentleman will add "and the gathering of the information upon which they are based," I will accept his amendment.

Mr. WANGER. If the reports are not published I do not see what harm the collection of the facts can do.

Mr. MARSH. But what is the use of expending money in collecting them?

Mr. WANGER. I assume that the Secretary would not ex-

pend any money for that purpose if he could not publish the reports.

Mr. MARSH. I assume that he would.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the point of order on so much of that amendment as is in the nature of a proviso. Of course the motion to strike out is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order then would go to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER].

Mr. HATCH. Yes; to that part of it which proposes to change existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. It would go to the entire amendment. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MARSH, the Chairman declared that the yeas seemed to prevail.

Mr. MARSH. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 28, yeas 76.

Mr. MARSH. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum being made the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 45, yeas 137; so the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks the communication from Secretary Morton and the two bulletins which I referred to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inquiries relating to public roads: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make inquiries in regard to the system of road management throughout the United States, to make investigations in regard to the best methods of road making, for preparing, printing, and publishing bulletins and reports on this subject for distribution, and to enable him to assist the agricultural colleges and experiment stations in disseminating information on this subject, \$10,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of this bill what progress has been made in this investigation as to road making, and what bulletins have been published in pursuance of this appropriation which was of the same amount in the bill of last year?

Mr. HATCH. The Secretary has published a very valuable and interesting bulletin upon the subject, of which I have a copy in my committee room. He has already made one report, and he is gathering additional information on this subject.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are the bulletins for distribution?

Mr. HATCH. They are; and the gentleman will see in a subsequent paragraph of the bill that we are making provision for the printing of a larger edition of these bulletins, so that they can be supplied to members of Congress in large numbers.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this investigation being conducted by engineering experts or simply by persons detailed from the Department?

Mr. HATCH. As I understand it, the Secretary is getting information from every possible source, not merely from engineering experts, but from every quarter where he can obtain it. He is deriving a great deal of information, I understand, through the experimental colleges.

Mr. DINGLEY. I asked the question for information, because I regard this investigation as exceedingly important. If it be properly conducted by engineering experts there is no question that it will be productive of great advantage to the people of this country. The condition of the roads of a country practically marks its civilization.

The Clerk read as follows:

Botanical investigations and experiments, Division of Botany: Purchasing specimens, paper, and all necessary materials for the herbarium, and for labor in preparing the same, and for investigations and experiments with grasses and forage plants, including the establishment and maintenance of experimental grass stations and investigations of medicinal and other economic plants, including cost of reports and illustrations thereof, and for traveling and other necessary expenses connected therewith, and for employing local botanists in the field for exploration and collection of plants in little-known districts, \$30,000.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire of the chairman of the Agricultural Committee how this compares with the former appropriation for botanical investigation. Is it the same as last year?

Mr. HATCH. Identically the same. The appropriation bill last year carried \$30,000 for this purpose, of which \$2,000 was made immediately available.

Mr. PICKLER. Have there been any of these experimental grass stations established? I see there is a provision here for the establishment and maintenance of experimental grass stations. I would like to know the object of them and where they have been established, if any have been established.

Mr. HATCH. I am not able to inform the gentleman just how many, but I know that experiments have been conducted in different sections of the country. I know there is one in Kansas on

a considerable scale, where experiments have been conducted for the last three or four years.

The Clerk read as follows:

Laboratory, Division of Chemistry: Chemical apparatus, chemicals, laboratory, fixtures, and supplies, purchase of samples and necessary expenses in conducting special investigations, including necessary traveling expenses, labor, and expert work in such investigations, \$8,000; for rent of laboratory building, \$900; in all, \$8,900.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman, I see that last year a very much larger amount was appropriated for this item. The estimate this year was \$14,900. The bill carries an appropriation of \$8,900. I hope the chairman of the committee will give some explanation of this reduction.

Mr. HATCH. In accordance with the suggestion of a letter received from the Secretary after the submission of the first estimates a change was made in the sum appropriated for the salaried force of this division, and a lump fund was appropriated. The committee recommend in this bill exactly the amount estimated in this amended report of the Secretary. The amended estimate is, "Laboratory, Division of Chemistry, \$8,900."

Mr. BROSIUS. Is that reduction due to a reduction of force or a reduction in the salaries of employes?

Mr. HATCH. There is no reduction in the salaries of the employes. Those salaries are fixed in a paragraph in the early part of the bill, which has been passed.

Mr. BROSIUS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this reduction is in the force of this branch of the Department? If that be true, will the gentleman have the kindness to indicate if he can—

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman will find in another paragraph that exactly the same amount is appropriated this year for this Chemical Division that was appropriated last year.

Mr. BROSIUS. In what paragraph will that be found?

Mr. HATCH. This is all under the paragraph beginning "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and continue the investigation of the adulteration of foods, drugs, and liquors." Let the Clerk read the entire paragraph.

Mr. BROSIUS. That is not necessary. My inquiry is answered. I had not read the entire paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and continue the investigation of the adulteration of food, drugs, and liquors, including samples offered by consumers only, traveling expenses, stationery, return postage, printing and illustrations, analyzing, investigating, and examining such samples as offered, \$8,000; and for these purposes the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons as he may deem necessary: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby required to make a separate report to Congress as to where and from whom the samples of food, liquors, and drugs were obtained, when and where analyzed, and the result of such analysis, together with the names of the manufacturers, and the brands or labels on the packages or articles, so that attention may be called to any food adulterations that may be imposed upon the public and to the manufacturers thereof; and any unexpended balance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be applied to the printing and publication of the pharmacy and drug laws of the several States and Territories heretofore compiled by the special agent of the Department, and for the completion of a report begun by him under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for the printing and publication thereof.

Mr. RAY. I move to amend by striking out the word "only" in line 1 on page 11, and inserting "and those procured by the Secretary of Agriculture from such sources and persons as he may deem advisable, and the investigation of which will be most conducive to the public good."

Mr. HATCH. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. RAY. That certainly can not be considered a change of existing law, because the law as it now stands goes much farther in the investigation of the adulteration of foods, liquors, etc., than the amendment which I propose. I can not see why this investigation—

Mr. HATCH. I withdraw my point of order, and will not make any objection to the amendment, now that I see its support. I did not hear it read distinctly. The amendment leaves the matter discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. RAY. I could not see what reason the chairman of the committee had for confining the investigation of the adulteration of food, drugs, and liquors to samples offered by consumers only. That would prevent the investigation of the adulteration of liquors, food, and drugs upon samples obtained from those who had purchased for sale, or who manufactured for sale, as well as those who were consuming. It seems to me it would be entirely proper—

Mr. HATCH. Consumers are purchasers.

Mr. RAY. I know; but it would hardly be proper, it seems to me, to confine the provision in the manner which the bill proposes, to "consumers." If, however, the chairman of the committee has no objection to the amendment—

Mr. HATCH. I have none.

The amendment of Mr. RAY was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake a special investiga-

tion of the different typical soils of the United States to determine their chemical character, their physical properties, and especially the nature of the nitrifying organisms which they contain, \$3,000.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I offer an amendment to which I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 2, page 12, add the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further experiment and continue the investigation of flax and hemp culture for fiber purposes in the State of Washington, \$800."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I must make a point of order on that amendment. I will state to the gentleman that the Secretary has left out of the Book of Estimates any request for further appropriation to conduct these fiber investigations, stating that under the present appropriation he will at the close of this fiscal year make a final report to Congress on the subject.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1983) for the relief of the heirs of Elizabeth Townsend, deceased.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 123) defining and permanently fixing the northern boundary line of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 322) to place Dunbar R. Ransom on the retired list of the Army;

A bill (S. 409) for the relief of Olivia and Ida Walter, heirs and children of Thomas U. Walter, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1405) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamer Despatch on Assateague Shoals, Virginia.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 6975) for the relief of the heirs and creditors of Elizabeth Townsend.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. If the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will indulge me a moment, I would like to say a few words, not especially with relation to the point of order, but more as to the desirability of this very small appropriation named in my amendment. Heretofore an appropriation has been made for the investigation of fiber culture in this country.

At the time that this appropriation went into operation our Territory had not been admitted into the Union. The amount of \$5,000, I think, was expended at that time in the establishment of experiments in this line, mainly, I believe, in Florida. Afterwards a very distinguished gentleman of my own State, Dr. Thornton, made some investigations into the matter and reported them to the Chief of the Agricultural Bureau. I have in my hand the result of his investigations, which are exceedingly interesting and important.

Mr. HATCH. If the gentleman from Washington will permit me, I will withdraw the point of order and allow the vote to be taken directly upon the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Very well, Mr. Chairman; then I merely submit this report of Dr. Thornton and the letter forwarding the same to me.

The letter and report are as follows:

FAIRHAVEN, WASH., April 7, 1894.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed letter, written by Dr. A. W. Thornton, Ferndale, Wash., and published in the World-Herald, will explain itself.

The Fairhaven Land Company, some fifteen months since, contributed \$50 to purchase flax and hemp seed, pay freight on same, etc., upon an agreement with Dr. Thornton that he would induce some twenty or thirty of his neighbors to raise a quarter of an acre, or more, of either or both flax and hemp. This was done, and the crop of both this season was more than satisfactory. The Agricultural Department, some thirty days since appropriated \$150 more, especially for having some of the flax prepared and sent to them. Mr. Charles R. Dodge, special agent of the Fiber Investigation Department, is very much interested in what has already been done, and pronounces the samples sent to him the best that he has seen raised in the United States, etc.

Dr. Thornton has made application for a special appropriation of \$4,000 to the Puget Sound region, for the purpose of making investigations more thorough and complete and proving beyond a question that flax raised here is fully equal to that raised in Belgium or Ireland. This appropriation should be under the especial control of the Agricultural Department at Washington, and should be so guarded that it will do the most good possible.

The Pacific Northwest seems to be especially adapted for the raising of flax, and when this is proven it will be of very great and lasting benefit to Western Washington and Oregon.

Will you kindly take an interest in this and help us out what you can? We will be glad to render any assistance that we can, free of charge, to fur-

ther this investigation, for we believe that it can be made a very important industry.

It may be of interest to your readers to learn the progress of developments in the important investigations in flax and hemp culture in Whatcom County, which I have been engaged in for the past two years. As I have fully demonstrated the perfect adaptability of our Puget Sound climate to the profitable cultivation of both flax and hemp of the highest quality, it is a matter of importance to compare the yield and profit of the flax crop raised in Whatcom County with the average results in Europe, a matter upon which I am now in a position to express in definite figures, having personally weighed and measured some of the crops of flax raised in the course of this investigation, and having found them to surpass my most sanguine expectations. It must be remembered that my investigations have been carried on with thick seeding for the sake of securing a fine quality of fiber, regardless of the yield of seed. In fact, in the north of Ireland, in the great flax district around Belfast, the yield of seed amounts to so little that it is entirely ignored, and in many cases no attempt is made to save it, being left to rot in the ponds; consequently the yield of such in my investigations in no way represents the yield of seed that could be obtained in this climate by thin seeding, and making the seed product the primary object, as in other States of the Union.

In the flax-growing States, where large tracts of flax are planted for seed, the straw is frequently burned up or wasted, as of little value, while on Puget Sound the straw is of so fine a quality that the seed is of little consequence compared with it. Yet, even then, our Puget Sound grown seed surpasses that grown in any other part of the world, both in yield and quality. In Europe, with the same heavy seeding that I used, of 1½ to 2 bushels per acre, the yield of seed averages from 2 to 5 bushels per acre, while in my experiments it ran from 9 to 17 bushels per acre; and had my seeding been with a view to grow as large a crop of seed as possible, regardless of straw, I have no hesitation in saying that over 20 bushels of seed would have been secured, while 11 to 14 bushels only is the average for good crops in Dakota, Minnesota, and Illinois. It is not, however, to the seed yield of flax that the Puget Sound grower need confine his efforts, the value of the fiber so far overshadowing it that it need only be considered a side issue, or a waste product, although of great value in itself.

The yield of flax straw, in the best crops in Europe, amounts to from 1 to 1½ tons per acre, only rarely reaching 2 tons, while the straw grown for me the past season ran from 2½ to 4 tons per acre, a yield that must be regarded as almost phenomenal, and hardly would be believed in Europe or the Eastern States. To enable your readers to realize the enormous profit to be derived from the development of the flax industry in Whatcom County, I will reduce the above showing to figures, based upon actual working results in European flax districts. In Charles Richard Dodge's official report to the Department of Agriculture in 1890, on his return from Europe, where he had been sent as special agent of the Department fiber investigation, page 23, he says: "If the straw is properly rotted, and of fair length, the yield of clean fiber will amount to 25 per cent. \* \* \* Good Irish has given 30 per cent, and Belgian 33 per cent." It will be noted that length of straw is an important element, and although our Puget Sound straw is both longer and stronger than the European, I will take the lowest rate as a basis of comparison, thus:

#### IN EUROPE.

One and one-half tons per acre, at 25 per cent, yields 750 pounds of clean fiber, which will dress 70 per cent, equal to 525 pounds of "line," worth 17 cents per pound; also 5 bushels of seed per acre, worth \$1.30 per bushel; 525 pounds of line at 17 cents, \$89.25; 157 pounds of tow at 4½ cents, \$7.06; 5 bushels of seed at \$1.30, \$6.50; total per acre, \$102.81.

#### ON PUGET SOUND.

Two and three-fourths to 4 tons of straw per acre yields 1,375 to 2,000 pounds of clean fiber per acre, which will dress 92 to 1,400 pounds of "line," worth 17 cents, and 9 to 17 bushels of seed, worth \$1.30; from 923 pounds of line, at 17 cents, \$153.54; 412 pounds of tow, at 4½ cents, \$18.54; 9 bushels of seed, at \$1.30, \$11.70; total, \$193.78. To 1,400 pounds of line, \$238; 600 pounds of tow, \$27; 17 bushels of seed, \$22.10; total per acre, \$287.10.

The above is a conservative estimate, and based upon the lowest European estimates; whereas with our superior quality of straw and greater length of fiber the higher percentage of 33 per cent may fairly be looked for, making the totals for Puget Sound \$208.32 to \$308.30 per acre. This very profitable showing is not, however, the only profit derivable from establishing the fiber industry in Whatcom County, but the formation of a strong company to engage in the flax industry would so increase population and enhance the value of all property that Bellingham Bay would immediately advance to the position of the leading section of the Northwest, and be the site of a city stretching from Chuckanut to Lummi, and from deep water back to the foothills.

It may naturally be asked by the cautious investor, What will be the cost of realizing these high figures? While the question opens up a large field of inquiry, the details of which would be too voluminous for a newspaper article, I will answer in brief, leaving the details for the consideration of capitalists who may be inclined to take practical or financial interest in the subject, and to whom I shall be pleased to submit them when required. From my past experience in this field of investigation I can freely assert that if a company was incorporated with sufficient capital to handle the flax crop, I could effect contracts with farmers to cultivate for such a company, under my instructions, 2,000 acres of flax for the crop of 1895, at prices ranging from \$25 to \$40 per acre, the difference depending upon whether the crop was harvested with a self-binding reaper or by pulling by hand. Upon these terms the company would be owners of the whole crop, both straw and seed, and would then require to meet the expenses of freight to the scratching mill; ripping, retting, and scratching, at a cost of from \$15 to \$20 per acre, and thus, for an outlay of say \$60 per acre, the company would have a finished merchantable product of from \$200 to \$300 for each acre operated; and not only so, but the company could establish its own oil mills and spinning mills, to work up its own fiber product, at an increased profit, thus stimulating all other lines of business on the bay.

In this connection the question of tariff and foreign competition naturally arises, neither of which cuts any figure. First, as to the tariff, it would be entirely a dead letter, having absolutely no effect upon the question either one way or the other, for the reason that the yield of fine fiber, such as can be grown on Puget Sound, is far below the requirements of the European consumers, and there is not enough to supply their own demand, let alone exporting to this country at low prices. In fact, so urgent is the European demand, owing to the steady and continuous falling off of yield in the old European countries, that even my investigations have been attracting considerable attention in Europe, and inquiries have been made at the Department of Agriculture at Washington with respect to the possibility of Puget Sound being able to supply the requirements of the fiber trade, and these inquiries have come from Ireland, England, and the Continent of Europe, a fact that speaks in no uncertain tone that now is the time for capitalists to come forward and start the fiber industry in this country, as we are entirely above the influence either of "tariff tinkering" or foreign competi-

tion, and by starting now matters will be in training to take advantage of the speculative activity which always succeeds a time of financial depression like the present.

DR. A. W. THORNTON.

Hon. JOHN L. WILSON,  
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

The amendment of Mr. WILSON of Washington was adopted.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry: For carrying out the provisions of the act of May 23, 1884, establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry, and of the act of August 30, 1890, providing for an inspection of meats and animals, also the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891, providing for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are the subjects of interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, the sum of \$800,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient, and in such manner as he may think best, to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, and other diseases of animals, and for this purpose to employ as many persons as he may deem necessary, including \$1,000 additional temporary compensation to the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and to expend any part of this sum in the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals and the quarantine of the same whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State into another, and for printing and publishing such reports relating to animal industry as he may direct; and the Secretary is hereby authorized to rent a suitable building in the District of Columbia, at an annual rental of not exceeding \$1,200, to be used as a laboratory for said Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding after line 17, page 14, the following:  
"And for the publication of special report on Diseases of the Horse, to be distributed by the Senators, Members of Congress, and Department of Agriculture in the usual manner, \$50,000."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. I hope the chairman of the committee will not raise the point of order on this amendment.

I do not wish to discuss the matter, but only ask that the House may be permitted to vote upon the amendment. The need of the publication of an extra edition of this book, Diseases of the Horse, has been so often discussed on the floor of this House, and is so widely recognized as being desirable, that I need scarcely undertake to discuss the matter, and will only express the hope that the gentleman from Missouri will withdraw the point of order.

I know, as other members of the House do of course, that we were promised something in the bill reported some time since by the Committee on Printing and passed by the House. I also know that the gentleman now occupying the chair, the chairman of the Committee on Printing, has been diligent in trying to have that bill attended to in the Senate. But so far it has not been acted upon. The reports of the Department in this regard are exhausted, and the demand has been constant and increasing. It is only an expenditure of \$50,000 for an exceedingly important publication, one of the most important furnished by the Government.

I presume, of course, that it may be subject to the point of order, but in view of the importance of the work I hope the gentleman in charge of the bill will withdraw that. Certainly he will admit that the money can not be better expended than in this manner, and it seems entirely proper that such an expenditure should be placed upon the agricultural appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman admits the fact that the amendment is subject to the point of order, and the Chair will be compelled to sustain it.

Mr. HATCH. If the Chair will permit me, the gentleman will see on a moment's reflection that this amendment is not appropriate to this bill. He will see that I could not permit the amendment to go on the bill when it is known that two editions of this book have been already ordered by Congress, and there is a bill now pending, I believe, to print 75,000 copies more.

Mr. PICKLER. But, if the gentleman will allow me, that bill has not been passed. We passed it in the House, it is true, at the extra session, and it is known, as I have already said, that the chairman of the Committee on Printing has been exceedingly diligent to get it through the Senate. Other members of the House have also been anxious to secure its passage. But it looks as though we might never have it.

The gentleman from Missouri knows the wants of his district in this regard, and he will concede that this is a most valuable work. This is an appropriation bill; this appropriates only \$50,000, and it would add but little to the amount of the bill if it is incorporated as a part of it.

I think, probably, as I have said, that the point of order is well taken, but it seems to me that there can be no more proper place for the proposition than on this bill.

Mr. HATCH. I indorse and approve of everything the gentleman has said about the value of this book, but it is no fault of the Committee on Agriculture that the House and the Senate have not passed bills reported from the proper committees.

Mr. PICKLER. The House has passed it.

Mr. HATCH. I am aware of that. The House has passed it, but the Senate has taken no action on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. COFFEEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. HATCH. Before the gentleman offers his amendment I hope he will permit me to make a statement.

Mr. COFFEEN. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. I stated when we reached that paragraph on yesterday that I would give some information to the committee in regard to the insertion of the tuberculosis provision in the paragraph which has just been read. I did not deem it necessary, because the language of that section is broad enough to cover this disease as well as pleuro-pneumonia, it being one of the contagious diseases contemplated by the act. But inasmuch as great interest is manifested in the subject, not only in the House but throughout all of the cattle-raising regions of the country, and especially on the dairy farms, we thought it necessary to report it; and I now ask the Clerk to read a letter received by the Secretary of Agriculture and transmitted by him to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,  
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1894.

DEAR SIR: The Assistant Secretary has conveyed to me your request for a statement in regard to tuberculosis, for your information in the preparation of the committee report.

Tuberculosis is now admitted by all to be the most dangerous and destructive disease affecting animals in this country. It has been distributed by the traffic in animals to all parts of the country, and is particularly frequent in the large dairies which supply milk for city consumption. The exact proportion of milk cows affected is not known, as no systematic and thorough investigation has been made to determine this point. But from the imperfect data at hand my opinion is that the proportion is not less than 5 per cent, and that it may reach 15 per cent. The Bureau has been called upon to test a number of herds which were supposed to be affected, and in these the proportion of affected animals varied from 60 to 80 per cent. There are, however, many herds which are not affected, and these would reduce the average to the figures given above.

It is important that there should be a systematic inspection made of some district, in order to determine the proportion of animals affected. The best place to make such an inspection would be the District of Columbia and the surrounding country from which milk is supplied to the District. I should advise the application of the proper sanitary measures to this section to determine the practicability of eradicating the disease, or reducing it to a minimum. Such a work, while it would be of great value locally, would be of greater value to the country at large as a scientific experiment, to determine the facts which are necessary to be known before comprehensive measures can be formulated for controlling the disease.

In addition to this local work it would be well to have some inspections made in various parts of the country, to determine the effect of different conditions, and to make demonstrations for the information and education of our people.

The importance of dealing with tuberculosis does not depend entirely upon its destructiveness among animals, but, as is well known, it is also the most common and fatal disease of people. Tuberculosis in cattle is identical with tuberculosis in people, and there is no doubt but that it may be transmitted from animals to man by means of infected milk and meat. Milk is far more dangerous than meat, however, because it is so frequently used without being cooked. The danger of milk to the consumers, and particularly to children, is illustrated by the fact that a sample taken at random from what was supposed to be excellent milk, delivered in this city, produced tuberculosis in Guinea pigs in a most virulent form and in the shortest possible time. The question is therefore not only one which affects the property of farmers, but also the health of the consumers of milk.

Tuberculosis is a strictly contagious disease. It is caused by a parasite which does not live outside of the animal body in this part of the world, and consequently the disease can only arise by contagion. Any measures taken to lessen the number of animals affected, lessens in a corresponding degree the opportunities for contagion, and by systematically destroying affected stock the disease may be almost entirely eradicated from our milk and meat-producing animals.

Referring to your inquiry made sometime ago as to the expenditures of the Bureau, I would say that at present these amount to about \$41,000 per month. The meat inspection costs, in round numbers, \$35,000 per month. The inspection of live animals for the export and interstate trade costs about \$7,500 per month. The scientific investigations and the salaries of the clerical force make up the remainder of the \$41,000. There are many abattoirs and packing houses engaged in the interstate and foreign trade where an inspection has not yet been inaugurated. The inspection is being extended, however, and should include at least 50 per cent more establishments within the next year than it does at present. This, of course, will correspondingly increase the expenditures.

Very respectfully,

D. E. SALMON, *Chief of Bureau.*

HON. W. H. HATCH,  
*Chairman Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.*

Mr. HATCH. I also ask the Clerk to read, in this connection, the two paragraphs which I have marked, in the Washington Post of May 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At a meeting of the National Medical Society two weeks ago a committee consisting of Drs. Charles H. Stowell, J. H. Bryan, and E. A. Balloch was appointed to report on what measures, if any, could be taken by the society for the prevention and restriction of tuberculosis. An interesting and instructive report was prepared and submitted, and at the meeting of the society on Wednesday it will be discussed by Surg. Gen. Sternberg, Dr. J. S. Billings, and Dr. Osier, of Johns Hopkins University.

From a letter received from Prof. A. E. de Schweinitz, of the biochemic laboratory of the Agricultural Department, we learn that two herds have

been examined in the District of Columbia, and were found to be badly diseased. He says it is probable that the cattle all over the country are, to a greater or less extent, affected with tuberculosis. Prof. de Schweinitz makes the startling statement that "in nearly all cases where the disease has been discovered, from 50 to 70 per cent of the whole herd has been found infected."

The report deals in detail with the manner in which the disease is communicated, and says: "It is doubtful if tuberculosis is truly hereditary, at least to any great extent."

Mr. COFFEEN. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 3, page 14, after the word "tuberculosis," the words "sheep scab."

Mr. HATCH. I raise the point of order on that.

Mr. COFFEEN. On the point of order I desire to say a word, or if the gentleman will reserve the point of order, I will address myself to the merits of the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to the gentleman occupying his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will treat the point of order as reserved, and will hear the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEEN. I desire to say that the addition of this word or phrase—sheep scab—among diseases specified for treatment, thus calling attention to contagious diseases in sheep, is very important to the sheep-raising interests of this country. It is not only in order, but it is included within the bounds of the law as it now exists, as we are informed by the Secretary of Agriculture. We do not add, in connection with the insertion of this provision, that the appropriation shall be increased, well knowing that we could not get that done, but we put this disease among sheep forward and ask that the argument that the chairman of the committee has made in behalf of the treatment of tuberculosis, a disease among cattle, may be also applied in behalf of the sheep industry. We believe that the Agricultural Department has proved exceedingly beneficial to this country in what it has already done for the eradication of contagious diseases among animals. But it seems that so far almost the entire appropriation for this work has been applied in behalf of the cattle industry to the neglect of the sheep industry—though the law as it exists in general terms allows that diseases among sheep may be treated as well. Yes, in the great and yet good work of eradicating pleuro-pneumonia it seems that so far almost all the money has been expended upon this disease, and the cattle interests have had all the benefits. The sheep industry of the entire mountain region, existing right alongside of cattle ranges, has been entirely left out and discarded.

I trust that when this is fully comprehended by the chairman of the committee, he will without opposition allow us to have a good, fair portion of this appropriation, since the committee does not make anything so mandatory as to bind the action of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Let me call your attention to one other thing. This is a disease that is costing the West so many millions of dollars that it is exceedingly burdensome to the people, and unless soon eradicated it will sweep on eastward over all of the United States. You have also already in this Congress decided that the wool-growers shall have no benefit from a revenue tariff on wool with an incidental protection, as I advocated on this floor during the tariff debate. You have done everything to leave them entirely dependent on the prices, whatever they may prove to be, of an absolutely free and open market. All the efforts of the Agricultural Department are being devoted now to the eradication of other diseases, while it has been leaving the sheep industry uncared for. Yet this disease of sheep is one of the most easily eradicated that can be found among any class of stock diseases.

In Australia the government has already taken action in this matter, and has already eradicated this disease, and has thus proved that it is a practical subject for governmental legislation, for governmental work. They have accomplished the eradication of scab in that country. I am informed by the sheep men of the West that the disease can be eradicated here even more easily, and that it will not cost anything like the sum that has been expended already in the successful eradication of that contagious disease known as pleuro-pneumonia among cattle.

One word further, if my time permits, and that is that the disease of pleuro-pneumonia among cattle has, as I am informed, already been so thoroughly eradicated that when we come to make such a large appropriation as this, it is entirely fit and proper that the money of this appropriation should be expended in the line of new diseases that ought to be eradicated, but little more being needed on pleuro-pneumonia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming—

Mr. HATCH. There is a point of order pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is pending. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] that the debate ought to be addressed to the point of order first.

Mr. MARSH. Does the gentleman from Missouri want to take me off the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the floor, but he should address himself to the point of order.

Mr. MARSH. I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] why he did not make that point of order when the gentleman from Wyoming was speaking to the merits of this question.

Mr. COFFEEN. He did that.

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman from Missouri did what he would do for the gentleman from Illinois, or any other gentleman who offered an amendment. He reserved the point of order to allow the gentleman to explain his own amendment, but not for general debate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MARSH] has the floor.

Mr. MARSH. I hope the gentleman from Missouri, who is my neighbor when he is at home, will hold his point of order for five minutes, and be neighborly. His actions speak louder than his words; and so, Mr. Chairman, I will proceed, and I hope that the time thus occupied will not be taken out of my five minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of this amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. COFFEEN], because it is an amendment in the interest of the great sheep industry of this country, and I join with him in saying that you, by your attempted legislation in this Congress, have been doing all you can to strike down that industry. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. COFFEEN] calls the attention of this House to the fact you will have a little protective duty on horses and cattle, but you have taken all of it off from the sheep industry.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of this committee to that, and to remind the gentleman from Wyoming that he voted for that very provision of law that deprived the sheep industry of the protection that he now complains of. He stood up here, and by his voice and by his vote contributed to the establishment of a disease vastly more injurious to the sheep industry than "scab." [Laughter.] He has by his vote applied a "scab" to that industry infinitely more injurious than the disease he now asks this Government to appropriate money to avert. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I hail with pleasure the gentleman's returning reason, and rejoice to see him take his position here on the floor and advocate that some little thing shall be done by this Government for that great interest that the agriculturists have so much money invested in, and that is the sheep industry; and I will vote with him and do what I can to assist him in carrying this amendment and in having it incorporated upon this bill, because it will in some slight measure tend to rectify and remedy the destruction that he and his colleagues, by their action in this Congress, are bringing upon that industry. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COFFEEN. I desire to be heard upon the point of order.

Mr. HATCH. I want to insist upon a decision on the point of order; and I will state to the gentleman from Wyoming that—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear from the gentleman why this amendment is not in order.

Mr. HATCH. Because it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not covered by the language of the law which provides "to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases?"

Mr. HATCH. Not to the extent suggested by this amendment, because if it is inserted in that place it will require the Secretary of Agriculture to go out throughout the country to exterminate a disease that is not a constitutional disease at all, and is not embraced in that class of diseases, such as tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia.

The gentleman from Wyoming himself knows of every single bulletin ever issued from the Agricultural Department in relation to the sheep industry, and hundreds of books have been published on the subject; and there is not a farmer in the United States to-day who can not control that disease in his flock if he wants to, and to put it by name in this bill, and in that connection, you will have to double the appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will protest, if my friend will allow me, that I can not stand still and concede that scab and foot rot shall not be placed on the same footing with tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia. I think they stand on the same footing.

Mr. COFFEEN. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wyoming on the point of order.

Mr. COFFEEN. I desire to submit to the consideration of the Chairman one or two simple propositions. First, by the statement of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the com-

mittee, I desire to say that my amendment is in harmony with existing law. And he has said that the Department had already in every bulletin given information concerning it, and he acknowledges that it is included among the other diseases of animals referred to in this bill. This, then, admittedly is a disease that is included in a sense among the other diseases of animals; and this is the only way to have it attended to. The purpose of my amendment is not to change the existing law. It does not change the existing law.

It does not increase the appropriation, but simply calls the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and the entire country to the fact that there is a contagious disease affecting another branch, and one of the largest branches of the live-stock industries of this country, that has been so far neglected and passed over; and by introducing the words of the amendment offered by me it will be explicitly understood that among the other diseases a reasonable portion, not the entire appropriation, but a portion of the appropriation shall be devoted, such as the Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion may himself decide is reasonable to the eradication of this disease among sheep. I think when you take this into consideration with the fact that you have already decided that it is in order to include tuberculosis, a new disease to be treated, and include that in the appropriation bill, the naming of another one of those diseases of live stock as my amendment does can not, therefore, be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to add the words "sheep scab" after the word "tuberculosis." The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that it changes existing law. By reading the paragraph under consideration it will be seen that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use any part of the sum appropriated and described in the bill that he may deem necessary or expedient, and in such manner as he thinks best "to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, and other diseases of animals." The proposed amendment adds the words "sheep scab" after word "tuberculosis." The Chair does not see that that changes the law, as the words "other diseases" may properly be held to include "sheep scab;" and therefore overrules the point of order. The question will be on the amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. The Chair overruling the point of order, I merely want to say that I hope this amendment will carry. The great sheep industry of the country certainly should have some attention, for scab and foot rot are doing more damage to-day than tuberculosis. I therefore hope the amendment will carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HATCH. Division.

The Committee divided, and there were—ayes 69, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury what countries or parts of countries are free from contagious or infectious diseases of domestic animals, and that neat cattle and hides can be imported from such countries without danger to the domestic animals of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall suspend the prohibition of the importation of neat cattle and hides in the manner provided by law.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

That the President of the United States be requested to cause correspondence and negotiation to be had, through the Department of State or otherwise, with the authorities of the Kingdom of Great Britain, for the purpose of securing the abrogation or modification of the regulations now enforced by said authorities which require cattle imported into Great Britain from the United States of America to be slaughtered at the port of entry, and prohibiting the same from being carried alive to other places in said Kingdom.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment and ought to be adopted. I have incorporated it in House resolution No. 9, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I understand that action similar to this has been taken in the other branch of Congress. Under the regulations which now obtain in Great Britain cattle from this country are required to be slaughtered within ten days after arrival, and at the port of entry. This requirement obtains regardless of the condition in which the cattle are, and of course regardless of the condition of the market. No such restriction exists with reference to cattle from Canada or other countries; and it is a fact that Canadian bullocks bring from ten to twenty-five dollars more per head than American bullocks in the Liverpool market, simply because of the fact that the Canadian animal is not required to be slaughtered at the port of entry and within ten days of arrival. It will be readily understood that our cattle when they reach the port are not in a fit condition to be slaughtered, and that they need some rest and recuperation before slaughter. This can be done advan-

tageously only in the interior. It is also a fact that in the interior portions of the country the markets may be and at times are better than at the port of entry. It is for the purpose of correcting this discrimination against our cattle, which has its ostensible reason in the fact that we once had pleuro-pneumonia among the cattle of this country, that I offer this amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. This regulation, then, as it stands, is a discriminating regulation against the United States?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. It is.

Mr. DINGLEY. And it is based upon the fact that formerly pleuro-pneumonia existed among American cattle?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. That is true.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the restriction is still continued by that free-trade country, Great Britain, under the guise of protecting against a disease which no longer exists?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. It is.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman if that restriction or requirement does not apply also to the Canadian cattle? Two or three years ago there was an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia among the Canadian cattle, and since that time I think they also have been subject to this restriction. All that is necessary in order to obtain admission for our cattle to Great Britain is to show a free bill of health, and it is extraordinary to me that the Secretary of Agriculture, or the predecessor of the present Secretary, did not declare long ago that this country was entirely free from pleuro-pneumonia. The same restrictions of which the gentleman speaks apply to Canadian cattle.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. The gentleman is mistaken as to the facts. The matter has been thoroughly investigated by the Committee on Agriculture, as is shown by its report. There is a discrimination against us which does not obtain against Canada, and it does not depend upon pleuro-pneumonia at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Have the Canadian cattle been released from the restriction?

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. Such is my understanding of the fact, as ascertained by the committee:

Mr. HARRIS. It has been done very recently, then.

Mr. HAINER of Nebraska. I will hand the gentleman a copy of the report, which I presume sets forth the facts. This amendment meets with the hearty and unqualified approval of our cattle feeders who feed for export.

I have in my possession a letter from one of my constituents, who is a large exporter of cattle, an excellent business man, and who explains the injustice of the British discriminating regulation from which he, in common with other exporters, has suffered. Every regulation which affects the market for our cattle as this manifestly does, withholds from our own people a considerable portion of the actual value of their cattle.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, and for the printing, publication, and distribution of farmers' bulletins: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, \$130,000; *Provided*, That this purchase and distribution of seeds shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the proviso beginning on line 20 and ending on line 23, that it is new legislation, an absolute change of existing law; but if it can be amended, I am perfectly willing that it shall stand. It provides that the purchase and distribution of seeds shall be confined "to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country." Now, what does that language mean? If you look at the dictionary definition, you will find that uncommon means "not common, not usual, infrequent, rare, and hence remarkable and strange." Now, I do not think we want to put ourselves in the position of providing only for the purchase and distribution of such seeds as are remarkable and strange; yet that is what we shall come to if we adhere to the language of this proviso. I send to the Clerk's desk to have read at this time an amendment, which I trust the gentleman in charge of the bill will agree to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not make the point of order and offer an amendment at the same time.

Mr. RAY. I send up the amendment now simply for the purpose of having it read for information, to see if we can not agree upon a modification of this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read for information.

The proposed amendment was read, as follows:

On page 15, amend lines 20 to 23, so that the proviso shall read as follows: "*Provided*, That this purchase and distribution of seeds shall be confined to such seeds as are of the best and most improved varieties, and having in view the introduction of new and rare varieties suitable for those sections of the United States where distribution as hereinafter provided is to be made, or such as, by changes from one part of our country to another, will tend to increase and make more profitable the crops produced therefrom."

Mr. HATCH. That is not in order at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not. It is merely read for information.

Mr. HATCH. I want to reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] on the point of order. If he will turn to section 527 of the Revised Statutes of the United States he will find that by an act of July 23, 1866, it was provided that—

The purchase and distribution of seeds by the Department of Agriculture shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another.

So that in this bill we have copied the exact language of the statute, and there can be no change of existing law. The provision of the bill is the law, and has been since 1866.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman, of course, is right as to the language of the Revised Statutes; but that has not been the language used in the appropriation bills for several years past.

Mr. HATCH. That is true; but the change of language in the appropriation bills did not change the law.

Mr. PICKLER. A good deal might depend upon how the Secretary would construe the language.

Mr. HATCH. The language used in the appropriation bill has been used simply as synonymous with the language I have read from the statutes.

Mr. PICKLER. Does not the gentleman think that the Secretary of Agriculture, if he were so inclined, could construe the provision of the bill as giving him authority to distribute none but uncommon and rare seeds?

Mr. HATCH. I do not think there is any trouble about that in the world.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that under all the rules of construction a change in the terms of the laws passed from year to year, during several years last past, must be deemed to have repealed the section of the Revised Statutes to which the gentleman from Missouri has called attention. It is well understood by every lawyer that where a new act is passed by a subsequent Congress which covers the subject and takes the place of the former legislation, it does repeal the previous law. Now, here, year after year for six or eight or ten years—at least six or seven years—there has been inserted in the appropriation bill a clause providing for the purchase and distribution of these seeds. Now, it must be true as a matter of law that those provisions have taken the place of and have repealed the section of the Revised Statutes to which attention has been called. There can be no doubt about that as a question of law; the new laws cover the whole subject and were intended as a substitute for the Revised Statutes. And it is going far out of the way, it seems to me, to try to bolster up this new provision in this bill by appealing to a provision of the Revised Statutes which I think has been repealed.

If we examine the last appropriation bill we find no such provision as this. And it seems to me the chairman of this committee can not intend to limit the purchase and distribution of seeds to such as are uncommon and rare—"uncommon to the country." I do not care who framed that section of the Revised Statutes, the framer did not look carefully at the meaning of the words used; because if you give to the word "uncommon" its ordinary meaning the Secretary of Agriculture in the purchase and distribution of seeds would be limited to those which are remarkable.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the qualifying clause of the proviso, which says, "or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another."

Mr. RAY. I have read that disjunctive clause and have considered its meaning. When we consider the whole paragraph together it leaves the Secretary of Agriculture at perfect liberty to say that there are no rare or remarkable seeds that he can purchase that would be of any use, and therefore he will purchase none under this clause. Then, coming to the next clause, "or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another," he would say, "That is entirely impracticable; there are no such seeds." And so he would refuse to purchase and distribute any seeds under that disjunctive clause. If we shall enact into law the language contained in the bill the result will be that the Secretary of Agriculture is at liberty to refuse to purchase and distribute any seeds whatever.

What does the bill mean when it says, "such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another?" Does it mean changes from the East to the West, or from the North to the South? Everybody knows, Mr. Chairman, that it would be absolute nonsense to send cotton seed and tobacco seed from the Southern States into the Northern States; or to send most of the seeds which are useful and profitable in the Northern States into the Southern States. I might say

the same as to the transfer of seeds used in the East to the West, or *vice versa*. When we look at the character and quality of the products of these various sections of our country, we see how nonsensical, how inapplicable to the wants and needs of our country is the proviso now embraced in the bill.

I trust that the chairman of the committee will examine the proposed amendment which I have sent to the desk; for I think he must recognize that it covers everything that he desires to cover in this matter. I ask that the amendment I sent to the desk be again read for information.

The Clerk again read the proposed amendment of Mr. RAY.

Mr. RAY. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there can be no objection to that. It provides for the purchase and distribution of the best kinds and qualities of seeds, those that are most rare and of the best or most improved qualities. It seems to me this proposition will provide for just the kind and character of seeds that we desire. If, however, the chairman of the committee will not consent to that as a substitute for the language of the bill, then I insist on my point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If I may be allowed one moment, I wish to call attention to one point in this connection, that it may go on record.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] makes a point of order on the ground that the wording of the bill now before the House is not in accordance with the existing law. The chairman of the committee [Mr. HATCH] reads a provision of the Revised Statutes to show that it is. In replication to that the gentleman from New York says that appropriation bills of several years past, including the appropriation bill of last year, changed the law as set forth in the Revised Statutes. In that the gentleman is mistaken. Let me read the words of the appropriation act of last year, under the heading, "Purchase and distribution of valuable seed, division of seeds." The Chair will mark this language:

Purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expense of labor, transportation, etc.

So that the appropriation bill, instead of changing the statute, simply emphasizes the statute as existing law by saying that these seeds shall be purchased and distributed as required by law.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would ask the gentleman from Missouri if he would not agree to striking out the words "rare and uncommon" and substituting the words "valuable and adaptable"?

Mr. HATCH. I could not consent to that, because it would be a change of existing law, and you have insisted all the way through that the law should be carried out as it is on the statute books. We supposed here that it would be only necessary to refer to it in the language heretofore used. We do not change the existing law, but simply call attention to it so as to insure its enforcement.

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

Mr. HATCH. Certainly.

Mr. RAY. Now, this proviso that we find in the bill has not been inserted in previous agricultural bills for some years past.

Mr. HATCH. Not in words, but it has been inserted by implication.

Mr. RAY. Very good. Assume that it was by implication; then, if it has not been repealed or affected by legislation heretofore—that is to say, if it is to-day the statutory law of the United States—then I ask the chairman of this committee why he now, in this appropriation bill, finds it necessary or proper to incorporate under the head of a proviso a section of the Revised Statutes? Its insertion here is, I claim, an admission by the Committee on Agriculture and by the Secretary of Agriculture that that section of the Revised Statutes has been repealed; and upon that matter, as a question of law, I will base my reputation as a lawyer when I assert that it has been repealed by subsequent enactments.

Mr. HATCH. It is only necessary to say, in response to the gentleman from New York, that the Committee on Agriculture never have made such an admission as the gentleman proposes, and the purpose of using the exact language of the statute in this proviso is to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that under the law only such seeds as are rare and uncommon, in the language of the section, should be purchased and distributed by the Secretary. The fact is that that law has been relaxed or abused in the past, and common seeds, such as turnip seeds, for instance, that can be bought by the ton, have been put up in packages and shipped through the mails over the country as rare and valuable seeds.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, right at that point I wish to ask the

gentleman a question. As I understand the gentleman, he says the object of changing the language of this provision as used in prior appropriation bills, has been to call attention to what he says have been violations of the law, and that changing the language of the appropriation bills and going back to the language of the statute is to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture that he shall restrict the seed distribution and send out in the future only rare and uncommon seeds?

It is then an instruction to the Secretary to change the distribution or the manner of distribution, and confine himself in the language of the statute to rare and uncommon seeds.

Mr. HATCH. I may state for the information of the gentleman that the present Secretary of Agriculture will not require any instruction from Congress to obey the law.

Mr. PICKLER. But the gentleman—

Mr. HATCH. Now, the gentleman has asked me a question and will not allow me to finish the answer.

Mr. PICKLER. The gentleman, I think, has not understood my question. Certainly he has not answered it.

Mr. HATCH. You do not give me an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. MICKLER. Very well, then; I beg the gentleman's pardon. I shall be glad to have an answer.

Mr. HATCH. As to the distribution of seed, the purpose the committee had in view was simply to bring prominently to the Committee of the Whole and to Congress, as well as to the people of the country generally, the fact, through this appropriation bill, that the distribution of seeds shall be hereafter as required by law. For that reason we have inserted the exact language of the statute. The gentleman must know that there has been in the past a purchase and distribution of seeds that were not such seeds as were worth sending to his constituents.

Mr. PICKLER. But if the gentleman will allow me, where this paragraph has been inserted in previous appropriation bills it merely refers to the usual seed distribution, and does not restrict the Secretary in the manner proposed here. In other words, there has not been this restriction imposed in the distribution of seeds.

But the question is what is the intent of the present appropriation bill in that regard? Now, if it is the purpose of the committee to restrict the Secretary of Agriculture to the distribution only of rare and uncommon seeds by requiring him to obey the exact language of the Revised Statutes I should be very slow to want to see it prevail. I think seed distribution has been successful heretofore, and believe that it has done a great deal of good throughout the country and ought to be continued.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This is simply to warn them that there must be no further violation of existing law.

Mr. PICKLER. It does not violate the law.

Mr. RAY. I trust the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will not so reflect upon the Secretary of Agriculture as to deem it necessary to put into one of our appropriation bills the section of the Revised Statutes applicable to and defining his duties in the purchase and distribution of seeds. It is a confession on his part that he believes the Secretary of Agriculture to be so ignorant or careless that he needs to have the Revised Statutes spread before him in every appropriation bill which he is to carry into effect. I hope he will not do that, but that he will agree to strike out the proviso if he will not accept the amendment.

Mr. BROSIUS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HATCH. It is only necessary to say, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me for a moment, in response to the gentleman from New York that this section of the bill was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture before it was acted upon by the committee and received his hearty and cordial approval.

Mr. RAY. If this is a part of the law of the land, if it is now in force and in the Revised Statutes, unrepealed heretofore, what kind of a Secretary of Agriculture have you who proposes deliberately to put into an appropriation bill a section of the unrepealed statutes? It seems to me that it is a confession on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture himself that this section of the Revised Statutes has been repealed, and that it is an appeal to this House to re-enact it in order to give it force or effect. Otherwise it has no place here.

Mr. COOMBS. I should like to ask the gentleman—

Mr. RAY. I should like to ask the gentleman one other question, if I may be permitted; and I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to unnecessarily consume time. It is only for the purpose of having the bill put in the shape that some of us here think it should be put in. I will ask the chairman of the committee if he does not know it to be a fact that the present Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to the purchase and distribution of seeds to the farmers of the country?

Mr. PICKLER. And has so said in his annual report?

Mr. RAY. Is not that true?

Mr. HATCH. I have already stated, Mr. Chairman, that when this provision was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture, and his attention was called to the law, he cordially and heartily approved it.

Mr. RAY. He cordially and heartily approved it!

Mr. HATCH. I am satisfied that the Secretary of Agriculture has been and is now opposed to the distribution of any other than rare and valuable seeds throughout the country.

Mr. RAY. Then why, if the gentleman will permit me, do you not provide in this bill that the purchase and distribution of seeds shall be confined to those which are rare and valuable, such as new varieties. That is what I propose by the amendment which I send to the desk; but you insist on retaining this provision which provides only for rare and uncommon seeds—that is, remarkable seeds. They must not only be rare, but they must be uncommon.

Now, what does uncommon mean? I have already stated, and this may absolutely do away with the purchase and distribution of seeds.

I asked the gentleman a question which he has not answered. It was whether or not the present Secretary is opposed to the purchase and distribution of seeds at all? The truth is that the present Secretary of Agriculture, in his annual report, or in some report which he has made, has stated in substance and effect, and in most emphatic language, that he is opposed to this purchase and distribution of seeds. And the gentleman [Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi] who is seated on this side of the respected chairman of this committee saw fit yesterday to make an attack upon this idea of the purchase and distribution of seeds. He referred to uncommon seeds. He referred to gentlemen on this side of the House who represent agricultural districts as pumpkin-headed or pumpkin-seed politicians, or something of that kind. I do not know that he used those words, but he said something of that kind.

At any rate he called these seeds electioneering documents. I desire right here, if I may be permitted to say it, that the farmers all over this country of ours believe in this purchase and distribution of seeds. It is about all the recognition they do get from the Congress of the United States, and I trust that the members of this House will see to it that the farmers are not deprived of the seeds which they have been receiving heretofore.

Mr. PICKLER. By a hostile Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RAY. Every man who is at all acquainted with the farming interests of this country of ours, knows that an interchange of seeds from time to time, and from one locality to another, is absolutely essential. Every one knows that the crops of the country will run out unless the farmers are from time to time supplied with new seeds. What is true of the animal kingdom is true of the vegetable kingdom. A continual in-running and in-breeding of the same seed, in the same locality and upon the same soil from year to year, will diminish and in time run out the crop. The bringing in of new seed is absolutely essential.

Now, I could speak a long time on this subject. I feel deeply, because, to some extent, I am a practical farmer myself and have great interest in this subject, and I represent in part an agricultural community. I again appeal to the chairman of this committee, who poses here as a farmer and as the farmer's friend, to consent to the striking out of this proviso, and to the insertion of the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk. If that amendment is not just as he would like to have it, then let us make some changes in it, but do not let us make it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to cease to purchase and distribute seeds. Do not let us make it possible for him, at his will and under his construction, to deprive the farmers of this country of this one recognition that they are receiving at the hands of the United States Government.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order unless some gentleman desires to speak upon it.

Mr. SIBLEY. I do not know that the question of order has been very closely adhered to in the remarks which have been made, and I may wander a little if I get on my feet; but there are so many of us sitting around the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that I should like to know to whom the gentleman from New York alludes, and on what page of the RECORD will be found the remarks, when he says that some gentleman sitting near the chairman of the committee made a remark about pumpkin seeds.

Mr. RAY. I referred not to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. You would not say anything of that kind. You would not have dared do it. It came from the gentleman from Mississippi. Just what his remark was I do not remember.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (to Mr. SIBLEY). Yield to me.

Mr. SIBLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Ever since I have been a member of the House of Representatives—

Mr. RAY. I took it at the time as an imputation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (continuing). Having found the gentleman from New York here when I came here, I have been astonished at his peculiarity about getting things wrong. [Laughter.] My attention has frequently been called to the difficulty on his part of comprehending the simplest thing. Now, I at no time said anything about "pumpkin-headed politicians."

I have not at any time designated gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber as being anything at all. Having indulged in no designation, the gentleman was either lacking in comprehension or lacking in physical ability to hear; and yet he is not always as entirely and fully and completely inaccurate as he has been in that little matter. What I said is in the RECORD, and there is nothing discourteous, impolite, or even sarcastic in what I said.

Mr. RAY. Does the gentleman say that he did not refer to pumpkin seed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You said that I called gentlemen on that side "pumpkin-seed politicians."

Mr. RAY. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is what you said.

Mr. RAY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not mean to say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You said it, whether you meant it or not.

Mr. RAY. Now the gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wants to be heard upon the point of order the Chair will hear him; but the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to have a communication read.

The CHAIRMAN. On the point of order?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read, as the gentleman says it is on the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BRITTON, S. DAK., January 31, 1894.

DEAR SIR: My wife has been pestering me for some time to write to some member of Congress for a batch of seeds; I mean such seeds as are sent out from the Agricultural Department. Now that the Democrats are in power I presume you have nothing to do but to help make a quorum and send out seeds to your hay-seed constituents. Now I am one of your hay-seed constituents, or rather my wife is, as she is going to farm extensively the coming season, and we deem it but fair that we have our share, or rather my wife's share, of garden seeds. Now, we want good, honest, Democratic garden seeds, none of your back numbers, something good enough for old Andrew Jackson or Samuel J. Tilden or any other Democratic saint. I would like some seventy-day corn, and if the new Administration have any new silver seed that will produce standard silver dollars, or even Mexican dollars, in about sixty days, I would like some of that.

Our land is well adapted to the raising of silver. We would like something that would yield a thousand bushels to the acre, and sell for a dollar a bushel. We have not farmed much, but are looking for anything new or profitable. Some of our friends say German carp is a good crop. We will put in a few acres of carp for a starter if we can get the seed. Some of our kind friends recommend ostriches, but they grow so few in a hill that we will not venture to try them. There is a small lake near our farm, and my wife is anxious to raise some gondolas. They are an Italian bird, I believe. The climate here is severe, but she thinks she could raise them by keeping them near a hard-coal burner in the winter season. If Mr. Morton could be prevailed upon to send us a pair of young ones we would esteem it a great favor. We could use some canvas-back duck seed to good advantage.

Mixed farming is talked of a good deal, and some say our farm is just the thing for wool. I do not want Poland China or Shorthorn wool seed. I would prefer Shanghai or Irish setter that would shear about 12 pounds to the vine. We want to try some hard-coal seed this year, as we have paid \$10 a ton for coal about as long as we care to. One of my young sons has a desire to raise a pair of elephants to break our land with. Do you think Mr. Morton would be willing to send us a couple of elephant eggs to try the experiment. Some of our advanced thinkers advise me to raise a crop of plug tobacco. In selecting seed I wish you would send "Spearhead," "Climax," or "Star." The climate is too dry for fine cut. If the Department has anything new in jack rabbits, I would like a few vines that would bear the second year.

Thanking you for past favors, I am, very truly, yours,

JAMES WELLS.

Hon. JOHN A. PICKLER.

[Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to speak on the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Yes, sir; I should like to be heard on this point of order.

Mr. HATCH. I insist that the gentleman must confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the point of order is whether this changes existing law. Now, I desire to say that the President of the United States is

his message undertook to give us information as to whether this changes existing law. In his message to this Congress at the opening of the session he devotes a couple of pages to this very point of order, suggesting that we should change existing law in this particular. Now, then, the campaign was made in 1892 on the slogan of "economy, retrenchment, and reform." We know what "reform" means, so far as five or six different tariff bills can inform us. On the question of what "retrenchment and economy" mean we were enlightened very much by the message of the President on the subject of garden seed.

The farmers in voting for retrenchment and economy supposed that there would be a retrenchment in Wall street and among the "gold bugs" and among some other fellows except themselves. When we came here the President sent in his message proposing to tell us how to economize, and he told us last year the expense of these seeds was \$66,548.61. Is not that rather astonishing? That is a little picayune item. That is all it means. It will cost \$66,000. That is all. That is the picayune kind of economy and retrenchment. That is all it sums up, and we are required to pass these items in which we are to economize and reform. We are to stop this little expenditure of 2 cents a package, as that is what it cost last year, for these few garden seeds.

He tells us on page 26 of the message that last year there was enough cabbage seeds sent out to plant 19,200 acres. How many cabbage seeds were sent out this year, I would like to know? I did not get a single one, and I do not suppose that other members did. The President goes on to tell the quantity of sweet corn and other expensive seeds that were sent out last year. Under the existing law the Secretary of Agriculture was not allowed to skip the seed business entirely, but he was allowed to use his discretion and to purchase cheap seeds instead of costly ones, so that instead of onion and cabbage seeds that it takes two years to grow, we get this year squashes and radishes and salify, things that are of no good, but that are cheap and that enable the Department to economize in buying seed so as to redeem the pledge of "economy, retrenchment, and reform."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The paragraph under consideration provides a sum of money for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of seeds, bulbs, trees, etc., as required by law. If the provision stopped there, there could not be any controversy as to whether it would be obnoxious to the point of order. But there is a proviso beginning on line 20, which provides that this purchase and distribution of seed "shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent change from one part of our country to another."

The point of order is that these words, beginning with the proviso on line 20, change existing law. The fact is that the proviso is in the exact language of the existing law. The Chair therefore holds that it does not change existing law, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, of course that decision leaves the paragraph in the bill, and now I ask that my amendment be read.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The amendment of Mr. RAY was again read, as follows:

On page 15 amend lines 20, 21, 22, 23 so that the proviso will read as follows: "Provided, That this purchase and distribution of seeds shall be confined to such seeds as are of the best and most improved varieties, and having in view the introduction of new and rare varieties suitable for those sections of the United States where distribution as hereinafter provided is to be made, or such as by changes from one part of our country to another will tend to increase and make more profitable the crops produced therefrom."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order, unless the gentleman from New York has something new that he desires to submit.

Mr. RAY. I want to occupy just about a minute. I desire to apologize to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in so far as an apology may be necessary in view of the language that I used. I did not mean to be offensive in any way, and I trust that I was not so. I want to call attention, however, to the language which the gentleman from Mississippi did use, and to which I referred in my remarks. It will be found on page 5779 of the RECORD; and is as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail. I differ from the gentleman from Georgia more widely. I think what we want in the Agricultural Department is less pumpkin seed, less corn, and less electioneering vegetable seed generally, and more systematic, scientific information based upon intelligent experimentation.

I see, Mr. Chairman, that instead of the gentleman's speech being a reflection upon this side of the House, it was a reflection upon the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in that connection, that I am compelled now to make a remark exactly opposite to the one which I made awhile ago with reference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], because his last ob-

ervation shows that so far from being blind or shortsighted, he is a man of remarkable penetration of vision if he can possibly discover in anything that I have said a reflection upon the Secretary of Agriculture or upon anybody else. What he has quoted is exactly what I said except as to one word. The Official Reporter, not being acquainted, I presume, with "collards" turned that word into "corn." I do not blame the reporter for not catching the word, because collards, I believe, are peculiar to my section of the country, and with the exception of that word, what is in the RECORD is exactly what I did say.

Now, seriously, Mr. Chairman, I do say that what we want is that the Department of Agriculture shall be turned into a piece of machinery for the improvement of the agriculture of this country, and to that end that it shall be required to expend its money in such a manner as to introduce new products in different parts of the country, to diversify our agricultural industries instead of frittering away the people's money by sending blue grass seed to Bourbon County, Ky., and ordinary upland cotton seed to Yazoo County, Miss.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PICKLER. I desire to offer an amendment. I move to strike out "thirty," in line 19, before the word "thousand," and insert "sixty," so as to make the clause read "one hundred and sixty thousand dollars." I want the same amount for seeds that we had last year, that is all, and I desire to be heard upon that for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLER. It will be observed that \$130,000 is appropriated here for the purchase of seeds. That was the amount, as I understand it, appropriated last year, and, as far as I know, for several years previous, and it would be all right if it stood by itself, but near the bottom of page 16 is found a provision "that the Secretary of Agriculture may use not to exceed \$30,000 of the amount here appropriated for other purposes which are there defined."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am positively and emphatically against reducing the amount of this appropriation for garden seed. I know it is quite common to sneer about sending out garden seed to our constituents, but I take it the gentleman from Mississippi must have been indulging a jocular spirit when he even referred to the subject in that strain. I do not believe a member on this floor has a constituency that could be influenced by a few packages of garden seed. Furthermore, I believe there is not a member here who, in the distribution of these seed, discriminates between members of different political parties, or sends these seed entirely or principally to members of one party. I believe there is no member here who does not make a fair distribution among members of all parties.

Six papers or ten papers of garden seed may seem like a small thing to many of us; yet there are here and there in the cabins which dot the various parts of this country men to whom even these small quantities of seed are some help when gardening time comes.

But, sir, the great importance of the appropriation for this purpose lies, in my view, in this: The Government certainly does send out good seed; it selects the best qualities; it supplies new and valuable varieties. This is the only means we have of distributing these new and improved varieties over the country. Now, while a package of garden seed may be worth only 5 or 10 cents, yet in some States a man receiving a package of such seed may find an improved variety. From what he plants he saves the seed, and continues to plant from year to year this new and valuable variety; and within a few years his neighborhood, and probably his State, are benefited to the extent of tens of thousands of dollars by reason of that small package of a desirable variety of seed, sent originally from Washington.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. As I understand the provision here relative to seed we are going to discontinue in a large degree the distribution of the ordinary packages of seed, and are going into the dissemination of rare varieties of bulbs and all that sort of thing. If we are going to strike down any part of this appropriation, why not strike out that part which refers to "rare and uncommon seed." My people and your people, if they want any of these seed at all, want seed that will raise something to eat. We do not want any flowers; we do not want any bulbs. Who on earth away out there on the prairies wants rare and uncommon bulbs? Why should the committee come in here with that sort of phraseology in order to get back to an old statute which has been repealed time and time again? Give us an appropriation (if you give us anything at all) that will furnish us seed from which we can raise something to eat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. I ask for three minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] yield to me a second?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] asked me just now, although members generally may not have heard the remark, whether I would prefer the cash. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who represents a rich and powerful and distinguished constituency, that we would prefer at all times and under all circumstances the cold and silent cash. [Laughter.]

Mr. COGSWELL. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. There is no doubt about that, and if we can not get the cash we will take something to eat.

Mr. PICKLER. I was trying to bring to the attention of the House the great advantage which the country generally receives from the distribution of these better varieties of seed. Gentlemen know that in this way our varieties of wheat have been improved, and various kinds of vegetables have been improved; and in this way there has come to the country untold wealth.

Furthermore, why should we begin with the farmer on a measure of this kind? The gentleman from New York, in my opinion, made a good point while ago when he said that this is about the only way that a large number of our constituents ever know that they belong to the Government of the United States. It is gratifying, I believe, to a man living away out on the prairies or in the timber country, for him to find once in a while that he is remembered, and for him to know that somebody here in Washington connected with this great Government remembers him sufficiently to send him even a few packages of garden seed. Such a thing brings to his mind the fact that he is a part of the Government; that we have a Department of Agriculture, with a Secretary of Agriculture at its head. I believe such things tend to foster patriotism, and in this way help the country apart from any direct benefit from the seeds themselves.

I regret to observe that the present Secretary of Agriculture is against this distribution; and I am sorry that the chairman of the committee has yielded, as I believe, against his own judgment, which would be in favor of continuing the provision heretofore made in this direction. I believe the influence of the Secretary of Agriculture, who has shown himself an enemy to this appropriation, has forced this new departure in this bill. I trust that this House will not begin to cut down where the interests of the farmers are concerned and deny them the small benefit they have heretofore derived in this matter. I know that from my State I have frequent calls for these seeds; and I know that when I distribute them they are appreciated.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have read from the Clerk's desk, in reply to the gentleman, a letter sent to the committee by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, which is a complete answer to the statements which have been made.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1894

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inclose you herewith a printed copy of a letter dated April 23, 1894, addressed to the Hon. Secretary of Agriculture by the chief of the seed division of this Department. This letter contains some items which I believe will be of interest to your committee. One or two points are worthy of repetition here. The chief of the seed division reports that during the seed distribution season just closed the actual cost of seeds, apart from the expenses of packing and distribution, was about \$57,000, as against \$66,548.61 during the same period last year—a saving of \$9,000. While there was this reduction in the cost of the seeds, he was still able to increase the number of packages forwarded by Congressmen 23.3 per cent as compared with last year. Each Member of Congress received about 17,000 papers of vegetable seeds and 1,500 papers of flower seeds. In addition to this, the Secretary's quota has been almost entirely exhausted by direct distribution to the people of the country. An extensive distribution of sugar-beet seed, sorghum seed, and foreign cotton seed was made for other divisions, and without increasing expenses.

The grand total stands 7,704,464 papers of seeds for 1892-'3, and over 9,500,000 papers for 1893-'4. The large increase in the amount of seeds supplied at the diminished cost to the Government is the point to which we would ask your especial attention. It is believed that still greater improvements can be made in the force of this division during the coming year. These facts would lead us to believe that Members of Congress need not expect any reduction in the supply of seeds for distribution as the result of the proposed use of \$30,000 of the seed appropriation for the preparation and publication of Farmers' Bulletins to be distributed by them as seeds are distributed.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. W. DABNEY, JR.,  
Assistant Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM H. HATCH,  
Chairman of Committee on Agriculture,  
United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HATCH. I also ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, without reading it, a report from the Chief of the Seed Division, which members can see in the RECORD in the morning, as having a direct bearing upon this question.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed

It is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF CHIEF OF SEED DIVISION,  
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1894.

SIR: The distribution of seed for the fiscal year 1893-'94 being practically completed, I desire to submit to you a report of the operations of the Seed Division, together with a comparative statement of expense of distribution for the fiscal years 1892-'93 and 1893-'94.

The distribution for 1892 and 1893 amounted to 7,704,464 papers of seed, for which an appropriation of \$139,000 was made. In addition thereto \$5,000 was appropriated for repairs to printing presses, and for printing seed labels and seed pockets.

A separate appropriation for salaries of the clerical force in the Seed Division, amounting to \$13,500, and clerks detailed from other rolls, brought the statutory salaries up to \$16,000. The Congressional Division, engaged solely in the handling of correspondence relative to the Congressional distribution, required a force of clerks whose aggregate salaries amounted to \$14,000, making in round numbers the sum of \$165,000. Of this sum \$68,548.61 was expended for seed; \$5,000 for bulbs, cuttings, etc., and the balance, \$93,551.39, for statutory salaries, per diem labor, and supplies.

It is apparent, therefore, that each dollar's worth of seed purchased cost the Department about \$1.47 for distribution. From a business standpoint this appeared to be rather expensive work, and a reorganization of the methods of preparation and distribution of seed was effected which has resulted in considerable saving in the cost thereof.

During the current fiscal year, for which appropriations were the same as in 1892 and 1893, 9,500,000 papers of seed were prepared for distribution, or 23.3 per cent more than last year. Had the same methods been followed as those pursued last year in distributing such a large amount of seed, the cost would reach the sum of \$180,000, taking for granted, of course, that an increase of 23.3 per cent in product would require a like increase in labor and supplies.

The cost of seed for the current fiscal year amounts to about \$57,000, a saving of about \$9,000.

The abolition of the Congressional division and the transfer of its work to the seed division has effected a saving of \$12,600.

The position of superintendent of the seed room being one of no importance to the Department, and carrying a salary of \$1,600, has been abolished; which, with the reduction in the clerical force, makes a saving of \$4,000 in statutory salaries in the seed division. Paper and seed bags cost \$2,500 less than last year. On labor in the seed room a saving of about \$3,000 under last year's figures has been made; but in view of the fact that 23.3 per cent more seed was handled, the comparative cost is much less than formerly.

The employes in the seed room were formerly classed as per diem employes at \$1.50 per day for time actually employed. The injustice of this was so apparent that the employes were placed upon a monthly roll at a salary of \$40 per month and thereby given the privilege of the usual amount of leave of absence without loss of pay, a privilege enjoyed heretofore only by the better paid clerks and higher officials to the exclusion of the "laborers" in the seed room and printing office.

The slight additional outlay was, in my opinion, fully covered by the better quality and greater quantity of work performed. The amount in addition to the monthly pay of each employe was less than \$5 per month for each person.

Notice of distribution and Congressional allotment was published on November 15, 1893, and the first Congressional quota was delivered on November 24, nearly six weeks earlier than the usual time of first delivery, thus giving the people of the Southern States an opportunity to test the seeds furnished by the Government in ample time for their early planting.

The allotment to Senators and Members of Congress was largely increased over last year, averaging 17,000 papers of vegetable seed and 1,500 papers of flower seed to each. The demand, however, was greater than the supply, and in complying even in part therewith the Secretary's quota suffered to such an extent as to necessitate the refusal of many thousand requests from miscellaneous applicants. In the transmission of the seed through the mails some 25,000 mail sacks were used.

Considerable attention was given to the distribution of new and useful seed, especially in field corn and forage plants. The vegetable and flower seeds were of the best varieties obtainable and subjected to the most careful tests as to germination before acceptance. Distribution was also made of special seeds for other divisions, viz, sugar beet, sorghum, and cotton seed.

For whatever success the division may have had I have to present my thanks to the chief clerk for his valuable aid and advice and his careful selection of employes assigned to duty in this division, and also to the cheerful manner in which the assistants in the division seconded any effort made by me in the improvement of the methods of business.

Respectfully submitted,

M. E. FAGAN,  
Chief of Seed Division.

Hon. J. STERLING MORTON,  
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I desire, as a representative of the farming interest of this country, to say that I hope the amendment offered by my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] will prevail. This is the place and the only place that the farmers of this nation are recognized.

It is so rare in the distribution of the public funds in the way of appropriation that the large mass of representative men who are known as farmers ever receive any recognition, that at this point it seems to me manifestly proper that in the matter of a few thousand dollars to be distributed all over the nation, which will inure largely to their benefit, there should not be a moment's hesitation in the minds of this body. There is no one thing that a farmer is so proud of as to be recognized at the Departments of the Government, or to receive a package of seeds from the National Government.

As to this matter of seed distribution, there can be no question of the value and importance of keeping it up. This spring I, as well as others, I presume, on this floor, have received applications for many more seeds than I had in my power to distribute; in fact, I could have distributed 10,000 more packages than I was able to get. And not only that, sir, but the calls are still coming in, and when my colleague has tried to make provision for next year by increasing the appropriation for this purpose, it seems to me we should not hesitate to grant \$30,000

or even \$200,000 more if necessary, so that the farmers of this nation who form the basis—the substratum—on which the whole fabric rests, may receive some recognition from the Government, and be enabled through the distribution of these seeds to reap some of the benefits to which they are entitled.

I hope the amendment of my colleague will be adopted.

Mr. ENGLISH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact, which must be manifest to all, that I am a farmer of very large experience, and cultivate an extensive plantation in my back yard in the city of Newark, I think my remarks on this subject should engross the attention of the House.

I have looked for some years at this matter of the distribution of seeds with considerable interest; and I have found, as I believe every other member of the House will find who gives any consideration to the matter, that the original intent and purpose of the law providing for the distribution of seed has been continually violated.

It was a beneficent purpose that throughout the country there should be distributed seeds of new and excellent qualities unknown to our cultivators; that they should experiment upon them and determine how well they were adapted for certain localities and what advantages would spring from their use. There could have been nothing better or more appropriate than that. But of late years—I will not lay the fault anywhere, I only state the fact—of late years we have had the oldest, most worn-out seeds—and when I say worn-out seeds I mean those which have been thrown away by intelligent cultivators long since—distributed all over the country.

I remember last year to have received my quota of seeds. As I am not the representative of an extensive farming district I exchanged a good many of them with my agricultural friends for books, and circulated them instead amongst my constituents. But I sent some seeds also. Among some of the seeds which I received were the seeds of the yellow cantaloupe. Now, if you will go through the South and West you will find that pernicious melon exploded and worn out, and only to be eaten by any man with pepper and salt [laughter]—I suppose you can find it everywhere. And it is in the interest of good taste, and the stomachs of our rural friends as well, that it should be driven from the country and not be distributed around through the Agricultural Department. [Laughter.]

Again, you find the red or blue top strap-leaf turnip. Why, there is not a farmer in the whole country that does not raise that turnip in abundance, and yet they are sending the seed of it throughout the land. Let them send out through the Secretary of Agriculture such seeds as are novel and rare, and let the people determine whether they are of real advantage to the country or not. That can only be determined by experiment, made by careful cultivators and by close observation.

As to the amount of the appropriation, I do not care what it is. I am perfectly willing to vote for any reasonable amount, provided the original and logical purpose of the law is carried out. But to send out yellow cantaloupe seeds and blue top strap-leaf turnip seeds throughout the country, I would not vote a dollar for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. COFFEEN. Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose to take any part in this discussion, but I know how easily the people who vote on this question in this Hall may be lead astray from the main issue by such a speech as we have just listened to. I desire to say in behalf of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] that all that has been said as a criticism of the kind of seeds sent out by the Department of Agriculture, I believe to be not only pertinent to the question we are discussing, but to be in the main correct.

Let us not vote down this amendment to provide a proper supply of seeds simply because the administration of affairs has not been the most wisely conducted. Let us rather accept the criticism.

I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ENGLISH] that the sending out of purple-top turnip seeds and yellow cantaloupe seeds, and all these old-fashioned seeds which are already in general use ought to give way to the distribution of the newer and more experimental kinds, and that these newer and improved kinds of seed which are valuable and which cost more should be widely distributed for the purposes of experimentation.

This amendment now pending is in the direction of allowing \$30,000 more for the very purpose of enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to better carry out a more perfect system of seed distribution, to send out more valuable seeds, to send out more new varieties, if you please, that they may be experimented upon in every part of this country.

One word further while I am on the floor, and that is the principal purpose for which I have arisen. I wish to say, in behalf of the State which I have the honor to represent, that so far from the seeds being unappreciated in the State of Wyoming,

we have had the same experience there that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LUCAS] has mentioned—that is, we have many calls for seeds, away beyond the number which we can supply. Although it looks very well to say that our quota of seeds is 17,000 packages; yet, put up in little parcels as they are, it means only three or four thousand parcels to reach therefore three or four thousand families, and the amount is entirely insufficient to supply the demand from my State. I therefore stand with other gentlemen from the West in behalf of agriculture in general, and say that if we are to appropriate anything for the distribution of seeds, we should endeavor to enable that Department to do the most efficient work possible, and add this \$30,000 more for the distribution of the better and newer kind of seeds. That is the purpose of the amendment and my reason for favoring it.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] to increase the amount of this appropriation should be adopted. Inasmuch as we have gone forward thus far in this bill, and have cut down the appropriations in no other respect, I think it would be well not to reduce, but increase, this amount. I find on examining the bill that we still continue the appropriation for ornithology and mammals and pomology, and all that sort of thing, and as long as we do that I think we might at least continue the appropriation that would be of benefit to the farming portions of the West. I find that the chief of this division, whose letter has been read from the Clerk's desk, recommending that this appropriation be cut down, has written another circular, which was not read, but which will appear in the RECORD. I do not understand why, in the first year of the administration of the Agricultural Department by the Democratic party, they seek to take away that which gives the greatest benefit to the farmers, in my judgment, of any appropriation we have.

What do the farmers care about the appropriation for ornithology? What do they care about the appropriation for stuffed birds? What do they care about delving into prehistoric times to tell whether birds in the paleozoic age existed with or without teeth? They care nothing about that. They want something practical, something beneficial, something by which or through which they can improve their condition. All of these appropriations running along here, page after page, for objects with unpronounceable names—botany, ornithology, mammals, pomology, and that sort of stuff—are not for the benefit of the farmer.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. With pleasure.

Mr. CRAIN. Does not the gentleman think it would be very advantageous to the farmers of the country to keep in the bill this appropriation for arboretum?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Certainly; arboretum is a good thing. It may take an operation on the brain to tell what it is, but it is a good thing for the farmer. He can raise more wheat, hogs, corn, and things of that kind. In making the recommendation that the appropriation for seeds be cut in half, no recommendation has come to us that the salary of any of the chiefs of these divisions be cut down. They are all getting two, three, and four thousand dollars per year. No chief of division has recommended in his letter that his salary be diminished, nor that of any subordinate.

Mr. WISE. You do not take them for fools?

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Why, certainly not. They are simply Democrats.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman will allow me, I think the farmers of the country have not agreed with the present Secretary of Agriculture on much that he has done, and I do not think they will.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Oh, the Secretary of Agriculture is running newspapers.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say this: The seeds which I have sent out this year to my constituents are doing and will do a great deal of good, and I think it is about the only thing in this bill that does anybody any good. I do not think pomology or anthropology or anything of that kind does the farmers of the country much good. So I hope that the gentleman from Missouri, who takes such great interest in everything that will benefit the farmers, will not oppose the increase called for in the amendment to the amount appropriated in the agricultural appropriation bill of last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if I can have the attention of the House for a few moments I would like to call its attention to the importance of this movement begun in this bill for the distribution of the Farmers' Bulletins among the farmers of the country. I like it, Mr. Chairman, that we are all agreed that with the limited means at our command we ought to do the utmost possible good for the farming element of

this country. I know that is true of men who come from my section of the country, nine-tenths of whose constituents depend for a living upon agriculture.

Now, it just so happens that lately I have had my attention called to some of these bulletins. This bill provides, Mr. Chairman, that \$30,000 of the amount hereby appropriated shall be used for the distribution of these bulletins among the farmers of the country, the Representatives here getting for distribution two-thirds of the bulletins, just as they do now of the seed. I have sent to my district lately some bulletins on the subject of "cotton fertilizers," and some on "raising and turning under as fertilizers leguminous plants" of various kinds. There has lately been a great deal of interest aroused in my section of country on the subject of the "cultivation of the sugar beet;" and the Agricultural Department has issued a very important and interesting pamphlet upon experimentation in the cultivation of sugar beets.

We are beginning down there to find that a large part of the country which has heretofore been worn out by the cultivation of our staple can be finely adapted to some other things. I have, I believe, received more thanks for those bulletins than for anything I have sent out. I agree with the gentleman from South Dakota, that the farmer gets entirely too little, so far as that is concerned, of the benefits of this Government, which should inure to the benefit of all. They get benefit from the protection of their lives, liberty, and property and the maintenance of civilization; and they do not pay a dollar too much to get those things if their worth is considered, because they are valuable things to have. But they get no special benefit of any description that I know of; and I do think that this seed distribution is a matter of the very utmost importance to them; but I think at the same time that that distribution ought to take place in a manner that shall inure to the diversification and improvement of agriculture.

I do not think that it is a specially important thing to send out "Blue Peter peas." When I wrote to the Department for "Texas blue grass," a new grass which has been introduced in my section, they should not have sent me a lot of "Kentucky blue grass," as I can buy that at any seed store. I think we ought to use the money in such a manner that it shall not be wasted or recklessly thrown away. If I had my own way about it I would only use the money for the introduction of new, uncommon, and improved varieties. And, moreover, gentlemen, although it may be treason to say so here, so far as I am concerned, I would have these seed distributed by the experimental stations of the country, or through somebody who has the time to study the soil and the localities and the question of the adaptation of vegetables to the particular locality, and not through Congressmen, who, as a rule, know just about as much about farming as a drove of hogs do about the theory of metempsychosis. If that be treason, you can make the most possible out of it. Now, the diversion of \$30,000 of this seed appropriation will not hurt you in the amount of seed received heretofore; and that is shown by a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PICKLER. How can you take off \$30,000 and not decrease the quantity of seed sent out?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, the Secretary shows very conclusively that he will be enabled to give as many seeds with that amount as the Department has been giving heretofore, because seeds of all sort are so much lower in price.

Mr. PICKLER. Now, if the gentleman will allow me, why would it not do, if he could get the seeds a little cheaper, for him to give us more seeds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is what I am coming to. We want to put the money in our hands to the best use possible for the farming interest. We have just so much money to use. We are standing here in the face of a depleted Treasury. You want, by your amendment, to increase the appropriation here \$30,000.

Mr. PICKLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. My amendment only seeks to fix the amount of \$130,000 for seed, as appropriated last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that.

Mr. PICKLER. And I take care of the bulletin proposition. We are for the bulletins also; but we want some seeds after our lands have been improved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand the gentleman fully, and if he had permitted me to complete my remarks he would have understood me.

Mr. Chairman, we have heretofore appropriated a certain amount for this purpose. Now, the Secretary of Agriculture, after getting hundreds of letters from agricultural colleges and commercial cities, comes here with a proposition recommending the diversion of \$30,000 of the usual amount to the publication and distribution of these interesting bulletins, some of which I have called your attention to.

Now, the gentleman comes in and proposes to keep the amount for seed distribution at the same figure, which is of course an increase of \$30,000 in the appropriation, which we do not believe we can afford in the present condition of the Treasury.

Mr. MOSES. I desire to ask the gentleman a question, and I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of making any appropriation whatever for the distribution of seeds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course I am, and I think the law now on the statute book is one of the wisest that Congress ever enacted; a law which enables the Federal Government to send to all parts of the country seeds of new varieties, improved varieties, uncommon varieties, and to introduce them to the notice of the people to improve and diversify our agriculture. There is no man on the floor of this House who will go farther in that direction than I will. I believe we have a right to do it, and I think it is our duty to do it.

Mr. MOSES. Yesterday afternoon when I pleaded for the maintenance of the same amount as in the last bill for the purchase of seeds I thought the gentleman denominated me a pumpkin-seed politician. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If you thought so the expectation must have been father to the thought, for I did no such thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOSES. I will say this to the gentleman from Mississippi: Ten years ago you had a cotton that, when it opened, would not stay in the boll two weeks, but through the efforts of this Department you have to-day in your State of Mississippi and in Texas a cotton that will stay in the boll until February, thereby adding hundreds of millions to the value of the cotton crop. The gentleman knows that is so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. Now, I am one of these pumpkin-seed farmers. I was taught agriculture not in the universities of Germany, but between the plow-handles in Georgia. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I gave way for the gentleman to ask me a question, not to make a stump speech for his own benefit and my damage. Now, I did not either yesterday or at any other time, designate the gentleman or anyone else as a pumpkin-seed politician. I do not indulge in language of that sort, especially to a gentleman who has always been so kind and friendly with me as the gentleman from Georgia.

I am aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Agriculture has distributed some very valuable seeds. In my own part of the country it has distributed seeds of some new and very much improved varieties of cotton and other plants. We used to raise cotton that was only five-eighths of an inch long in the staple, whereas we now have cotton that is from an inch and a quarter to an inch and three-eighths, and an inch and a half long, and we get 1½ to 2½ cents a pound more for it than for the common cotton.

To some extent and for some few varieties we are largely indebted to the Government for this improvement.

What I am contending for is that the Department of Agriculture shall continue in the line of just such improvements as that, introducing new or improved varieties of seeds, and shall not fritter away its energies or the farmers' money in sending ordinary cabbage seeds obtained from Landreth's Seed Farm, near Philadelphia, to Yazoo County, Miss., or into the district of the gentleman from Georgia.

Now, I have said that this view as to the desirableness of these bulletins meets the approval of the agricultural societies and colleges all over the country. I have received numbers of letters to that effect, but here are two that I happened to get as I came up the steps this morning. One of them is from a director of the Agricultural College of the State of Pennsylvania, and another is from the Secretary of the State Agricultural Society of Pennsylvania, and I ask to have them read by the Clerk for the enlightenment of the House. But before he reads them I want it distinctly understood that my position on this matter is not to circumscribe the usefulness of the Department, not to limit its operation, but to follow out the law as it stands on the statute book, and as it was enacted with a great deal of wisdom in the beginning.

When I ask for grass seed for my district I do not want a grass which will not grow there, or one which we already have, but I want a seed that we are seeking; for example, a grass that will do for winter pasturage, a great desideratum in my part of the country, without which ours can not possibly become a stock-raising region. It has not yet been supplied to us or discovered. I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture about it. I have written to the experimental stations about it. I got information that the Texas blue grass was the thing, and I tried to get it

from the Department, but I could not. I could get Kentucky blue grass, which has been tried in my section and has failed, and which is being distributed now to parts of the country where it is absolutely indigenous.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I got the Texas blue grass from the Agricultural College in your State.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I could not get it when I wanted it. Probably they had then distributed all that they had.

The communications referred to by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi were read, as follows:

BLOOMSBURG, PA., May 14, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I notice that House bill No. 6937 appropriates \$130,000 for the distribution of seeds, etc., with the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture may use not to exceed \$30,000 for the publishing and distribution of farmers' bulletins. As a member of the board of trustees of our State experiment station, it has been my privilege to observe the interest manifested by farmers in publications of this kind, and I firmly believe that by dividing the amount appropriated and distributing the portion in literature as proposed, will be far more beneficial to the farmers than sending out the whole amount in seeds. Trusting that you can give this measure your support, and thanking you in advance for whatever attention this communication may receive at your hands, I remain,

Most respectfully,

H. V. WHITE.

Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY,  
Harrisburg, Pa., May 15, 1894.

DEAR SIR: This society is anxious to see the agricultural appropriation bill recently reported to the House from the Committee on Agriculture pass in its present form, which we understand appropriates \$130,000 for seed distribution, but provides that the Secretary may use not exceeding \$30,000 of this sum for the preparation of farmers' bulletins, similar to those already issued, and giving results of Department and experiment station work in a form to be of use to the practical farmer. This latter proviso we are heartily in favor of—that is, to distribute information instead of seeds—and we shall feel deeply grateful to you for anything you may do in aiding the passage of this bill.

The writer is also a member of the Grange and Farmers' Alliance, who also indorse the measure.

Yours truly,

J. SCHALL WILHELM, Secretary.

Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS,  
Chairman Subcommittee on Agricultural Experiment Stations,  
Washington, D. C.

STATE COLLEGE, CENTER COUNTY, PA., May 15, 1894.

DEAR SIR: House bill No. 6937, providing for the distribution of literature among our farmers, interests me very much. The present depression of our agriculture is in large measure due to lack of knowledge of the best methods and best crops among the farmers. New crops and improved processes must be substituted for the old, and this can not be better brought about than by the free distribution of information on these matters. I sincerely hope that the portion of the bill that provides for this may pass Congress and go into immediate effect.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN HAMILTON.

Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

And also, in conclusion, this from the National Stockman and Farmer:

FARMERS' BULLETINS VS. SEEDS.

The appropriation bill now before Congress contains a clause authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to use a sum not exceeding \$30,000 for the publication and distribution of farmers' bulletins. This amount is to be taken out of the \$130,000 to be appropriated for the distribution of seeds. Everyone who believes that the American farmer stands more in need of good sound agricultural information than he does of a few packages of stale seeds should lend his influence toward the passage of this clause of the bill.

Many of our readers are already familiar with these farmers' bulletins, which contain a concise, plain statement of the discoveries of the experiment stations of the world and their bearing upon practical agricultural affairs. Next to the agricultural press and the publications of the experiment stations, these farmers' bulletins have, within the past two years, been among the most important factors in pointing out to farmers a more profitable agriculture.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask now that we may have a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota. I am sure the Committee of the Whole understand it; and as chairman of the committee in charge of this bill I want a full vote upon it. While I do not believe that the amendment ought to be adopted, yet, so far as I am concerned, I want to abide by the majority vote of this committee. Whatever they decide in regard to it will govern my action throughout this bill until it becomes a law. I ask for a vote.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. PICKLER, it was agreed to, there being—ayes 78, noes 52.

Mr. RAY and Mr. CRAIN addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

Mr. CRAIN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso beginning in line 20, and reading as follows:

Provided, That this purchase and distribution of seeds shall be confined to such seeds as are rare and uncommon to the country, or such as can be made more profitable by frequent changes from one part of our country to another.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I see no necessity for inserting

that proviso in this paragraph. The paragraph provides in the beginning "for the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of seeds," etc. What necessity can there be for inserting this proviso in a paragraph which already provides that the distribution shall be made in accordance with law? If it be true, as suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, that the law of 1866 is in force, and is the only law applicable to this distribution of seeds, I see no necessity for reenacting existing law.

Mr. HATCH. The language which the gentleman proposes to strike out is the existing law; I hope he will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CRAIN. If it is the existing law, that is just the reason there is no necessity for it. Why reenact it?

Mr. HATCH. We think it is the existing law.

Mr. CRAIN. Why, then, insert it in this bill?

Mr. HATCH. I have already stated over and over again the reason for inserting this language; I do not propose to take up time in arguing the matter further. Mr. Chairman, I have already made a point of order on a similar amendment, and the Chair sustained the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that any point of order has been made against this amendment. This is simply a motion to strike out.

Mr. HATCH. And striking out the provision would be a change of the existing law.

Mr. CRAIN. Not at all. The Chair will allow me again to call attention to the fact that the paragraph begins with this language: "For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of seeds," etc. Now, if the construction of the gentleman from Missouri be correct, and if the existing law is embraced in this proviso—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks debate on the point of order is not necessary. The point comes too late at any rate, as the amendment had been debated for several minutes.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN]. I had prepared an amendment to the same effect and sent it to the Clerk's desk. The Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has asserted that the language of this proviso is now the law, is a part of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and is unrepealed, and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has so ruled. Now, if that provision is a part of the law, it should have no place in this bill, but should be stricken out. There is no necessity and no propriety in repeating in our appropriation bills the living provisions of the statutes. It is a waste of time and a waste of money; and as this is an Administration of "economy and reform," I ask in the name of "economy and reform" and for the purpose of reducing expenditures, that this proviso be struck out.

If it should turn out that this is not the law, then the Secretary of Agriculture will be at liberty to purchase such seeds as he may think advisable and proper. There will be no limitation upon his authority in that respect; he can purchase and distribute such seeds as he believes the farmers of this country desire and need.

In this connection I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have no sympathy whatever with that kind of oratory which has here to-day fallen from the lips of bankers and millionaires who own no land except that occupied by tenants, and who have no interest in the farmers of this country except to collect from them the rents that are due to the landlords.

I have received from the farmers of my district hundreds of applications for seeds that I can not supply. These requests I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture before the 1st day of May, and received answer from him returning my request, saying, "Not complied with because it is impossible for me to do so." It seems to me that this very fact is an appeal to this Congress from the farmers of the country for recognition, and that we should not take away from them the rights—the privileges more properly—which they now have under the laws already passed by Congress.

Mr. MOSES. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. RAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSES. I am a farmer myself and presume that you are. Are you willing to give them recognition also in a tariff bill?

Mr. RAY. Certainly I am; and for the very reason that I am willing to give the farmers recognition in a tariff bill, I am opposed to striking off the duty on wool and putting it on the free list [applause on the Republican side], because my doctrine is to stand by the farmers and preserve the sheep industry and protect them in that regard at the same time that we protect them in the seed industry.

Mr. MOSES. How about the cotton industry?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Let us have a vote.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. CRAIN, it was rejected.

Mr. CRAIN. I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the paragraph:

"Provided also, That all seeds that are rare and uncommon to the country which may be imported by the Secretary of Agriculture for distribution shall come in free of duty."

Mr. DINGLEY. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. CRAIN. I offer the amendment in compliance with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. I would like to be heard on the point of order. Will the gentleman from Maine state what it is?

Mr. DINGLEY. I simply make the point of order that it changes existing law, and is not germane to this bill. The amendment relates to the duties on imports.

Mr. CRAIN. Well, I will say against the point of order that I merely wanted to carry out the suggestion of the gentleman from New York in the interest of the farmers, and I supposed he had that side of the House behind him. But as the point of order against benefiting the farmers comes from that side of the House, and you will not allow these seeds to come in free of duty, gentlemen on that side of the House making objection, I will withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

An equal proportion of two-thirds of all seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents; and the person receiving such seeds shall be requested to inform the Department of results of the experiments therewith: *Provided*, That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of May shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase, but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting the chairman of the committee to explain the effect of the language beginning in line 11, the following words:

But nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same.

The first part of the paragraph gives to Congressmen two-thirds of all the seeds. Now, if that language remains in the bill, it strikes me that the Secretary of Agriculture can send a part of the seed that may be set apart for Congressmen at his own discretion.

Mr. HATCH. Not at all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then why not amend by saying from his one-third?

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman will see, if he will look at the bill, that the paragraph preceding that, which provides—

That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of May shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not object to that.

Mr. HATCH (continuing):

*And provided, also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Go on down a little farther.

Mr. HATCH. I will read the whole paragraph.

*And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase, but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same.

Now, that applies to his one-third, and to that portion of the entire distribution left over and uncalled for by Members and Senators.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I have no doubt that it was so intended, but it does not say it.

Mr. HATCH. That has been on the statute book for years, and has never been complained of by any Secretary. I hope the gentleman will not make a supercritical objection to that portion of it. There is no objection to the language used.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. RAY. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 8, after the word "Agriculture" insert, "giving precedence to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the Department."

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order against the amendment. It changes existing law and is new legislation entirely.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how there can be any point of order raised against the amendment or how any gentleman who is in sympathy with the farmers of this land can object to it.

Now, this proviso of itself reads:

*Provided*, That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of May shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, that gives the right to the Secretary to send these seeds to whomsoever he pleases. The amendment that I suggest simply provides that the Secretary of Agriculture, in distributing this surplus, shall give preference to those persons whose names have been supplied by Representatives in Congress and Senators, and who have not before been supplied with seeds during the same season. In other words, it provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall send this surplus of seeds to those persons throughout the United States who think enough of them to ask for them.

Mr. HATCH. Do I understand the gentleman from New York that this applies simply to the surplus after the 1st of May?

Mr. RAY. That is all.

Mr. HATCH. Then I withdraw the point of order, and I have no objection to it. I misapprehended it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the paragraph the following:

*Provided, also*, That the seeds allotted to the Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude, shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January, or at the earliest practicable time thereafter."

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to that. It is practically complied with now.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NORTHWAY. In line 7 of page 16, I move to strike out the word "May" and insert the word "June."

Now, it will be seen that this amendment just adopted, offered by the gentleman from New York, will not reach the point that I want to reach. For instance, on the 1st of May the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to send out seeds. He must send them to members, or to such persons as they designate, up to that time. But suppose he is ready to send them out on the 2d of May, and there is no person designated. In that case he can send them out as he pleases. Now, where I live, as in many parts of the Northern and Western States, garden seeds are used much later than the 1st of May. This year I have had applications for seeds clear down to this week, and sometimes applications are made as late as the 1st of June.

Under the system of distribution adopted by many of us we send seeds out to a very large number of individuals. That creates a demand on the part of others. They see their neighbors receiving seeds and they send in orders for them; and I have had probably fifty or more requests this month, since the 1st of May, for garden seeds. In one day I had applications from a large number of laboring men in one of the villages or cities of my district stating that they had had no work this winter, had earned no money, and were too poor to buy seeds, and as late as the 10th of May I sent out a large number of packages to these laboring men. They were very grateful for them. It was a great boon.

Mr. BROSIUS. Will my friend allow a question?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes.

Mr. BROSIUS. Would not the gentleman's proposition postpone the sending out of the residue to so late a time as to practically render them valueless?

Mr. NORTHWAY. No, sir. Members send out large quantities of seeds before that time, but I find it is necessary to keep some on hand, to answer the demands of those who request them. Those who request them are anxious for them and are grateful to receive them.

Mr. BROSIUS. Will the gentleman allow one other question?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Certainly.

Mr. BROSIUS. Will this seed be of any value to any farmer or gardener, or to anybody else, after the 1st of June?

Mr. NORTHWAY. No.

Mr. BROSIUS. Then, if you postpone the distribution until after the 1st of June, will not these seeds be practically valueless?

Mr. NORTHWAY. But between the 1st of May and the 1st of June a large number are applied for, and if this proposition in the bill is agreed to, we shall cut off the opportunity to respond to requests which are made to us after the 1st of May.

Mr. BROSIUS. Have not members and those whom they represent time enough to get in their requests for seeds by the 1st of May?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Yes; but they do not always make their applications in time.

Mr. BROSIUS. Now, if you postpone until the 1st of June the distribution of the residue, will not all that residue be useless after the 1st of June?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Here is the idea: I distribute a large amount of seed long before the 1st of May. That distribution creates a demand for more, and that demand has been continued this year right down to the present time. If I had no seed on hand after the 1st of May, then I could not answer that demand. I have answered the demands of a large number of persons who needed these seeds, which demands have come in after the 1st of May.

Mr. BROSIUS. Is there a single seed in the whole catalogue of seeds, except perhaps turnips, that can be used by the people after the 1st of June?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes; radishes all the year.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I move to strike out the 1st of May and insert 1st of June.

Mr. BROSIUS. What are you going to do with the seed after that date?

Mr. NORTHWAY. Let the Secretary distribute them.

Mr. BROSIUS. It is then too late.

Mr. NORTHWAY. It has always been the 1st of July heretofore.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, there can be no force in that statement made by the gentleman from Ohio. If he had paid attention he would know the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York has already been adopted; and that is, that after the 1st of May, of these surplus seeds to be distributed by the Secretary, preference shall be given to those whose names are furnished by Senators and Representatives to the Department of Agriculture, and who had not already received them. There is no more important provision in this bill; and there has not been a greater waste of money or a worse leak than the depreciation in the value of seeds that have been left on the hands of the Secretary on the 1st of July. I hope that every member of the committee will vote against this amendment. It has been a loss to the country and to this entire fund; and it has been one means why we have in times past received so little for the money we have expended. I think it is the most beneficial provision in the bill.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Let me suggest to the gentleman that if this provision is adopted the Secretary will have in his possession the seeds that would be required to fill the demands of each member after the 2d day of May, and at a time when perhaps one-half of the requests come to him.

Mr. HATCH. There is no reason, in my judgment, why the amendment of the gentleman should be adopted.

Mr. NORTHWAY. The Secretary will have at his disposal the amount left to the credit of each Representative and Senator on the 2d day of May; and after the 3d day of May he will have no allowance there; and I have complied with hundreds of such requests since the 10th of May.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, in further explanation, and in answer to the gentleman from Ohio, I wish to say that he or any Senator or Member who wishes to do so can draw his entire quota of seed prior to the 1st day of May and have them on hand to meet the demands which the gentleman says come in after that time. This bill as drawn simply provides for the nonaction of a Member or Senator.

Mr. NORTHWAY. We do not hire a warehouse when we come here.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. It is presumed that a large bulk of the seeds have been distributed long before the 1st of May; and the remaining portion would only be a small quantity and would not be in the way.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Have you not had requests for seeds since the 1st of May?

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will say that I have had but very few requests since the 1st of May.

Mr. NORTHWAY. I have had a hundred of them; and they are coming along now.

Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire. I will say further that I drew my entire quota in bulk and sent every one of them out myself without any assistance from the Department; and that I disposed of them before May to my entire satisfaction, and I think to that of my constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRETZ. Let us have it reported, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAIN. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, in line 23, after the words "upon their request," insert "after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution."

Mr. CRAIN. The amendment simply provides that we shall be notified that they are ready.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. RAY. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, after the word "seeds," insert "bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, or plants."

Mr. RAY. Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that the Secretary shall not "distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents," leaving it to be implied that he might send bulbs, shrubs, and trees of a character entirely unfit for that climate. Therefore, in order to make the bill symmetrical, and to perfect it, I move to insert those words.

Mr. HATCH. I will explain, as I have explained to the gentleman before, that these words are embraced in the general language of the statute, and to insert them now would be a repetition. It is simply surplusage, and will accomplish no good. It is always done. I care nothing about it, except that it makes a bungling section of what was a perfect section.

Mr. RAY. It does not make a bungling section. It makes a plain, common-sense section of what was a bungling section. A seed is not a tree, although a tree may grow from a seed. A seed is not a shrub, although a shrub may grow from a seed. So that the argument that the word "seed" covers trees and shrubs is all nonsense, as the gentleman well knows.

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. RAY. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 36, yeas 97.

Mr. RAY. No quorum.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] to act as tellers.

Mr. RAY. The gentleman can get along with it in three minutes, and let that go in.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; and the gentleman has yielded every courtesy and every fairness to the gentleman from New York that he is entitled to, and will not permit any more of it. That is all there is of it.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 33, yeas 77.

Mr. RAY. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum being made, the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, when the following-named members failed to respond:

Abbott,	Cornish,	Heiner,	O'Neil, Mass.
Adams, Ky.	Cousins,	Henderson, Iowa	O'Neil, Mo.
Adams, Pa.	Crawford,	Hendrix,	Outwaite,
Aitken,	Curtis, N. Y.	Hermann,	Page,
Allen,	Dalzell,	Hicks,	Paschal,
Apsley,	Davey,	Hines,	Paynter,
Babcock,	Denson,	Holman,	Pearson,
Bailey,	Donovan,	Hooker, Miss.	Pence,
Baldwin,	Doolittle,	Hooker, N. Y.	Phillips,
Bankhead,	Draper,	Hopkins, Pa.	Pigott,
Bartholdt,	Dunn,	Hudson,	Post,
Bartlett,	Edmunds,	Hulick,	Powers,
Belden,	English, N. J.	Hull,	Randall,
Bell, Colo.	Enloe,	Hutcheson,	Reyburn,
Beltzhoover,	Epes,	Johnson, Ind.	Richardson, Mich.
Bingham,	Everett,	Johnson, Ohio	Ritchie,
Black, Ill.	Funk,	Kem,	Robinson, Pa.
Bland,	Funston,	Kribbs,	Rusk,
Boatner,	Fyan,	Lapham,	Russell, Conn.
Boutelle,	Gardner,	Lefever,	Russell, Ga.
Bower, N. C.	Gear,	Linton,	Ryan,
Branch,	Gillet, N. Y.	Lisle,	Schermerhorn,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gillett, Mass.	Lockwood,	Scranton,
Brown,	Goldzier,	Lynch,	Settle,
Burnes,	Goodnight,	Magner,	Shaw,
Burrows,	Graham,	Marshall,	Sherman,
Bynum,	Griffin,	McAlear,	Sickles,
Cadmus,	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Simpson,
Campbell,	Grout,	McCreary, Ky.	Smith,
Cannon, Ill.	Grow,	McDowell,	Snodgrass,
Chickering,	Haines,	McGann,	Stephenson,
Clarke, Ala.	Hall, Mo.	McKaig,	Stevens,
Clark, Mo.	Hammond,	McKeighan,	Stockdale,
Cobb, Ala.	Harter,	McMillin,	Stone, W. A.
Cockrell,	Hartman,	Meredith,	Sweet,
Cogswell,	Haugen,	Milliken,	Tarsney,
Cooper, Fla.	Hayes,	Morse,	Tawney,
Cooper, Ind.	Heard,	Newlands,	Taylor, Tenn.

Thomas, Turpin, Tyler, Van Voorhis, N. Y.	Wadsworth, Walker, Wanger, Washington,	Waugh, Wells, Wheeler, Ala. Wheeler, Ill.	White, Whiting, Wilson, Wash. Wright, Pa.
--	---	--	--

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that my colleague, Mr. COBB, has been called to the Post-Office Department on business.

The roll call being completed, the committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, reported that that committee having had under consideration a bill (H. R. 6937) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and having found itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called and now reported the names of the absentees to the House.

The SPEAKER. The names will be entered on the Journal. One hundred and eighty-two gentleman have answered to their names. The committee will resume its session.

The committee accordingly resumed its session, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, and the tellers will resume their places. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 26, noes 116.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order for me to withdraw the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can withdraw it by unanimous consent.

Mr. RAY. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 6937) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

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

To Mr. WHITING, for this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CUMMINGS, for three days, on account of sickness in his family.

The House then, on motion of Mr. HATCH (at 5 o'clock p. m.), adjourned.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

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

By Mr. OUTHWAITE, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (S. 1526) for the relief of Henry Halteman. (Report No. 905.)

By Mr. HOUK, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 3003) to grant relief to Thomas L. Higgins. (Report No. 906.)

#### PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 7106) to establish a bureau of public health within the Department of the Interior of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FIELDER (by request): A bill (H. R. 7107) for the protection of the property of passengers carried in sleeping cars and limiting the responsibility for the same of individuals or corporations owning or operating said cars, and fixing a penalty for the violation of the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 7108) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRESHAM: A bill (H. R. 7109) to establish a lighthouse and a range light at the entrance to Galveston Harbor, in the county of Galveston, in the State of Texas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PENCE: A bill (H. R. 7110) to provide for coinage at the branch mint at Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

#### PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CONN: A bill (H. R. 7111) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of John F. Kelley—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7112) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Andrew Matheny—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7113) granting a pension to Cora L. Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 7114) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob K. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7115) for the relief of Jacob S. Fritts, of Emory Gap, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7116) for the relief of Jacob Henry, of Maryville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7117) for the relief of Henry T. Cox, of Louisville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEKLEJOHN: A bill (H. R. 7118) to relieve Isaac C. Biglow of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 7119) granting a pension to Anna Bell Wyvill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7120) for the relief of the estate of Josiah J. Bryan, deceased, late of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7121) for the relief of O. H. P. Wayne, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Petition of H. Hulman and others, of Terre Haute, Ind., favoring the passage of House bill 5294, to regulate the mode of removal of letter-carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CARUTH: Papers to accompany House bill 7100, for the relief of the estate of S. H. Patterson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of 4 citizens of Brooklyn, in favor of House bill 6840—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Letters from W. J. Mundt, of Garner; John Edge, jr., of Dakota City, and S. K. Winne, of Humboldt, all of Iowa, protesting against the income tax as applied to building and loan associations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of E. A. Donohoe, editor of Havelock Item, and F. M. Linehan, editor, Thompson, Iowa, against any increase in postage on second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition from Baton, Iowa, in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRADY: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Alexander McArthur, of Cumberland County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 50 citizens of Grant, Pa., asking the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of Farlington, Kans., against the Wilson bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of people of Chetopa, Kans., for change in the preamble of the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions by the Dickinson County farmers, protesting against the retiring on full pay of Judge Foster, of the district of Kansas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Galena, Hepler, Perry, and Chetopa, in the interest of fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 35 farmers and citizens of Fair View, Kans., for the issue of more money by the Government and for a fair hearing of Coxey's commonwealth army—to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of E. I. Tator, R. C. Friend, Frank Armstrong, and 420 other citizens of Webb County, Mo., protesting against treatment of J. S. Coxey—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OGDEN: Resolution of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, indorsing the Cotton States and International Exposition at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANDALL: Protest of the Boston Marine Society, against the passage of House bills 5501, 5502, 5503, 5504, 5505, and 5506—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDS: Petition of citizens of Sandyville, Ohio, against reduction of postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Michigan: Petition of the Grand Rapids Brush Company and 115 employes, of Grand Rapids, Mich., relative to the employment of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a resolution of Harmony Assembly, Knights of Labor, of Holland, Mich., indorsing the Coxey movement—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions by the Stephens Assembly, No. 3526, Knights of Labor, of Grand Rapids, Mich., against any removal of restrictions placed on Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Protest from citizens of Connecticut against income tax of Wilson tariff bill, as applied to national building and loan associations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW: Petition of F. B. Waste, F. A. Kellom, and 84 others, citizens of town of Mondovi, Buffalo County, Wis., in favor of the enactment of a Federal statute to enable States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of John M. Tessier, of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of Council No. 826, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Grand Valley, Pa., in favor of House bill 5246, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STORER: Memorial of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the discontinuance of Statistical Bureau in the Agricultural Department—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions (renewed) of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 62 citizens of Hamilton County, Ohio, protesting against the taxing of incomes of building and loan associations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. J. Smith and 37 others, citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Union Corners, in favor of an amendment of the laws of 1884, whereby the study of physiology and hygiene is made mandatory in all schools supported by public money or under State control—to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 17, 1894.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

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

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of December 20, 1893, a report of the Second Comptroller of the Treasury relative to certain Treasury statements heretofore certified to Congress for appropriations, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, for the information of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, a copy of a letter from the Superintendent of the Military Academy of the 15th instant, calling attention to an amendment as reported to the Senate of the item for continuing the construction of one new reservoir, and recommending that the item be restored to the shape in which it passed the House of Representatives; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry business firms of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against an increase of the internal-revenue tax on distilled spirits; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Corset Manufacturers' Association of the United States, remonstrating against an increase of the duty on horn strips; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Egbert C. Smyth, D. D., president of the Andover Theological Seminary, of Andover, Mass., and other members of the faculty and officers of that institution, praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Grange No. 23, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dalton, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called Hill oleomargarine bill 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.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Thomas J. Packard, rector, and 29 other members of Christ and St. John's Churches, of West River, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the lottery traffic; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Edward F. Fay and 69 other citizens of Boston, Mass., praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of certain remedial amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. IRBY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Columbia, S. C., 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. TELLER. I present the memorial of Hon. John Evans, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against the consolidation of other railroad lines with the Union Pacific. As this is a very important paper, I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of the Hooper Building and Loan Association, of Hooper, Nebr., praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of J. F. Downing and 52 other citizens of Erie County, Pa., and the petition of Charles Corkhill and 43 other citizens of Berks County, Pa., praying that building and loan associations, national and local, be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 352) to enable the people of Utah to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

### TRADE REGULATIONS WITH THE NEW HEBRIDES.

Mr. TURPIE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred certain memorials which were presented to the Senate and referred to that committee upon the subject of the traffic by Europeans and Americans in firearms and intoxicants with the natives of the New Hebrides Islands, in the South Pacific, to report the resolution which I send to the desk, and recommend its adoption. A written report accompanies the resolution. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to enter into negotiations with those European powers whose citizens and subjects are engaged in commerce with the natives of the New Hebrides, with a view of establishing with them joint treaty regulations for the prohibition of the sale of firearms and intoxicants to the natives of said islands.

### ADVANCES TO PUBLIC PRINTER.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7072) to amend section 3816 of the Revised Statutes, relating to advances made to the Public Printer, to report it without amendment, and to submit a report thereon. As it is a very important matter for the Government Printing Office, I ask that the bill be now considered. Let it be read for information.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3816 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to read that "There shall be advanced to the Public Printer, from time to time, as the public service may require it, and under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, a sum of money not exceeding at any time four-fifths of the penalty of his bond, to enable him to pay for work and material."

Mr. MANDERSON. The amount of the bond of the Public Printer is \$100,000. Under the existing law there is permitted