

The SECRETARY. In line 21, after the word "payable," it is proposed to strike out "quarterly" and insert "monthly."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, in section II, line 33, after the words "allowance for," to strike out "clerical assistance and;" and in line 35, after the words "sum of," to strike out "2,000" and insert "500;" so as to read:

The court shall regulate from time to time the fees to be charged by the said clerk, which shall be accounted for at least once in each quarter, and paid into the Treasury of the United States, and said clerk shall receive such allowance for necessary expenditures in the conduct of his office as the court may determine by special or general order in the premises, but not to exceed the sum of \$500 in any one year, payable as aforesaid at the Treasury of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HARRIS. Before the passage of the bill—for I do not wish to interfere with other recognitions—I want to give notice that, so soon as two or three other Senators who have already asked for recognition have been recognized, I shall object, thin as the Senate is, to the further consideration of bills this evening.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, Mr. COKE, and Mr. VILAS were appointed.

HEIRS OF MRS. COURTNEY ANN CLAIBORNE.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2857) to confirm to the heirs of Mrs. Courtney Ann Claiborne the title to a certain tract of land in the State of Louisiana.

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.

The preamble was agreed to.

COLLECTION DISTRICT OF HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1835) to amend an act approved September 23, 1890, extending the limits of the collection district of Hartford, Conn.

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

Mr. HAWLEY. If there is any explanation required, I will say, as there is no written report accompanying the bill, I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury approving its passage, which is based upon the report of Special Agent Cummings, of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am not going to read the letter. The Treasury Department recommend the passage of the bill, and it will effect a saving of \$2,500 annually.

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

MRS. LEVENIA D. ATHON.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 1391) granting a pension to Mrs. Levenia D. Athon.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Levenia D. Athon, widow of Dr. James S. Athon, deceased, of Indianapolis, Ind., late a volunteer surgeon in the service of the United States during the war of 1861, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1894, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 21, 1894.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal of Saturday's proceedings will be read by the Secretary.

Mr. MANDERSON. I suggest that less than one-fifth of the Senate is present. There is no quorum here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Allen,	Frye,	Mitchell, Oregon	Roach,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Wis.	Sherman,
Berry,	George,	Murphy,	Vest,
Butler,	Hale,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Call,	Harris,	Peffer,	Walsh,
Chandler,	Jones, Ark.	Perkins,	White.
Cockrell,	Kyle,	Platt,	
Daniel,	Manderson,	Pugh,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Thirty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the names of the absentees be called.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The names of the absent Senators will be called.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. PALMER and Mr. TELLER answered to their names.

Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. ALLISON, Mr. POWER, and Mr. DUBOIS entered the Chamber, and answered to their names.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is no quorum present.

Mr. HARRIS. There is but one thing to do, and that is to direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators. I move that he be so requested.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Sergeant-at-Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. VILAS, Mr. McLAURIN, Mr. HUNTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LINDSAY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. GRAY entered the Chamber, and answered to their names.

The VICE-PRESIDENT (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes a. m.). Forty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HARRIS. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Journal will be read.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of Queen City Lodge, No. 162, International Association of Machinists, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the governmental control of the telegraph service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of 123 holders of life insurance policies, of Ross County; of 132 holders of life insurance policies of Summit County, and of 82 holders of life insurance policies, of Belmont County, all in the State of Ohio, praying that mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of J. J. Finley and 43 other citizens of Florida, holders of life insurance policies, praying that in the passage of any law providing for the taxation of incomes, the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from taxation; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Volun-town and Sterling, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brinkley, Wynne, and Forest City, all in the State of Arkansas, praying that the Wilson tariff bill be so amended as to exempt such building and loan associations as make loans exclusively in the State in which they were originally organized from paying a tax on incomes and dividends; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BUTLER presented a petition of the city council of Greenville, S. C., praying that an appropriation be made for a national exhibit at the Cotton States and International Exposition to be held at Atlanta, Ga., in the fall of 1895; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VOORHEES presented additional papers to accompany the petition of Edward Lautenschlager, late private Company H, Seventh United States Infantry, praying to be compensated for imprisonment in the Kansas State penitentiary for a period of five days during the month of November, 1887; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6123) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River, at the foot of Dickson street, in the borough of Homestead, in the State of Pennsylvania, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5645) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county, reported it with amendments.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 11th instant, relative to the duties of the joint commission to inquire into and examine the status of the laws organizing the Executive Departments, submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and be printed; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2038) for the relief of Oklahoma settlers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 2039) granting increase of pension to Stephen C. Monroe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2040) granting a pension to John B. Lowther; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a bill (S. 2041) for the relief of De Witt Putnam; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin submitted sundry 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. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The bill (S. 1096) making a judgment a lien on all real estate or interest therein of the debtor in the District of Columbia was announced as first in order on the Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not believe in that bill at all; and certainly it ought not to be considered in the morning hour. The bill proposes to make a judgment a lien on every title to land, and also provides that the right shall attach to subsequently acquired property long after the debt has accrued. I do not think such a provision is contained in any statute in the United States. I hope the bill will go to the other Calendar under Rule IX.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There being objection, the bill will go over under the rule.

PEARSON C. MONTGOMERY.

The bill (S. 61) for the relief of Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn., \$3,200, in full compensation for all claims connected with the steamer New National, and its use, while in the United States, upon the Mississippi River and its tributaries, prior to the 21st day of March, 1863.

Mr. PLATT. Let the report be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. PASCO from the Committee on Claims, January 26, 1894.

Mr. PASCO. I think some time would be saved by reading short extracts from the report which will present the whole case.

Mr. PLATT. Let the Senator from Florida make an explanation of the bill so that we can understand it.

Mr. PASCO. The bill has passed the Senate in each Congress since I have been here, and it is now unanimously reported by the Committee on Claims. Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn., was the owner of this vessel, the New National, mentioned in the bill. She was impressed by the Confederates in the early part of the war and continued in their service up to June 6, 1862.

She was at Memphis on that day under orders from the Confederate authorities to proceed down the river. Said orders were not obeyed, but after the fight Chief Clerk Nicholas M. Johnson, under the direction of said Montgomery, as he alleges, went on board the monitor Benton and delivered the New National to Admiral Davis, and Capt. Alexander Grant, of the Navy, was immediately placed in command of her, and she entered upon the service of the United States with the full consent of said Montgomery, as he alleges.

She continued in said service from June 6, 1862, to March 20, 1863, a space of two hundred and eighty-eight days, at the expiration of which time she was turned over to said Montgomery by the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, and thereupon he chartered her for one year to Admiral Porter at the rate of \$50 a day, and for a second year at the rate of \$65 a day.

The said Montgomery now asks that he be paid at the rate of \$50 a day for the two hundred and eighty-eight days the New National was in the service of the United States, under the command of Capt. Grant, amounting to the sum of \$14,400.

The vessel was proceeded against by the United States authorities and a judgment of condemnation taken against her. The matter was appealed to the Treasury Department, and the letter from Secretary of the Treasury Chase to the Solicitor of the Treasury gives a history of the case. It is dated January 16, 1863, and is as follows:

Capt. Pearson Montgomery, master and owner of the steamer New National, seized and recently condemned in the United States district court for the southern district of Illinois, under the act of July 13, 1861, has made his petition before me for the remission of said seizure and release of the boat. The complete record in the case, together with a statement of United States District Judge Treat, and the evidence, are presented. From these it appears to my satisfaction that Capt. Montgomery was not of his own will in the rebel service with his boat, and that, so soon as he could, he escaped therefrom and voluntarily turned her over to the Federal authorities. * * * I conceive that the discretionary power conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury of mitigating or remitting forfeitures in cases of this nature should be used to extend relief to loyal persons and to lighten the hardships of the war so far as consists with the public interest.

In this view of the case, and for the reasons above stated, I feel justified in extending such relief as lies in my power to the petitioner upon the usual terms. You will accordingly please instruct the proper district attorney to dismiss said suit and further proceedings against said steamer upon these conditions, viz, that the claimant shall pay all costs of whatsoever character incurred by the seizure and judicial proceedings, together with a fee of \$100 to the United States district attorney, and agree that a certificate of probable cause of seizure shall issue from the court for the protection of the seizing officer.

That was done. Mr. Montgomery then put in a claim for the services of the vessel during all this time she had been in the hands of the court while the condemnation proceedings were pending. She continued in the possession and service of the United States Government for sometime after that. Still later, by order of Admiral Porter, a contract was made with her owner under which he received compensation for her further use. The committee have refused to grant relief for the time the vessel was in the service of the United States while the proceedings of condemnation were pending, but for the time after that, from her release until the formal entering into of the contract, they have thought that he should receive compensation. The judgment of condemnation had been set aside by Mr. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury, the proceedings had been dismissed, and the vessel was in the use of the United States officers on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, but without any agreement with her owner until after the contract made by order of Admiral Porter.

Mr. PLATT. And he obtained pay under his contract?

Mr. PASCO. He obtained pay under his contract, which was made later, but during the intervening time after the remission of the penalty and the release of the boat and before the contract the committee have thought he ought to receive compensation. During the Fiftieth Congress the claim was cut down to the present figure by refusing compensation for her use while the vessel was under seizure. As to the loyalty—

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the amount involved?

Mr. PLATT. Three thousand two hundred dollars. I think the loyalty appears from the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PASCO. The report states:

As to the loyalty of Capt. Montgomery the testimony is somewhat conflicting, but the committee are inclined to adopt the view of the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Salmon P. Chase, that Capt. Montgomery was loyal to the United States Government, and that his acts inconsistent with that were not of his own free will. It appears that as soon as the coercive acts of the Confederates were removed he voluntarily surrendered the New National to the United States.

It can not be supposed that the Secretary of the Treasury intended at the time he remitted to Capt. Montgomery the forfeiture, and requiring him to pay costs and \$100, that he was to have a claim against the Government up to that time for the use of it during the time it was in possession of the Government, and while it was in fact the property of the Government. Such a supposition is simply absurd.

That was the conclusion of the committee and they do not propose to give him compensation for that period.

The remission of the forfeiture can not have the effect of giving the right claimed in this case.

The statute of March 3, 1797, gives power to the Secretary to stay the prosecution and remit the penalty, if one has been imposed, but it goes no further. It does not confer the power to set aside or reverse the judgment. Its effect is to remit the penalty and restore the property, but the judgment and all its attendant disabilities, except those so remitted, stand, and the claimant is affected thereby.

But it appears from this case that this remission of the forfeiture was on the 16th day of January, 1863, but that the vessel remained in the use of the Government and was not surrendered to the claimant till the 20th day of March following, a period of sixty-two days. It does not distinctly appear where the boat was during this time. It does not appear but that the Government had the use of it during this time. The claimant alleges that it had, and the evidence tends strongly to show it. This point does not seem to have been considered at all by either the Third Auditor or the Comptroller of the Treasury.

The committee think it would be just that the claimant should be paid for the use of the boat during this time. After the 20th of March, when the boat came into the possession of Capt. Montgomery, the Government paid him \$50 a day for the first year, and \$65 per day for its use thereafter.

With reference to the use of the boat by the Government during the time covered by this report the committee finds the evidence stronger than the former report suggests. A letter from Admiral Porter, dated March 14, 1884, which is in the record, settles this question upon an authority which may safely be accepted as conclusive. The following extract is taken from this letter:

"I certify that when I assumed command of the Mississippi Squadron, in September, 1862, I found the New National and several other steamers of a similar class running on the Mississippi River and its tributaries in the employ of the Government.

"Owing to the fact that I was called upon to assume active operations against Vicksburg, and had to proceed in person to that point, I was unable to ascertain under what circumstances these vessels were employed, and did not know until March, 1863, that they were not chartered by the Government.

"The New National was, I understood, entitled by an arrangement with Flag Officer Davis to a compensation of \$50 per day, which the owners claim they never received. As this seemed a reasonable compensation, and the employment of the vessel without a charter an irregularity which I thought should not exist, I entered into a charter with the owner on the 21st of March, 1863, agreeing to pay him \$50 a day for the vessel for the period of one year."

The period covered by Admiral Porter's letter from September, 1862, to March 21, 1863, includes the time that the committee's report allows the claimant compensation for the use of his vessel.

I think there can be no doubt that for this period, sixty-two days, he is entitled to compensation. That was the conclusion of the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. The most important part of the report is on page 4, where Admiral Porter says he chartered the vessel at \$50 a day, which is what the committee allowed.

Mr. PASCO. That was at a later period.

Mr. PLATT. He got pay for that.

Mr. PASCO. That date was the 20th of March, 1863. The vessel was surrendered to Montgomery, or at least the order of surrender was made, on the 16th of January, 1863, and she remained in the service of the Government until the 20th of March, when the contract was made.

Mr. PLATT. I do not make any objection to this claim. The Secretary of the Treasury seems to have considered the question of the loyalty of the claimant, and afterwards the Government chartered the vessel. It is only proposed to pay for the time the vessel was in the Government service before the charter.

Mr. PASCO. Prior to the time when the formal charter was given.

Mr. BATE. Admiral Porter regarded him as a loyal citizen.

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

FLORIDA JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

The bill (H. R. 51) to change the boundaries of the judicial districts of the State of Florida was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that bill is to be proceeded with it will call for a great deal of discussion. I therefore ask that it may go over without prejudice.

Mr. PASCO. I ask that the attention of my colleague [Mr. CALL] may be called to the bill. He may have some request to make in regard to it.

Mr. MANDERSON. It has been objected to.

Mr. CALL. I understand we are proceeding under the rule which requires unobjected cases to be considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is correct. The Senate is proceeding with the Calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. CALL. Otherwise I should move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PASCO. One objection is sufficient to carry it over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. One objection takes it over.

Mr. PASCO. It is a mere local matter and ought to be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

INDIAN LANDS IN NEBRASKA AND KANSAS.

The bill (S. 1467) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the remainder of the reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouri Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1881, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if any member of the said confederated tribes residing at the date of the aforesaid act of March 3, 1881, and whose names appear upon the schedule of appraisement made by the commissioners appointed under the provisions of the act aforesaid, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior April 17, 1883, upon any of the lands authorized to be sold by said act shall make application for allotments of land the Secretary of the Interior shall cause a patent to issue to such person or his or her heirs who may be residing upon said lands at the date hereof, for the subdivision tract or tracts of land (not exceeding 160 acres of land to any one person) reported on the commissioners' schedule aforesaid as having been improved by such person: *Provided*, That the lands acquired by any Indian under the provisions of this act shall not be subject to alienation, lease, or incumbrance, either by voluntary conveyance by the grantee or his heirs, or by the judgment, order, or decree of any court, or subject to taxation of any character, but shall remain inalienable and not subject to taxation, lien, or incumbrance for the period of ten years, which restriction shall be incorporated in the patent.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the necessity for this measure?

Mr. MANDERSON. It is recommended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in order to reach the case of Indians who were not allotted under the former law, but who were living upon the lands and had been living on them for about twenty years and had improved them. It is to correct a very manifest injustice to some eight or ten Indians, some of them half bloods, some of them full bloods, that occurred under the former act.

Mr. COCKRELL. They did not apply for allotments?

Mr. MANDERSON. They did not apply. The Indian Office has been making this effort for a number of years. A similar bill passed the Senate at a former Congress.

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

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the bill which has just been passed a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior, showing the necessity for the passage of the bill, so that when the bill goes elsewhere it may be accessible.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, April 19, 1892.

SIR: I am in receipt of a letter, dated March 21, 1892, from Mary J. Barnes, Barneston, Nebr., stating that she is a duly recognized member of the Otoe and Missouri tribe of Indians, and that she applies for allotments of land for herself and each of three sons, under the act of Congress providing for the allotment of lands in severalty to the members of the different tribes of Indians in the United States; that the land for which application is made is embraced within the original reservation of the Otoe and Missouri tribe of Indians, situated in Nebraska and Kansas, and is described as follows:

For herself, Mary J. Barnes, the east half of the northeast quarter of sec. 36, T. 1 N., R. 7 E., and the west half of the northwest quarter of sec. 31, T. 1 N., R. 8 E.; for her son, F. H. Barnes, the northeast quarter of sec. 24, T. 1 N., R. 7 E.; for her son, William D. Barnes, the southeast quarter of sec. 19, T. 1 N., R. 8 W.; and to her son, Emmet F. Barnes, the east half of the northeast quarter of sec. 2 and the west half of the northwest quarter of sec. 1, T. 1 S., R. 7 E.

Mrs. Barnes further states that the land requested for herself has been her home residence for twenty-five years and is in a high state of cultivation, having valuable improvements; that the several tracts requested for her sons have been the permanent homes of themselves and families for a number of years, and are each in a good state of cultivation and well improved; that the above-described tracts were all withheld by order of the Secretary of the Interior from the sale of the Otoe and Missouri Reservation lands sold under the act of 1881; that none of tracts of land heretofore mentioned have ever, since said general sale nor before, been sold, and they have always been in applicant's possession by occupation.

By telephonic message of the 2d instant Senator Paddock stated that these applicants are his neighbors and friends and asked immediate action in the matter. In view of the fact that the rights or claims of other Indians of this class may be affected by the action hereinafter recommended, a brief history of the case is submitted for your information, as follows:

By the treaty of March 15, 1854, the confederated tribes of Otoe and Missouri Indians ceded to the United States all their country west of the Missouri River, excepting a strip of land on the waters of the Big Blue River, 10 miles in width and bounded as described in Article I of said treaty; in consideration of which the United States agreed to pay said Indians certain sums of money as set forth in Article IV thereof.

Article VI of said treaty provided that—

"The President may, from time to time, * * * cause the whole of the lands herein reserved or appropriated west of the Big Blue River to be surveyed off into lots, and assign to such Indian or Indians of such confederated tribes as are willing to avail of the privilege, and who will locate on the same as a permanent home. If a single person over 21 years of age, one-eighth of a section; to each family of two, one-quarter section; to each family of three and not exceeding five, one-half section; to each family of six and not exceeding ten, one section, and to each family exceeding ten in number, one-quarter section for every additional five members. * * * And the President may, * * * after such person or family has made a location on the land assigned for a permanent home, issue a patent to such person or family for such assigned land, under the restrictions specified in said article."

By office letter to the Department dated December 9, 1875, upon the application of Mary J. Barnes, received on the same date, it was recommended for reasons stated that, without reference to Article VI of the treaty aforesaid, this office be authorized, under the general relation existing between the Department and the Indians as wards of the Government, to direct the agent of the Otoes to assign to each Indian family prepared to enter upon agricultural life a tract of land not exceeding 80 acres, to be included in each case within the established lines of survey, except in cases where individual heads of families have already improved a quantity of land exceeding 40 acres, such family may be allotted 160 acres.

By Department letter of December 15, 1875, the foregoing recommendation was approved and authority granted to carry the same into effect.

By office letter dated December 23, 1875, United States Indian Agent J. W. Griest, Otoe Agency, was instructed to assign to each head of a family or single person over the age of 21 years, belonging to the Otoe and Missouri tribes, who shall manifest a desire to enter upon and pursue an agricultural life, a quantity of land within the limits of their reservation set apart by the treaty of 1854 aforesaid equal to 80 acres in extent, to be governed in each instance by the established lines of the public surveys. In cases, however, where the head of the family has already given evidence of industry and thrift by having in cultivation more than 40 acres, such head of a family will be assigned a quantity of land equal in extent to 160 acres.

By letter dated August 23, 1876, United States Indian Agent J. W. Griest requested a certificate of allotment to Mary J. Barnes, a member of the tribe with five minor children, for the west half of the northwest quarter of section 36, township 1, range 7 east, containing 160 acres, the same being fenced and improved with good dwelling house and 85 acres broken and in cultivation.

The act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stats., 208), provides that, with the consent of the Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cause to be surveyed and appraised the reservation of said Indians lying in the States of Kansas and Nebraska, and to offer 120,000 acres from the western side of the same for sale, through the United States land office at Beatrice, Nebr., for cash to actual settlers only, in tracts not exceeding 160 acres to each purchaser, the proceeds of said sale to be placed to the credit of said Indians in the Treasury of the United States.

The consent of said Indians was given December 23, 1876. The act of March 3, 1881 (21 Stats., 380), provided that, with the consent of the Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cause to be surveyed and sold the remainder of the reservation of said Indians lying in the States of Kansas and Nebraska; that the proceeds of the sale of said lands shall be placed to the credit of said Indians in the Treasury of the United States and bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum; and that the Secretary of the Interior may, with the consent of the Indians, secure their reservation lands upon which to locate said Indians, cause their removal thereto, and expend such sum as may be necessary for their comfort and advancement in civilization.

The consent of said Indians was given May 4, 1881. It will be observed that by the acts of 1880 and 1881 aforesaid the Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians agreed to the sale of all their lands and made no provisions for allotments to those members of the tribe who had elected to remain under the provisions of the treaty of 1854.

By office letter dated December 20, 1881, attention was invited to the fact that the act of March 3, 1881, failed to provide any protection for those members of the tribe who had, in good faith, made selection and location of lands on their reservation, placed valuable improvements thereon, and desired to remain in the enjoyment of them. With said letter a draft of a bill providing for such amendment of said act as the necessities of the case seemed to demand was submitted.

A bill intended to meet the foregoing passed the Senate March 21, 1882, but failed to become a law.

By letter dated April 14, 1883, this office transmitted the report of the commissioners appointed to appraise the Otoe and Missouri lands in Nebraska and Kansas, under the act approved March 3, 1881, entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the remainder of the reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes," (21 Stats., 380), and the act (sundry civil) approved August 7, 1882 (22 Stats., 323), submitting schedules of appraisement, separately describing the tracts appraised, and the valuation of each tract as determined by them. It was recommended in said letter that said appraisement be approved and that the Commissioner of the General Land Office be directed to proceed with the sale in accordance with the provisions of existing law withholding, however, from entry and sale the subdivisional tracts upon which improvements are found belonging to Indians as reported by the appraisers in their schedule of appraisement.

By letter dated April 17, 1883, the Department returned to this office the original appraisement of the commissioners and also transmitted copy of letter of same date to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, approving said appraisement and directing that the subdivisional tracts upon which improvements are found belonging to Indians, as reported by the appraisers in their schedule of appraisement, be reserved from sale and that the other lands be sold in accordance with the law.

The said schedule of appraisement shows improvements by said Indians as follows:

"*Edward Devoin*.—The SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 31, T. 2 N., R. 8, containing 36.10 acres, 3.90 acres being deducted for right of way of the Republican Valley Railway.

"*William M. Barnes*.—The S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 19, T. 1 N., R. 8, containing 80 acres.

"*Otoe Sam*.—The NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 20, T. 1 N., R. 8, containing 40 acres.

"*Charles A. Dripps*.—The S. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 21, T. 1 N., R. 8, containing 80 acres.

"*Mary J. Barnes*.—The W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 31, T. 1 N., R. 8, 79.62 acres.

"*Fred Barnes*.—The NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 24, T. 1 N., R. 7, containing 34.37 acres, 5.63 acres being deducted for right of way for Oregon and Republican Valley Railway.

"*John Mus-ka-ga-ha*.—The SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 24, T. 1 N., R. 7, containing 6.63 acres, 3.37 acres being deducted for right of way for Oregon and Republican Valley Railway.

"*Batiste Devoin*.—The NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 25, T. 1 N., R. 7, containing 37.44 acres, 2.56 acres being deducted for right of way for Oregon and Republican Valley Railway.

"*Mary J. Barnes*.—The E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of NE. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 36, T. 1 N., R. 7, containing 80 acres.

"*Emmett Barnes*.—The NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the NW. $\frac{1}{4}$ of sec. 1, T. 1 S., R. 7, containing 40 acres."

Upon this showing it would appear that good faith and justice entitles Mrs. Mary J. Barnes, the applicant in this case, to a formal allotment of the land applied for by her, and which said land is the same as that reported by the appraisers as improved and occupied by her. She can not get a patent for this land under the existing laws relating to the Otoe and Missouri Indians nor under the general allotment act.

I have, therefore, the honor to submit herewith a draft of a bill providing for such amendment of the act of 1881 as the necessities of the case seem to demand.

Attention is invited to the fact that the applicants for these allotments have apparently been in possession of the lands applied for since the date of the act authorizing their sale (1881), and as they are public lands the occupants have been presumably exempt from taxation during this period. I therefore doubt the wisdom of recommending that these lands be allotted, with the usual restrictions as to alienation and taxation, for twenty-five years, and have accordingly left blank in said draft of bill the period of time for which such restriction should be incorporated in the patent.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

T. J. MORGAN, *Commissioner*.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 443) to provide for the sale of new tickets by the street railway companies of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 6770) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange, in behalf of the United States, deeds of land with the Pemaquid Land Company, of Maine, in settlement of a disputed boundary of the Pemaquid Point (Maine) light station.

THE REVENUE BILL.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4864.

Mr. COCKRELL. Under the order of the Senate that bill will be laid before the Senate without any motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the opinion of the Chair a motion is necessary. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to, and 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 be resumed.

The Secretary read paragraph 84 as amended, as follows:

84. China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, including plaques, ornaments, toys, charms, vases, and statuettes, plain white, and not decorated in any manner, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire to have these paragraphs passed over this morning as the information which I desire in regard to these items has not yet been received from the printer, and I suggest that we go on with the metal schedule.

Mr. VEST. If it is a source of any serious inconvenience to the Senator, as a matter of course, we have no objection to passing the paragraphs over; but he can very well understand—for he has had considerable experience in the preparation and management of tariff bills—that that is not exactly the way in which we should like to proceed with the bill. We should like to finish one schedule, if we can, before taking up another. This matter has passed over now for two days.

Mr. ALDRICH. It has been passed over quite as much for the convenience of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber as for my convenience. They had not agreed upon the rates in the glass schedule until a very late hour on Saturday afternoon, so that I can not be charged with having delayed that part of the schedule. It would be a matter of inconvenience for me to go on with this subject this morning because the bulletins I want have not yet been received from the printer. We were assured on Saturday that they would be here this morning, but they have not come yet.

Mr. VEST. Very good. If the request of the Senator is placed on that ground, let the paragraphs which have been heretofore passed over be passed over again for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary read as follows:

SCHEDULE C.—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—IRON AND STEEL.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment under the above heading, on page 21, after line 2, to insert:

109 $\frac{1}{2}$. Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, also the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 40 cents per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the political campaigns for the last six years in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and the other New England States have been carried on by tariff reformers in behalf of the doctrine of free raw material. The people there have been assured, not only by the leading tariff reformers, orators, and newspapers of New England that Democratic success meant the removal of the duties from all materials used by manufacturers, but leading Democratic orators from outside of New England have visited that section of

the country whenever an election was pending and have taken great pains to assure our people that if the Democratic party should succeed the enormous rates which had been imposed upon iron and steel for the benefit of the ironmasters of Pennsylvania would be removed and that New England would be able to buy pig iron and the various other products of iron at a very much less rate, owing to the removal of these duties.

The distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who is not now in his seat, visited New England three years ago and made an extended campaign, taking for the text of all his speeches "free raw material." He said to the people there, "Wait until the Democratic party gets into power, and we will give you free coal, free iron ore, free pig iron, free wool, and all the materials which enter into your manufactures, and you will enter at once upon a new era of prosperity." He said in express terms, "We keep our pledges, and whenever we are restored to power, if we ever shall be, we will give you free coal and free iron ore and free pig iron." The distinguished Senator from Texas went a great deal further than that, and said, "I favor free bar iron;" and he also said he favored the placing of other things upon the free list which I do not now recall.

If any Congressional district in New England has been carried, if the electoral vote of any State of New England has been cast for the Democratic party or for their nominees, it has been upon the distinct idea and theory that that party was in favor of free raw material, and especially in favor of free coal and free iron ore.

The Democratic party in New England have no Democratic Senator or member of this body; there is no one here to speak in their behalf upon this side of the Chamber from a political standpoint, and there seems to be not a single man upon the other side to speak in their interests, their behalf, when this question of free raw materials is under discussion, and the distinguished Senator from Texas is not in his seat when the question of free iron ore is under discussion. What has become of the promises of the Senator from Texas to the people of New England in regard to free iron ore, made repeatedly from every stump in the various States of New England?

I am not commissioned by the Democrats of New England to speak in their behalf, but I know that the people of that section of the country have been deluded, some of them, into voting the Democratic ticket under these promises, and I feel bound to present to the Senate at least the view which these gentlemen have upon these questions.

I hold in my hand a communication of the Young Men's Democratic Club of Massachusetts, the leading Democratic organization of that State. I regret that neither of the Massachusetts Senators is now present, as I should be very glad to inquire as to the organization of this club. I know, however, it is the controlling Democratic organization in the State of Massachusetts, and that the men in it control the policy and suggest the nominees of the party. This is a communication sent to the Committee on Finance within the last two or three weeks, and it shows that at least the Democratic party in Massachusetts, through its representatives, has not abandoned the policy of the platform upon which it has been conducting its campaigns. This organization says:

We respectfully and earnestly call your attention to the unfortunate position in which the enactment of the proposed iron schedule of the Wilson bill will leave the Democratic party in New England. A leading reason for supporting the Democratic party urged by all Democratic speakers in New England throughout the campaigns of the last five years was, that by its return to power there would be secured a repeal of the prohibitory duties upon pig iron, scrap iron, and coal; which duties had compelled the people of New England (after a long and costly struggle under the tyrannical law) to surrender to Pennsylvania the right of manufacturing the goods which they themselves consumed.

No other issue was more prominently, or even as prominently, forced upon the attention of the voters in all those campaigns; and there was no other complaint considered by the whole Democratic party to be more fully warranted.

The duty imposed in the Wilson bill upon pig iron is a prohibitory duty, and it is also an excessive duty as compared with the duties imposed upon the manufactured products of iron. The duty imposed upon scrap iron, which is a waste material, is also too high, and is, as we think, unjustifiable.

If these duties are retained, the Democratic party can not claim to have redeemed their pledges to the people of New England, or to have carried out the principles laid down in their platforms; Democrats will not be able to claim that they have bettered in this respect the conditions maintained by the McKinley act, and must expect results injurious to their party here and in the whole country.

We inclose herewith a statement prepared by an iron manufacturer who is in full sympathy with the Democratic party, giving details and statistics. We also earnestly invite your attention to two papers entitled "Iron in New England," containing statistics collected by Mr. T. Aubrey Byrne, special employé of the Treasury Department, forwarded to the Committee on Ways and Means, but not printed by the Public Printer in time for convenient consideration by that committee. Mr. Henry Talbot, clerk of that committee, has the papers in charge, and will, doubtless, hand them to you upon application.

Here follows a statement to which I shall be glad to have the attention of Democratic Senators:

We note with regret, and almost with dismay, intimations in the papers of the possibility of the continuance of a duty, greater or less, on coal and

iron ore. While we hope that the reports may be based upon the imaginings of newspaper reporters, and not upon facts, we feel it incumbent upon us to protest earnestly against any such action. If there is any such thing as raw material, certainly coal stands at the head of the list of these articles, and there is no article on which a duty is less defensible. If a duty is put upon it, how can faith or credence for a Democratic platform ever be secured again?

I repeat that sentence, that Senators on the other side may have its full force and effect. Here is what the leading Democratic organization in the State of Massachusetts, speaking to their fellow-Democrats forming the majority of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, says:

If a duty is put upon it [coal] how can faith or credence for a Democratic platform ever be secured again?

The paper continues:

Not only because the Democratic platforms and pledges to the people call for it, but because honesty and justice also demand it.

Mr. PLATT. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am reading from a communication of the Young Men's Democratic Club of Massachusetts, directed to the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Is it found in any of these bulletins?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is found in a bulletin which ought to have been on our tables this morning, but it is not here. I hope it will be here before night.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator, then, is reading from the proof sheets?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am reading from the printed proof sheets, which I succeeded in getting this morning in advance.

and because the future success of the movement toward lower duties depends upon the satisfactory operation of the tariff which shall now be enacted we earnestly urge that the Committee on Finance shall report a bill in which coal and iron ore shall be free, scrap iron (carefully defined, as it is not in the present law) shall be free, and pig iron shall be subject to a duty not exceeding 5 per cent, which is the highest duty upon pig iron that can be imposed for the purpose of revenue; for any higher duty is for the most part a duty for prohibition and not for revenue.

I have had frequent occasion in the last few days to call attention to the inequalities and anomalies of this bill and to the fact that in its preparation every theory and every doctrine which the Democratic party has advocated in the past has been abandoned. Can there be a more striking illustration than the statement which I read from the leading Democratic authority in the State of Massachusetts. Not only in the State of Massachusetts, but wherever there was an intelligent tariff reformer in the United States, from the President of the United States down to the most humble member of the party, this doctrine of free raw material has been not only advocated, but has been made the basis of the whole structure of tariff reform; yet upon the first occasion that the Democratic party has had an opportunity to prepare a tariff bill, this doctrine and all that it implies is deliberately abandoned.

The iron people of New England have been told by Democrats that, if they succeeded, this duty should be removed. A large number of the iron manufacturers in Massachusetts and Rhode Island signed a petition, which was presented to Congress three years ago, asking for this removal upon the ground that it would give to them and their employes greater prosperity. How do you, gentlemen, propose to answer that appeal? How do you propose to carry out the pledges made in your behalf by the distinguished Senator from Texas and by all the other Democratic reformers and tariff reformers? The great tariff-reform newspaper of New England, the Boston Herald, has filled its columns for years with appeals to the people of New England that their real interests lay with the Democratic party and with the policy which they had deliberately adopted as their policy in regard to the duties levied upon materials of manufacture.

As I have already said, if a Democratic member of Congress had been elected in New England for the past ten years, if a Democratic governor had been elected in any of those States, if any of those States have cast their electoral votes for the Democratic ticket it has been upon the distinct idea and promise that these materials were to be made free.

The statement appended to this rather remarkable appeal of this leading Democratic organization of Massachusetts is so intelligent and so pertinent and has such application to this and the next paragraph that I feel justified in asking the attention of the Senate to its reading. I shall be very glad, however, if the courtesy of my friends upon the other side will permit it, to have it read by the Secretary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATEMENT.

The articles dealt with in the iron and steel schedule of the Wilson bill are three, to wit, iron ore, crude iron, and, as a group, steel and the manufactures of iron and steel.

Of great importance to the ironworkers is the proposed removal of duty from an article—coal—not included in the schedule.

The effect of this removal is not a matter for long remark. It will, undeniably, be a benefit to every man in New England who uses light, heat, or power; and this benefit will accrue, as soon as the goods are put upon the market, in proper supply and cost.

The removal of the duty upon iron ore will cheapen the cost of Bessemer iron in New England, but it will not cause iron ore to be smelted in New England, nor will it materially assist the iron manufacturers of New England in their efforts to supply the consumers of New England with the manufactures of iron and steel. This fact was distinctly outlined in the petition of the 600 iron manufacturers to the Fifty-first Congress.

In Nova Scotia and, measurably, in Great Britain, coal, iron ore, and lime stone lie almost contiguously to each other. They should be smelted where they are already collected together by nature.

To build a \$300,000 furnace in order to bring to it 4 tons of crude material for the manufacture of each ton of iron, involving a freight cost more than twice as great as the whole labor cost of each ton of product from the collected material, is not an operation likely to commend itself to the capitalist.

If iron ore is made free it is only the Bessemer ores that will be imported. By this importation into Eastern Pennsylvania Bessemer pig iron (but not forge or foundry pig iron) will there be more cheaply made than it is now, and, as a consequence, Bessemer pig iron, thence transported into New England, will be cheaper than now in New England. But in consequence of the cost of freight and hauling, pig iron of all kinds will, under the proposed continuance of a prohibitory tariff, be kept more costly in New England than it will be in Pennsylvania, and the steel works, mills, foundries, and forges of Pennsylvania will be continued in unjust possession of the privilege of doing the steel-making and iron and steel manufacturing pertaining to articles consumed in New England.

Nothing but substantially free pig iron and scrap iron will restore to New England the right and power of doing her own steel-making and iron manufacturing. And it is in this respect that the Wilson bill falls far short of the just demands of the New England people; for it imposes a duty of 22½ per cent upon these basic articles, and it thus continues the oppression of the old tariffs. While it removes about two-thirds of the former mountainous duty, it still retains a duty which is prohibitory under the present, and probable future conditions of the market. It should be stated, in partial explanation of this provision of the schedule, that it more than meets the petition of the iron manufacturers of New England, as literally read; for that petition asked for free coal, free iron ore, and a 24 per cent duty on pig and scrap; and the bill gives free coal and iron ore, and a 22½ per cent duty on pig and scrap.

But the petition was made in 1839, and was adapted to conditions then prevailing; and annexed to the petition was a statement providing for future contingencies, and running as follows:

"The laws should not degrade one section of our common country in order to exalt another. They should not forbid New England the enjoyment of all the rights which her location on the coast gives; they should be so amended that crude iron may be as cheap in her ports as it is in Pennsylvania or Alabama; and that coal and iron ore may be as cheap as the world will furnish them to her."

And again, page 16:

"We claim that the tariff should allow crude iron to be as cheap on the coast as it is in the interior, in order that New England men may manufacture and finish the iron that New England uses; and that she may not be set back in civilization by the impediments arising from the lack of cheap iron and steel."

As market values were then, the reduction then asked for would have thus equalized values. As they are now, not even a full release of the duty will do this; for, as shown by the American Manufacturer of December 28, Bessemer iron is selling in Pittsburg at \$11 per ton, and at the same price in Great Britain; while gray forge, selling in Birmingham, Ala., for \$7, is selling in Great Britain at \$8.50; and No. 1 foundry, selling at \$8.50 at Birmingham, Ala., is selling at \$12 in Great Britain.

There is no other place on the face of the earth where iron is made so cheaply as in our Southern States. Surely their prosperity does not depend upon keeping crude iron artificially high in New England and California. They have water courses to the sea, and if the boundless West and Southwest of this country do not give them room to bustle in, they have but to reach out their hands and take the markets of the world. The six hundred iron manufacturers of New England further said, in their statement to Congress:

"The petition annexed to this statement is based upon the supposition that the present duties upon manufactured iron and steel will remain as they are. If, however, these duties shall be reduced, an equivalent reduction in the duty upon crude iron (pig and scrap), asked for (24 per cent), should be made."

The defect in the Wilson bill (iron schedule) that most concerns the iron and steel workers of the coast is this: First, that the duty which it places upon pig and scrap is prohibitory; secondly, if it were not prohibitory, still muck bar iron could not be made in this country, under the proposed duties, from British pig to compete with imported British muck bar iron, nor could merchant bars be made in this country from British pig to compete with imported British merchant bars, and still less could the manufactured iron and steel articles classed under the 25 per cent duty be made from imported British bars.

The British pig can not be imported, because under the proposed duty it costs more than American pig, and so also of British scrap. And if they could, they could not be further manufactured, for at the duties put upon the manufactures every article just named would be undersold, if made in the United States from British pig, by similar articles made in Great Britain.

The following figures of costs at places of production, from the American Manufacturer of December 28, will show the correctness of this statement upon addition of the proposed duty and freight, it being assumed that a fair average ocean freight rate to Boston is \$2 per ton.

BRITISH IRON.

	Bessemer.	Gray forge.	No. 1.
Cost f. o. b., Great Britain.....	\$11.04	\$8.52	\$12.24
Duty, 22½ per cent.....	2.45	1.92	2.75
Freight.....	2.00	2.00	2.00
Cost at Boston.....	15.52	12.44	16.99

AMERICAN IRON.

Cost, Pittsburg.....	\$11.00		
Cost, Birmingham, Ala.....		\$7.00	\$8.50
Freight to Boston.....	2.00	4.62	4.62
Cost at Boston.....	13.90	11.62	13.12

The proposed duty on 1.1 tons of gray forge pig iron at \$8.52 per ton necessary to make 1 ton of muck bar iron, is \$2.11, and the proposed duty (25 per cent) on one ton of muck bar iron (\$17) is \$4.25, or \$2.14 more than the duty on the pig iron. Col. Wright (page 119) shows the cost of making a ton of muck bar iron to be, exclusive of iron, \$4.06 more in America than in Great Britain. A ton of imported British muck bar iron would therefore undersell a ton of muck bar iron made in America from British pig iron by \$1.92 per ton. Of course, puddling would be impossible in New England under such conditions.

The cost of a ton of Welsh bars is given in American Manufacturer, December 28, as \$23.28. The duty on them, as proposed in the bill, is 30 per cent, or \$6.98. The duty on 1½ tons of pig iron necessary to make them would be \$2.40, the difference being \$4.58. Adding to the increased cost of making muck bar iron in America, as shown by Col. Wright, \$4.06, the further increased American cost \$2.18 (see pages 132 and 133) of putting the muck bars into merchant iron, we have \$6.24 as the cost above English cost of making the merchant bars in America, while the increased duty on the bars is, as shown, only \$4.58.

It is quite clear, therefore, that by Col. Wright's estimates the British bars, under the proposed duty, would undersell the American bars made from British iron. In such a case, the making of merchant bars from British pig iron would become impossible upon the Atlantic coast. It is not necessary to go farther, in order to show that the British bars, imported at 30 per cent duty, can not be further manufactured, with high-priced American labor, and then sold in competition with similar articles, imported under a 25 per cent duty; this is self-evident, and we may therefore cross also from the list of New England manufactures all the articles in the 25 per cent class, and doubtless the greater part of those in the 30 per cent class also, if we are to depend upon British iron, at a 22½ per cent duty, for material.

The exact workings of the proposed schedule, as it now stands, will be as follows:

So long as American pig iron remains at the present low prices, British crude iron can not be imported into New England under the proposed duty, and consequently the manufacturing for New England will continue to be done, as of late years it has been done, in the mills, forges, and foundries of Pennsylvania. This simply continues the oppression of the present tariff. If American pig iron shall advance to such a point that British pig iron can be imported under the proposed duty, the British pig iron can not be here worked into manufactures upon which the duties have been put at 25 per cent and 30 per cent, because the articles can be imported from Great Britain more cheaply than they can be made from British iron in New England; and, in this case, it will be the mills, forges, and foundries of Great Britain that will do the manufacturing for the consumption of New England.

Right and justice call for the complete removal of the duty upon pig and scrap iron and scrap steel. But if the necessities of the Government require a revenue from these articles, whatever duty may be put upon them should be accompanied by an internal-revenue duty of the same amount upon pig iron made in this country. By this expedient the burden of the tax would be fairly distributed, and not be put upon the coast alone, and the tax upon crude iron would no longer be used as an instrument for uprooting the industries of New England.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I have not had these articles read with a view of expressing any sympathy whatever with the arguments and the statements which they contain, but they are the arguments and statements upon which the tariff reform movement has been defended in New England for the past half dozen years. The Senators from New England who differ from these gentlemen in their views upon this question have been denounced as false to the great interests of the people they represent on this floor. This denunciation has been heaped upon us with no limitation.

I simply desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the pending bill, and in almost every one of its provisions, the promises which the party responsible for it have made in the past have been forgotten, to use a very mild phrase. I am glad to see that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] is now in his seat. During his absence from the Chamber I have stated that in the campaign in Massachusetts and the other New England States three or four years ago the Senator from Texas had distinctly stated that if the Democratic party were entrusted with power they would keep their pledges and place upon the free list the materials used in the manufactures of New England, especially coal and iron ore. The distinguished Senator from Texas said in the course of that campaign that he was in favor of free iron ore, free coal, free pig iron, and free bar iron.

I know how helpless the Senator from Texas finds himself in influencing to any extent whatever the provisions of the various paragraphs of the bill, but I do expect him, as the representative of the gentlemen whose petition I have just had read from the Clerk's desk, to stand up and try at least to keep the pledges which he made to the Democrats of Massachusetts, and which Mr. Cleveland and the other tariff reformers of the country have made to the people of the country, to put these materials, especially coal and iron ore, upon the free list. Certainly he can speak in this forum in behalf of the doctrines and the principles which he has advocated for a quarter of a century. He may be outvoted by a vote of a solid Democratic party, pledged in advance by a caucus, but he can certainly show the people of the

New England towns, whose halls have resounded with his eloquence, that he at least stands true to the pledges and promises he has made to them. It can not be possible that every man in the Democratic party has deserted its flag and deserted the principles which they have held in the past.

How do the committee propose to answer these strong and earnest appeals made by the leading Democrats of New England? In the petition which has been read the Young Men's Democratic Club denounce and protest against the imposition of a duty of 22½ per cent upon pig iron, which lies at the basis of all the iron and steel industry of the United States. What answer do the majority members of the committee make to that protest by action taken since it was received? They have increased the duty from 22½ per cent ad valorem to \$4 a ton, or 50 per cent ad valorem upon the foreign cost of pig iron.

Mr. VEST. May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question without breaking the thread of his argument?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. I should like to know from the Senator, whilst he is going into the question of consistency and principle, etc., whether he is prepared to vote for free coal and free iron ore?

Mr. ALDRICH. In a protective tariff bill I am for the protection of every article which because of the increased labor cost here can not be produced in the United States on equal terms with the same article in any other country in the world; but in a nondescript measure like the pending one, which I believe should be defeated, and the defeat of which is demanded by the highest interest of the country, I should not hesitate to give any vote which I thought would contribute to that result.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator from Rhode Island will pardon me, I do not yet understand exactly what he means. He would vote, then, for free coal and free iron ore if it would defeat the bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly would.

Mr. VEST. What would he do if it would not defeat it?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know what I would do under those circumstances. My impression is that I should vote according to the light and judgment which I had upon the amendments as they were presented. I am in favor of a protective duty upon coal and upon iron ore, and I have so voted; and, as I stated, I have been denounced by every Democratic paper in New England for so voting.

Mr. WHITE. Then the Senator has not been converted?

Mr. BUTLER. The duty under the McKinley law is 75 cents a ton on coal and on iron ore.

Mr. ALDRICH. Seventy-five cents a ton on coal and iron ore, under the conditions that existed in 1890, were not as high rates as are proposed in the pending bill upon the iron products of the United States under existing conditions to the continuance of which I do not intend to contribute.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand that the Senator from Rhode Island is in favor of a duty upon iron ore, or that he is not in favor of a duty upon iron ore?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have stated that I am in favor of a duty upon iron ore.

Mr. WHITE. The McKinley law provides a tariff of 75 cents, I believe, and the proposed measure reduces it to 40 cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator from Rhode Island opposed to that reduction? Does he think that reduction is too small?

Mr. ALDRICH. That depends entirely upon the rates which the Senate shall decide to fix upon the articles which follow. The whole iron and steel industry of the United States is based first upon iron ore and then upon pig iron. I will give the Senator an illustration of exactly what I mean. The bill proposes to impose a duty equal to 50 per cent ad valorem upon pig iron, while it proposes to impose a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem upon the finest products of iron and steel. I do not propose by any vote of mine to consent to that arrangement. If I can not get the 30 per cent advance I am willing to vote to put down the duty on iron from 75 to 40 cents, or even lower if necessary.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the Senator states that the Democratic party of New England is clamorous for free iron ore and free coal.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have had their own statement read to that effect.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator criticising this side of the Chamber because it puts some duties upon those materials, while he himself voted for the McKinley bill, which places a duty of 75 cents a ton upon each of those articles?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am finding fault with the other side of the Chamber, if it can be called finding fault, for having forgotten,

to use a mild phrase, the deliberate promises and pledges which they have made to the people of New England in regard to duties upon coal and iron ore.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Democracy of this Chamber approximates criminality as it approximates toward the Republican rates? That I understand to be the Senator's position.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not made any such suggestion. The Senator from California himself is making the application.

Mr. WHITE. That is the logic of the Senator's position.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from California is himself making the application. I am not making any application; I am only stating the facts.

Mr. WHITE. I am disposed to think it is always subject to criticism if it nears the Republican view. If the Senator from Rhode Island will permit another interruption, the Republican tariff being 75 cents and the proposed tariff 40 cents, there is a manifest reduction. I presume the Senator from Rhode Island will not dispute that fact. Now, the Senator from Rhode Island is not prepared, I understand, to vote with the Democratic party or any of its members for free coal or free iron ore.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not said that yet.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator say it? Does he know?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not now discussing my own position; that will appear later on. I stated that my vote upon these propositions will depend entirely upon the rates fixed in the subsequent portion of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator does not know how he would vote?

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

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am in doubt how to vote on this item. I suppose we are to get some light from the discussion, but Senators on the other side of the Chamber do not seem inclined to participate. I welcome the Senator from California to the field of discussion. I have no doubt we shall get from him enlightenment and good advice on this subject, and I hope he will help us to solve a problem which troubles my mind, as I have no doubt it troubles the mind of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who was in favor of free iron ore and has promised that great boon to New England, and who now sits here calmly in his seat and sees it taken away from us.

We are all mixed up on this question; there is no doubt about that; and we are seeking light on the subject. I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether, with reference to the schedule of manufactures of iron, the bill as it came from the House of Representatives, with free iron ore in the bill, the duties were high enough with free iron ore, and if they were not, whether they are high enough now with a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore? The question I wish to get at in determining how I shall vote upon this question is, as the Senator from Rhode Island has stated, how do the rates between iron ore and manufactures of iron compare?

If we are to be treated in accordance with the promises which the Senator from Texas made to us in New England, if, as the great apostle of the coming tariff law promised to New England, we are to get free coal and free iron, and his pledges are to be fulfilled, then I understand we must accept the inevitable, because there is a Democratic majority, and then we must take such duties upon manufactures of iron as will correspond to free ore and free coal, and there could safely be some reduction upon manufactures of iron. But until we know into whose hands we have fallen, and whether it is to be free coal and free iron, or 75 cents a ton iron ore or 40 cents a ton iron ore, we can not tell what duties we must have upon manufactures of iron, and until we know what duties we are going to have upon manufactures of iron we can not tell what duties we can stand upon iron ore.

Mr. President, I am entirely at sea upon the subject, and I do not wonder that the Senator from Rhode Island is in doubt as to what he shall do upon this item. It seems to me that the first question to be discussed is why do we not have here free iron and free coal for New England, whether we want it or not, forced upon us as it was to be upon the Republicans of New England, promised to the young Democracy of New England as it was. When that question is settled and the other side of the Chamber has determined that we are not to have it and fix the rate of duty that is to be put upon the raw material, then we can form some notion as to what kind of duties we want upon the manufactures of iron. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will not be discouraged by the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] in his attempt to bring some order out of this chaos and to work out some principle, if he can find one, and that the Senator from California will contribute to find it, by which we can find out how we are going to vote on coal and iron for New England which the Senator from Texas (whom our

people supposed had been living and laboring for years in order to destroy our industries) assured us in 1892 we should have protected not by duties but by free raw materials.

I hope that question may be settled first, that we may find out where we stand and in whose hands we are, whether the Senator from Texas is running this thing or whether the Senator from California is running it, or whether it is to be conducted by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas. I hope the Senators, before they ask us to vote on these questions, will enlighten us as to how we are to vote when we consider the free raw materials which were promised us but which we are not to get in connection with the proper duties upon manufactured articles.

Mr. PLATT. I propose an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PLATT. In line 4, I move to strike out "40" and insert "60," so as to make the rate 60 cents a ton.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Rhode Island pardon me for a moment?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly; but I have promised to yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from New Hampshire has just stated that he is laboring under some embarrassment, and that he does not know whether the bill is in charge of the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Arkansas. This side is getting a little embarrassed just now. The Senator from Rhode Island gets up and insists upon free iron ore and free coal, and his associate from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] gets up and insists upon raising the duties. In the classic language of a gentleman in another body I should like to know "where we are at?" [Laughter.] There is some little inconsistency on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALDRICH. The illustration may be a good one, but the facts are not good. I have not stated that I am in favor of free iron ore or free coal.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the argument of the Senator from Rhode Island has certainly been lost.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am trying in my feeble way to represent for the time being the Democrats of New England, not in making an argument, but in making a statement of the position which they have taken and which has been taken in behalf of the Democratic party by the junior Senator from Texas for New England.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Democrats of New England must be represented by the Senator from Rhode Island they are in a very bad way.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unfortunately they have no other representative sitting upon this side of the Chamber. There seems to be no one on the other side of the Chamber who is willing to represent their views.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; we are willing to do so if you will allow us to vote.

Mr. ALDRICH. You will vote against their wishes, I am sorry to say.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that by unanimous consent we allow the Senator from Texas to represent them. He went up there and whooped up the boys in 1892 for Cleveland with promises of free coal and free iron ore, and he now calls upon us, when he has got the bill through the other House with free iron and free coal, this great boon, to say whether we will take 40 cents a ton on iron ore and 40 cents a ton on coal. I think the Senator from Rhode Island perhaps is infringing upon what is the appropriate province of the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator from New Hampshire is calling on me to enlighten his understanding, to help him comprehend this question fully and thoroughly, that he may be enabled to discharge his duty to the American people. Mr. President, I give over the task. I have labored here a long time to convince Republican Senators and Republican members of the other House of their duty to the people. I have finally made up my mind to give them over to hardness of heart, and stiffness of neck and reprobacy of mind, that they may believe a lie and be damned; I mean politically, of course, I see no hope for their conversion. I have given them "line on line, and precept on precept."

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Texas a question?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether he sees any hope for the conversion of his Democratic associates on this particular question?

Mr. MILLS. I have been making good headway all along, but I have struck a hard rock on the Republican side on the question. There is too much behind them that will not let them be converted.

Mr. President, the two Senators who have spoken for New England have stated correctly, not that I made promises, I suppose, but that I have advocated free raw material, and I have promised, as far as my vote is concerned, that I would give them free wool from Texas. We have no coal and not much iron ore, but as far as I was able I was in favor of giving them not only free wool, free coal, free iron ore, and free pig iron, but free material of all kinds that require to be manufactured before going into ultimate consumption. I may go further than that, Senators, and tell you that if I had the making of the bill to be passed by the Congress of the United States and approved by the President I would convert every custom-house in this country into a schoolhouse to teach the truth to the people. That is what I would do. But I speak for myself when I say that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Texas allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I made a statement before the Senator from Texas came in which I am not sure I have repeated since. The people of New England, especially the Democrats of New England, look upon the Senator from Texas not only as the apostle, but as the very high priest, of tariff reform.

Mr. MILLS. I am very much obliged to them.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Texas, in a speech which he made at Webster, Mass.—

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I know what it was.

Mr. ALDRICH. Said, "We keep our pledges; and when the Democratic party is returned to power coal and iron ore and pig iron will go upon the free list." Now, it is not so much the particular individual sentiment, but the pledges and the promises that he made for his party with which I find fault, and I do not like the way the Senator keeps them.

Mr. MILLS. I am reminded of a great substantial fact that the Senator must keep before his mind, that in going into action, as I once heard Admiral Porter say before the Naval Committee, it is necessary that the fastest vessel shall regulate its speed by the speed of the slowest vessel, because if you do not, the fastest vessel will run away from your fleet and the enemy will attack you when you are scattered on the seas and cut you to pieces. That is precisely what the Senator from Rhode Island wants me to do now.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator from Texas clear in his mind whether the Democratic fleet is behind or ahead of the Republicans at this time?

Mr. MILLS. Some of it is behind and some ahead. I am on the front ship. Whenever New England shall see her interest to take the taxes off the materials of her manufacture, which is her chief industrial occupation, in order that she may give employment to all her people during all the months and days of the year and bring prosperity to her people and her section, and heed the words of admonition I gave her, and send Democrats here instead of twelve Republicans to prevent us from doing it, then I will redeem the whole of the promise which I made. Thus far we are giving her free wool, which is one part of free raw materials, and perhaps the one of the largest consequence to her in her manufactures.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Texas allow me a further question?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. If we will give you 12 Republican votes for free coal and free iron ore will you keep your promises then?

Mr. MILLS. If you will give us those votes to go on and pass the bill I will. Now stand up and tell me whether you will do it or not.

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. MILLS. You say you will not.

Mr. ALDRICH. That amount of sugar coating is not thick enough.

Mr. MILLS. I am too old a coon to be caught in such a trap as you are now setting.

Now, then, the problem is this, and I can not be fooled about this question even by so shrewd and adroit a diplomat as my friend from Rhode Island. If I vote for free coal and free iron ore and such other things as I want free on the bill and then cause the bill to be defeated, your people will have to pay 75 cents a ton on coal and 75 cents a ton on iron ore. Had I not better give them a reduction of 35 cents and secure it than to vote for free coal and free iron ore and at last compel them to pay 75 cents a ton? I am again between the devil and the deep sea, and I am going to sea again. I will take 40 cents instead of 75 cents. That is all there is about it.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator from Texas thinks it makes a fascinating temptation to the manufacturers of New England when he offers them free ore. I know that free ore and free coal were the favorite topics with the so-

called tariff reformers up in Massachusetts. They began to think "If we could get bituminous coal for a half cent less, or if we could get iron ore free, we would abandon the whole protective policy."

I have here an elaborate argument upon our side of the question from a concern which uses 20 tons of pig iron a day. The upshot of it is, among other things, an argument against free coal. I hold in my hand a book which has about one thousand little pictures of articles that this concern makes. I want to ask the Senator now what difference in any one of these articles or in any dozen would the 75 cents a ton on coal make? That is a magnificent bribe on the 20 tons of \$15 a day, even suppose they got the whole benefit of it.

Now, the Senator has an extraordinary misunderstanding of the proper gradations of industry. What difference is it to a man who makes a watch spring whether iron ore has a duty upon it? The duty has vanished—it is absolutely invisible long before it reaches the condition of fine steel.

The Senator from Texas says he wishes all our people to have raw materials as cheap as possible; that we should take the duty off all raw materials. The ore in the hill is perhaps worth 20 cents a ton. Some Senator can tell me what you can buy a mountain of it for, perhaps 20 or 30 cents a ton in Gogebic for example; something like that. When that ore gets down to Cleveland it is worth, say, \$3 a ton, and the \$2.80 is all labor. It is just as much a conversion of labor into a visible product as is the conversion of labor into a visible product when a man makes a watch spring.

Every successive step from the ore at Gogebic up to the watch spring is a step in which the raw material changes itself into the finished product. Now, the gentleman must begin and make it free all the way up to the man who makes the watch spring, until he can get a bar of the best possible refined steel into his hands to make a watch spring.

No, sir; we are not to be bribed, and we are not to be misled. I am against free coal and against free ore; but I am willing to take anything I can get, even a cent, because I am for the interests of my region and the industries of the whole country. The Senator, among others, makes a terrible mistake in supposing that any one section of the country can be hurt without hurting the whole of it. He will as sure as he lives drive out of business many large establishments in New England, I do not say by his theory, but by the bill as it now stands.

Take the concern whose book I hold before me. He bribes them with free ore, but when he gets up to the finished product in paragraph 177 of the bill, where they are classed, he reduces the duty from 45 per cent ad valorem to 30 per cent. The other House reduced it to 35, and that was bad enough; and the bill as it stands now reduces it to 30 per cent. I appeal to the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Missouri to take this into serious consideration. I ask them to take this very book if they choose to see whether it is fair to make that reduction in the duty.

Every one knows that these ad valorem duties are not what they appear to be. I have heard many manufacturers in estimating their values say really a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem was not as a matter of fact more than a duty of about 30 per cent, because it is absolutely impossible to keep the appraiser up to the true market value of the goods as they come here from abroad. Now the duty of 30 per cent on that article, 5 per cent lower than is proposed by the other House, is simply ruinous, and my constituents do not care whether it is ruin at 50 or ruin at 100 per cent on any particular article, or ruin with free coal or with free iron ore. It is ruin to them anyhow.

I beg the Senator from Texas to study the different gradations between raw material and the finished products from the red dirt in the mountain up to the beautiful polished watch spring; and then if he will make a conscientious endeavor to so grade the different products as to apply an old-fashioned Democratic principle of counterbalancing the cheapness of European labor, we may perhaps get a bill which we will vote for. We do not say that we insist upon the precise figures of the McKinley law in every respect, but we do want the principle. We do want common sense in the gradation of these articles according to the cost of the raw material in each case and according to the difference between labor in Europe and in this country. I am sorry the Senator was not better received in New England.

Mr. MILLS. I was never better received anywhere in my life.

Mr. HAWLEY. I was thinking of a little incident that it is hardly fair to mention. It was jocular. The Senator got off his balance for a moment. A Yankee mechanic in New Haven asked a question, and the Senator advised him to go and soak his head. The Yankee mechanic has carried that to this day rather as a trophy. He thought he had bothered the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MILLS. That shows how far a man can be driven when he has no legitimate argument. The Senator and one of his colleagues have repeated this incident on the floor. Such a thing as that ought not to be done among gentlemen in discussion on the floor of the Senate. I spoke in New Haven. I never was more cordially received in my life, and I should be cordially received there if I went again. I am very much attached to the people of New England. A man got up in the audience after I had finished and came down to the railing. Everybody was going out of the house, people were shouting, and I could not hear what he said. His hands were waving wildly in the air. I thought the fellow was drunk; he seemed to be excited; his head was hot, and I did say to him that I thought he had better go and stick his head in water and cool off.

Mr. HAWLEY. I did not charge the Senator with any great crime in what I said. The Yankee mechanic thought he had asked the Senator a question which bothered him, and the Senator made the most convenient reply.

Mr. MILLS. I never heard his question. I did not know what it was. I do not know to-day what the question was. If you will ask the question now I will answer it.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I remember the question, in the story as it was narrated (and I certainly do not think it ought to be brought in here if it was not true) the Senator was making this favorite argument of his, that to make New England the most prosperous manufacturing region on the face of the globe all we needed was free raw material. It was the device by which he attempted to make, and I do not know but that he did make, a great many votes with his pleasant manner and fervid eloquence for Cleveland in New England. When he had finished his argument this citizen of Connecticut asked him why, if free raw material made a duty unnecessary, we needed any duty whatever on cotton manufactures where we had free raw material. That was the question.

Mr. MILLS. Now, I will answer the question, and you can carry the answer back to your constituents. Cotton is free, and the machinery that makes the cotton product pays \$45 on every \$100. That is one thing. All your dyes that enter into your cotton goods are taxed 25, 30, 40, 50, 75, and 100 per cent. The leather that turns the wheels of your machinery is taxed. The coal which generates the steam is taxed. That is enough to make the difference in the cost of the finished product. That keeps the cotton goods of New England out of the markets of the world. I mentioned that the other day to my friend, Mr. Thornley, a gentleman sent over here from Old England. He was sent from Lancaster to the United States, and he brought his books with him, I am told. I mentioned this very fact in Providence, where I was invited to dine with a club of two or three hundred gentlemen, as excellent gentlemen as I ever saw, and nearly all Republicans. They treated me very kindly. Mr. Thornley brought his books and showed every item in the cost of making a yard of calico, I believe.

Mr. ALDRICH. Print cloths.

Mr. MILLS. Print cloths. He had every item of cost, labor and every other, and followed it clear up. In every single instance he gave, the labor cost was lower in the United States (I have got the book and will read the figures)—at Providence, Lowell, Fall River, at every place in the United States—than it was at every place in Old England. When he had carried out the entire cost of a yard of calico or print, the finished product, it cost more in the United States than it did in England, and that additional cost kept it out of the markets of the world.

Now, that is the legitimate argument for me to make to those gentlemen of New England. Take off these taxes, each of which adds a little, notwithstanding the Senator from Connecticut tells us that the tax on coal does not add anything. If the tax on coal adds nothing and the tax on the ore adds nothing, why do you follow it up and put a tax on bar iron and steel made out of pig iron? Your system is that through the whole of your protected manufactures each successive change of form compensates for the tax paid on the one that preceded it. If that system is right, and I say it is if protection is right, then it must be that there is a tax paid on each one of those items as it is assessed. That is all I have to say.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I regard this item of iron ore as something in the nature of a test on this bill. There are two theories in regard to protection which are very different. One is that it should be largely confined to manufacture and that raw materials, the result of American labor, should not have the benefit of the protection that is given to manufactures in an advanced stage. I have always regarded that position as totally indefensible and untenable. We do not wish specially to support and encourage manufactures at this stage of our industrial development. Our manufactures have been already developed by a hundred years of protection. What we want to do as the

foundation stone of our national policy is to protect our labor from undue competition with the cheap labor of Europe.

Therefore, when I heard the petition of Democrats of Massachusetts read I thought it was the meanest specimen of selfishness that I ever had heard in my life. What they desire is free raw material, although it is the result of American labor competing with European labor, and to have the highest possible protective duties on their own production. I was about to say I thank God that no man with such a selfish idea, one that would protect his particular interest and refuse protection to other interests of the people of the United States, belongs to the Republican party. I think it is the proudest merit of the Republicans of New England that they have resisted this form of temptation, which is the very element and gist of selfishness, and that they have been willing by their votes and in their debate in the Senate and the other House to give to all forms of labor which come into competition with foreign labor the same fair rule of protection.

Mr. President, this iron ore industry is one of the most remarkable developments not only in our country, but probably in any country in the world. I do not know of any other development, except probably the new developments of gas and oil and other natural products, that is at all to be compared with the development of the iron-ore industry of the country. Fortunately iron ore is found in all parts and all sections of the country. But the greatest development has been in the Lake Superior region. There it is phenomenal. I have here a document signed by all of the leading manufacturing establishments, mining establishments, iron companies, etc., along the whole Northern coast, including many men of high prominence who have invested all they have in the development of the iron-ore industry. The result has been perhaps the most remarkable, as I said before, of any in industry now extant.

By reference to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation ending June 30, 1893, the number of vessels employed upon the lakes is 3,761. Of these 1,731 are steamers. The gross tonnage of the lake fleets is 432,000 tons. The estimated value of the steam vessels is \$59,000,000, and of sailing and unrigged vessels \$9,000,000, or a total valuation of \$68,000,000. Hon. Mr. Ely estimates the amount expended within a short time for piers and docks and their equipments at \$10,885,000. The capital employed in the railroad transportation from the mines to the shipping ports on Lake Superior and Lake Michigan amounts to \$32,000,000. The capital employed in the Lake Superior mining districts, as per census report, is \$71,000,000. The capital in docks and their equipments at Lake Erie ports is \$12,000,000. The capital employed exclusively in the railroad transportation of ores from Lake Erie ports and mills and furnaces is \$26,000,000. In all, the amount of capital invested and employed in this industry alone is \$200,000,000. I see also that the total product of iron ore in the United States for 1892 was estimated at 16,000,000 tons. Of this amount about 9,000,000 tons came from the Lake Superior and Lake Michigan districts.

Now, sir, there is probably not in the history of the country any industry that has more largely grown and been more beneficially developed than this; and yet, by a change of Administration and the resulting change in the policy of the Government of the United States, this industry is suddenly paralyzed. The fear and threat that the duty of 75 cents which had been given them to protect their industry in its development would be probably repealed suspended the demand for this iron ore, and brought them into close competition with iron ores produced in Cuba, Spain, and Africa and in other countries. To meet this competition and to cover the difference in wages here and abroad the duty of 75 cents per ton was put upon domestic ores. The result of this protection has been that 9,000,000 tons, a quantity so vast that we can hardly conceive it, has been produced from the Lake Superior mines. An immense commerce has been built up within a very few years of development. It is fortunate, too, that in some of the Southern States, especially in Alabama and Tennessee, the same productive forces have been at work and have there developed and built up by the reasonable protection of 75 cents per ton.

What was that duty for? It was merely to enable our people here to give reasonable wages that would tempt miners to go into these new parts of the country and develop the hard and severe toil of mining iron ore. Nothing in the world has built up that industry except the duty of 75 cents a ton. They could not compete on equal terms, especially with iron ore utilized on the Atlantic coast, with the countries near by, in Cuba, and in other parts of the world. This vast development in which \$200,000,000 are now used has been built up solely and alone by this small duty.

Mr. President, when it is proposed to strike down that duty and make iron ore free, what has been the result? The very

moment that it was known this policy was to be entered into, here is the result:

Nearly all the mines are closed, the value of Lake Superior iron stocks have fallen in market value from 100 to 500 per cent, and tens of thousands of workmen have been thrown out of employment and now swarm in idleness in every great city of the lakes. * * * We add that contracts for shipbuilding at Cleveland have practically ceased, although this city has heretofore been the second largest shipbuilding port in the world. * * * It must be remembered—

So they state—

that we carry our ores to market about 1,200 miles by water, as great a distance as from Cuba to New York. In 1889 and 1890 the average cost of labor per ton of ore in the Lake Superior region ranged from 89 cents to \$1.33. The average total cost of the ore per ton at the mines was about \$2.32. The average wages paid was \$2.10 per day. Of course all that is now changed.

Here again it is said:

The closing of mills, furnaces, and factories at Cleveland, caused by the fear of unfavorable tariff legislation, has already thrown out of employ over 5,000 workmen, and it is estimated that over 12,000 workmen in this city are out of work. Of these, over 4,000 families are dependent entirely on the Bethel charitable organization for support; and the public square holds at this writing over 2,000 men having a public meeting to demand labor or bread. No such alarming, painful spectacle was ever known in Ohio.

Now, Mr. President, under these circumstances the proposition to entirely repeal this duty, and to deny this form of labor any protection it seems to me would be unjust and cruel. I would not myself, with my knowledge of the circumstances of this industry, have signed that Democratic document for all the mines of the world. When people come to us demanding protection in every grade for their industry and refuse to give a very moderate degree of protection to other forms of industry of a more crude nature, I look upon it as the meanest selfishness that could be possibly devised by mortal man.

There are more people interested in the development of this mining industry than in any branch of iron manufactures, because here is the foundation of the iron trade, and the industry is spread over every part of our country. It has so happened that more than three-fourths of the Territories and States of the Union contain iron ore in greater or less degree, and probably no finer mines are developed of this kind than can be found on Lake Superior.

I say, therefore, that while the Democratic propagandists may have talked about free trade and raw material, it was only a kind of a popular talk, probably for votes. I do not believe that the Democrats of Ohio, or any portion of them, would favor such a proposition. I believe if that question was left to the Democrats of Ohio more than two-thirds of them would vote for a reasonable tariff on raw material. They do not ask much. The capitalists do not ask anything. All they want is the means to supply their laborers fair pay, such as is consistent with American citizenship; and it is the demand of labor that is the most pressing upon them.

Mr. President, I am not willing to stand in the position of growling at what has been done by our Democratic friends on this question. They have put themselves in a wrong position in taking ground against a duty on raw material. Raw materials ought to be protected just like the finished article when they can be developed in our country. I am in favor of protection to all forms of industry; not of a particular form. I am in favor of protecting the crude industry employed in mining as well as the industry that is employed in the highest works of mechanical art. There is no other foundation for the system of protection except as a system of protection of labor; and if that is broken down and if reasonable protection is denied where the labor of the miner and the labor of the persons who mine coal and iron and all the rude forms of industry are concerned, then I am in favor of denying it to all. I say free trade for all or free trade for none. The same rule should be applied to one form of industry as to another.

I am glad to see that the Republican party, so far as I know, in every part of our country, has always stood by that position and given to the miners a reasonable protection on their raw industry, and that also the miners in the Western States have received the protection necessary to maintain their industries. I say, therefore, while I do not think the rate reported by the committee is high enough, I will support the rate that has been proposed. I believe it would have been better to have left it at 75 cents a ton. I will vote for 60 cents, and I will vote for 40 cents if we can get no more.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has offered an amendment making the rate 60 cents a ton. I do not think that is at all too high when we consider the nature of the labor. It must be remembered that the cost is not only in digging out this ore from the earth, but it must be transported for a short distance to the water on the lakes, and it must there be conveyed by vessels. The vessels have been devised and invented

for that particular purpose. Great "whalebacks," as they call them, have been devised in order to carry this heavy transportation. As a matter of course, a denial to them of a protective duty would destroy these vessels, costing, as was stated here, some twenty or thirty million dollars, built within a few years and recently devised. There is now more tonnage of this kind passing through the Straits of the Sault Ste. Marie than all the rest of the commerce of the United States. Over 10,000,000 tons pass back and forth through those straits, and it is increasing every year, until now we have to enlarge the locks and the canals. This commerce is not a small matter. It is a commerce of such vast extent that it might be compared to any form of production or any form of industry.

I say to deny to this industry its fair rate of duty should defeat this or any other bill. This might just as well be understood now as ever. If there can not be justice and fair play and an equal and just distribution of the benefits of the system of protection, then the whole system will be swept away. It is founded only upon the idea of protecting our labor and preventing our laborers from falling to the condition of European labor. That is its foundation. If that is stricken out, then it all falls.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] may very well feel easy about this matter, because Texas does not produce anything that needs protection except wool. In former times the South had no manufactures and no productions needing protection. They did not mine the ore and the coal that was under their soil. Now they have developed these raw productions. I thank the Senators from Alabama in differing, if you please, with a portion of their fellow Senators and insisting that this new industry of their State must be protected to a reasonable extent. If they have aided in giving us a duty of 40 cents a ton I thank them for it, and I shall vote for it if we can not get any more.

That is the position I occupy in regard to this matter, and with these remarks, Mr. President, I will leave the question, stating that I wish to see the rule of protection as understood by the Republican party applied to all. I do not believe that the intense selfishness manifested by the writers of that petition will have any serious representation on this floor. I look upon the demand by these advanced workers in manufacture that they shall be fully protected in all their industries and yet deny to the miner who gives them the raw material of their industry the benefit of this little pittance of 40 cents a ton on their ore, as supreme folly or shameless selfishness.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The papers which I caused to be read were not statements from manufacturers at all, but from a young men's Democratic club of the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. SHERMAN. A political club. I think these young men in Democratic clubs had better study a little the lessons of experience. Most of them I have no doubt are well educated in the science of school; many of them are, I know, in the city of Boston. If they are not manufacturers of some experience and do not represent any sort of interest, I do not think we need care much for their opinions. The truth is that that idea of free trade has been recently taught in some of the colleges. It is founded upon an erroneous basis, upon English ideas, based upon the commercial wants of a purely commercial and manufacturing country. It is taught in the schools, adopted in the colleges, taken up by the young men as a scholastic theory. They are for free trade, free ships, free anything, without experience or knowledge of the results of free trade. That idea has been adopted by the class of men whose voices ought not to be heard here against the cry of laborers coming to us with piteous laments from all parts of the country lest their industries shall be crippled by the proposed tariff law.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I believe the debate has grown out of a petition which has been read from the desk from the Young Men's Democratic Club, of Boston, I desire to say a few words in regard to the views which they have been presenting for some years past to the people of Massachusetts, and on which they have been seeking votes. I wish to show from the events now happening, and from the bill now before us, the absolute dishonesty of the arguments which have been addressed by the recent Democratic orators to the people of my State and to the people of the New England States generally.

During the last ten years there has been a number of young men, and of some persons not so young who like to call themselves young men, who have come very actively into politics on the Democratic, or, as they choose to call it, the reform side.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Mugwump side.

Mr. LODGE. They seem to have the idea, in the first place, that history began when they entered politics; that there had never been any tariff discussion before, and that they were representing a new and beautiful theory. They also seem to be-

lieve, and they are encouraged to think so by one of their newspapers, that they represent a great moral movement; that they are like the Abolitionists, who took their lives in their hands in defense of human liberty. On that basis they proceeded to preach a reform campaign, and their idea of a reform campaign was not to preach the doctrine of free trade—with one exception they all shrank from it—but to preach what they called the doctrine of free raw material.

Anyone who has given the subject any careful consideration knows that the free-raw-material cry is rubbish, merely as a statement. The only raw material that exists is that which lies in the earth or grows upon its surface, untouched by labor. The moment that you touch anything with the hand of labor it ceases to be a raw material. The iron ore of the miner is his finished material, and the cloth, which represents the highest product of the loom, is the raw material of the tailor, who makes it into clothing. It was the most utter piece of rubbish ever put forward in an economic debate, and they put it forward because it was a taking device, nothing else. They did not dare to attack the doctrine of protection with the mills of New England about them on every hand; and so they went to one manufacturer of iron and another manufacturer of woolen goods and to the people who worked in their industries, and said: "All you want is free raw material; in other words, we are in favor of having everything which comes into the mill come in free of duty, and everything which goes out of the mill have a high protection."

The utter selfishness of such a proposition is only equalled by its utter and impracticable folly. Everyone knew there was no possibility of maintaining any such doctrine as that, and yet that was preached up and down the length and breadth of my State by these virtuous reformers to the workmen in our industries, that the Republican party was cutting their throats because they would not give them free coal and free iron. Now the Democratic party have got control of every branch of the Government, and they bring in a bill with a duty of 40 cents on iron ore, to start with.

I believe that that duty is right, except that, in my judgment, it is not high enough. There is no possibility of carrying on a system of protection unless you give proper protection to every industry and to every product; and there is no possibility of having sensible or intelligent or honest tariff reform unless you make it free trade for everybody. Of all the people concerned in this business, the manufacturer—of whom there are very few, but of whom there are some in New England—the manufacturer who wants to bring free wool into his mill and turn out of it a highly protected carpet occupies the most absolutely mean and indefensible position of which it is possible to conceive.

I wish now to call attention to some utterances which were made during these campaigns, utterances which misled some of the people of my State and some of the people of the New England States, people whose eyes are now being opened wide to the humbug which was then preached to them. The Democratic party was so impressed with the fact that they had elected a governor of Massachusetts that they seemed to think a governor of Massachusetts was such a very rare thing that a man who held that office ought to have his speeches in book form. They have collected, therefore, in a large volume the speeches of Hon. William E. Russell, lately governor of Massachusetts, and I want to call attention to some of the things which he says, and on which he gained votes for himself and his party, and contrast them with the Democratic performance in the bill which is now before us.

In a speech on the tariff at Tremont Temple, in Boston, on the 27th of October, 1888, he said:

I went to the little town of Bridgewater, and what did I find there? The Bridgewater Iron Works with their fires out, their industry killed. How? By a high tariff tax on its pig iron and its coal, and hundreds of men out of employment in that little town can testify to the crushing effect of high tariff taxation. I went to the little town of Sandwich, and what did I find? Its glass industries, thriving under a low tariff, declining under a high tariff, dead to-day. Why? Because of high tariff taxation on coal and on the raw material that enters into glassmaking.

I suppose by raw material for glass he refers to sand. [Laughter.]

I went to Gloucester, and what could I show to those fishermen of Gloucester? That high tariff taxation had diminished the foreign shipping of this nation from 2,500,000 to less than 1,000,000 of tonnage since 1880. It is dying. Why? Because of the burden, the restrictive burden, of high tariff legislation. Then I went to Fitchburg, to the iron industry, and what could I show there? One-third of the rolling mills of Massachusetts killed since 1880—in seven years dead; half of the rolling mills of New England killed; the product of Massachusetts reduced from over 100,000 tons to less than 50,000, and now about one-fifth of what we once produced. What is the reason? High tariff legislation. Their life has been taken by law to satisfy the State of Pennsylvania. And who has been benefited? Labor in Pennsylvania? There is not a State in the Union, there are no industries in the Union, where labor is more downtrodden and depressed, where wages are lower and men more often out of employment, than in the highly protected industries of the State of Pennsylvania.

It was on such sectional cries as that that they tried then and failed to carry the State of Massachusetts.

At a later time, speaking before the Bay State Club—a Democratic club—on the 12th of October, 1889, Governor Russell, who was elected governor the following year, said:

Now, contrast that evasive platform—
referring to the Republican platform—

with the declaration of Democracy upon the question. We do not hesitate to say, in answer to the demands of business interests and of the whole people, that we stand for free wool, for free coal to make more cheerful the fireside of the humblest home, and to give our industries greater prosperity. Free iron we demand; free raw materials we demand; and cheaper necessities of life. There is no evasion in the platform of the Democratic party.

And this bill, with a duty on coal and a duty on iron, is the answer to that stuff about there being no evasion in the Democratic platform, which was put forward year after year to the people of Massachusetts. All that remains of that promise is the slaughtered sheep industry, picked out for destruction because the Democratic party feel that they can not let this bill go to the country without murdering at least one industry. Here again he spoke of one-half of the iron furnaces of New England, which have gone out in the last ten years, and many dependent iron industries, like nails and shovels and foundries, have been suffering and died. He drew a dismal picture of calamity all over New England at a time when employment was plenty, when capital was used, when labor was employed; and the fanciful picture he drew when the Republicans were in power is a miserable truth to-day, when the Democratic party has had control for a year.

Again, he said later, in a speech at Music Hall, in Boston, on the 6th of October, 1891:

Let me now refer to another, the iron and steel industry.

And he quotes from the petition of the industry itself, which was circulated in February, 1889, asking for free iron and free coal. He repeats this over and over again. I shall not weary the Senate by reading these attacks. He says in his speech at Fitchburg, October 31, 1892, in speaking of the duties on iron ore—the precise point we are now engaged upon—

The urgent demand of a single Republican Senator, to which the Republican party yielded, gave us this infliction. Yielded! It was bound to yield. Is not its whole tariff policy founded on the principle and pledge that all protected interests must stand united for the tariff taxation each demands, and that it is not safe to lower a single duty, however exorbitant or unjust, for fear that their coalition may break, and their system be endangered—

This is the duty on iron ore—

New England may thank this coalition and this unjust policy for the putting out of the fires in her great industry, for the throwing out of employment of thousands of her workmen, and for the closing up of the great concerns which I have mentioned.

Then he continues:

Now, who would be injured by reducing or removing these duties? I assert that no one who has a right to complain or who is supplying a market which rightly belongs to him.

Then he makes another attack on Pennsylvania. That demand for free raw material, as they call it, that promise, that pledge of free coal and free iron is met in this bill by a duty on both articles, and the people of New England and the people of Massachusetts understand to-day the absolute falsity of the arguments, the devices, and the tricks by which for years the Democratic party has sought to get votes for their ticket in my State.

I think, now that this schedule has been reached, it is well to call attention to the absolute failure to fulfill those pledges. The men who made those pledges knew, if they knew anything, that it was absolutely out of the question to destroy the duties on those great industries of iron and coal. They ought to have known, if they know anything—which I sometimes a little doubt—that the States of Alabama, of West Virginia, and of Virginia were quite as eager and quite as anxious for duties on iron ore and on coal as ever the State of Pennsylvania or the State of Ohio was; yet they preached this doctrine over and over; and it has remained for the action of the Democratic Senate to open their eyes to the bitter truth that it has been a deception from the beginning to the end. Instead of free coal and free iron we have duties on both with ruinous cuts in the duties which protect New England's diversified industries.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I simply wish to put in evidence, in reply to the paper which was read by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], a document which I hold in my hand, and which was filed before the subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Senate in reply to that petition. It comes from Mr. S. J. Ritchie, of Akron, Ohio, a gentleman of high character and great intelligence, who answers seriatim the statements made in the paper which the Senator from Ohio produced and read here.

Mr. Ritchie declares that this paper was prepared by two editors in the city of Cleveland, Mr. Covert, the editor of the Cleveland Leader, which is a Republican paper, and Mr. Holden, the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, a Democratic paper. He exposes so succinctly and distinctly the manifest absurdities contained in that paper, that I shall ask that the whole of it be put in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks, although I shall only read a part of it.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the paper be read. We are on this item now, and if it is an important paper I want it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The Senator from Iowa desires that the paper be read.

Mr. VEST. In the interest of economy of time I did not propose to read it all.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will see manifestly that, if this is an important paper, as certainly the statement made by the Senator from Ohio was important, we should know the effect of these two papers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The document will be read, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

AKRON, OHIO, February 22, 1894.

GENTLEMEN: In the Cleveland Leader of Saturday the 17th, there is printed a copy of a petition addressed to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. This petition is signed by John C. Covert and L. E. Holden as a committee representing the Western Iron Ore Association. Mr. Covert is the editor of the Cleveland Leader, a strong Republican paper, and Mr. Holden is the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, a Democratic paper. In this petition the magnitude of the iron ore business and of other interests closely identified with it, such as the lake marine and railway transportation companies, dock companies, and the capital representing the several corporations operating them, are set forth in a most bewildering array of figures.

This petition states that it contains the signatures of 25,000 of the good people of the city of Cleveland, Ohio. The petition is quite as significant for what it fails to state as for what it purports to state. It tells you that in the mines, in the docks upon the upper and lower lakes, in the lake marine, in the railways connecting the lower lake ports with the several points at which the ores are smelted there is an aggregate of \$197,224,000 of capital invested, and that the whole of this vast sum is at once going to ruin unless Congress imposes a tariff of 50 cents per ton on iron ore.

In the first place the committee will see the utter absurdity of charging the whole investment in the lake carrying trade to an investment in the iron-ore business. It will also see the utter absurdity of charging all the investment in the docks upon Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Erie, over which iron ore is handled, to the iron-ore business, for, with the exception of the pocket docks at two or three places upon Lakes Superior and Michigan, these docks are all used for the handling of every other kind of freight. Still more absurd is it to charge all the capital invested in the numerous lines of railways connecting the lake ports of delivery of this ore, with the points at which it is smelted, to the iron-ore business. Every one can see at a glance how wholly misleading such an arrangement of these figures is.

This petition also tells you that there is now a cash investment in these Lake Superior iron mines of \$71,325,000, and that \$16,500,000 of this has been added during the last four years. If this means that stock has been issued upon these mines aggregating this amount, no doubt these figures are correct, but if it means that a cash capital outside of that taken out of the mines themselves has been invested in them, then the statement is wholly wrong. The fact is that a great number of these mines were purchased from the State at a mere nominal price, and that a large number are still owned by the State and are worked upon royalties and leaseholds. Companies are organized upon these leaseholds with a large paper capital. A small amount of this capital stock is sold for working capital, and the ore taken out soon pays all the additional expense; and this money taken first out of the ground and a part of it afterwards put back into it in the way of improvements and developments constitutes the capital represented by these enormous figures in the petition.

No industry in the United States has been so enormously profitable as these very Lake Superior mines, and many of the signers of this petition, which is so full of walling and prophecy of evil, are to-day in possession of great fortunes made out of them as a return for a very small investment; and what is still worse, there are others in whose interest this petition is presented and urged, who are and have been actively engaged in gathering in these vast properties to themselves. Taking advantage of the financial disaster of those who have been operating these properties, they have been using the machinery of the courts or of such contracts as rendered the operation of the courts unnecessary, to clean out the great number of people in whose interest this petition professes to speak. Many millions of dollars of these properties have thus been gathered in and now these petitioners and their 25,000 signers ask the Government to reach out its protecting arm to aid them, after the great number of unfortunate owners have been completely ruined.

In the Cleveland Leader of Monday, the 19th, is a long report of the manner in which this gobbling-up process is at this moment going on. Mines, railway and transportation companies, according to this report, are all being gathered into the big net of John D. Rockefeller. This transaction is reported in Mr. Covert's paper in large head-lines in these words: "His deal in iron. John D. Rockefeller on the Mesaba Range. Got everything in sight." Others who are signers of this petition are imitating Mr. Rockefeller's methods on a less gigantic scale. The depression is being used by these men for the scooping in of these properties, and Congress is being asked to protect these very same men after the scooping has been completed, and those in whose interest the petition professes to speak have been cleaned out. The same cry was made at the time of the passage of the tariff of 1853. The whole iron-ore business was at once going to ruin unless a high tariff was imposed, and this cry was successful to the extent of having the duty changed in the conference committee of the two Houses from 50 to 75 cents per ton. These ores were at that time selling at from \$5 to \$8 per ton, and still they wanted protection. Now they are selling at Cleveland at \$2.75 per ton and still they want protection.

In the Cleveland Leader of the 17th, the same number containing this petition to Congress, is the report of a very large sale at \$2.75, and this is some of the very best ore in the market. In the article reporting this sale the

following figures are given as the estimate cost of delivering the ores from the great Mesaba Range, just acquired by Mr. J. D. Rockefeller:

Cost of mining by steam shovel.....	\$0.05
Cost of royalty.....	.50
Rail freight to docks.....	.80
Lake freight.....	.85
Interest on bonds, salaries, and commissions.....	.25
	2.45

I am informed by a man thoroughly reliable and familiar with all of these iron fields that this ore can be laid down at any of the Lake Erie ports at \$2 per ton and at the furnaces at Pittsburg for \$3 per ton.

There is not a single iron or steel works in the whole of Europe which can get so many units of iron in their ore for so small a price as the Cleveland furnaces can get their ore for, and this is equally true of their coke with regard to Pittsburg; the raw material necessary to make a ton of iron costs the great establishment of Krupp, in Germany, more than it does in either Cleveland or Pittsburg.

In the Cleveland Leader of February 20 is printed what is called "the Cleveland vessel owners' protest to Congress." These "vessel owners" who signed this "protest" are of the same number who signed the petition presented on the 16th, and unfortunately some of them are of the number who are engaged in the business of gobbling up these iron mines which they are telling Congress are going to ruin unless protected by a high tariff.

This "protest" states that these Lake Superior iron stocks have fallen from 100 to 500 per cent. The parties who are raking them in through foreclosure and other legal proceedings at these depressed values are hardly the proper parties to be stretching out their hands in appealing to Congress against all competition. In none of these "petitions," "protests," or "appeals" is the fact disclosed that all the great "investments," so called, were the profits of the properties themselves, and hundreds of private fortunes aside from these represented here have been made so large as to enable their owners to retire from business. The fact is that these so-called investments, so far as these iron properties are concerned, are little more than the bountiful gifts of nature capitalized, and it would seem as if there ought to be some point or place where legislation should cease to interpose artificial barriers solely in the interest of a few individuals or a few corporations against the natural operations of the law of supply and demand.

The United States has a larger supply and a better quality of ore than any other country in the world. She can and does produce it cheaper than any other country in the world. Any claim for protection on the part of the Lake Superior mines against any other producers, either in this country or any other country, is absolutely without any merit, and if granted is solely in the interest of a very few individuals or some gigantic trust whose acquisitions in many cases are of a very questionable character. All these demands upon Congress are made in the name of labor, but the laborer is without protection; and, save China, he must compete in the open market of the whole world. Any legislation which leaves labor free to the competition of the world and at the same time taxes the product of that labor so as to bring this product under the control and manipulation of a few individuals, corporations, or trusts, will soon present, as it is even now presenting, in close proximity and alarming contrast the extremes of luxury and the extremes of penury. It is not difficult for a few influential individuals to secure thousands of names to almost any kind of a petition, and with these to attempt to overshadow Congress and to secure not class legislation, but individual, corporate, and trust legislation.

Iron ore is not a manufactured article. No man ever made a ton or a pound of it. The only labor there is in its production is the labor of the Creator of the universe, and that labor needs no protection, and no man or set of men, be they individuals, corporations, or trusts, have any right to demand from Congress or any other lawmaking power any protection or special privileged legislation such as will give to them the sole benefit and monopoly of the work of its Creator. The lifting of this ore out of the ground does not change its form or fashion nor any of its constituent elements, and until this is done by the hand of man it is not manufactured. The petition of this committee to Congress, asking for a protective duty upon iron ore in the interest of its signers, is nothing more nor less than a courageous demand that Congress shall pay to them a premium upon the handwork and bounty of the Almighty. The demand for a protective duty upon coal is based upon no higher morals or better claim.

Very respectfully,

S. J. RITCHIE.

To the SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SHERMAN. Who is the signer?

Mr. VEST. Mr. Ritchie, of Akron, Ohio.

Mr. FRYE. His argument is against this bill, is it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. With the leave of the Senator from Missouri, I should like to say that I know Mr. Ritchie very well. He is the owner, or represents the owners of some mines in Canada; he is engaged in the mining industry. He is the representative of a corporation which is said to have a capital of five or six million dollars, located at Sudbury, in Canada. I have been there and I know about it. It is one of the greatest nickel mines in the world. The same ore contains a great deal of copper, and is very valuable. All around that region along the north Superior country there is an iron formation as well as on the south side. I have no doubt the corporation he represents will make more than double its capital if the duty is removed. We all know Mr. Ritchie. He is a gentleman who has been about the Committee on Finance, over and over again, representing his interests in a Canadian corporation.

It is said in this letter, which I do not believe is true, that Mr. Rockefeller is buying up all the iron mines in the Lake Superior region. Undoubtedly it is true that mining property has greatly depreciated in value. No doubt its price was too high, caused by speculation; but now it has gone down. The proposed repeal of the duty on foreign ores compelled the owners to stop their works, they could not sell their ore, and now all along the borders of Lake Erie and Lake Michigan there is an immense store of iron ore from the Lake Superior mines with no sale, because of the fear of the duty being removed. They can not go

on and mine the ore, and the whole work is suspended; but I do not believe there has been any attempt to create a trust.

If there is, Mr. Ritchie, who is an acute man, an able man, will doubtless seize the opportunity to take advantage of the depression caused by the threat of the reduction of the duty or the repeal of the duty to make a great fortune out of his mines in Canada. With free iron ore he could land his iron, nickel, and copper ore at Cleveland and Buffalo, and undersell the American miner.

I am not in favor of a trust of any kind. I think our legislation ought not to favor trusts, and yet the threatened legislation has favored and will favor trusts. The removal of the duty on iron ore would, by a combination of American and Canadian companies, create a greater trust than any that exists in this country to-day.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the personality of Mr. Ritchie has very little whatever to do with this argument. He makes statements in the paper which has been read which are absolutely true in regard to the cost of taking out these ores from the Mesaba district, and he states that there is no iron industry in Europe which can produce iron as cheaply or put it upon the market as cheaply as can the Lake Superior mines. That is the salient point in this whole argument; and that determines the question as to whether they ought to have what they call protection or not.

The Senator from Ohio speaks of trusts—

Mr. SHERMAN. Let me say to the Senator that the whole of the cost of this ore is labor, except the 10 or 20 cents per ton royalty, whatever may be the charge—I think it is from 10 to 25 cents royalty, according to the character of the ore. That is the capital represented by the men who own this land. All the balance is labor. The ore is transported on short lines of railroad to Lake Superior, and there put upon vessels, all of which are built for this particular trade, and are good for nothing else, except to carry wheat, ore, or some article in bulk. The whole cost, as I have said, is labor from beginning to end.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if the ore is put upon the market lower than foreign ore can be brought here in competition with it, that is all that we are concerned with now.

As to the question of labor, I do not care to go into the old argument in regard to it. It is enough for me to point to the testimony which was taken in regard to the Homestead riots. When one of the leaders of the riots was asked by Col. OATES, recently nominated by the Democrats as their candidate for governor of Alabama, how much his wages were a day, he said \$14 and something. "Why," said Col. OATES, "that is good wages, is it not, for a single man who only pays two helpers, one \$1.75 a day and the other \$1.50?" "Yes," he said, "Col. OATES, that is good wages; but you gentlemen at Washington gave Mr. Carnegie in the McKinley act \$1,500,000 profit on steel beams, and we want to know what has become of our part of it."

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to say to my honorable friend from Missouri that he has fallen into the same error into which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VORHEES] fell in his opening speech. The McKinley law reduced the rates on every article of iron and steel, and I expect at some time in the course of this discussion to show the reductions and the reasons for them.

Mr. ALLISON. The McKinley act reduced the duty on steel beams.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, yes; and on every other item in this schedule.

Mr. VEST. At the proper time we can discuss what the McKinley act did or did not do. I did not say it had reduced the rates of duty or put them up. I gave you the reply of this workman in order to illustrate the position of the labor in the United States, which the Senator from Ohio himself stated in a public interview caused more than anything else the defeat of the Republican party in 1892.

I have the Senator's own interview in which he stated that the operatives in the United States came to the conclusion that they did not get their just proportion of the benefits of the tariff, and that that operated against his party in 1892. I quoted simply the argument made by that operative when he answered to Col. OATES that he did not get his part of the plunder that you gave over to Mr. Carnegie. Whether you did it or not, is not the question now. That was the man's statement, and his belief was that because the laborers did not get their part of it, the riot came on, which, above anything else in the early part of that campaign, antagonized the claims of the Republican party upon the labor element in the United States.

Returning to what Mr. Ritchie said, and it is the salient point in his argument—and if it is not true it can be disproved very easily by the trade reports as to the price of the Lake Superior iron on the market, and I say that the report is true—the foreign iron can not compete with it in this country at those rates.

Mr. ALDRICH. Would it interrupt the Senator if I should ask him a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly not.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask why the Senator put a duty of 40 cents a ton upon iron ore in this bill?

Mr. VEST. I will answer the Senator with a great deal of pleasure. I was about to come to that. It is entirely legitimate for our friends upon the other side to taunt us with having put this 40 cents a ton on iron ore.

I believe in free iron and free coal and free lead and free zinc and free lumber and free hides and free cotton and free wool. Now, you ask me why these rates are put in this bill, and I answer because we could not help ourselves with the meager majority we had in this Chamber, and because there were Democratic Senators upon this floor who disagreed with us, who were unwilling to support any bill with free iron ore and free coal. I have no hesitation in making the statement that an immense majority of the Democratic party hold the opposite opinion.

Why did not the Senator put a duty upon cotton and upon hides in the McKinley act? Why does not the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who attacks Governor Russell here to-day, go before his people and urge the putting of a duty back upon cotton and upon hides? Because he knows very well that the cotton manufacturers of New England and the leather manufacturers of New England would rise against the Republican party if they dared to do any such thing. He knows very well that while the woolen manufacturers of New England were depressed and closing down, the cotton manufacturers were enabled, by reason of their free raw material, to stand much better the financial difficulties which were before them. He knows now that the Republican party do not dare to advocate a duty upon hides, because the leather interests in the Republican party of New England would immediately rise against the Republican party if they dared to do it.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] thanks the Senator from Alabama for advocating or bringing about this duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore. I have nothing to say about who brought it about; I do not propose to indulge in any personalities here. I have simply to say that I am responsible for my opinion and responsible for my action in voting for this bill as the best we can get, and I propose to go before the people of Missouri and tell them what my private opinions are and that I am in favor of free raw materials, although the Senator from Massachusetts, who spoke the other day, said there is no such thing as raw material. I propose to say to my people that I did the best I could under the circumstances to pass a tariff bill with which I did not agree.

The Senator from Ohio says the State of Texas has little interest in this matter. Mr. President, every Senator is interested in it whether his State has manufactures or not, and the argument is not a fair one. But for myself I say that I represent a State, the seventh in manufacturing in the Union, with large iron interests, and yet I will go before the people to-day or to-morrow and say to them that I am in favor of free iron ore, and that I was obliged to vote to put this 40 cents a ton duty upon it by the exigencies which arose in the Senate in our own party.

But, returning to the thanks the Senator gave to the Senators from Alabama, if the people of Alabama or their representatives urge a duty upon iron ore they make a great mistake. They have no interest in that duty, and I hold in my hand an article from the Engineering and Mining Journal, which goes on to state in a carefully prepared article the cost of coal and iron in Alabama, as follows:

Coal is now loaded on the cars in Alabama at a cost of 60 cents per ton, and coke is produced at a cost of \$1.16 per ton. The amount of coke required for 1 ton of pig iron is 1 1/2 tons. The entire cost of making a ton of pig metal, according to the Journal (which gives the items in detail), is \$3.87, average, but there are some establishments which produce it as low as \$6 per ton of 2,240 pounds, and yet further economies are expected. As the lowest price of Cleveland pig in England is \$3, the Journal reaches the conclusion that "The day is not distant when Alabama will capture the South American markets now supplied by England and Germany, and will even become a formidable rival in some of the European markets." We commented the other day on the fact attested by the American Manufacturer that there had been a sale of Alabama iron in Pittsburg at \$5 on the cars at the place of production. This was, of course, an exceptional sale. The same paper in its issue of January 25, says that sales of Alabama iron in large lots are now making at \$6.90 to \$7 per ton cash at the works.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the date of the article?

Mr. VEST. I read from the Engineering and Mining Journal of about a month ago, I think.

This shows that the Alabama iron ore can compete successfully with any in the world, and that there is no necessity for the people of Alabama to ask for any protection on iron ore. The effect of putting a duty of any sort upon iron ore is simply to handicap the iron manufacturers upon the Atlantic seaboard.

It has no other effect, and can have none other. It is a struggle between Pittsburg and Lake Superior as to the domestic market.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the Senator from Missouri is as well aware as I am that the Alabama ores do not compete with the Lake Superior ores at all?

Mr. VEST. Of course I know you can not make Bessemer out of it, and therefore the Alabama people have no interest at all in this duty. As the article says, from which I read, they will soon command the foreign markets, because with their limestone, their ore, their coal, and their cheap labor, altogether, they will be enabled to produce this article cheaper than any people in the world.

Mr. President, as far back as the testimony before the Tariff Commission, an Alabama miner, the owner of one of the largest mines there, testified that they needed no protection, and the Senator from Rhode Island knows that the freight upon iron ore from abroad gives to us the advantage upon the Atlantic seaboard and everywhere else, as against the foreign ores.

There are certain sorts of foreign ore which are necessary to be mixed with the domestic ore. They are brought generally from Cuba and Spain; but the effect of this duty being a prohibitory one, is simply to keep out those ores, and to that extent it is a burden upon the iron manufacturers of the East. As to my own State, it has very little interest in the matter, because the transportation gives to us the domestic market in our immediate vicinity, and that is all we can claim.

I repeat, in conclusion, that the only effect of imposing the duty which is now proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, to increase it to 60 cents a ton, is to handicap the iron and steel manufacturers of the Eastern seaboard.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. President, the State which I in part represent is probably more interested in this matter than any other State in the United States, and I have just a few words to say on this question in addition to what has been said by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] in relation to the wonderful increase of the products of the iron ore industry in Michigan.

Thirty years ago or thereabouts 1,000 tons, I think, was about the total product of iron ore that was produced and shipped in the State of Michigan. To show the wonderful increase, in 1884, 2,417,113 tons were shipped from Michigan alone—I am not speaking now about all of the Lake Superior district. That production has gone on steadily year by year until in 1892, 7,623,598 tons of iron ore were shipped from the iron regions of the State of Michigan.

Just as soon as the Democratic party came into power, when a tariff bill was talked about, the iron business collapsed completely. There were no sales, no demand for the ores, and the iron mines were practically closed during last fall and winter, a very unusual thing.

One of the gentlemen who own these mines, in answer to the inquiries made by the Finance Committee, writes as follows:

Our output—

This is the reply of the Columbia Iron Mining Company, of Crystal Falls, Mich.—

Our output since commencing has amounted to 340,000 tons of non-Bessemer iron ore.

In 1893 we closed down eight months because of threatened tinkering with the tariff.

A duty of 75 cents per ton is necessary to place us on an equal footing with foreign miners, because we pay our laborers more than 100 per cent over foreign competitors.

If the duty were reduced one-third a reduction of about 40 per cent in cost of production would be necessary.

Speaking of the prices of ore, a subject which has been talked about considerably here, they say:

The prices of ore have been as follows: 1884, \$4.75; 1890, \$3.75; 1892, \$2.75; 1893, or present time, \$1.90 per ton.

That is non-Bessemer ore—

Mr. ALDRICH. Are those the prices at the mines?

Mr. MCMILLAN. Yes, those are the prices at the mines. The reply proceeds:

There has been an increase in foreign and domestic competition, principally domestic.

It is true there has been much competition during the last few years, owing to the duty upon ores, and we have received Cuban ores, which are brought as far west as Pittsburg, but not to any great extent as yet, however.

This firm further say:

We prefer a specific duty. An ad valorem rate gives the foreigners a chance to doctor prices to suit themselves.

We are entirely shut down at present; all our mines are full of water. In 1892 we had fifteen mines working, employing about 1,000 men. Now every-

thing is idle and scores of people starving on account of no work, the result of monkeying with the tariff.

There has been a reduction of over 60 per cent in wages during the past twelve months.

We have no difficulty in construing the existing tariff.

Price of living remains *in statu quo*.

Keep the 75 per cent per ton duty on iron ore to remedy the trouble.

Our product is among the necessities.

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator state from whom that communication comes?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is from Crystal Falls, Mich.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it not from the Columbia Iron Mining Company, of Crystal Falls, Mich.?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, and these are answers given to questions propounded by the Committee on Finance.

From 8 to 10 per cent is the rate of interest.

Immigration has had no effect on our business.

Sixty per cent of our labor is skilled.

We propose to meet a reduction of the duty by reducing labor.

If working full force we would employ 300 men, and under our present tariff system would pay ordinary laborers \$1.50 to \$1.75.

As to the number of people employed in our State in the production of iron ores we have what are called the Marquette range, the Menominee range, and the Gogebic range, and the number of people employed in 1892 was 17,272. There is a very large number of people employed in that one industry. In 1893 the number employed was reduced to 3,673, and the condition of the iron country during the last winter was pitiful; in fact, the condition there at the present time is very threatening. It is only two or three weeks since that riots took place there involving very serious trouble among the men who are out of work and who are inclined to make trouble.

I will state, Mr. President, that I hold in my hand the eleventh annual report of the commissioner of labor of the State of Michigan, giving the latest information on the subject. He gives the amount of the production in the State; and I ask permission to have this statement printed in the RECORD without reading. It contains a great deal of important information.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will have it read if it is not too long.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is pretty long.

Mr. CHANDLER. On what page of the bulletin is it found?

Mr. McMILLAN. It is not to be found in the bulletin; it is the report of the commissioner of labor of the State of Michigan.

Mr. HOAR. How many pages of the document the Senator holds in his hands does it cover altogether?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know exactly, but quite a number of figures are given in the report, and, as it is quite lengthy, if there be no objection, I will ask that it be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The extract from the report referred to is as follows:

MICHIGAN IRON MINES AND MINERS.

In this connection it is believed that the following history of Michigan iron mines and miners, from the discovery of iron ore in 1884 to the present time, covering the development of the mines, tons of ore produced, the cost and prices received each year, together with the wages paid men in different years will be not only interesting, but instructive, especially at this time when the great industry is almost at a standstill.

While the Upper Peninsula of this State is celebrated for its mines of iron ore, and while they have been continuously wrought since the year 1848, there are many of the inhabitants of Michigan and especially among those living south of the Straits of Mackinac, who do not possess anything like a correct conception of their magnitude, or the amount of capital and labor employed in their development and operation. Contributing as they do so much to the support of the labor of Michigan, a brief outline describing them in a general way may not be amiss at this time and place.

The wonderful growth of our ore-mining industry is something Michigan people, who pride themselves upon the many successful enterprises of their State, can point to with no inconsiderable degree of satisfaction. Beginning with the discovery point, the Jackson mine, Marquette County, in the year 1844, Michigan now stands at the head of all States in the Union in the number of tons of iron ore mined each year, and has made it possible for the United States to gain the position it now holds as first in the list of all countries of the world producing iron ore and pig iron.

For many years after the finding of the original ore deposit, development was necessarily slow, due to the lack of proper facilities for shipping of product and securing of supplies, and to the absence of suitable machinery and correct knowledge of the inclosing rock formations and how they could be best taken care of. It was not until the year 1873 that a product of 1,000,000 tons per annum was achieved, a record that was heralded far and near as one the State might never again equal, and while the wonder was that so much had been produced, a greater problem was presented in how was it all to be consumed. The latter was answered by the building of new furnaces and mills in Ohio and Pennsylvania, to which markets the ore was freighted by boat from Marquette, the then only outlet by water.

As the demand for iron grew there was incentive offered for the discovery of new mines, and this led to search in other fields than the then single one which had made such progress. The work of the prospector was rewarded, and in 1877 was added the Menominee range with its natural lake port at Escanaba, Mich. The contribution from this district was utilized, and the year 1885 witnessed the addition of the Gogebic range with lake ports at Ashland, Wis., and Escanaba, Mich. Every pound of the ore from these three great ranges was marketed, and at a price that allowed liberal profits

to those who placed money in the enterprise, and gave fair wages to the labor employed in and about the mines.

No region was more prosperous or contented, and the almost entire absence of strikes or labor dissensions is conclusive proof that the relation between employer and employé was agreeable even unto cordiality. No other region in the country employing a like amount of labor can show a better record in this respect. Contributing to this end we find a population of intelligent laboring men. The miners are Englishmen from the mining districts of Cornwall; Scandinavians, from Norway and Sweden; a small percentage of Irish nativity, and a few Italians and Finns. The laborers who are given place on the surface doing ordinary work, and who tram the cars of ore underground in the mine, are made up from the different nationalities with a larger percentage of Finns than is found among the miners. Altogether they comprise a very thrifty population. Many possess their own homes, which are well provided with comforts, and all are well dressed. The number of children enrolled in the different districts as attending school show that particular attention is given to educational affairs, speaking volumes for the thrift and patriotism of the people.

The success attending the business of mining has built up many substantial towns that derive their support from the labor here given place. In the Marquette district is Ishpeming, the largest city in point of population in the upper peninsula, it possessing about 12,000 souls. Negaunee, 3 miles distant, has 6,000, and besides these are the villages of Republic and Champion, with 3,000 people. Marquette, the lake port for a portion of the product, has over 8,000 people who are dependent upon the railway and lake shipping interests directly associated with the mines in the transportation of their product. Escanaba, that takes a portion of the ore of the Marquette and Gogebic, and the entire amount sent from the Menominee range, has 6,000 people who are directly associated with the ore shipping industry. The Menominee range has the active city of Iron Mountain, the location of the principal mines, while Norway, Crystal Falls, and other towns are important. In Gogebic County is Ironwood, with 8,000 inhabitants; Bessemer, the county seat, and other places of importance, and all of them entirely dependent upon the mining of iron ore for existence.

When it is said that \$80,000,000 are actually invested in the iron mines of Lake Superior, so called, and that \$180,000,000 have been placed in the mines and in the equipment of docks, railways, and boat lines necessary to the conducting of the business, the place that capital holds is apparent. And when to this is added the fact that of the entire cost of the finished forms of iron and steel 85 per cent can be charged to labor—figuring from the time the miner breaks the ore from the vein until the sheet of steel comes from the rolls—the importance of the industry to the laboring men of this State, and to other States to which the ore is sent upon its journey of transformation, can be realized.

Nature has contributed her full share in the giving of ores of different varieties and grades that are especially desirable for the manufacture of both iron and steel. They are the richest in iron of any produced in America, giving to the finished product the greatest tensile strength and toughness which has made their use so popular and afforded so ready a market for many years at a fair price. In this feature of excellent qualities is found one reason for the rapid development of the mines as compared to those of lower grades situated at nearer proximity to the great iron and steel manufacturing centers, and whose operation can be carried on at less cost, owing to climatic advantages over the Lake Superior fields, where winters are long and severe, and where labor needs greater aids in the way of clothing, food, and fuel.

We find many changes in the methods of working the mines as compared to those in vogue earlier in their history, these being to the advantage of the men employed as well as to the shareholders. As the mines grow older they increase in depth. Where the lowest levels were working at 200 feet below surface ten years ago they are now down to 600 and 1,000 feet. In the majority of mines the men are raised and lowered in cages that are substantially constructed of iron and steel. This does away with the fatiguing exertion of climbing slippery ladders, the old method of going up and down. We find that special signals are given the engineers handling the hoisting engines whenever there are men in the cage, and at such times a lower rate of speed is observed in raising or lowering the cage, or skip.

There is a State law requiring that every mine shall have at least two shafts, so that in case of accident to one, which might close it, there may be another avenue through which the men underground could escape to the surface. We find this law universally lived up to. A State law creating the office of mine inspector in each county where mining was extensively carried on went into effect in 1886. In case dangerous places exist in the mines the inspector can be called in at the request of a certain number of men and he may order such changes as he may think necessary to their protection. We find upon inquiry among the miners that the office is acceptable to them and that it is being well attended to in the different ranges. We find, too, that each mining company gives its mining captain and shift bosses particular directions with reference to the care of ground that may appear defective, so that accident to life may not occur. After each blast is fired men as "barriers" take down such loose pieces of rock or ore as may not have been thrown completely out by the force of the explosion. There are no gases in the mines and the ventilation is generally good, the older mines having many shafts, affording an abundance of pure air.

In years gone by no little sickness was caused by the nitroglycerin used as an explosive, the fumes of the burning acid causing severe headaches, from which the men suffered considerably. This is now almost entirely overcome by the introduction of dynamite in which the nitroglycerin is taken by an absorbent, the chemical properties of which dispense with former sickening fumes. Of importance, too, is the greater safety in handling the modern explosive, accident from premature explosion now being rare, whereas in times gone by death from such causes was frightfully common by reason of the very sensitive nature of the pure nitroglycerin.

At all of the larger mines we find considerable "dry" or change houses, where the miners wash themselves and change their clothing after coming out of the mine. There are baths provided with hot and cold water, closets for the keeping of the clothing of the men while they are at work, and a man is employed to take charge of the building and its contents. Heating is done by steam. For this service each miner pays 50 cents per month.

Nine hospitals are found in the principal towns, these being in charge of physicians of excellent skill who provide medical attendance, medicines, food, and place for men injured in the mines, and besides treat their families. The married men each pay from \$1.50 to \$2 for this service, and the unmarried men 50 cents less per month. The general health of the ore districts is good, the principal towns having excellent sewerage systems and pay particular attention to sanitary affairs.

An epidemic of typhoid fever at Ironwood the past summer was an unusual exception. At each mine there is a benefit fund to which every miner belongs. In case of accident rendering him unable to work, the benefit club takes care of him, and in case of death his widow or family receives from \$500 to \$1,000, and besides this the funeral expenses are paid. Each miner subscribes 50 cents per month, and the mining company puts as much into the fund each month as do the miners. Some of the clubs have accumulated considerable property in this way from which they have derived important

benefits, and have rendered substantial aid to those of their number who have been unfortunate in the mines.

Of much interest to the miners of Michigan and other ore-producing fields of the country is the fact that the eight-hour day has been adopted at three of the mines of the Marquette range. It was first inaugurated at the Pittsburg and Lake Angeline Mine, Ishpeming City, October, 1892. The company, unsolicited by the employes, offered to make a three-months' trial of the plan, which, if it gave as large a product per man as under the ten-hour day, would result in the adoption of the shorter day. Not only has the trial given as large a product, but has been increased by a considerable percentage over the old day of ten hours, and the system is now employed throughout the entire property of this company.

In November of 1892 the Winthrop Iron Company, in the Marquette district, followed the plan of the Lake Angeline, and has been working satisfactorily upon that system ever since. These mines work three "shifts" or parties of men. They relieve each other "in place," as they term it, one party taking the tools from the hands of the retiring one, so that no time is lost. Two shifts of eight hours each are being worked at the Salisbury mine of the Cleveland-Cliffs Company, Ishpeming, Marquette range, with about the same result as shown under the ten-hour day. The addition of the third shift would undoubtedly show a gain over results now accomplished, and would be tried but for the fact that the company does not wish to make a larger output of ore until the market for it is more satisfactory than now. The eight-hour day is not as yet observed by any other mines of the Lake Superior districts than those here mentioned.

The amount of ore produced since the time the mines were first opened is enormous. Up to and including the year 1893 the three Michigan fields have shipped 73,936,827 gross tons. Contributing to this the Marquette range has credit for 40,971,000 tons; the Menominee 18,032,311 tons, and the Gogebic 14,933,516 tons. Including the entire Lake Superior region, which embraces the mines of Minnesota, the grand total tonnage is 80,390,352.

Showing the rapid and steady gain in production, the following figures giving the number of tons annually sent out for each of the past ten years will prove interesting:

Year.	Michigan mines.	Entire lake region.
	Tons.	Tons.
1884	2,417,113	2,506,814
1885	2,285,249	2,516,201
1886	3,126,517	3,558,571
1887	4,170,078	4,748,276
1888	4,283,926	5,046,503
1889	6,054,249	7,282,644
1890	7,678,637	9,003,701
1891	6,063,814	7,091,981
1892	7,628,598	9,069,556
1893	4,300,000	5,933,196

The great falling off in shipments from Michigan mines for the year 1893 as compared to 1892 and previous years is noticeable. In 1892 all former records were eclipsed with the exception of 1890, but it will be seen that the entire Lake Superior output was in excess of any previous year. In 1892 Michigan produced 46.29 per cent of the ore mined in the United States, an achievement of which her people may justly feel proud.

With the falling off in product for 1893 there was still greater reduction of labor. As early as April several mines of the Gogebic range shut down, while a number materially reduced their forces of men. At Bessemer, the Colby mine, the principal one at that place, ceased operations, throwing 700 men out of employment. At Ironwood the Norrie mine, employing when active 1,600 men, was wholly closed in June, at which time the Ashland, the second largest mine in the city, also stopped, letting out 650. The Menominee range was affected at about the same time; the Chapin, the largest mine on the range, suspended, as did every property employing labor in the Crystal Falls section of that range.

The mines of the Marquette range held on generally until July, when they, too, succumbed to the same causes that had silenced their neighbors—inability to secure money to carry on the business and lack of a market at bidding prices. The following table, showing the number of men given place on the different ranges at the 1st of November in each of the years mentioned, suggest the seriousness of present conditions:

Year.	Marquette range.	Menominee range.	Gogebic range.	Total.
1889	6,585	2,752	3,279	12,616
1890	7,484	4,012	3,962	15,458
1891	7,230	4,208	3,843	15,281
1892	7,986	4,665	4,621	17,272
1893	1,895	1,365	413	3,673

The year 1893 has certainly been a great disappointment to the labor and capital of the ore fields of this State. Personal visitation of many of the principal mines of the different fields reveals the fact that much was expected of the year. In almost every instance the representatives of the mining companies informed us that they had anticipated and arranged for a large output. Their forces of men had been kept up throughout the winter of 1892-'93 (the usual custom, as the ore is stocked upon surface at the mines at this season, when navigation on the lakes can not be carried on), and all had been made ready for a still larger output than the one achieved in 1892.

The thousands of men who were forced into idleness sought employment in other fields, but other mining fields were experiencing similar troubles as those of Michigan. A few hundred were engaged by coal-mining companies at Spring Valley, Ill., the larger percentage of Italians emigrated to their native country, and many of the English miners returned to Cornwall, but there were thousands who remained at home, hoping that each succeeding day would bring news of the opening of the home properties. A few of the mines continued in operation, giving place to the number of men indicated in the table before printed.

Some of these arranged to supply the men with provisions until such time as they could raise the money to pay them, this depending upon the condition of the market and promptness of buyers to meet maturing paper. But there was a severe cut in former wage rates of those who continued in employment, this being due to the fact that ore had fallen in price at least \$1 per ton, and there was no other way of meeting the reduction than by lessening the wages of the men employed in the mining. Showing the severity

of this, I append the following table of wages paid at one of the principal mines for the last thirty-six years:

Years.	Wages paid surface-men.	Wages paid miners.	Years.	Wages paid surface-men.	Wages paid miners.
1857	\$0.75	\$0.90	1876	\$1.35	\$1.50
1858	.75	.90	1877	1.35	1.50
1859	.75	.90	1878	1.35	1.50
1860	1.25	1.35	1879	1.35	1.50
1861	1.00	1.15	1880	1.55	1.75
1862	.90	1.10	1881	1.50	1.70
1863	1.75	2.25	1882	1.50	1.85
1864	2.50	3.00	1883	1.65	1.90
1865	2.00	2.50	1884	1.65	1.95
1866	2.00	2.50	1885	1.55	1.90
1867	2.00	2.40	1886	1.65	1.90
1868	1.80	2.25	1887	1.65	2.05
1869	1.80	2.25	1888	1.55	2.00
1870	1.75	2.25	1889	1.50	1.75
1871	1.75	2.25	1890	1.50	1.75
1872	1.75	2.25	1891	1.55	1.75
1873	2.00	2.75	1892	1.50	1.70
1874	1.35	1.50	1893*	1.00	1.50
1875	1.35	1.50			

*Since July.

The above wages were upon what is known in the mining region as the "company-account" plan. This is for a stipulated wage per day. By far the largest portion of the mining is done upon the contract system, the miner receiving so much per ton of ore broken and placed in skips, or else so much per foot of ground drifted, or sunk, as the case may be. The wages earned by the contractors will average much better than those of the company-account men. At the mine from which the figures above were obtained about one thousand men are employed when full force is on, and fully seven-eighths of this number were working on the contract plan.

At another mine, whose full complement of men is over 800, we were shown the books of the company operating it, which contained a record of the earnings of the contract labor, this including miners and skip-tenders. Figures representing the net earnings per day (the cost of oil, candles, and explosives having been deducted) were as follows:

1884	\$2.32	1890	\$2.58
1885	2.22	1881	2.51
1886	2.39	1892	2.43
1887	2.39	1893, first nine months	2.11
1888	2.36	1893, October and November	1.54
1889	2.46		

The mine from which these figures were taken is located in the Marquette range, where we found wages higher than those paid in the Menominee or Gogebic districts, the latter paying miners \$1.25 per day on contract plan.

In the Vermillion district of the Lake Superior region miners were being paid \$1 per day, and surfacemen 80 cents. The latter district requires skilled labor, the mines being producers of hard and soft ores much like those of the Marquette district of the Michigan field. Mining is conducted on the underground plan, where experienced miners are necessary to successful operation.

In the above table of figures, showing the earnings of contract miners where the highest wages are now paid in the Lake Superior mines, it will be noticed that the months of October and November, 1893, show a reduction of 36 per cent as compared to the average daily wages of the nine years previous, and of 38 per cent for the nine years preceding 1893. This lowered wage has resulted in general dissatisfaction on the part of the laborers who find they can barely exist upon it, and in cases where the surface laborers have large families, which we find to be often the condition, they are forced to suffer for lack of much that the severe climate demands. Cold weather comes with the first of October. Snow generally comes with the first week of November and frequently lasts until the first of May. In past years the miners and laborers were abundantly able to make provision for the cold weather part of the year, having a surplus of money that was devoted to such use. Nor is the forced change acceptable to the mining companies, who appreciate the fact that low wages beget trouble as well as cause physical suffering.

The great shrinkage in the selling price of ore gives reason for the lowered wage. Bessemer ores containing 67 per cent metallic iron and .02 per cent in phosphorus dropped from \$4.50, the price received in 1892, to \$3.25 per ton; this for deliveries at Lake Erie ports. An average of \$1.60 of the selling price must be paid for transporting each ton from the mines, this including insurance and commission, which amounts to 15 cents per ton. A majority of the Lake Superior mines are wrought by those who lease them from the owners of the fee of the lands holding the ore deposits, a royalty being paid the fee owners of so much per ton, this varying with the quality and character of the product from 25 to 60 cents.

With this added to the cost of freight there is little left for mining, local taxes, and the many other items entering into the cost of raising the ore. The companies are employing the best machinery known to the industry for rapid and cheap winning of the mineral stores, and lessened cost is now largely at the expense of labor. We find magnificent plants of hoisting machinery, modern pumping engines, rock drills operated by compressed air that have taken the place of the old style drill that cut the ground slowly, and with much effort on the part of the miner who wielded the hammer to force its passage into the ore or rock.

There is machinery that fashions the sets of timber that go into the mine to support the hanging walls; steam and electrically propelled tram cars take the ore from the stope to the shaft. Instead of being wheeled by hand in barrows, the ore of stock-piles is now placed in the shipping cars by means of the steam shovel, saving time and severe effort on the part of labor. All that the ingenuity of man can devise to assist in the obtaining of ore at the lowest possible cost had been adopted.

In interviews with many of the miners of the different fields they complain that lowered wages had not been accompanied by lessened cost of living. Rents were lower than before the cut, but aside from this single item they were paying as much for the necessaries of life.

Many of the representatives of the leading mines of the different ranges were seen and questioned with reference to their opinions as to the cause of the change in their condition as contrasted to former years. They were as a unit in replying, all having substantially the same statement to make. They claimed that the furnaces and mills had generally suspended work be-

fore the closures at the mines, and as consumption had stopped, production could not be continued. Changes in duty on pig iron, steel rails, and other manufactures of iron ore had been promised; free iron ore had been advocated, and this with such apparent sincerity by those who held the reins of government that capital had decided to await such promised changes before making further iron ore or iron purchases.

Changes in tariffs might be reflected by changes in values of iron products, and it had been decided by the manufacturers to hold aloof until Congress gave final decision upon the question. The consumers of ore had given the producers this reason, too, and the mining companies as well as their employes are agreed upon this as the cause of their troubles.

At one mine producing hard specular and magnetic iron ore and which was idle, we were told that the Cuban ores had already taken the place of theirs in Pittsburg, Pa., furnaces. Inquiry as to whether home production might not have been too largely in excess of the demand we were answered that there had been no evidence in support of such point. The amount of iron ore in stock at Lake Erie ports at the close of navigation for the past five years is shown as follows:

	Gross tons.
1889	3,607,106
1890	3,893,487
1891	3,508,489
1892	4,149,451
1893	4,070,710

It is from this stock that the furnaces are supplied during the season when lake navigation is closed, or from about November 15 to May 20 of the following year. In addition to home product of iron ore there had been sent in from foreign countries the following tonnage, the ores coming directly into competition with those of Michigan:

	Tons imported.
1889	853,573
1890	1,246,830
1891	912,864
1892	806,585
1893, first ten months	501,845

A statement that natural labor no longer was entitled to consideration in figuring upon the cost of mining ore, for the reason that the innovation of the steam shovel had shown that it was to do the mining in future, was bitterly resented by the mining men and the miners of the Michigan fields. They claimed this to be unfair, because it was untrue. Of the 16,036,043 tons of iron ore mined in the United States in 1893 none had been raised with the steam shovel, and of the twenty-four States producing ore in 1893 but one had employed the shovel in the stead of the miner, and that at but three mines of the many it possessed. The total tonnage of ore so secured would amount but to 200,000 tons.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—
Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Iowa pardon me a moment?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.
Mr. BUTLER. I want to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to some testimony given before a select committee of which I happened to be a member, of which, by the bye, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] was a member, on our relations with Canada. I remember the statement of a very intelligent man by the name of Horace P. Tobey, given in Boston in 1889, September 12. I suppose the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Rhode Island would scarcely read the statute of limitations upon that testimony. Mr. Tobey was the treasurer of the Tremont Nail Company, at Wareham, N. H.—

Mr. CHANDLER. It should be Massachusetts.
Mr. BUTLER. It is printed here "New Hampshire" and not "Massachusetts."

Mr. HOAR. That is not the only thing wrong in the report.
Mr. GALLINGER. There is no such town in our State, I would say to the Senator, and it evidently should be Wareham, Mass.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well. After giving a long statement as to the effect of the duty on coal and iron and one thing or another, he sums up in this way:

While foreign pig iron has fallen to about one-third of its value of 1872, the specific duty has not been reduced at all. In other words, for the last ten years pig iron has paid nearly three times the duty, value for value, that was imposed upon it in 1872.

The case has been nearly the same as regards scrap iron: but, in the absence of exact statistics, we do not tabulate the prices of this grade of crude iron.

This duty is practically prohibitory. Importations are confined almost entirely to certain high grades of pig iron, in the use of which quality is more considered than price.

Then he gives the result of this system of taxation, and I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to one of his observations in reply to a statement he made this morning in regard to the protection of labor. If I understood the Senator a right, he said that the manufacturers of this country did not require protection on their own account, but on account of labor, and I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio and also of the Senator from Rhode Island to the observations of this gentleman upon that subject:

The result has been that New England rolling mills and foundries have been compelled to pay for their crude materials the price ruling at distant furnaces in other States, plus a freight rate of several dollars per ton to their works. As the rolling mills, foundries, and machine shops located near such furnaces can transmit their finished goods to the New England consumer nearly as cheaply as the New England mill, foundry, or machine shop can bring in its pig iron, the tendency has been to throw all the manufacturing, manipulating, and finishing of iron and steel, as well as the production of pig iron, into the hands of the iron-producing States, and to wipe out the iron and steel industries, large and small, of New England.

This is the remark which struck me with a good deal of surprise at that time, and to which I should be glad to invite the attention of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber:

The surviving mills owe their continued existence, in a small part, to the fact that they have been able to pick up and rework a little old material (scrap-iron, castings, and turnings) in their own territory; but chiefly to the fact that they have, through the compulsion of circumstances, been systematically engaged in the degradation of American labor in New England. A skilled operative in a New England rolling mill does not, on an average, receive one-half the pay that a man similarly employed in a Pittsburg mill receives for the same work.

So much for that. Then he goes on to give the price in New England rolling mills and what other manufacturers are compelled to pay for iron ore, iron, and coal.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. The statement which was read this morning by the Secretary, on my suggestion, appended to the petition of the Massachusetts Democratic Reform Club, was the statement of an iron manufacturer who is a Democrat. There is no name given on that paper at all, but I have no doubt whatever that the same Mr. Tobey, who made the statement from which the Senator is now reading, also made the statement which I have submitted. Mr. Tobey is the treasurer or the president, as the case may be, of the Tremont Coal Company, of Wareham, Mass., and he is the leader in the Democratic party of the free raw material movement in that State. He is the man above all others who puts this question to the front, and there is no sympathy, so far as I know, anywhere in any State of New England with the statement made by Mr. Tobey and quoted by the Senator from South Carolina, that there has been any degradation of labor in New England. The Senator from South Carolina has read this same statement to the Senate two or three times before.

Mr. BUTLER. I believe I have only read it once, but it will bear reading several times, and I will give the Senator enough of it before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will show his sympathy for Mr. Tobey by voting for his proposition, and not by empty words.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will possess his soul in patience I will convince him, as I will the Senate, that this is not a Democratic movement by any means. I do not know Mr. Tobey, and never met him except on that occasion. He appeared to be a very intelligent man, and I was informed he was a very reliable man. I do not know whether he told the truth or a falsehood.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. BUTLER. I would rather be permitted to get through with this statement, and then I will allow the Senator from New Hampshire to interrupt me, and also the Senator from Rhode Island.

Upon that point I desire to read from the testimony in answer to the statement that this demand for free raw material came alone from the Democrats of New England, as I understood the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. Entirely so, without the slightest exception, so far as I know.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will just bear with me a moment, I think I shall convince him that in that he is mistaken.

Mr. Tobey then goes on and summarizes the result of his statements and his experience, which I shall read. He says:

1. The duty upon imported crude iron is, and for ten years, on an average, has been, nearly three times as large, computed by value, as it was in 1872.
2. The existing duty upon bituminous coal prohibits to New England the exercise of the right which she enjoyed and largely used before the war, of importing Canadian coal, and, without producing any revenue for the Government, puts an extra and unnecessary cost of \$1.50 per ton upon all bituminous coal used in New England.

I am stating the New England side of it now, mind you.

Mr. PLATT. What amount does he state?

Mr. BUTLER. One dollar and a half per ton.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator pardon me? He speaks of that as the New England side of the question, when New England entirely repudiates that argument and takes the opposite side of it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Tobey is a New England man; and I think, before I get through, I shall convince the Senator from Massachusetts that some other very prominent Republicans in Massachusetts indorse this statement. If Senators will just bear with me a little while I think I shall convince them. I know it is uncomfortable for them, but still they must submit to this sort of thing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to repudiate that idea?

Mr. BUTLER. No, sir; I will not.

Mr. CHANDLER. I must repudiate that idea.

Mr. BUTLER. I will not permit the Senator to repudiate it, because I intend the Senator shall indorse it before I get through.

Mr. ALDRICH. Nothing the Senator from South Carolina could say would make us uncomfortable.

Mr. BUTLER. I am really sorry to see the Senators so restless in their chairs, which gives them the appearance of being very uncomfortable. I do not know whether the statement is correct or not, but I beg the Senators to remain quiet, and not to manifest so much anxiety and uneasiness about what I am reading.

Mr. Tobey continues:

3. The combined duties upon coal and iron ore prohibit the smelting of iron in New England, and the duty upon pig and scrap iron and coal is closing her iron and steel mills and workshops.

4. Under the pressure of these duties statistics indicate that the iron and steel working industries of New England have during the last ten years shrunk 40 per cent, while those of the country at large have during the same period increased about 57 per cent.

5. No natural disadvantages have caused this large loss to New England. The obstacles interposed by the tariff are solely responsible for it.

6. These obstacles have caused a degradation of American labor in New England.

7. In the manufacture, manipulation, and finishing of the iron and steel consumed in New England there would be support for 700,000 of her people if the prohibitory tariff duties upon crude iron, coal, coke, and iron ore were removed or properly reduced.

8. Crude iron is, in whole or in part, raw material in thirty-two of the States and in all the Territories.

9. The prohibition of cheap iron and steel to New England (through the heavy duty upon the crude materials used in their manufacture) is an obstacle to her progress in arts, sciences, manufactures, and civilization, and tends to her degradation in rank among the States.

10. National economy calls for the removal or large modification of the restrictions upon the importation of coal, coke, iron ore, and crude iron, since more men would thereby be given employment in the New England States than would be thrown out of work in other States, and the labor done would be of a higher grade.

11. The importation of crude iron under a largely reduced tariff into the seaboard States will not prevent the American furnaces from making iron for all the interior States, and through the fluctuations of the market competing for and securing a large part of the trade of the seacoast.

12. While this argument has been closely confined to the interests of the New England States it applies with nearly equal force to all the seaboard districts of the United States.

13. The rate of duty imposed upon the crude materials used in iron and steel manufacturing is at least six times as large as the average duties imposed by the existing tariff upon all other crude materials used in the arts and manufactures. It finds its parallel only in the heavy duty still imposed upon lead.

I want the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from New Hampshire to what this gentleman says.

Now, gentlemen—

He says, speaking to the committee—

I should be sorry to leave this subject without having you understand that this argument which I have read is not a partisan document originating in the minds of any fanatics or extremists. It is a deliberate statement of the wants and desires of the iron manufacturers of this district; and in proof of that I wish to call your attention to the annexed petition:

PETITION.

To the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the New England States:

Not Democrats or Republicans, but to Senators and Representatives in Congress from the New England States.

The undersigned, proprietors or managers of iron-working establishments in New England, being members of all political parties, and believing that in the adjustment of the tariff a careful regard should be had to the rights and interests of all sections and of all the people; that the local interests of each section should be carefully watched by its delegates in Congress; and that in order to be fully informed, such delegates must necessarily depend largely upon information furnished by their constituents, do hereby respectfully unite in calling your attention to the condition of the iron and steel working interests in New England, and to the effect of this condition upon the general interests of this section of our common country, as fully set forth in a statement prefixed hereto.

The statement from which I have just read.

And, in view of the approaching revision of the tariff laws, we further unite in the request that you will insist upon the incorporation of the following provisions in any revised tariff law that shall be enacted:

First. That iron ore, coal, and coke shall be put upon the free list, as they were before the war.

Second. That the duty upon pig iron and scrap iron and scrap steel which prevailed immediately before the war be restored, to wit, a duty of 24 per cent ad valorem.

The Senator from Rhode Island says this demand for free raw material comes alone from the Democracy of that section. This gentleman says:

I have selected hastily from among the signatures to this petition a few signatures of gentlemen who are so well known as being distinctively Republicans that I thought it would be well to give their names to the gentlemen of this committee, with a few words as to who they are, in order that you may not go away with any impression that this is a partisan document representing the opinions of the manufacturers of New England generally. Every name is the name of a Republican prominent in New England circles; Mr. John Sylvester, of the Sylvester Works; Thomas Cunningham, of the Cunningham Iron Works; Mr. Dart, treasurer of the Rhode Island Tool Company—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Dart is not a Republican. I do not know anything about the other gentleman, but Mr. Dart is not a Republican. He was a supporter of Mr. Cleveland.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well.

Peleg McFarlin, a Republican senator—

Mr. HOAR. Peleg McFarlin has gone over to the Democrats.

Mr. ALDRICH. He is a Democrat now.

Mr. BUTLER. Thus showing that he is coming to his senses.

Mr. HOAR. Will my friend from South Carolina allow me to ask him if that is a sound, fair answer.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, evidently, there is hope for the country.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question. He is reading a document which he says is signed by Republicans.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not say so.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator to say so.

Mr. BUTLER. I have said Mr. Tobey says so.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator is reading a statement of Mr. Tobey, and he would not, of course, desire to permit Mr. Tobey to mislead anyone. When two of those names in succession are read to Senators who know them and they rise and say "Those persons are not Republicans; it is a mistake," he turns around and says, "Well, he is glad they are coming to their senses."

Mr. BUTLER. Why should I not say that?

Mr. HOAR. I do not think that is a fair answer.

Mr. BUTLER. I am glad, and I do not see any reason why I should not express my gratification.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will take his own course.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Massachusetts is sorry, and of course I take it for granted that I am glad. I do not see anything unparliamentary in that.

Mr. RANSOM. Nothing unconstitutional.

Mr. BUTLER. There is nothing unconstitutional nor unparliamentary. I was simply expressing my pleasure at the fact that these gentlemen had seen the light, and I trust more of them will see it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator give us the date of that document?

Mr. BUTLER. Eighteen hundred and eighty-nine. I implore the Senator from New Hampshire not to plead the statute of limitations on it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, no; we do not.

Mr. BUTLER. Then it goes on—

Peleg McFarlin, a Republican senator in the State Legislature; Z. Talbot, a pig manufacturer; Bartlett & Perkins; Clark & Dow; Smiley Bros.; E. Phillips & Sons, a representative concern which is more than half a century old; James C. Warr, proprietor of iron and steel works and a gentleman who has been engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel ever since he was 10 years old, and therefore he may be supposed to understand the wants of this section of the country; William A. Nye, a prominent Republican politician from Cape Cod, and a representative in the house; Arthur Ames, governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and one of the owners of the Ames Shovel Factory; Albert T. Parlin, treasurer of the McKee Furnace Company, the largest foundry in New England and one of the largest in the United States; William P. Hunt, treasurer of the South Boston Iron Works, one of the largest iron works in Boston, a concern more than half a century old, I do not know how much older, but at least that old; Thomas Gogin, who has been for twenty years, I should say—perhaps I overestimate that—the manager of the Norway Iron and Steel Works of Boston; John H. Reed, manager of the Bay State Iron Works, more than half a century old, and who was in fact, I believe, during the entire war, quartermaster-general on the staff of Governor John A. Andrew; William E. Coffin, one of those iron manufacturers of New England who formerly operated the Franconia Iron Works, and the last name is that of Mr. A. M. Stetson, for nearly fifty years a most prominent manufacturer of iron in Boston, and who was formerly, I think, connected with the Bridgewater Iron Company, treasurer of the Barker Mills, treasurer of the Preston Iron Works, and also connected with the Somerset Iron Works and the Weymouth Iron Company, each of which concerns had a capital of from \$100,000 to \$500,000, and he was also largely interested in other works. Every gentleman whose name I read here was constantly, from the breaking out of the war down to the present day, and still is, a Republican, and this expression I have read must be understood to represent the deliberate opinions of the iron manufacturers of New England.

Mr. Tobey speaks for himself, Mr. President. I do not know whether he is reliable or not. I simply give his statement and what he said subsequently to a question propounded by one of my colleagues on the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH], indicating pretty clearly the status of the average New England manufacturer in regard to the tariff, as I think. The Senator from Alabama asked him this question:

Q. That is to say, the manufacture of the products of iron and steel here has tended to decrease the price of those articles very largely?

A. Undoubtedly—

Said Mr. Tobey.

Q. Do I understand you to advocate the removal of duties upon articles manufactured from iron and steel?

A. Not at all.

"Not at all." Bring it down on the raw material and keep it upon the manufactured article.

Mr. ALLISON. This is Tobey now?

Mr. BUTLER. That is Mr. Tobey, and I think it would be almost anybody else who was engaged in iron manufacturing in New England.

Mr. ALLISON. I simply wanted to understand whose statement it is.

Mr. BUTLER. That is Mr. Tobey answering the question.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me one moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Tobey takes that view, and has taken it publicly in the newspapers a great many times. He is a very active and earnest Democrat, and believes in tariff reform on the free raw material which comes into his mill and a high duty on what comes out of it. He has asked for 35 per cent on the product that comes out of his mill.

Mr. HOAR. Will my colleague state how it is with McFarlin?

Mr. LODGE. McFarlin left the Republican party in 1884, I think, and has been active in the free-trade movement.

Mr. HOAR. How about Governor Ames?

Mr. LODGE. Governor Ames is a Republican, and has always remained such, and has taken the same view. As I said this morning, the position there taken, which is taken by only a very small minority of New England manufacturers, is absolutely indefensible and impossible.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator must settle that with his constituents. I am simply reading from the testimony of a gentleman who gave his evidence before a select committee of which I happened to be a member.

Mr. LODGE. I am not questioning it in the least; they have taken that ground publicly over and over again.

Mr. BUTLER. We have had two or three biographical sketches of Mr. Tobey and these other gentlemen, and we are very glad to get them. I know nothing about them of my own knowledge. I am simply reading from the RECORD. When Mr. Tobey, with all of his earnestness and zeal for free coal and free iron ore and free raw material generally and free pig iron, was brought to book on the manufactured articles, "Oh, no," he says, "we do not want the duty on those reduced; we can not have it reduced." That would injure the New England manufacturers, but the introduction of free coal and free iron ore and free pig iron would help the New England manufacturers, whatever effect it might have upon the rest of the world.

It is of that that I complain. I suppose the New England manufacturers are like everybody else. They are selfish (and doubtless I would be too under such circumstances) when they insist upon bringing in coal and iron ore free. When the question is put, as it was put to the Senator from Rhode Island and other Senators this morning: Will you consent to a proportionate reduction on the manufactured article?—the answer is: "Oh no; of course not."

Mr. ALDRICH. I have made no such statement, and nothing analogous to it.

Mr. BUTLER. That was the inference at least, from what the Senator said. That is what Mr. Tobey says and what, I take it, every New England manufacturer would say. Then, Mr. Tobey goes on to say:

Q. Do I understand you to advocate the removal of duties upon articles manufactured from iron and steel?

A. Not at all, sir.

Q. Who would get the benefit of the reduction of duty upon pig iron and coal?

The WITNESS. Who would get the benefit so far as the sale of crude iron is concerned, do you mean? I do not fully understand your question.

Q. Who would get the benefit of the removal of duty, if any accrued, to any portion of the community?

A. I think the population of New England would ultimately receive the benefit.

If this Congress is called upon to legislate in that way and we are asked to bring in those crude articles simply that New England may be benefited when New England herself is unwilling to make any concessions, it seems to me it is stretching the liberality of people entirely beyond the point where we ought to be expected to go.

I say frankly that I suppose we have not a pound of coal in my State, and very little iron ore, and yet I shall vote to put a duty of 40 cents a ton on coal and iron without any hesitation. I have no apologies to make for it. I shall vote for it for the reason that I think every article of that kind ought to be made to contribute reasonably to the revenues of the Government, and if protection results from it I see no reason why there should be any complaint.

I do not hesitate to say that in my view the proper way to frame a tariff bill is, as I have said, to put all articles that ought reasonably to be expected to contribute to the necessary revenues of the Government upon the dutiable list; and if incidental protection results from it I shall not complain.

Mr. POWER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. POWER. Would the Senator include wool?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I am perfectly willing to vote for a duty on wool. I think everything ought to contribute to the revenues of the Government. That is my idea in framing a tariff

bill; but I am utterly and entirely opposed to giving the entire benefit to one section of the country when they are not willing to make concessions and give the benefit of the reduction of duty on the manufactured articles to other sections. This is all that I complain of. I have no desire whatever to impair or destroy or affect injuriously in the slightest degree any manufactures in New England or any other part of this country. I have no prejudice or feeling against them, but when they come and demand that these articles shall be put upon the free list I think we have a right to demand in reply that they must consent to a reduction all along the line; and if that can be done I shall be quite willing to put iron ore on the free list.

This gentleman in the course of his testimony indulged in a great many reflections of not a very complimentary character to the Pennsylvania Railroad and to Pennsylvania, Maryland, and other sections of the country. I remember there was another gentleman who came before that committee, whose name I do not now recollect, but he represented the glass industry. He sent up a wail and lamentation that the glass industry of New England was languishing and perishing from the face of the earth. When I asked the gentleman where it had gone he said it had gone to Pennsylvania and Maryland and the South.

Mr. HOAR. It had gone where natural gas had been discovered.

Mr. BUTLER. I asked him the question and he said, as I now remember, there were but two glass manufactories left in New England; that they had all gone except two. I do not remember whether he said they were sustained or maintained by the degradation of American labor, but his statement before that committee was that they had gone to Maryland, Pennsylvania, Alabama, West Virginia, and Virginia, and I suppose they will all go there, where the raw material is.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not exactly know what line of argument to take in reply to the Senator from South Carolina, for I do not exactly understand his own position, although he generally has a gift of pretty clear statement. I am glad to say in regard to that Senator that while manifesting a very earnest and almost excitable nature in regard to matters upon which he has a deep conviction, during the time I have served with him in the Senate he has exhibited a great nationality of sentiment in many particulars. He has been an example not only to his own party, but to all parties in this matter. I do not know that I have personally ever had occasion to appeal to the Senator from South Carolina for an act of liberal expenditure for the Navy or for the glory of the country, or its prosperity, or dignity, or an act of personal justice, without finding a response to the appeal.

I do not understand that the Senator has read what he has read from these gentlemen (who are pretty much all of them what we call Mugwumps, at any rate who have gone over from the Republicans to the Democrats within the last ten years in New England because they like the Democratic position on the tariff question better than ours), as sympathizing with them in the least. But the fault I have to find with the honorable Senator's argument is that he has persisted in ascribing to New England sentiments which the Republican people of that section of the country have buried, not only their votes but under their scorn whenever they could get an opportunity. We have had this talk about protection for our manufactories and freedom for our materials in New England.

My colleague, in the speech which he made a little while ago, read it from a late Democratic candidate for governor; and that gentleman, who had been urging free raw material protection for manufactures in regard to the matter we buy and the matter we sell, and urging the election for local offices of men without regard to their opinions, has recently, in an interview, demanded that this tariff bill should be put through as it comes from the Senate committee, and says it is a case for the application of Democratic party discipline.

Mr. President, whenever the suggestion to protect our manufactures and give us freedom for what we buy has been put before the people of Massachusetts, or New Hampshire, or Maine, or Vermont, or Rhode Island, it has received the answer, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense unto me."

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I understood the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to say this morning that the American manufacturers do not need protection; that it is only the labor that needs protection.

Mr. HOAR. I do not care about being interrupted. I am stating the opinion of the people of Massachusetts in respect to a gross attack on their public honor. The Senator from South Carolina got up and read a document from Mr. Tobey, announcing principles which that Senator scorns as I do; and he stated

that that was the general opinion of the manufacturers of New England. That is what he said.

Mr. BUTLER. I read the statement.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from South Carolina read a paper by Mr. Tobey expressing sentiments which he scorns as I do, and then he added that that was, in his judgment, the average opinion of the manufacturers of New England. Now, I do not think when I am replying to that that I care about entering upon the question concerning the general argument by which the honorable Senator from Ohio defends his own tariff policies.

That utterance made by Mr. Tobey, concurred in by the Democratic leader of Massachusetts, the late Democratic governor, has been rejected and repudiated by every New England Republican vote on the floor of this or the other House and by the overwhelming majorities of our people at the polls whenever they had an opportunity. It is the very essence of selfishness and sectionalism.

I have no doubt that in regard to the heavy iron industry, where freight of the iron and freight of the coal and freight of the lime enter largely into the product, if we could strike down the iron production of this country by adopting the policy of free trade, if we could strike down the production of steel blooms in Pennsylvania, the coarser forms of either iron or steel, and could strike down the American coal producers by free trade, we could get from our proximity to the seacoast in Wareham, where Mr. Tobey dwells, in South Boston, which is on Boston harbor, and any other coast places a monopoly of all the iron production of this country.

If this were a sectional and not an American question, it might be done. I suppose the same thing might possibly be true to a limited extent in regard to wool. But the people of Massachusetts repudiate that doctrine. If under a protective tariff America has become and can hereafter remain the great iron producer of the world for mankind, as it is now, if such a story, rivaling almost the creation of oriental imagination, which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] read from the census of his State, can go on, let the manufacture of iron to be consumed in Alabama be transferred from Massachusetts to Alabama; let the manufacture of iron or of wire or of steel rails to be consumed west of the Alleghanies be transferred west of the Alleghanies. It is an American question. I know, and I mean to know so far as my votes are cast upon this floor, no distinction between the interest of the man west of the Alleghanies or the man south of Mason and Dixon's line and the man whom I immediately represent.

Mr. President, when an illustrious representative of New England was taunted upon this floor with his vote for some distant local improvement benefiting at once and directly the community of a distant State, he replied that if a public work beginning in South Carolina and ending in South Carolina were of importance enough to be a national benefit and he failed to support it he should not dare to go home and face his constituents; that these narrow-minded men of New England would tell him that the patriotism which was not broad enough and large enough to comprehend the interest of the whole was not fit to be trusted with the interest of any part. That is the spirit of the Republican and the protectionist opinion of Massachusetts to-day.

Undoubtedly you may find occasionally that a few dozen manufacturers finding that some particular form of their industry was being transferred to another part of the country, a glass manufacturer who found that the discovery of natural gas had transferred that manufacture to Pittsburg or an iron manufacturer who found that Birmingham and Atlanta were becoming his rivals and that he must turn his attention to something else, may have wanted to strike down American manufactures and get the advantage of his proximity to the seaboard to get his material by employing the pauper labor of other climes; but the doctrine never has found any support there.

I understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that he is willing to have all these industries treated alike. That is all that we ask. If you put the tax upon our material give us a compensatory duty and protection upon the product which we make from that material.

I should like (and perhaps this is a good time) to ask for an explanation—I hope there is one—why it is that if the doctrine of tariff for revenue only is to be maintained and the doctrine of an ad valorem, not a specific, duty is to be maintained in this new bill, there is 90 per cent protection on the product of rice?

Mr. BUTLER. I did not put it there.

Mr. HOAR. I understand it.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not put it there.

Mr. HOAR. That is what we get when we ask a reason for these things. These gentlemen get up and tell us, "Oh, it is contrary to my principle, but we can not get anything through unless we consent to it. We give up our views for the sake of

our meager majority," as the Senator from Louisiana said. If the Senator from South Carolina will get up and say with his Democratic associates from the other rice-producing States, "We want you to strike this out, it is contrary to our principles; we have been denouncing specific duties and we have been denouncing protective duties"—

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has not heard me denounce them.

Mr. HOAR. "And now you are putting upon a chief necessary of life a specific duty amounting to 90 per cent ad valorem; we beg you in charity to our principles to strike it out," has the Senator any doubt that there would be any difficulty in getting that done? That is what we say when we apply our principle of tariff. We say, "Put in your duty on coal, though it bear hard on some Massachusetts industries." Put in your duty on the American product of iron. Protect your steel and your wool. And we will stand by it. We will apply our doctrine to the rest of the country which we ask you to apply to us.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator do that, Mr. President?

Mr. HOAR. What will the Senator from South Carolina do in regard to rice?

Mr. BUTLER. What will the Senator from Massachusetts do in regard to very many of the manufactures of New England? Will he consent to a large reduction on the articles that the rice planter uses? If he will, I will meet him more than half way.

Mr. HOAR. I will consent to take the principle on which I stand and carry it through. I will vote for 75 cents a ton on coal, for 75 cents or even a dollar a ton on iron, with a proper account.

Mr. BUTLER. Would the Senator consent—

Mr. HOAR. But there are two things I will not do. I will not consent to put these things on the dutiable list and put on the free list many of the things that any American makes of them, whether it is in Massachusetts or in South Carolina or in Alabama, and thereby throw all the manufacture into the hands of our foreign competitor; and I will not consent to take an adequate and moderate protective duty and split it in two for the sake of saving a few Democratic Senators their seats in the Senate. If you put on proper protection I will go with you. If you put on a pretense of protection, that presents a very different question.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, see where the Senator finds himself. He gets up and asks me if I will consent to strike off the duty on rice; and when I tell him if he will consent to reduce the duties on the articles the rice producer uses I will meet him more than halfway, he says he will not consent to it.

Mr. HOAR. I have not said any such thing. I deny it. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I have entirely misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. Certainly, my honorable friend seems to me to have entirely misunderstood pretty much everything he has been talking about all the morning. That is a difference in the point of view.

Mr. BUTLER. I certainly misunderstood everything the Senator has been saying, for I do not think he understands it himself.

Mr. HOAR. We will see about it.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator can not very well make other people comprehend what he does not understand.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think it is worth while to yield to an interruption for such criticism.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him to make a correction? He was referring a while ago to the denunciation of specific duties. He has never heard me denounce specific duties. I think there are cases where specific duties might with great propriety be imposed.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator agree to the Democratic platform of 1892 on this subject?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I suppose just about as much as the Senator from Massachusetts agrees to the Republican platform.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator then agree that specific duties are a fraud, a delusion, and a snare?

Mr. BUTLER. I think there are many articles upon which specific duties must be laid and a great many upon which ad valorem duties must be laid. I do not think there is any—

Mr. HOAR. How is it about rice?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator will understand me. I think if an ad valorem duty can be properly imposed it ought to be imposed.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator inform me why a specific duty is put upon rice?

Mr. BUTLER. I presume because it was thought that was the best way to collect the revenue from it.

Mr. HOAR. What does the Senator think?

Mr. BUTLER. I would be quite willing to have an ad valorem duty on rice.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator favor a specific or an ad valorem duty on rice?

Mr. BUTLER. It is perfectly immaterial to me.

Mr. HOAR. Entirely immaterial?

Mr. BUTLER. It is immaterial.

Mr. HOAR. Is the Senator willing to reduce the duty on rice from 90 per cent down to 40 or 35 per cent, which is the highest protection he is willing to give New England?

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will reduce duties on articles which the rice planter uses I say to him, yes.

Mr. HOAR. I will reduce them to that percentage with great pleasure. We do not ask anything more.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will agree to reduce them in the same proportion, he and I will meet on common ground.

Mr. HOAR. I am glad to have the Senator's practical testimony to the gross and outrageous injustice of the bill which we have before us.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HOAR. I say, oh, yes.

Mr. BUTLER. That is a matter of argument.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator who represents rice is compelled to admit, as its representative, that, in his judgment, it ought to be reduced to a duty not above that which is accorded to the manufacturing industries of New England and to an ad valorem instead of a specific duty. Now, this bill does exactly the contrary, and therefore when the Senator admits that he has got twice as much for this Southern industry—

Mr. BUTLER. No, I do not admit it.

Mr. HOAR. As he is claiming as reasonable, because he admits his willingness to reduce it from 90 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem—

Mr. BUTLER. I admitted that, with a qualified statement.

Mr. HOAR. That is the substance of the Senator's admission.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will just consent to reduce everything else in the same proportion I will agree to it.

Mr. HOAR. Everything else is reduced in the bill in the same proportion I suggest as to rice.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no.

Mr. HOAR. And more, too.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HOAR. What New England industry has the Senator in mind?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not—

Mr. HOAR. What industry has received—

Mr. BUTLER. I can not—

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish my statement. Rice is produced directly from the soil by the rudest form of agricultural labor, and the lowest paid class of agricultural labor in this country, so far as I know. Now, can the Senator name a single manufacture of New England, requiring the highest manufacturing skill, paid for at a wage of from two to three dollars or four dollars a day, on which this bill proposes half the rate of duty ad valorem which it proposes on rice? I pause for a reply.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not at this moment—

Mr. HOAR. The Senator says he can not at this moment, and I say he can not at any other moment if he lived a thousand years.

Mr. President, what sort of an attack is it upon the selfishness of the New England protective principle when they are willing (and show their willingness by their votes not by their silence) to give the rest of the country adequate protection, although it is their material that is protected, and to give the rest of the country adequate protection though it be that it shut up their factories, so an American competitor gets them, and they do not go abroad. I say it is very strange when the Senator from South Carolina makes that charge and still stands here admitting that his own party associates have got a duty on the cheaply raised rice of South Carolina, a necessary of life, the common food of the poor throughout the whole country, of more than double, indeed, of more than treble the average protection we ask or get for ourselves.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator has put up a man of straw, it seems to me, for the privilege of knocking it down.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator represents South Carolina—

Mr. BUTLER. I have not attacked New England industries, but the Senator is extremely sensitive when I read a statement from a New England man, who I understand is a very respectable man, and he makes that the ground of a savage attack upon me. I have said nothing—

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, let me ask him if he did not say what I shall state? If he did not I will take it back. After the Senator had read that doctrine of Mr. Tobey, which he denounced as selfishness and sectionalism, did he not add that that represented—

Mr. BUTLER. That it appeared to represent.

Mr. HOAR. The average opinion of the manufacturer of New England?

Mr. BUTLER. That it appeared to represent the opinion of the average manufacturer of New England, because—

Mr. HOAR. That is what I am stating.

Mr. BUTLER. Because a manufacturer of New England had said it. I had no right to say that the man had stated what was true. Now, the Senator gets into a frenzy on this subject and attacks Mr. Tobey, and indirectly me, because I read what Mr. Tobey stated. He must settle that with Mr. Tobey, not with me.

The little question of rice down in South Carolina seems to disturb him very much. I am afraid it will interfere with his slumbers, but if it will be any sort of gratification to the Senator to strike rice off of the dutiable list and put it on the free list I do not know that I should complain so much. It does not disturb me now. The Senator must not imagine for an instant that I have made any great to do about the rate of duty on rice. It is a very small industry in my State at best.

Mr. LINDSAY. The bill makes a 25 per cent reduction on it.

Mr. BUTLER. I am told by my friend who sits on my left [Mr. LINDSAY] that there is quite a reduction on it from the rate in the McKinley law. If the Senator will consent to that reduction all along I tell him that I would be quite willing to consent to it. I have not made any to do about rice, but it is a sort of *bête noir*. Every time I say anything about the tariff, the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Rhode Island and other Senators get up and raise a great hullabaloo about rice.

Now, strike rice off if that will be any gratification to you. It does not disturb me in the slightest. I think the duty on rice is perhaps pretty high. I am frank to say so. There is no doubt about that, but it is a very limited agricultural industry in my part of the world, and really it is about the only thing in the bill where a farmer does get protection. Simply because the agricultural people are engaged in it, the Senator from Massachusetts wants to destroy it. That is about the English of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator disclaims caring anything about the duty on rice. I suppose he has done so ever since he has been in the Senate, and he thinks he or his State escapes from criticism in connection with the high rate of duty on rice because he says he does not care anything about it. How does it happen that if the Senator does not care anything about it and his State does not care anything about it, year after year when tariffs are revised there is a hundred per cent ad valorem rate of duty on cleaned rice? If the selfishness of the Senator is not challenged and he is indifferent about it, is not the selfishness of the Senator's State challenged when it is engaged through its Senators and Representatives in destroying the New England industries and yet gets a hundred per cent duty on rice?

Mr. BUTLER. In the first place, the Senator makes an entire misstatement when he says the State is making a to do about it. I have not heard any representation from the State here at all on the subject. I have received two or three telegrams from rice planters, and I take it they are like the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Massachusetts; they are selfish, and if the pork is being divided out, I take it they want their share of it. That is the only principle I can see.

Mr. CHANDLER. But collars and cuffs get only 55, and most of the other articles get only 30 or 40. Why does the Senator want 100 on rice?

Mr. BUTLER. The rice interest does not get 100 per cent. There is a reduction of 20 or 25 per cent on it.

Mr. FRYE. Eighty-three.

Mr. HOAR. Eighty-nine and a fraction.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, call it 100 in order to satisfy our friends on the other side. If the Senator will consent to a reduction of the tariff on woolen goods I shall be glad to meet him halfway. But that he does not do.

Mr. HOAR. How does my consent have anything to do with it? I have got to submit to what the Democrats do.

Mr. BUTLER. What has my consent to do with it? I am only one—

Mr. HOAR. Because the majority are making the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I am only one of 44 Senators. The other side made the McKinley bill, and they made the McKinley bill after compromising and swapping with each other here for weeks; and now they complain that we are compromising. I suppose the Senator knows perfectly well there never has been a tariff bill that has not been the result of compromise. The McKinley bill, with all its enormities and infamies, was the result of a compromise, and so it will be, I suppose, with every tariff bill ever made here.

The Senator from New Hampshire says that I will not escape criticism. I am not desiring to avoid criticism. He can criticize me until the end of the session, so far as I am concerned; it is not going to provoke me into doing what is not right about rice or any other schedule in the bill. If the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Hampshire can have any comfort whatever in making war on rice, they are entirely welcome to it.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to add what I meant to say before I sat down, that when any manufacturer in New England has been led to utter any such sentiment as that which the Senator from South Carolina has criticised in Mr. Tobey's communication he either leaves the Republican party and goes over to the Democrats, as most of the gentlemen whose names he has read as far as I know them, or he very soon changes his mind.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Massachusetts a little while ago complimented the Senator from South Carolina upon his enlarged nationality; that he is a man of broad national views, and his readiness to act in this body on broad national considerations.

Mr. BUTLER. Can not the Senator confirm that?

Mr. CHANDLER. I was about to say that I would not injure the Senator from Massachusetts by adding my testimony to that effect, but I would take occasion to compliment the Senator from South Carolina upon the possession of one quality, and that is, extreme adroitness. He is certainly the most adroit Senator who has sat upon this floor during the last twenty years, because here he is caring nothing about rice; he is perfectly indifferent about it; he is never arguing in favor of it; he is doing nothing about it, and getting up whenever it is discussed and saying, "I do not care anything about it at all;" and yet somebody somewhere keeps the duty on rice up to 100 per cent.

I think, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is the most valuable Senator to his constituents that there is on this floor, because when the rest of us want anything done we have to beg for it, and plead for it, and demand it, and then we do not always get it; but here is the Senator from South Carolina disclaiming all interest in this highly protected product of his own State, and yet somebody gets it away up to 100 per cent while he is disclaiming it. If that is the rate of duty on a product of South Carolina that the Senator from South Carolina does not care anything about, I should like to know whether a rate of duty would not be about 150 per cent upon some product of South Carolina if he were really to get up and earnestly insist upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, an observation which just fell from the lips of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] attracted my attention. In his colloquy with the Senator from Massachusetts he suggested that if he [Mr. HOAR] were willing to allow a reduction on the manufactures of wool as great relatively as was made on rice, we might come to some understanding.

A reference to the bill now under discussion shows that while there is under the existing law a tariff duty of 98.53 per cent on the manufactures of wool, it is proposed to reduce it to 35.09, or 65 per cent.

Mr. BUTLER. We propose to put wool on the free list.

Mr. GALLINGER. I refer to manufactures of wool. The proposition is to reduce the duty on manufactures of wool 65 per cent, so that the reduction is to be very much greater than is proposed on rice.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from New Hampshire vote for that reduction?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say frankly to the Senator that I do not propose to do so if I can get a higher rate.

Mr. BUTLER. Then we are not likely to get on common ground.

Mr. GALLINGER. No. Neither do I believe the Senator will vote to put rice on the free list, which a moment ago he suggested he was willing to do.

Mr. President, there is no question as to the fact that a few New England manufacturers have advocated what they are pleased to call free raw material. I think it is safe for me to say that not one single manufacturer in the State of New Hampshire, which is quite a manufacturing State for its size, has ever joined in such a demand. I certainly know of no such man. I think it is safe for me to say that very few in the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, and Vermont have joined in that demand.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. FRYE. There was one man in Maine, and since the new schedule has been exposed to the public he is no longer in favor of free raw material.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am glad to have this corroboration of

my statement. The fact is that the men who have made this demand and who have advertised themselves to the world as desiring this change in our tariff rates are a comparatively few of the manufacturers of Massachusetts, a large proportion of whom are now in the Democratic party, where they properly belong. They are not consistent protectionists, but proceed upon purely selfish grounds, advocating doctrines that would destroy the industry of mining in this country and transfer it to foreign lands.

The answer to this proposition for free raw materials is made by the Republican Senators from New England, every one of whom is against it and will vote against it whenever an opportunity is presented to them. We have no sympathy with that demand. It is contrary to our conviction of what is right and proper under existing economic conditions in this country, and I think the Senators can claim to represent more definitely and correctly the opinions of the people of New England than the few interested manufacturers, who, in advocating free raw materials, were building a bridge over which they proposed to walk into the Democratic camp, where they are mostly all to-day.

Mr. President, there is no doubt but that certain New England industries have suffered under the existing tariff laws. I wish it were not so, but it is so, and I see no way to help it. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] has very truthfully said that the glass manufacture had gone from New England to Pennsylvania and other States where natural gas had been discovered. It was a question of fuel and nothing else, and that solved the question so far as the manufacture of glassware in New England was concerned. The same is true of the manufacture of iron. We can not compete to-day with Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Alabama in that great industry, and we have got to surrender it to those States and direct our attention to other lines of industry to give support and employment to our people.

I believe, as every New England Republican Senator does, in adequately protecting not only manufactured goods, but also the so-called raw materials, such as wool, lumber, iron ore, coal, etc.

It has always been rather interesting and somewhat amusing to me to hear this talk about raw materials. A few days ago we discussed the question of granite. Our Democratic friends rose up and said, "Why, that is raw material and it ought not to be protected." Now, some of the most extensive granite quarries in the world are situated 3 miles from the State capitol in the city of Concord, N. H., and yet when that granite is taken from those quarries, transported by wagon to the railroad cars, put upon the cars, and carried 3 miles to the sheds where the blocks that are going into our beautiful Library Building here are worked out by human labor, the granite is then worth five times as much as it is when it is in the quarries 3 miles away.

Four-fifths of the value of those granite blocks, before a drill or a chisel or a hammer touches them in those sheds, is placed there by human labor and nothing else, and the talk of it being raw material is utter and unmitigated nonsense. I do not know but that I might say truthfully that nine-tenths of the value of those blocks is labor and not raw material. And yet intelligent Senators stand here and tell us that granite is a raw material, and that wool, and iron ore, and coal are raw materials. I always had a great deal of sympathy with the definition that the distinguished Congressman from Maine [Mr. REED] gave of raw materials when he said the only thing he knew of that is raw material is a hole in the ground. [Laughter.] That comes pretty nearly being true.

The question as to whether the Democratic party is consistent in sending their eloquent advocates into New England as they have done—and they have been in my own little State more than once saying to our people that if the Democrats were put in power they would give to the New England manufacturers this so-called free raw material which would enable them again to engage profitably in the manufacture of iron, of glass, and of certain other things that have been on the wane of late years in our section of the country—I say the question as to whether the Democratic party after such representations is consistent or not in putting a duty on coal and iron ore I am willing to leave to the Democratic conscience to settle for itself. That sort of gospel has carried out of the Republican ranks a good many men in the New England States. That kind of gospel has organized the so-called Tariff Reform League in Boston, and the Young Men's Democratic Club of that city is largely composed of men who, formerly Republicans, left our ranks on the issue of free raw materials promised them by the Democratic party. But they are wiser to-day than they were a few years ago, and in due time will utterly repudiate their new political allies.

Mr. President, I can not refrain from calling the attention of our Democratic friends to a gathering of tariff reformers that was held in Boston three or four days ago. It was the last dinner for the season of the Tariff Reform Club, composed mostly of gentlemen who were formerly Republicans, but who of late

years have shouted and voted for "Cleveland and reform." They discussed the bill that we are now considering. The meeting was presided over by Hon. Henry L. Pierce, a former member of the Republican party, but a gentleman who, notwithstanding his tariff reform proclivities, has been wise and thrifty enough to see that chocolate and cocoa have a duty upon them in this bill quite as large as the McKinley tariff law gave to those products. He is a manufacturer of those articles. So Mr. Pierce, while preaching tariff reform in Boston, is very careful to exert his influence here and to see that the products in which he is interested have been put on the dutiable list at a very high rate.

Mr. Pierce presided over that meeting of the tariff reformers in the city of Boston. The first gentleman whom he introduced to the audience was a Mr. McBeth, of Pittsburg, who is a glass manufacturer, and who calls himself an out-and-out free trader, and with what Mr. McBeth said I have no controversy. The next gentleman was Mr. Henry W. Lamb, a distinguished citizen of Boston, who has taken a great deal of interest in the subject of so-called tariff reform during the last few years. Mr. Lamb delivered himself as follows:

I am one of those free traders who have for a long time thoroughly believed in the moderate policy called tariff reform as a wise means to a great end. That policy was based on increasing and overwhelming evidence that excessive tariff burdens upon consumers were owing to the taxes upon the materials that lie at the foundation of our manufacturing industries. Tariff reform struck at the root of the evil. It was honest if honestly applied. It was also just. It was as fair a way as possible of undoing the great wrong and injustice of our protective system without sacrificing great interests that had become accustomed to protection by more than thirty years of it. Now this Gorman bill—

You will observe that Mr. Lamb calls the present tariff bill not the Wilson bill, not the Jones bill as we have called it here sometimes, not the Voorhees bill, as some of us think it ought to be called, but "this Gorman bill."

Now, this Gorman bill is not tariff reform. On the contrary, its present rates are often prohibitory, and were either dictated by protected interests through treacherous Democrats, or were hastily patched up without proper investigation in committee. The bill has its merits. It does give us the great, the very great boon of free wool. But it does not pursue the policy of free materials, and its favors and concessions break faith with the people.

When Mr. Lamb got through Mr. William Lloyd Garrison was introduced. Mr. Garrison is the son of the late great anti-slavery agitator of New England. He was formerly, I believe, a Republican. On the issue between the two parties in which the question of tariff reform is involved Mr. Garrison left the Republican party and allied himself first with the Mugwumps and then with the Democratic party of Massachusetts. He is a very prominent member of the so-called Tariff Reform League of that great State. I want to read what Mr. Garrison said, notwithstanding there are some allusions to Democratic Senators that propriety might have dictated should have been left out of his speech. He said:

I desire merely to record my dissent to the current reasons given by tariff reformers for welcoming the passage of the Gorman-Brice corruption bill.

You will observe that Mr. Garrison has a new title for this remarkable bill. It is not now the Wilson bill, it is not the Voorhees bill, it is not the Jones bill, it is not the Gorman bill, but it is the Gorman-Brice hyphenated "corruption bill." He continues:

To my thinking, its defeat would far better serve our cause than its success. If I were a member of the House when the measure is returned for conference, my vote would be unyieldingly against it. Its betrayal of principles by professed friends, its shameless surrender to robber trusts, its personal and sectional preferences make it a satire upon reform and treason to the people who, trusting to party pledges once more admitted the Democratic party to power.

With the vigorously opposing parties, it goes without saying that legislation can only be reached on the line of agreement, one gaining what is possible and the other conceding what it must. But the compromise we are asked to accept is not between the Republican and Democratic parties, but the abject surrender of the Democratic majority to the base and unscrupulous Democratic minority.

The present pitiful plight of the dominant party comes from this same compromising spirit. No President ever entered the White House more untrammelled than did Mr. Cleveland at the beginning of his second term. He owed nothing to the spoilsmen. It was because he forgot expediency and adhered strictly to principle that the people exalted him. How does it happen that a single year reverses the picture and that the rotten and rejected stone of Hillison has become the head of the corner? History will answer that it came about simply because principle was exchanged for expediency by the new Administration.

The civil-service professions and manifestations of Mr. Cleveland were admirable. If subsequently adhered to with that inspired stubbornness that led him to risk reflection rather than weaken his testimony, he would not occupy the humiliating position of a President who has not only lost his grasp on his party, but on the people. The former might have deserted him, but the people never. In order to comply with "practical" advice, to accomplish one reform by the sacrifice of another, he parted with his clearness of vision and lost his way. To bring about the repeal of the silver iniquity he used the spoils of office, swayed by the politician's and the devil's maxim, "To do a great good it is justifiable to do a little evil." The sacrifice of civil service was not atoned for by the repeal of the Sherman law. Better a thousand times to have been true to the first, regardless of consequences, and appealed to the nation for support, never yet withheld when he asked it for a principle.

That sop to Cerberus gave the scepter to his enemies. The waning spoilsmen waxed again and grew imperious. They are in the saddle and that unshaken popular confidence in the President's clear-sightedness and firmness has vanished. So marked is the change that low comedians upon the stage who wish to raise a ribald laugh have but to mention Mr. Cleveland with disparagement. How short a time ago his name was greeted with irrepressible applause.

We come to the parting of the ways again. The question to be decided is, "Shall the boon of a small reduction of duties in the Senate tariff bill be accepted rather than no bill?" The temporizers say "Yes." It seems to me that he who cares for his party or his country will best serve both by a thunderous "No."

To answer in the affirmative is to seat the Hills and Gormans and Brices more firmly in power, with added ability to scotch the Administration and enthrone Tammany at Washington. Moreover, nothing substantial is gained. Gentlemen, there is a day after to-day, and to settle the present difficulty by a sacrifice of principle to the Senatorial highwayman is to breed difficulties like bacilli. Makeshifts beget makeshifts. It is safe and prudent to meet issues at the outset and settle them then and there. Here the tariff is transcended by that of legislative decency and honor.

Some victories are dear. Some defeats are glorious. With honor all is safe, whatever may be done, Grant that the next election will show an overwhelming Republican triumph. Resisting present temptation, striking down the poisoned chalice the enemies of self-government are putting to your lips, standing upright for the integrity of the principles you profess, how easy it will be to suffer the temporary reverse! Through it strength will flow into your veins. But, conscious of your lapse, apologetic, perpetually on the defensive, bereft of self-respect, which makes adversity enviable, what comfort is there left?

If we believe what we profess, that McKinleyism is costly and destructive, inimical to trade and foster-mother of strikes and tramps, can we not trust it to work for us with the same effectiveness that slavery ever contributed to abolition? The burden of hard times will then rest where it belongs, upon Republican shoulders. Pass the Gorman bill and the Democratic party assumes the fatal load and all that it implies. It will not only inherit McKinleyism, but will have sought the curse. Can folly go further?

The report of this great speech by this son of a great man says that some of the members applauded Mr. Garrison's remarks while others sat silent in their chairs. They were evidently divided on the question, just as Democratic Senators are divided on the same issue.

Mr. President, I have only to add that, acting in conjunction with my colleagues from New England in the Senate, in this hour so fraught with the highest possible consequences to the people of this country, I shall be glad whenever opportunity offers to vote to place adequate tariff duties upon all the productions and commodities of the country of which we are citizens. For this reason I shall vote for the amendment offered to the present paragraph by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]; but that failing, I shall reserve the right, if I conclude so to do, to vote against the proposition of the committee to place a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore, which to my mind is utterly inadequate protection.

Mr. President, I am bound to say, as other Senators have said, and as these gentlemen of the Tariff Reform Club of Massachusetts have so pointedly said, that the attitude of the Democratic party to-day in view of its declarations on the stump in New England and elsewhere, and in view of its declaration in its last national platform that high protective rates were unconstitutional and the McKinley act was "the culminating atrocity of class legislation," is utterly inconsistent and absurd. It will certainly require a great deal of political sagacity on their part to prove to the people that they are either honest or consistent. I sympathize with them in their efforts to do this thing, but see no escape for them from utter overthrow as soon as the people get an opportunity to record their opinion of the legislation that we are now considering.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I propose to modify an amendment submitted by me some time since to the cotton schedule of the bill, and I ask that the modified amendment be printed.

Mr. HALE. What is the paper submitted by the Senator?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Some time since I gave notice of a number of amendments which I propose to offer to the bill, one of which was an amendment to the cotton schedule. This is a modification of the amendment, which I give notice to the Senate it is my intention to offer. I ask that the modification be printed so that Senators may have notice of it.

Mr. HALE. As a pending amendment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As an amendment to be offered when that schedule is reached.

Mr. HALE. It will of course be printed so that we may have an opportunity to see what it is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, in discussing the pending bill on a previous occasion I endeavored to find out from Senators in charge of the pending measure upon what principle the bill was constructed. I was unable to do so. It is not a revenue bill, because if passed it will not provide sufficient revenue from duties upon imports to maintain the Government. It is not a protective bill, because many of the products of important industries of this country are placed upon the free list. Even where protective duties are imposed by the bill they are mainly upon the products of the South. It does not appear to be satisfactory to anyone.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who has been understood for many years to be an exponent of the doctrine of the Democratic party on the tariff, is so dissatisfied with the bill as it is proposed now to be amended that he refuses to vote for every amendment offered by the committee. We have the extraordinary spectacle of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], while he discusses the amendments offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] and supports them, saying emphatically over and over again that the bill is not satisfactory to him; that he believes in free raw materials, but "that the bill is the best we could get and we have done the best we could." This morning I understood him to state substantially that he should go back to the people of Missouri, give them his views in regard to duties upon imports, and inform them that he is in favor of free raw materials, and had done the best he could to embody his views in legislation and throw himself upon the tender mercies of his constituents.

The Senator's position, and that of the majority in the Senate and the Democratic party, is illustrated by a story which was told me once by an eminent member of this body. He said that away out in one of the Northwestern Territories, where the population was sparse and was composed mostly of miners and herders, the citizens of a town got up an impromptu entertainment. The best music they could provide was an old cracked piano, and the best musician they could obtain was a young girl 10 or 12 years of age who had not had much instruction. Fearing that the miners and cowboys, all of whom carried revolvers, would not be pleased with the music, the management put up over the piano a sign, "Don't shoot at the girl; she does the best she knows how." [Laughter.]

This is the plea of the Senator from Missouri and every other Senator who has spoken on the other side of the Chamber who state that the bill is not satisfactory to them. "It is not a bill to carry out the Democratic platform, but it is the best we could do." Mr. President, when the people of this country next fall come to use that weapon which is better than bullets, the ballot, no sign of that kind placed over the Democratic party, or over the Administration, or over the majority in the Senate will save it from the righteous indignation of the people of the United States.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] has read elaborately from the statement of a Mr. Tobey, a witness who was examined before the Senate Select Committee on Relations with Canada, of which the honorable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] was chairman and of which I am a member. I remember Mr. Tobey's testimony. The committee heard the testimony of everyone who offered himself upon the question of our trade relations and our political relations with Canada. We heard Republicans and protectionists; we took the testimony of Democrats and free traders, and of people who had hobbies. Mr. Tobey impressed me if not as a crank as a man who has a hobby. He had written an article which he had read before some association or had published, and he came before our committee to read it. It was an article in which he substantially favored free coal and free iron ore for the iron manufacturers of Massachusetts.

The trouble appeared to be, as nearly as I could ascertain from him, that manufactures of iron which were flourishing in early times before the great development of the iron industry in Pennsylvania and other Western States of the Union, had become depressed, and that the iron industries of Massachusetts could not compete with the iron industries of Pennsylvania. What Mr. Tobey desired to do was to open our ports to the free admission of iron and coal from abroad, hoping thereby to maintain the iron manufacturing industries of Massachusetts, notwithstanding the sharp competition of the iron industries of Pennsylvania. By a few questions which I put to him on cross-examination, I drew out of him his exact position on this question. I first showed by his own testimony that the changed conditions in the United States, the great development of the iron and steel industries, had greatly reduced the price of all the manufactures of iron and steel. I said to him:

Q. You have given us a very interesting paper upon this subject, and are perhaps informed. I would like to have you tell us how the prices of the products of iron and steel manufactures correspond to-day with the prices at the breaking out of the war. Take tacks, steel rails, engines, and machinery of all kinds. What has been the effect, on the prices of those articles, of the tariff legislation and other forces operating together?

A. I think that throughout the world the prices of iron goods are lower now than they were before the war; not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Then the tariff had done some good.

Q. How does the amount of the product in the United States correspond with the amount of the product in 1860?

A. It is immeasurably greater.

According to this witness, not only has the price of all the manufactures of iron and steel been reduced, but our product

has increased from 1860 until it is immeasurably greater than then. I asked him:

Q. The United States has become a very formidable competitor with all the world in the manufacture of iron and steel?

He answered:

A. I think so, undoubtedly.

Q. Has that been a factor in reducing the prices?

A. I should say unquestionably that the deprivation of their American markets has reduced the price of iron in foreign countries, in England more particularly; that the loss of their American markets has tended to reduce the price of iron in Great Britain.

Q. That is to say, the manufacture of the products of iron and steel here has tended to decrease the price of those articles very largely?

A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Do I understand you to advocate the removal of duties upon articles manufactured from iron and steel?

A. Not at all, sir.

While asking to have the duties removed from iron ore and coal, the witness did not desire any reduction of duties upon the products of iron and steel.

Q. Who would get the benefit of the reduction of duty upon pig iron and coal?

The WITNESS. Who would get the benefit so far as the sale of crude iron is concerned, do you mean? I do not fully understand your question.

Q. Who would get the benefit of the removal of duty, if any accrued to any portion of the community.

He says:

I think the population of New England would ultimately receive the benefit.

Q. Your complaint now is that under existing duties you can not maintain iron or steel manufactures in New England?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your object in removing the duty would be to build up those manufactures?

A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Do you think that would reduce the price of manufactured articles in the United States materially?

A. I think it would in New England, but that is so small a corner of the United States that perhaps it would not have a great influence on prices throughout the country.

The witness substantially admits that with free iron and coal there would be no considerable reduction in the products of iron throughout the country. Then I asked him:

Q. Why should you not extend your argument further, at least to those who have to pay for small articles, and admit the articles manufactured from iron and steel free of duty in order that the consumers might obtain them as cheaply as possible; why should you not look beyond the manufacturers to the consumers?

A. If I were looking only for the methods in which iron and steel goods should be made as cheap as possible to the consumer I think I should not advocate the importation of goods free for the reason that I think the closing of our immense manufacturing industries here would create such a demand abroad for manufactured goods that the prices upon them would be enormously advanced and that our people would have to pay for that advance.

I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], who read the testimony of this witness as an authority upon the question of free iron ore and free coal, will admit that the witness is a good witness upon this proposition, that the admission of imported goods free would destroy our American industries, and that prices would be higher in the end than they are now?

Q. Then you do not believe that the removal of duties upon manufactured goods would reduce the price; you think when foreign countries obtain the monopoly of manufactures the prices would be increased?

A. If the removal of duties closed our establishments here I think the prices would advance, and I think the immediate effect of the removal of duties would be to close our manufacturing establishments here, and that they would remain closed until the rate of wages in America became equal to the rate of wages in foreign countries.

Mr. FRYE. Is that Mr. Tobey's testimony?

Mr. DOLPH. I read from the testimony of Mr. Tobey, who was cited here as an authority upon the question of free iron ore, in answer to questions propounded by myself.

Q. In considering this question I presume you will agree that the interests of consumers of manufactured products, as well as the interests of the people who are engaged in manufacturing articles made from iron and steel, ought to be considered?

A. Certainly.

Q. What proportion of the manufactures in the United States do you suppose are produced in New England?

A. I think, sir, that New England has no advantages for producing cotton goods that are not free to all other States in the Union; that by the industry and enterprise of her people they have succeeded in establishing large cotton industries in Massachusetts, and make to-day—I am not informed as to the exact percentage, but a very large proportion of the cotton goods that are used in the United States.

Q. Nevertheless, the fact is that New England is manufacturing a very large amount of the cotton goods that are used by other portions of the United States?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are consumed in the United States?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What would be the effect of the removal of duty from cotton fabrics upon your cotton manufactures here in New England?

A. I think the effect would be to hasten the movement which is already going on in the manufacture of cotton in the Southern States instead of New England. I think the removal of duties upon cotton goods would hasten the development of cotton manufacturing in the Southern States, where the cotton is produced.

Q. Would it have any further effect upon the business of New England?

A. Yes; I think it would very largely have the effect, if an absolute removal of duties were made, of closing all the cotton factories in New England.

Q. So that the great industry of New England really exists and thrives, if at all, by reason of the duty upon cotton manufactures?

A. Yes; I do not think that the New England cotton manufacturers could at present make goods to compete with the English manufacturers, without reducing the price of labor, if the duty were removed.

I asked him further:

Q. How far do your free-trade opinions extend—to raw materials only?

A. I think articles which are raw materials in any large number of States of the Union should be admitted without duty.

Q. How about wool?

A. I should be very strongly in favor of the admission of wool without any duty.

Q. So you speak in this elaborate and able paper which you have presented for the interests of the manufacturers?

A. I spoke for the interests of iron manufacturers. I didn't touch that question purely and simply in that connection; I spoke, of course, of the interests of the people who buy their goods from there. I mean the iron manufacturers are the only ones whom I speak for in that paper, not that they are the only people whose interests I have considered.

So it will be seen that Mr. Tobey, who claims to be a protectionist, admits that all the great industries of New England would be destroyed by free trade. He does not want the duties reduced upon the products of iron and steel, but he has his hobby, and that is that iron ore and coal shall be admitted free of duty, so that the manufacturers of New England can be maintained and can manufacture in spite of the competition of Pennsylvania.

The truth is that present conditions, the development of the iron industry in Pennsylvania and other Western States, and the great development of the coal-mining industry in connection with the iron industry, so that fuel and the raw material are brought in close connection, have removed the great manufacturing establishments of iron and steel to Pennsylvania and other Western States, and it is idle for New England to expect to contend in the manufacture of iron and steel with those Western States.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I am unable to understand the principle upon which the bill has been made. One principle I can very well understand. I reiterate what I said on a previous occasion upon this floor, that this is a sectional bill. I am glad that the Senator from South Carolina has found some crumb of comfort in the testimony of Mr. Tobey, who represents, or claims to represent, New England manufacturers.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Several times while the Senator from Oregon was making his speech heretofore, I asked him if he was not going to seek to find the principle, if there was one, upon which the bill was being constructed. He seemed to me to evade or put off that duty, and he is now approaching the topic which I thought he ought to have taken up long ago. Under those circumstances, as the Senate is very thin and the Senator is reaching a very important point in his argument, I suggest the want of a quorum.

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

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

Aldrich,	Dubois,	McLaurin,	Power,
Bate,	Faulkner,	McMillan,	Pugh,
Berry,	Frye,	Martin,	Quay,
Blackburn,	Gallinger,	Mills,	Roach,
Blanchard,	George,	Morrill,	Sherman,
Brice,	Gordon,	Murphy,	Teller,
Call,	Gorman,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Camden,	Hale,	Pasco,	Vest,
Cameron,	Harris,	Patton,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Peffer,	White,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Perkins,	
Coke,	Hunton,	Pettigrew,	
Dolph,	Jones, Ark.	Platt,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOLPH. When the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] appealed to me, when I was addressing the Senate on a previous occasion, to state upon what principle the bill was constructed, I was unable to do so; but I think I have discovered it in part at least. One principle upon which the bill is constructed, is to protect everything that concerns the South and to destroy pretty much everything that concerns the North. So under the bill we find that rice receives a very large protection, and it is a very remarkable spectacle for the Senator from South Carolina to stand here and say we can take the duty from rice, that he is willing, and to try to make it appear that the majority of the Senate are forcing a protective duty upon a product of his State. The Senator knows very well that the duty on rice will not be taken off or modified.

Then, under the bill as it is now made, there is a protective duty upon sugar, a product of Louisiana. I am told that the duties that are provided in the bill under the amendments upon the class of cottons that are manufactured in the South are almost

or quite prohibitory, while the reduction of duties upon cotton fabrics is to be upon a class of cotton goods that are manufactured in New England and the Northern States.

Mr. PLATT. The committee have changed the cotton schedule in some way to day.

Mr. DOLPH. I am reminded by the Senator from Connecticut that the duties are to be still further changed, and while the amendment has not been read I shall be curious, until it is read, to know whether it is not an increase of duties upon cotton goods manufactured in the South and a reduction upon those manufactured in New England.

Then there is another principle upon which the bill seems to be made up. It is to be a bill in the interest of foreigners instead of Americans, in the interest of foreign industries, foreign capital, and foreign labor. Who is complaining about the duties under the McKinley law? Who is it that is complaining about protective duties? It is not the manufacturers of this country; it is not the laboring men of this country; it is not the producers of raw material; but there have come up from every foreign country having any foreign trade with the United States a united demand for the repeal of the McKinley law. I have here a little pamphlet which was sent to me by some person, probably the author. It contains a speech by Léon Chotteau, a member of the London Cobden Club, delegate of the French committee to the United States, delivered at a public meeting organized by the Chamber of Commerce of St. Etienne (Loire), October 4, 1893. In his speech at this meeting this gentleman said:

The great Republic of the West possesses elements of vitality that insure to it a place which grows more and more brilliant in the world.

You can not fail to realize that the doings of such a nation have great weight. If the Congress at Washington adopts a wise law, practical in its effects, at once its influence extends far and wide, like a refreshing and fertilizing dew. On the contrary, if the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States unite in a thought of hatred, and inflict on their contemporaries a dark McKinley bill, which on that account is the more fierce and threatening, at once fright seizes on every soul, labor loses that security which is its strength, and production soon experiences the first effects of a crisis.

Not labor in the United States, not production in the United States, but production in other countries. It is France that this speaker is now talking about:

To show that the United States is by no means refractory to an accord with France, Europe, and the industrial world, I may here remind you that, by reflecting Mr. Grover Cleveland to the Presidency on the 4th of March last, and the consequent return to power of the Democrats in the two Houses, the Americans have accomplished a real economical evolution.

Proceeding, he says:

The spoliated citizens cast their eyes on Mr. Grover Cleveland, and Mr. Cleveland was elected President of the great Republic.

Concerning the abolition of the tariff now in force, he declared in January last:

"We have not been returned for any other purpose."

A short time after, on the 4th of March, the new President emphatically said:

"The people of the United States have to-day decreed that, so far as the executive and the legislative powers were concerned, the control of this Government should pass into the hands of the political party which pledged itself, in the most absolute manner, to bring about the reform in the tariffs."

Again, he says:

The better to convince ourselves of the necessity there is to get the bill abolished, let us seek together what influence this measure, which includes entrance dues at times exceeding 60 per cent ad valorem, has exerted on foreign produce entering the American frontier.

From statistics furnished by the Treasury Department at Washington, the exports from all countries to the United States amounted to \$789,000,000 in 1890 (June 30), and to \$827,000,000 in 1892.

We have here, therefore, an increase of \$38,000,000 in 1892 as compared with 1890.

It would seem in consequence, since those who sell to the United States have sold more, that the McKinley bill has proved beneficial to the commerce of the whole world.

We should wish to be able to say that such is the case; but alas, a closer scrutiny reveals the following fact:

In 1890 the taxed products exported to the United States amounted to the sum of \$507,000,000. In 1892 they had fallen to \$369,000,000. Hence a real diminution in the exports of all countries to the United States amounting in 1892, as compared with 1890, to \$138,000,000.

Then he goes on to state where these losses have occurred. He says:

If we examine Europe separately, we notice that the taxed products from Europe exported to the United States were subjected in 1892, as compared with 1890, to a depreciation of \$74,300,000. Their value, effectively, fell from \$375,700,000 in 1890 to \$302,400,000 in 1892.

Mr. HARRIS. From what does the Senator from Oregon read?

Mr. DOLPH. I am reading from a speech of Léon Chotteau, member of the London Cobden Club, delegate of the French committee to the United States, delivered at a public meeting organized by the Chamber of Commerce of St. Etienne (Loire), October 4, 1893. It will become interesting pretty soon, when I read some correspondence between this gentleman and Chairman WILSON, of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course it will.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me, I simply desire to put in the RECORD the fact that Monsieur Chotteau was in this country as a representative of the French committee, of which Monsieur Petit was chairman; that he was here, as the chairman says, to—

Attend the legislative debates, give us an account—

That is, the people of France—

of the proceedings, and endeavor to get the desires and wishes which we have imparted to him incorporated in the new law.

He was here in an official capacity, representing the people of France, to guide us to a certain extent in framing the tariff law in their interest rather than the interest of the people of the United States.

Mr. DOLPH. That is the point I am making, that it is the people of foreign countries who are complaining about high duties in the United States and the loss of trade with the United States in consequence. The bill seems to have been made up so as to remedy this wrong inflicted upon foreigners, and in the interest of foreigners and foreign countries instead of in the interest of the United States. He continues:

In applying the distinction of taxed and untaxed products, and of taxed products only, as regards the exports from the principal countries of Europe to the United States in the years 1890 and 1892, we find:

Countries.	Taxed and untaxed products together.	Taxed products alone.
France.....	-\$9,100,000	-\$6,300,000
Belgium.....	+ 937,000	- 481,000
England.....	-30,000,000	-34,800,000
Austria-Hungary.....	- 1,600,000	- 5,900,000
Denmark.....	- 10,000	- 54,000
Germany.....	-15,930,000	-22,771,000
Greece.....	+ 175,000	- 1,085,800
Italy.....	+ 1,800,000	+ 1,200,000
Netherlands.....	+ 6,200,000	+ 6,300,000
Portugal.....	+ 482,000	+ 149,000
Russia.....	+ 921,000	+ 1,087,000
Spain.....	- 81,000	- 677,000
Sweden and Norway.....	+ 220,000	+ 168,000
Switzerland.....	+ 1,245,000	+ 1,733,000
Turkey in Europe.....	+ 602,000	+ 42,000

Thus, you see that France, instead of incurring a loss of \$9,100,000, shows a deficit of only \$6,300,000, which is still a high figure.

You further remark that our friends, the Belgians, instead of gaining \$937,000, lose in reality \$481,000.

What part does St. Etienne play in the movement brought on by the McKinley bill? Your chief industry is the manufacture of ribbon.

That is the principal industry of the town where this meeting was held.

From 1890 to 1892 the silks of the different countries exporting to the United States fell from \$38,683,374 to \$31,173,894, showing a decrease of \$7,512,480. France figures in this decrease for \$1,112,037.

The ribbons, which you have so long manufactured with so much practical knowledge and taste, and indeed wherein you excel, as is only fair, particularly claim your attention. You inquire whether the McKinley bill has been useful or baneful to your industry.

In order to enlighten you, I find the following figures:

SILK RIBBONS.

Exports from different countries to the United States.

Countries.	1890 (June 30).	1892 (June 30).	Difference.
Austria-Hungary.....	84,250	\$1,203	- 82,917
Belgium.....	553		- 553
France.....	1,197,755	741,388	- 456,367
Germany.....	148,355	142,864	- 5,471
England.....	28,290	12,502	- 15,788
Canada.....	224	27	- 197
Hongkong.....	16	10	- 6
Cuba.....	2		- 2
Switzerland.....	589,101	746,260	+ 157,159
Italy.....		99	+ 99
Mexico.....		325	+ 325
Total.....	1,968,486	1,644,769	- 323,717

France, being the chief exporting country, has therefore sold less to the Americans by \$456,367, thanks to the McKinley bill.

In his remarkable work, "The Chamber of Commerce of St. Etienne and the industries of its circumscription," M. Lucien Thiollier, the learned secretary of your Chamber of Commerce, states:

"The worst blow given to the industry of St. Etienne came from the United States. After the war of secession, and protected by exaggerated rates, numerous factories were established at Paterson, and they are to-day well nigh sufficient for the American supply.

The United States, which since 1830 was the great and chief customer of the St. Etienne manufacture, which took from it the third of its production, now asks of it special articles only. From 30,000,000, which was the yearly figure for 1860, the exports of all kinds of goods manufactured at St. Etienne fell to 2,500,000 francs in 1884. They have since somewhat risen, and reached 11,892,120 in 1890; but ribbon, properly so called, figures in this sum for only 3,354,128 francs. The rest, 8,537,992 francs, is made up of velvet ribbons required by the fashions. In spite of this vexatious competition, and of the heavy custom-house dues it has to pay, the production at St. Etienne has

constantly increased. It was 50,000,000 of francs in 1833; it was set down at 103,000,000 in 1880.

Again he says:

I should accomplish only a portion of my task if I failed to call your attention to the administrative McKinley bill.

There are, then, two McKinley bills: the custom-house bill, of which I have just spoken, and the administrative bill, about which I will now say a few words.

This latter is dated June 10, 1890.

It should have come after the custom-house bill, of October 1, 1890, since its object was to insure the execution of the said custom-house bill.

It came out first, however.

How was this?

Because the authors of that iniquitous law wished to replace, as regards the importer, the judicial power by the administrative authority.

Such an exclusion from the ordinary courts was plotted by the political party then at the head of affairs, in order to increase still more the yearly average of entrance dues. Congress would soon have reached prohibition if the Democrats had not interfered on the 4th of March last.

Then they passed resolutions at the meeting:

Whereas the Democratic party, whose platform is to afford the United States a truly liberal economic system, has come to power:

And whereas the McKinley bill of October 1, 1890, has considerably increased the old tariffs which might have been already considered as exaggerated and well-nigh prohibitive;

And further whereas a new general tariff can not be applied in the United States before the year 1895,

Have resolved:

That friendly and courteous entreaties be urgently made to the Congress and Government at Washington with the object of obtaining at an early date a more liberal law which shall considerably reduce the present rates, until the day when a new tariff shall have been passed.

I will quote from a letter from Mr. Léon Chotteau to Hon. WILLIAM L. WILSON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

He says:

Mr. PRESIDENT: You have just accepted the high mission of preparing a new project of American custom-house tariff.

There can be no doubt that you will be able to compass this difficult task in the well ordered interest of the United States, France, and the whole of Europe.

In the fiscal year 1892 the United States saw their foreign trade assume proportions such as they had never expected since the war of independence. Consider that your imports and exports combined reached \$1,857,000,000 (\$827,000,000 for imports and \$1,030,000,000 for exports).

Hence, a sum of \$202,000,000, showing the increment of your foreign sales over and above your purchases abroad.

That is the kind of argument that this foreigner addresses to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to show why the McKinley act, under which the balance of trade was in our favor \$202,000,000 in a single year, should be repealed. Not reading connectedly, I proceed to quote:

Europe exported to your shores in 1890 \$49,000,000 worth of goods, and \$394,000,000 worth in 1892. The result is a decrease of \$38,000,000 lost by the European exporters.

That is another argument addressed to the Hon. WILLIAM L. WILSON as to why the McKinley law should be repealed, because in the year 1892 there were lost \$58,000,000 to European exporters.

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

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is nothing I know of in the laws of the United States or those of France which prevents a foreigner entering into a correspondence of this kind with and making suggestions to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I presume there is nothing in the paper which the Senator has before him to lead one to suppose that Mr. WILSON appreciates or has any sympathy with any movement of this kind, or that he would take any notice of an impertinent letter like that from a foreigner.

Mr. DOLPH. We will come to that directly.

That sum shows the influence exerted by the McKinley bill on this side of the Atlantic.

What is that sum? The sum of \$58,000,000 lost by European exporters.

That sum shows the influence exerted by the McKinley bill on this side of the Atlantic. Of these \$58,000,000, \$36,000,000 were wrested from England.

Wrested! That is a strong word. I suppose he means wrongfully taken by force, taken under the McKinley law in opposition at least to the wishes and desires of European exporters:

Of these \$58,000,000, thirty-six were wrested from England, fifteen from Germany, nine and a half from France, six from the Netherlands, one from Switzerland, and one from Austria-Hungary.

These \$58,000,000 would have exceeded sixty-four millions, if other European countries had not exhibited a slight increase in the amount of their sales to your countrymen: Italy, Belgium, Sweden and Norway, and Russia in Europe.

Then he proceeds:

If the misfortunes of others should ever cause us to be unmindful of our own troubles, France might be readily comforted; for England, which already suffers by you a prejudice of \$30,000,000, is, moreover, bound to an additional purchase of American goods amounting to nearly \$50,000,000.

He takes some degree of comfort in the losses to France from the fact that England has lost \$30,000,000 in exports to this country and has purchased \$50,000,000 more of our exports.

There is also printed here an answer from Hon. WILLIAM L. WILSON, of which I will read a single extract:

I trust that the results of our labors to reform and reduce the existing system of tariff duties may lead to such larger commercial intercourse between our respective countries as will result in great and permanent benefit to both of them.

Mr. ALDRICH. There must be something preceding that sentence. The honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would not have used the words "our labors" with reference to France.

Mr. DOLPH. I did not read the whole of the letter. I will read it:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I am indebted to you for a copy of your interesting work, *Mes Campagnes aux Etats-Unis et en France*, which reached me several days since, and for which I beg you to accept my sincere thanks.

I have also received several documents, in which I find published a letter addressed to myself. I have read it with much pleasure, and am glad to learn that you take so close and intelligent an interest in the prospective tariff legislation on this side of the sea.

Rather commendatory of this letter from which I have read an extract:

I trust that the results of our labors to reform and reduce the existing system of tariff duties may lead to such larger commercial intercourse between our respective countries as will result in great and permanent benefit to both of them.

Very sincerely, yours,

W. L. WILSON.

Monsieur LÉON CHOTTEAU.

Mr. President, I repeat that it is mainly foreign countries and the citizens of foreign countries who have objected to the McKinley act. It is the importers into this country, the manufacturers of products abroad who complain of the high rates of duty. The bill by the removal of duties upon several articles that are called raw materials by the majority in this Chamber, the Democratic party, by the reduction of duties upon manufactured articles in this country, by the provision for reciprocity with Canada in agricultural products, seems to be a bill more in the interests of foreign producers, foreign labor, foreign investments, and foreign countries than it is in the interest of the United States.

Then, I do not know but that I may add a further principle upon which the bill, as it is now proposed to be amended, seems to be framed. We have heard from time to time from the other side of the Chamber denunciation of the manufacturers of this country. There is scarcely an epithet that has been too severe to be applied to them, but when the Democratic party comes into power, committed to a revision of the tariff, it is such articles as lumber and wool that are placed upon the free list, and such articles as iron ore and coal upon which duties are to be reduced, articles in the production of which unskilled labor is employed, and thousands and hundreds of thousands of laborers in this country are employed, and out of which they earn a living.

But the increases proposed to be made in the rates of duty provided in the Wilson bill as it came from the other House, and the only cases in which protective duties are provided, are upon the products of manufactures. There is to be a reasonable duty upon manufactures of cotton; there are still protective duties upon woolen manufactures taken in connection with free wool; several manufacturing industries, and especially those of the South, are to receive full protection, and the free-trade principle, the tariff-for-reform principle, is to be applied only to products the production which gives employment to agricultural and unskilled labor. The products of iron and steel are still to receive a considerable degree of protection, but business of the men who delve in the mines for the iron ore, and the farmers in the great West who raise their flocks of sheep, and the industry of the men who fell the trees in the forests and cut them into lumber are to be crippled or destroyed by placing their products upon the free list or by greatly reducing duties.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. Does not the Senator from Oregon think that he and others on the other side of the Chamber, who, for the sole purpose of delaying the passage of the bill, are making long

speeches, to which nobody listens and which nobody reads, and who are using filibustering tactics, continuing them day by day, are inflicting really more damage on the business interests of the country by the delay and the uncertainty than the passage of the tariff bill could possibly inflict even from his standpoint?

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, although the Senator from Arkansas seeks every occasion, no matter what is the subject under discussion and no matter what I have said upon it, to oppose the measures which I advocate and to speak slightly of my efforts in the Senate, whenever he puts to me a respectful question I will answer him; but the statement of the Senator, if he calls that a question, is beneath my notice, and I will not answer it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Observing the interruption and the interrogatory of the Senator from Arkansas, I desire simply to call attention to one or two facts, which I think perhaps the Senator omitted in his discussion of this pamphlet or address by that noted Frenchman, Leon Chotteau.

Leon Chotteau is a member of a French committee of France and the United States for the repeal of the McKinley bill. This is the title of the committee: "France and the United States French committee for the repeal of the McKinley bill."

The president of the association in writing concerning their organization says:

I have the honor to inform you that the French committee for furthering the abolition of the McKinley bill was completed November 16, in the sitting held at the Grand Hotel.

Then he gives the organization of that committee.

Mr. MORRILL. Where was that?

Mr. GALLINGER. At Paris. The president is M. Henry Petit, manufacturer, in the firm of Gros, Roman & Co.; the vice-president is M. Louis Tabourier, manufacturer; the delegate in France and in the United States is M. Leon Chotteau, barrister, publicist, and member of the Cobden Club, London; the treasurers are Messrs. Gros, Roman & Co., manufacturers; the assistant treasurer is M. Prosper Staehle, cashier of the firm of Gros, Roman & Co.; the secretary is M. Leon Guillaumet, manufacturer.

So that here is a club composed of five manufacturers and one barrister, who is a member of the Cobden Club of London, and cooperating with the Democratic party, addressing letters to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and having a representative in this country to influence this legislation, and yet when the Senator from Oregon calls attention to that matter in a very respectful way the Senator from Arkansas inquires if it is not about time to stop killing time in the discussion of this bill.

Mr. President, if we are here legislating for France, it is time—if we are here legislating for Great Britain, with a representative of the Cobden Club in Washington, it is time to stop talking about this bill; but if we are here to legislate in the interest of the industries of the United States as against the industries of Great Britain and France, it is just time for us to commence to talk; and I am glad the Senator from Oregon is occupying the attention of the Senate to-day as interestingly and effectively as he has, and the interest and effectiveness of his speech is demonstrated by the pain it is evidently giving the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I have my own convictions on this question of the tariff. I take no advice from anyone as to what course I shall pursue in regard to the pending bill. I stated recently in a very few words that this bill, if it should become a law, would be destructive of every great industry in my State. In fact, the threat of the legislation proposed by this bill and by the success of the Democratic party has had the effect to demoralize every industry in the State. To-day, while the manufacturing industries in Oregon are not great, there are not one-half so many people employed in Oregon in the great industries of that State as there were two years ago. The wool of eastern Oregon remains in the warehouses without buyers, the wheat raised in eastern Oregon can not be sold at a price which would justify its transportation to the seaboard, and every industry in the State is paralyzed. I believe that if this bill should become a law—

Mr. DANIEL. Did I understand the Senator from Oregon to say that this condition had existed for two years?

Mr. DOLPH. I did not say that it had been going on for two years.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the Senator to say so.

Mr. DOLPH. I think I said that there were not one-half so many people employed in the industries in the State to-day as there were two years ago.

As I was about to say, if this bill should become a law, no

doubt there would be a temporary revival of business. Whenever manufacturers know what they can depend upon the wages of labor will have to be adjusted to existing conditions, and the wages of labor will be reduced and some of the manufacturers will start; but if this bill becomes a law there will never be again the prosperity which this country has enjoyed; there will never be more than a lame and a halting prosperity until the party which believes in the protection of American industries comes into the control of the administration of this Government and both branches of Congress, so that the law may be repealed and a protective law enacted.

I do not take any advice from the Senator from Arkansas. I do not fear the verdict of the people upon the course I may take in regard to this bill. So far as I am concerned, if I could prevent the passage of the bill I should do it, whether it should be by talking upon it until the 4th of March next or by beating it on a direct vote, but I do not speak for anyone else. I do deny, however, that I have been talking for the purpose of consuming time.

The question of the duty upon iron ore, which is under consideration, is an important question. Almost within sight of the metropolis of Oregon there are iron works where iron is produced and manufactured into various useful products. My State and the adjoining State of Washington are full of iron ore, and there is no reason why we should not produce there all the iron which is used on the North Pacific coast and should not manufacture there all the products of iron and steel.

I am told that the bulletins which should have been printed and been on the desks of Senators in order that they might intelligently discuss the pending question have not even been printed, or at least have not been received from the printer; and because I seek to occupy a few moments of the time of the Senate to talk about this great industry of the production of iron ore, I am accused by the Senator from Arkansas of consuming time. It is immaterial to me whether anybody listens or not. It seems the Senator from Arkansas was listening at that time. It is immaterial to me whether anybody reads what I say or not. I generally discharge my duty according to my own convictions, without asking any question or any advice from anybody, and then I am satisfied with the consciousness of duty performed.

Mr. President, I said that this bill was a sectional bill, and I want to say that there are strong protests against it which come up from the South. I quoted on a former occasion the statement of one W. A. McCorkle, the Democratic governor of West Virginia—and I will read but a sentence from it now—before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. He said to the committee:

Another thing I do know, and that is that politics to-day plays a part in that portion of the State. I mean to say that we were raised up as a buffer for armies to march against, when men pursued each other with cannon. We are to-day in that same border warfare in the great politics of this country; therefore I say, meaning no threat, "Don't do it."

Do not put coal on the free list. The statement that it is not meant as a threat does not change the character of it. It is a threat substantially, taken in connection with his other statements; it is a threat that if their industries are to be stricken down, West Virginia will not be found in line with the Democratic column.

I also hold in my hand a statement by Mr. W. T. Smith, president of the W. T. Smith Lumber Company, of Chapman, Ala., concerning the lumber question, in which he says:

Our lumber manufacturers in the South were in a fairly prosperous condition up to the time the tariff was lowered on Canadian lumber in 1890 and reduced to \$1 per M feet, soon after which we began to feel the effects, and our prices as well as our demand for Western stock began to decrease, and so continued until the panic came on last summer, and yet our prices for home consumption are about the same as heretofore. And these low prices caused by Canadian competition are not only hurting the manufacturers, but are seriously affecting the poor man and his family; for with them it is a matter of bread, as the wages of the men have been cut from \$1 to 80 cents per day, and with this reduction the mills running are not paying expenses, while many have been closed. The very men whom the Democratic party are evidently trying to aid are really being chastised with the Canadian tariff rod. * * *

Further on he says:

Ten years ago I was engaged in the lumber business at Bozeman, Ala., and we received \$24 per 1,000 feet for first and second boards. Now we get only \$12 per 1,000 feet for the same. We got \$24 for first and second flooring; now we get only \$12. We got \$13.50 for common flooring, for which we now get only \$8, and have but little demand for it at these low figures. Stiff competition has brought lumber to what it now is.

Again, he says:

I am of the opinion that if this tariff on lumber is not restored, the Canadians will advance the price of their lumber to a point at least sufficient to balance the tariff after they have run us out of the western trade. They

would then keep an eye on us, and in case we started up again would lower their prices at will, thus keeping us out, and from time to time advancing prices. I have often seen the stronger work the weaker out, and then put up prices to pay for the fight.

Then he says—and this is a sort of a threat:

Only one side of the tariff has been debated in the South, but our business men and our suffering laboring classes will in the future be compelled to turn the rays of the political sun on the other side of the question, that the people may see both sides thereof.

The average mill has a monthly pay roll of not less than \$3,000; then for the 781 mills we have monthly pay rolls amounting in aggregate to \$11,341,000, or \$133,082,000 per annum, 75 per cent of which is paid out for actual labor, and \$8 used by our poor people. The mere sight of the Wilson bill caused wages to be cut from \$1 to 80 cents per day, and has already thrown thousands out of employment, many of whose families are now in destitute circumstances, being half clad and having only corn bread to eat, and some not enough of that. If the above-described situation is caused by the blossom of the Wilson tariff bill, what may we expect to reap as the fruit thereof?

So, Mr. President, after all, there are some industries which are to be injuriously affected, even in the South. I pity my friend from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. In accordance with his theory of a tariff for revenue, he has been willing to report a bill which would put wool on the free list, and strike a blow at a great industry of his own State, and he has the supreme mortification of finding the bill changed, so that while it leaves wool on the free list, it has been made protective to many other great industries where he would apply the principle of tariff for revenue only.

Mr. President, the industry of iron and steel is an industry, I think, in twenty-eight States of the Union. It employs 450,000 laborers. There are dependent upon it two millions and a half persons, including the families of the laborers. This does not include the men who are engaged in mining iron ore and preparing the raw material. By this bill these great industries are to be jeopardized and destroyed, and a large portion of the laborers employed on them are either to be turned out of employment or are to be compelled to work for wages which will not support them in independence and comfort.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be adopted.

Mr. DOLPH subsequently said: In my remarks in regard to the sectional character of the bill, I wish to submit a table showing the number of manufacturing establishments, their aggregate value, the average number of hands employed, and the aggregate wages paid in California, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, with the total, showing that these States have only three and seven-tenths of the establishments, three and eight-tenths of the value, three and one-tenth the number of hands employed, and 4 per cent of the wages paid.

I also submit a table showing the same thing with regard to the other States of the Union, except the Southern States, and showing that they have 80 per cent of the establishments, 85 per cent of the value, 85 per cent of the hands employed, and 86 per cent of wages. I also submit a table of the thirteen Southern States, showing that they have but 16 per cent of the establishments, 10 per cent of the value, 12 per cent of the hands employed, and 10 per cent of wages paid.

I submit these tables as showing by inference the reason why the industries of the country are dealt with as they are in the pending bill. I wish them to go in in connection with my remarks.

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

The tables referred to are as follows:

Factory system in the Pacific States compared with the Southern and all other States.

State.	Estab-lishments reporting.	Aggregate value.	Average number of hands employed.	Aggregate wages.
California	7,923	\$146,797,102	83,642	\$51,538,780
Colorado	1,518	26,651,840	17,067	12,285,734
Montana	289	4,293,794	2,696	1,948,213
Nevada	95	1,211,269	620	445,503
Oregon	1,523	32,122,051	18,798	11,535,229
Washington	1,543	34,369,735	20,366	12,658,614
Wyoming	190	1,411,184	1,144	878,646
Total	13,081	246,856,975	144,333	91,290,719

	Per cent.
Establishments037
Value039
Hands employed031
Wages paid040

Factory system in the following States compared with the Southern and Pacific States.

State.	Establishments reporting.	Aggregate value.	Average number of hands employed.	Aggregate wages.
Connecticut.....	6,822	\$227,004,496	149,939	\$75,990,606
Delaware.....	1,003	33,695,400	21,966	9,892,387
Idaho.....	140	1,048,916	774	324,202
Illinois.....	20,482	502,004,512	312,198	171,523,579
Indiana.....	7,440	77,513,097	59,174	25,878,997
Kansas.....	4,471	43,926,002	32,843	16,323,485
Maine.....	5,010	80,419,809	75,780	29,526,217
Maryland.....	7,485	119,607,316	107,054	41,526,832
Massachusetts.....	26,923	630,032,341	485,182	239,670,509
Michigan.....	12,127	262,412,240	163,941	66,247,798
Minnesota.....	7,505	127,686,618	79,629	38,189,239
Nebraska.....	3,014	37,599,508	23,870	12,984,571
New Hampshire.....	9,221	249,890,423	180,901	95,509,703
New York.....	65,840	1,130,161,195	850,084	466,846,612
North Dakota.....	382	2,894,553	1,847	1,002,881
Ohio.....	28,673	402,793,019	331,548	158,768,883
Pennsylvania.....	39,393	990,990,375	630,484	305,556,229
Rhode Island.....	3,377	126,483,401	88,976	37,927,921
South Dakota.....	499	3,207,796	2,422	1,098,418
Vermont.....	3,031	23,763,291	24,894	10,096,549
West Virginia.....	2,376	28,118,080	21,969	8,339,967
Wisconsin.....	10,417	246,515,404	132,031	51,843,708
Total.....	281,157	5,568,587,273	3,958,162	1,939,163,383

	Per cent.
Establishments.....	80
Value.....	85
Hands employed.....	85
Wages paid.....	86

Factory system in the Southern States compared with the Pacific and all other States.

State.	Establishments reporting.	Aggregate value.	Average number of hands employed.	Aggregate wages.
Alabama.....	2,977	\$46,122,571	33,821	\$12,676,029
Arkansas.....	2,073	14,971,614	15,972	5,749,888
Florida.....	805	11,110,304	13,927	6,513,068
Georgia.....	4,285	56,921,580	56,383	17,312,196
Kentucky.....	7,745	79,811,980	65,579	27,761,746
Louisiana.....	2,613	34,764,121	31,901	13,159,564
Mississippi.....	1,698	14,896,884	15,817	4,913,863
Missouri.....	14,045	189,236,422	142,924	76,327,907
North Carolina.....	3,667	32,745,965	36,214	7,830,536
South Carolina.....	2,382	29,276,261	24,662	6,590,983
Tennessee.....	4,559	51,475,092	42,759	16,899,351
Texas.....	5,268	46,815,181	39,475	18,586,338
Virginia.....	5,915	63,456,799	59,591	19,644,850
Total.....	58,032	671,594,804	579,025	233,966,319

	Per cent.
Establishments.....	16
Value.....	10
Hands employed.....	12
Wages paid.....	10

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President—

Mr. PEFFER. I will ask the Senator from Connecticut to yield to me for a moment. I desire to propose an amendment, which I think ought to be disposed of before the amendment proposed by him is acted upon, and I rise for the purpose of asking him to withdraw his amendment until I may submit one.

Mr. PLATT. I understand from what the Senator from Kansas has said to me that he desires first to test the sense of the Senate upon whether iron ore shall be placed upon the free list?

Mr. PEFFER. That is my object.

Mr. PLATT. And as that is naturally the first question to be decided, although I hope and pray that iron ore will not be put upon the free list, I am willing to withdraw my amendment temporarily in order that the Senator may propose his amendment.

Mr. PEFFER. Then, Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the committee, after the word "pyrites," in line 4, by striking out "forty cents per ton" and inserting "shall be admitted free of duty."

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

The SECRETARY. After the word "pyrites," in line 4, on page 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "forty cents per ton," and insert "shall be admitted free of duty;" so as to make the paragraph read:

Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, also the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. PEFFER. Mr. President, the doctrine that raw materials, as they are termed, ought to be free from duty, is either sound or it is unsound. If it is sound, reasoning from analogy, all manufactured articles ought to be equally free from duty; or,

from the standpoint on which I view the subject, if duties are levied for any other purpose than for revenue only, they ought to be levied with a view to protection, and then everything which is produced by labor ought to receive its share of the protective duties.

Iron ore comes as near being a raw material as anything that I can conceive of, unless it be coal, of which I shall take occasion to speak when we come to that schedule. Iron ore is found in every State in the Union in greater or less quantities. It is probably more widely diffused in the arts and sciences than any other one substance. The articles made from iron ore are numberless; they are like the sands of the sea; they can not be counted. It is unquestionably the most useful of all the minerals. That being true, if any article ought to be admitted free of duty, iron ore should be.

It is one of the tenets of the Democratic party, Mr. President, that iron ore, coal, lead, wool, cotton, and a number of other articles, which I might go on to enumerate, all classified as raw materials, should be exempted from duty. If that is true, I now come to the question why it is that the Democratic members of this body insist upon putting a duty upon it, and I want an answer to that question, and I want it from the Democratic side of the Senate, not from the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], nor from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], nor from any other Republican Senator, because I understand their doctrine.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] stated it this morning very clearly, as he always states everything which he undertakes to state. "Free trade all around," said the venerable Senator, "or protection all around." The Democratic theory has been—and I am not saying that it was wrong—that iron ore ought to be free. I ask any member of the Senate on the Democratic side of the Chamber, why this duty is placed upon it, and I ask it with so much seriousness, so much earnestness, for the sake of eliciting a true and correct answer, that I pause that any Senator may answer the question. The question is: In view of the course of the Democratic party and their doctrine upon this subject, why it is proposed to put a duty of any amount upon iron ore? I ask an answer. I see two, four, seven, eleven, thirteen, fifteen Democratic Senators upon the floor.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, there is no pretense of any attempt to evade any question at all, and I will answer the Senator from Kansas from my standpoint, and answer him very frankly. It is not at all a secret, not even an open one, that a great difference of opinion exists inside the Democratic party in regard to the imposition of tariff duties. It is hardly necessary for me to give the reasons for this difference. There are certain Democratic Senators who represent large manufacturing States and States in which there are large interests of the manufacturing interest who honestly believe—and I have no disposition to criticize the integrity of their opinions—that there should be some tariff taxation upon these articles; but a very large majority of the Democratic Senators believe that iron ore should be on the free list.

Mr. ALLISON. A majority of Democratic Senators?

Mr. VEST. Yes, sir. I meant what I said; and the Senator from Iowa, I think, understood it.

Mr. ALLISON. I was not certain that I did.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I suppose the Senator from Iowa was troubled, as the rest of us are, with the Senator's answer. If the statement of the Senator is true, that a majority of the Democratic Senators are in favor of iron ore being upon the free list, how does it happen that the Committee on Finance, which is simply the organ of the Senate and the representative of a majority of the party on the other side, who are responsible for legislation, report here a duty? Was not that the trouble with the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLISON. That was my trouble.

Mr. HALE. That is the trouble with all of us.

Mr. PEFFER. I hope the Senator on my left will not interfere with the answer of the Senator from Missouri to my question, because I am not speaking as a Republican.

Mr. VEST. I am undertaking to answer the Senator from Kansas, but, however humane my impulses might be, I could not undertake in any reasonable time to remove all the pangs which afflict the Senators upon the other side upon the question of the tariff. I know their earnest solicitude, their Christian charity toward us in the present contingency, but I can not undertake to spend the afternoon in relieving the solicitude they feel toward us.

As I was going on to say, a large majority of the Democratic Senators favor placing iron ore upon the free list; but with the existing conditions in the Senate and the absolute necessity, as we consider, of passing some tariff legislation, it was necessary to make concessions to that small portion of Democratic Senators who believe in some duty upon iron ore, and we had pre-

sented to us the contingency either to pass the bill with an import duty upon iron ore and other articles, or to not pass any bill at all. That is the whole of it; and there is no disposition to conceal the fact. I myself am in favor of free iron ore; but if I can not get free iron ore, and can get passed a bill imposing a duty of 40 cents a ton upon iron ore, I am willing to take that 40 cents a ton, instead of 75 cents a ton upon iron ore, which is now the duty under the McKinley law. I am willing to make that concession.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, Mr. President, I have an answer very frankly given, that goes at least partially to the core of this matter. I understand the Senator from Missouri to assert that a large majority of the Democratic members of the Senate are in favor of free iron ore; but that, in order to secure the support of a small minority of the Democratic members of the Senate, the large majority yielded their convictions of duty to the small minority, so that a party measure might pass this body.

Then, I put this further question: Is it not true—and I ask it of the Senator from Missouri, who knows, if anybody does—is it not true, plainly stated, that the object of this 40 cents a ton duty on iron ore is a protective duty, and yielded at the request of persons who favor it for protection, and protection alone?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, as a matter of course, it would be impertinent for me to undertake to give the motives of Senators who have favored this tax of 40 cents a ton on iron ore. I can answer the Senator very distinctly for myself. As to whether I think it is a protective duty or not, that depends entirely upon the amount of revenue which must be raised for the support of the Government. I have my views in regard to the amount. I am willing to give the largest possible liberality in the way of revenue in view of the fact that large exports of gold are constantly being made to Europe, and I desire, above all things, to avoid the necessity for issuing any more interest-bearing bonds by the Treasury. It seems to me that under present contingencies we should make a liberal estimate in regard to the revenue necessary for the support of the Government. I should not vote for any protective duty over and above the necessities of the Government, and, in my judgment, this is, under present contingencies, a revenue duty, because I think the first necessity of the Government is to raise enough money from tariff taxation and internal revenue to prevent any possibility of increasing the interest-bearing debt of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate will understand when we come to discuss the wool schedule, at least to some extent, why I am anxious about the position of the Democratic members of this body; for, if this duty upon iron ore is a protective duty—and I have made up my mind that that is what it is for, but I wanted it to be put in the RECORD in that form—when we come to ask why it is that they propose to put wool on the free list we may understand what has caused that change.

I am inclined to believe that I am very nearly in full sympathy with that Democratic majority which favors free raw materials. Indeed, I believe that I am quite as radical upon this question as the most radical upon that side of the Chamber, not excepting even the intrepid junior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. I am ready to close every custom-house in the country and to establish absolute free trade. If American laborers are compelled to contend against the laborers of Europe not only there but here, I do not see why our manufacturers can not do the same thing.

It is said, I know, and it is eloquently said, that protection is asked in the interest of the working people. There lies the dividing line between my old Republican friends and myself. All of this protection cry is said to be in the interest of the laborer, that we may maintain a high standard of wages, so that our laborers shall be able to take care of themselves and their families in proper style. Mr. President, with due respect to the gentlemen who pursue that argument and who urge it, I do not believe that it is a correct one. I do not believe that those Senators and speakers and writers who advocate that doctrine have thought this subject all over carefully. It has cost the workmen of the United States a hundred million dollars to maintain their present position.

There has been no increase in the rate of wages at any time or under any circumstances by reason of an increase of tariff duties; and that has not been the intention at any time when tariff duties were raised. On the other hand, it has been necessary for the American laborer to fight his way. The strikes that are going on now and the strikes that have been going on during the last dozen or more years—and they are multiplying from year to year—show what a hard time the American workman has to hold his own in this country.

In 1864 a bill was passed and approved, and it was presented in this body and advocated by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], whose footprints we see so frequently in the legislation of the last quarter of a century, authorizing American manufacturers, railroad builders, and other persons

to go into foreign countries and contract for labor and to bring workmen here under contracts made in foreign countries, paying their transportation here, holding a lien upon their wages for a year, having a lien upon any real estate they might purchase during that year, and exempting them from military duty. From that hour until the present foreign workmen have been coming into our mines, into our factories, into our shops, into our hotels, into our stores, until to-day three-quarters of the men and women in our manufacturing establishments are foreigners, and most of them unnaturalized.

So it is with our mines. I heard a mine operator within the last two years say that Americans would not work in the mines. That is not true, Mr. President. If there is any truth in it at all, it is to this extent, that they will not work for the wages for which they will have to work. I remember hearing of one case where some 600 citizens of the United States were marched out and 600 aliens marched into one mining establishment with a high board fence between them extending from the establishment to the railway track, in order to keep the two classes apart. I need not go into the particulars, but I call attention to the fact in order that our Republican friends as well as our Democratic friends may get at some day or other on middle ground on this question.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] this morning spoke of the enormous development of the mines in the region of country which he so ably and so honestly and so sincerely represents upon this floor. If I were to ask that Senator to tell me how many Canadians work in those mines, how many foreigners of different nationalities, I doubt very much whether he would be able to answer that question. If I were to ask him how much higher the wages there are than they are across on the other side of the lake for the same kind of work, I doubt very much whether the Senator would be able to answer that question.

Mr. President, it is well for us to face this whole proposition. I want to give my free iron ore friends an opportunity to put themselves upon record, because, I say in all candor, I intend to hold you Senators from the South responsible before your constituents as well as mine for the votes that you give upon this question. I am interested in your people; I am interested in you just as much as I am interested in my own people, for I believe that I am at least tall enough, if not broad enough, to take in this whole country. I intend to make answer to my people and to your people out of your own mouths what your answer is to this question, and if a large majority of the Democratic members are in favor of free iron ore now you shall have an opportunity to say "aye" when the vote comes, and we shall see how many of you are willing to vote with me and with the Populists.

Before concluding, I wish to say that this amendment was proposed in a somewhat different form by my political colleague from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber, being detained on committee work. That Senator's proposition was of a dual character, to strike out the section which we are now debating, and to insert in the free list substantially what I have asked to have inserted here; but, upon consultation with friends, and from my own knowledge of parliamentary proceedings, it occurred to me that the proper way was to move to strike out the proposition to levy a duty of 40 cents per ton, and to insert the words which the Secretary read a few minutes ago.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say, except that I understand—and if I am wrong I want to be corrected before being seated, for I shall use the answer which I have already received during the remainder of this discussion and in future, unless I have misunderstood it—I understand that this duty of 40 cents a ton upon iron ore is levied as a protective duty in order to protect the American ore miners against the competition of foreign miners; and if I am not correct in that statement I hope the correction will be made.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, as I had a colloquy with the Senator from Kansas in regard to the subject, I only answer for myself that I do not propose to vote for the duty as a protective duty at all.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] by his proposition and his question has penetrated the fundamental weakness under which the other side is laboring, and nobody recognized that more clearly and plainly, if he had confessed as freely when he rose in his seat as he thought in his mind, than the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. There is not one Senator upon the other side who has been counted up by the Senator from Kansas who does not have a deep sense of mortification when the present condition and situation is pointed out, as it has been upon this side of the Chamber this morning, and especially with epigrammatic force by the Senator from Kansas. There is not one happy Senator upon that side,

unless it may be the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], whose principles and beliefs have all been discarded and who has, to appearances, abandoned all interest in the bill.

The Senator from Missouri, who was not as candid in the latter part of his remarks as in the first, was obliged to confess what is the situation, that the majority of his party, standing before the country upon a plain, clear, radical proposition that a tariff levied for anything but revenue only is bad policy and unconstitutional, has at last been driven to protective duties upon every schedule in this bill, and it is only a question of the degree and amount of protection.

I do not know of any great party which has ever gone to the country and made a campaign and carried an election upon a more distinctive, plain, unmistakable proposition than that contained in the Democratic platform of 1892.

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only.

Mr. President, that was adopted not *sub silentio*, not because a few men smuggled it into the platform and carried it through and notice was not attracted to it until afterwards, but it was carried excluding the reverse proposition that a tariff under the policy of the Democratic party might be laid as incidental protection, and to compensate for the difference between labor upon this side of the water and the other, which proposition was voted down.

Something can be said for the manhood and the bravery of a convention, that, on a distinct contest, embodied its propositions in the form of resolutions, voted them into the platform, and went to the country upon it. There was not in Chicago when that plank was adopted any such policy as the Senator from Missouri has outlined, that he and his associates are pursuing, where the majority yielded to the minority. The majority believed in one thing, and that was this thing; and they said "the majority will rule, and the line of policy of the Democratic party is to maintain its principles, and to say so, and to take its course." The minority did not come in and overcome the majority, as they have done here, and have their way.

No wonder, Mr. President, that a distinguished member of the Democratic party in the Senate a few days ago, when he was asked what was the condition of this tariff bill, replied, "We are at the mercy of the minority, who have put a pistol at our heads, who have taken first our purses, next our watches, and they are now hunting around to see if they can not rob us of some rings we have got in our waistcoat pockets." [Laughter.] I do not wonder that that is the feeling on the other side of the Chamber.

The Senator from Missouri shall not escape by declaring that a duty of 49 cents a ton upon iron ores may be a revenue duty. The Senator knows that by the bill he has presented here, or that he and his associates have put before this body, that all the amendments that have been put upon us, without reckoning the income tax and the tax that they lay upon sugar, the two thus increasing the House bill over \$30,000,000, there will not be a deficit obliging them to resort to protective duties in order to raise a revenue, but there will be a surplus. Nobody knows that better than the Senator from Missouri.

They have got on these two propositions—one of which taxes the breakfast tables of the American people, and the other of which makes it next to a felony for any man to dare accumulate property—to increase that amount to more than \$30,000,000, which will give them a surplus; and the Senator shall not escape by declaring, when he is confronted with a duty upon iron ore, although his people were promised free iron ore, that that is needed as a revenue duty. He knows better than that; there is not one member of the Finance Committee who does not know better than that; there is not a Senator upon the other side who does not know better than that. It is because the pistol has been put at the head of the Senator from Missouri, and he has yielded rather than to risk the fate of his bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator remember the pistol Mr. Edmunds, a former Senator from Vermont, put at the head of the Finance Committee when the McKinley bill was under discussion, and said that if they did not put maple sugar on the dutiable list he would vote against the bill?

Mr. HALE. No; I do not. I have never associated the Senator from Vermont with the presentation of a pistol at anybody.

Mr. BUTLER. That was stated on the floor of the Senate by the late Senator from Kansas, Mr. Plumb; and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Edmunds, said if they did not put maple sugar on the dutiable list he would vote against the bill; and they put it in.

Mr. HALE. Maple sugar was put not upon the dutiable list. The Republican party had a policy—

Mr. BUTLER. It was a bounty, I believe.

Mr. HALE. The Republican party has a policy that, as the years go by, will be sanctioned, and our people will be grateful for the building up in this country of industry in every form and of the production of sugar that, in the end, will relieve us from the tribute that we pay to other nations.

There is no more beneficent thing, Mr. President, that the Republican party has been engaged in for years, in all its mission since it has taken into consideration the great financial and fiscal questions of this country, than the two things which were embodied in that proposition upon sugar, that was, free sugar for the breakfast table, and a system of bounties which would encourage and build up in this country an industry by which within twelve years we should raise all the sugar consumed by the American people.

I am willing in the future to stand upon that proposition; I am willing to contrast that with the attitude that the Democratic party is in, either the other House or in the Senate, as will be shown by future votes in that body and by votes in this body upon the sugar question.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not discuss the wisdom or the unwisdom of it; I shall simply discuss the fact that when the McKinley bill was under discussion, what I have stated is correct, or at least it was so understood; and when the Senator talks about compromises, he ought to remember some of the compromises on the McKinley bill.

Mr. HALE. There were no compromises. The one thing about the McKinley bill—true there may have been things in it, as there will be in the line of action of any clear, honest, positive, man, that may be at times extreme—was that it was honest, and direct, and meant one thing from beginning to end. From the time it was reported in the House of Representatives until it finally passed and received the approval of the President, everybody knew what it meant, and from the time the Democratic party laid the keel of this tariff bill in the expiring four months of the year 1893, there has not been one twenty-four hours when any man could tell from all the documents, all the bills, and all the amendments, what the other side did mean. I do not know to-day—and our New England community is greatly interested in the cotton schedule—what is the plan of the cotton schedule in this bill. I have read all the reports and bills and amendments up to this time, but to-day the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] reported and had sent to the desk a bulk of matter that is to be printed, and not until that is completed will anybody know what is intended in that great schedule. The McKinley bill all through meant one thing.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senator will allow me to ask him what was that one thing—an increase of taxation?

Mr. HALE. No, sir; protection.

Mr. BUTLER. It meant an increase of taxation, and this bill means a decrease of taxation. That is the object of it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is wrong, and I am sorry that he is very apt to be so when he goes into the domain of figures and statements. That bill reduced taxation; that bill cut off everywhere; that bill did not raise prices either. Given a fair opportunity of proving itself as it is now, it accomplished two things—relief from the burdens of taxation and the reduction of prices; and the Senator can not point out in this bill anywhere that either of those things have been done.

Mr. BUTLER. The reduction of taxation?

Mr. HALE. A reduction of taxation and an increase of articles upon the free list. All of the things that go to make up profoundly wise tariff legislation were found in the McKinley bill. I do not say that in every item and in every schedule there were not duties that were not raised, and that, perhaps, some were not too high—that is human fallibility—but the general purpose and scope of that bill was as clearly understood by everybody when it passed as the light of day is disclosed when it is shining through our windows in the morning.

There is the difference and there is the trouble, Mr. President, as the Senator from Kansas has probed it, and he has brought the Senator from Missouri to the confessional, and that Senator has been obliged to declare that the majority has yielded to the minority for the sake of putting the bill through.

Mr. President, of what account is it to get the bill through? It is of some account to have a deep and sincere and honest and pervading principle, so that whatever bill embodies all of these things shall be presented to the American people and put on trial, and that the American people shall say "yes" or "no" in approval or dissent; but the mere being driven to the shift of passing a bill, the giving away at all stages in order that something shall be saved out of the wreck, is not a proud position for a great party to be in. There is not, as I said, a man on the other side of the Chamber who is comfortable under these conditions. I do not blame them.

You have sat here, Mr. President, during this discussion and

have seen that when this side of the Chamber is engaged in criticism, when it is asking questions, when it is pointing out inconsistencies, when it is lamenting the results that will follow, we can not, with the exception of two or three instances, get one word out of the other side. First they desert their seats, they refuse to answer questions, they refuse to defend the bill, they refuse to disclose the policy upon which it is created, and then the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] gets up here, and in clamorous fashion, because the talk on this side does not suit him and his associates and makes them wriggle, whether he does or not, and declares that this side is consuming time.

This side will simply consume all the time that is necessary to disclose the imperfections, the weaknesses, and the wickednesses of this bill; and it will go further than that if it sees proper. The junior Senator from Arkansas can escape from that, if he chooses, by leaving the Chamber; but no declaration that this side is simply delaying for the sake of consuming time, will prevent during this session just such things as have occurred to-day.

This side has been much more comfortable under this discussion to-day than the other side has been, Mr. President; and when we strike a great schedule like the metal schedule, it would be a very strange thing if Senators upon this side did not take it upon themselves to point out the weakness of the proposition that is presented to us by the other side.

When we have disclosed this and have come to the provisions of the bill, we are ready to vote; we are ready to vote item by item, and if the other side votes them down, we will go to the people; and if the minority on the other side puts the pistol to the head of the majority and compels amendments that are in our direction, we shall be very glad to see them, but we should like to know, as has been inquired, on what principle it is done.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, a stranger in the galleries here, after listening to the liquid eloquence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], would come to the conclusion that not a wave of trouble, not a ripple of discontent, had ever passed across that side of the Chamber in regard to tariff questions or anything else. While the Senator was speaking, in a reminiscent mood I went back to 1883. I remember very well that midnight scene when a tariff bill by a majority was forced upon the people of the United States, many of whose provisions had been voted down deliberately in both Houses of Congress.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who was one of the conferees, has been in the habit of denying that fact; but, Mr. President, it has passed into history, and from the lips of the Republican Senators themselves, of the highest character, and I have the record from a report made by a dead Senator who lives yet in our hearts and memory, James B. Beck, of Kentucky. That report gives this unique history of that transaction; and the record will bear out every word of it. The bill went into conference and came back to the Senate and House of Representatives with provisions, as I have stated, which had been voted down in both bodies. Here is what Mr. Beck said:

Much light was thrown upon this subject by a controversy that sprung up between Senator SHERMAN and Senator MORRILL. Mr. SHERMAN had published an elaborate interview in the Commercial Gazette, of Cincinnati, dated March 14, 1883, in which, among other things, he said:

"The truth is, there was a grave fault in constituting the committee on the part of the Senate. The two members of the Finance Committee from New England were put on the conference committee, when, by custom and precedents, Mr. JONES of Nevada, should have been a member, or, if he declined, Mr. ALLISON. The result was that these two New England Senators controlled the conference, and they were known to be opposed to the duty on wool and in favor of an increase on woolen and cotton goods."

During the debate in the Senate Mr. SHERMAN insisted that the rates upon woolen goods especially were too high, even as they passed the Senate, and of course he regarded the increase made in the conference, which, as I said before, the Senate knew nothing about until after Congress had adjourned, as an outrage; his language in the debate being:

"That about one-half of the cost of these woolen goods is in the cost of the raw material, the wool, and the other half is the cost of manufacture. Take therefore, a lot of these goods; suppose that the value of the goods imported is \$1,000, and one-half of that is the cost of the wool, and the other half is the cost of manufacture. The duty on \$500, the cost of the wool, has already been fully compensated for and more than compensated for by the specific duty. Then, as to the duty as levied, not as 40 per cent of the \$500, the cost of manufacture, which is all the manufacturer puts upon it, but the duty is levied at 40 per cent on the thousand, thus giving him a protection of \$400, or 80 per cent on the cost of manufacture. It seems to me that is too large, that the relative duties upon wool and woolen goods are unequal and unfair. The duty ought to be in proportion to the manufactures."

And in the interview above referred to he repeated his charges of improper conduct against his conferees from New England, saying:

"The protective duty of 35 per cent ad valorem in favor of the manufacturer remains unchanged, and in important branches is changed to 40 per cent; and the classification is so changed that none but an expert can understand it. Even in the conference committee additional duties were put on both cotton and woolen goods of certain grades, far in advance of existing law."

Mr. MORRILL answered Mr. SHERMAN in a labored article, dated April 28, and published in the New York Tribune. He confesses and avoids the truth of the charges. His main defense is that Mr. SHERMAN was as deep in the mud as he was in the mire. Both did their best to show their want of due respect for the expressed will of the Senate, although neither of them had any right to undertake the task of sustaining the action of the body that appointed them, unless they were determined to maintain and uphold its action by every honorable means, whether they approved it or not. It is painfully

apparent from their own statements that neither of them either did so or attempted to do so. Mr. MORRILL says:

"The distinguished Senator is a remarkably cool and sagacious man, but he was evidently in a pet, and by this time he will regret some of his rather exaggerated and hasty statements. He criticises the fact that two members of the conference committee were from New England, and would seem to indicate that this brought to bear a malign sectional influence, forgetting that two of the members of the conference committee were from the State of Ohio alone, and perhaps, too, sensitively remembering that the large increase of duties on plain white crockery ware had never been insisted upon in the Senate by New England."

Again, he says:

"But the Senator complains that the duties on woolens were raised in the conference committee; so they were on pig and bar iron."

These interviews show that the conferees, so called, paid no sort of respect to the wishes of the two Houses. They made the tariff which we are now cursed with to suit themselves. One accuses the other of increasing the burdens on cotton and woolen goods, and the other retaliates by charging his accuser with having increased the taxes on earthenware, pig and bar iron, and other things in the iron schedule which the Senate had over and over again defeated him in when he attempted to impose them upon the country on this floor.

Mr. MORRILL adds:

"A restoration of these rates, even in a committee of conference, was an unpromising risk. If anyone was more responsible than Senator SHERMAN for making the 'harmony and symmetry of the plan' of the commission's iron schedule 'as rough as a saw' I do not remember it."

So, Mr. President, it appears that in 1883 the Senators who are now taunting the Democratic party with a disagreement amongst themselves, rushed into the public prints of the country after Congress had adjourned to charge malign and sectional and improper conduct upon their colleagues on that committee.

We have heard that the Wilson bill and the present bill has been made for sectional purposes; that the rebel brigadiers were again in the saddle attacking New England; but here it seems that these grave and reverend Senators at the head of the Republican party deliberately charged each other with sectional purposes and with improper conduct as Senators and conferees.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has made a bitter and malignant speech; but I know him, and I am willing to ascribe it to a temporary fit of indigestion, that the Senator has eaten something in the lunch room that has disagreed with his usual cool and frigid temperament.

Mr. HALE. But he has not swallowed these amendments, as the Senator from Missouri has done.

Mr. VEST. No, Mr. President, he has not swallowed these amendments, nor would the Senator swallow any other legislation in favor of the consumers of this country; but give him a tax on fish, give him a tax on eggs, on butter, on stone, or anything in which New England is interested, and he would gulp it down with the avidity of a black bass when he swallows a minnow. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, if I used the word "malice," I acquit the Senator of any such intention; but I can not imagine that the Senator, if upon his ordinary diet, would have made any such speech. It is simply incredible that so much unadulterated snake juice could have come from his ordinary New England diet of cod-fish and Boston baked beans. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have had a great many controversies with the Senator from Missouri in the years he and I have been members of this body, and I have always discovered what has been seen to-day, that when he is hard pushed and the facts are presented and he is driven to the wall, he always resorts to some little by-play, or some phrase, or something that might be the next thing to personal taunt in order to get out of the controversy. My comments upon the conditions here were not leveled at the Senator from Missouri. I did not set him up as the representative of the condition of the other side. I was arraigning all of his fellows upon that side of the Chamber, and had no controversy with him. I did not in any way descend to any phrase or allusion or taunting speech, because I was not obliged to, Mr. President; I had plenty of facts, but the situation upon the other side is such that I was entitled to make the arraignment I made, not in a bitter personal way or in any way transgressing the limits of ordinary parliamentary courtesy.

I tell the Senator from Missouri that I shall take the liberty during this controversy, whenever we come to these provisions, that neither he nor his associates can read without the mantling blush of shame upon their faces as abandonments of everything that they have proclaimed to the American people during their political lives, to so arraign that side of the Chamber upon all of these propositions. Because retort is made after a fashion that has been gone out of the Senate for thirty years and has only been introduced lately when the new majority has come in, I shall not be deterred from arraigning that side as severely, Mr. President, as, in my judgment, seems proper under the occasion.

Mr. VEST. Nobody complains of that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I can not understand the relevancy a discussion of the action taken in regard to the tariff act of 1883 has to the present situation, but as the Senator from Missouri has gone into that matter and has read certain state-

ments in regard to it, I think it is important for the truth of history that the facts should be stated.

In the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress the House of Representatives passed a bill reducing internal-revenue taxes, which was sent to the Senate, but no action was taken upon that here. Between the first and second sessions of the Forty-seventh Congress the tariff commission, which had been appointed the year preceding, made their report to Congress.

The bill which they reported was introduced in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and sent to the appropriate committees of the respective Houses. The Senate Finance Committee reported to the Senate a bill, not precisely the tariff commission bill, but a bill substantially like that measure, as an amendment, one single amendment to the internal-revenue bill, which had passed the House at the preceding session. The lamented Judge Kelley, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, introduced the commission bill in the House. Sometime after he reported it back from the Ways and Means Committee, with slight amendments, and the House commenced the discussion of the measure. They proceeded, as I recollect now, halfway through the metal schedule, but were not able to go any further for want of time.

The amendment reported by the Senate Finance Committee was acted upon in the Senate, which, by the way, was not Republican, as the Senator from Missouri seems to think, but was then equally divided between the two parties, the late Senator from Illinois, Hon. David Davis, having the casting vote and balance of power, he being classed by himself and his friends as an Independent.

That bill was taken up in the Senate, considered paragraph by paragraph, and finally adopted as an amendment to the internal-revenue bill—a single amendment, I repeat. The bill went to the House of Representatives, which nonconcurred in the amendment of the Senate and appointed a conference committee. The conference committee, therefore, had before them every single paragraph of the measure, free to act upon them as they saw fit.

Mr. MCPHERSON. May I ask the Senator a question as he goes along?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Did the House of Representatives consider the bill at all?

Mr. ALDRICH. The House of Representatives considered a bill which was reported from their committee, and afterwards abandoned. They did not consider even this bill, except in Committee of the Whole. There was no action upon this bill in the House at all.

Mr. MCPHERSON. They considered the bill, then, which had been reported to them by the tariff commission. The Senate bill, unlike the bill of the tariff commission, was much higher in all its schedule rates. That bill went to the House from the Senate; it was not read in the House at all; but a new rule was passed there to enable the House to nonconcur in the Senate amendment without a two-thirds vote in order to send it to conference; and the tariff law of 1883 was made in conference without having ever been read in the presence of the House of Representatives or ever having been voted on by the House of Representatives at all, except simply to nonconcur in the Senate amendment, but the rule that was provided did not enable a vote to be taken to concur in the Senate amendments. So it was a plan to get the bill into conference without the action of the House of Representatives at all—I speak now of the rules.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is entirely mistaken in one part of his statement. The rates in the bill which passed the Senate were lower in nearly every instance than the report of the tariff commission, and lower than the rates which had been adopted by the House of Representatives, in such consideration as they had given their own bill up to the point in the metal schedule that had been reached when their bill was abandoned.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The average rate of duty, as the Senator will not fail to remember, of the law existing in 1882 was about 47 per cent. The Tariff Commission recommended a reduction of 20 per cent all along the line, or at least what was equivalent to a 20 per cent reduction. The next year, in 1883 or 1884, under the bill passed on the recommendation of the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Iowa, which was the bill known as the Allison bill and not the bill reported by the Tariff Commission—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is a little mixed in his history. He is speaking of the tariff of 1888.

Mr. MCPHERSON. No, I am speaking of the tariff of 1883.

The result of the whole thing was that one year subsequent to the passage of that law the average rate of duty was 47 per cent. Where, then, do you get your 20 per cent reduction?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is diverting me more or less from the course of statement which I was making. He makes a

mistake of five years in his history; but still we should not mind that.

As to whether the rates in the Senate bill were below the bill recommended by the Tariff Commission, there can be no question. I think the Senator will agree that I was more or less familiar with that bill; and I know that the bill reported to the Senate committee contained rates which were in every schedule less than those reported by the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission did not undertake to decide as to what the effect of their rates would be upon the revenue or upon an average ad valorem of the duties imposed. They did say, and they were undoubtedly correct in that statement, that the rates which they suggested were 20 per cent below existing rates.

But I will go on with my statement where I was interrupted by the Senator from New Jersey. The Senate passed that bill and sent it to the House of Representatives. The House nonconcurred in the amendment. It is not material to the question which I am now discussing how they did it. They adopted a rule, a course which is likely, I presume, to be followed in the House again if this bill passes the Senate. Does the Senator from New Jersey expect that all the amendments which we are now making to pending bill will be voted on separately in the House and considered there?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I expect the House of Representatives will be able to take up the bill under the present rules of the House and consider it by paragraphs, if the House should so elect.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think the House is likely to so elect?

Mr. MCPHERSON. At that time, as the Senator remembers, it required a two-thirds vote to take up a bill for consideration, and a new rule was introduced and passed which enabled the House to take up the bill by a simple majority vote for the purpose of nonconcurring in the Senate amendments, and not for the purpose of concurring. Hence the object of the rule was to drive the bill into conference, without any action having been taken by the House at all upon its different paragraphs. When it came back from the conference committee, it was a bill confessedly made in conference.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am getting to the point, if the Senator does not interrupt me too much.

The Senator should remember one thing; which he may possibly have forgotten, that at that time we were in the second session of a Congress. The bill did not finally pass the Senate, as I remember, until after the 20th of February, and that Congress expired by limitation on the 4th of March. If any bill was to be passed, and there was a general disposition on the part of all that some bill should be passed, it was necessary that action should be taken at once, that is, if it were to become a law before the 4th of March. Therefore, the rule which was adopted in the House seemed to have been justified by existing conditions.

The House did not concur in the Senate amendment, and a conference committee was appointed. There had been no action in the House upon any portion of this one amendment which the Senate sent them; not a single vote had ever been taken which bound the House in any respect as to the rates in the bill. When the members of the conference on the part of the two Houses met in the Finance Committee room they were entirely free by every parliamentary rule to recommend such changes in the Senate amendment as they thought proper to make.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, that is an interesting statement, and, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask him one question.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator hold that where neither House of Congress has voted for a duty, a conference committee has the right to put it in their report and incorporate it in the bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand the Senator to say where neither House has acted?

Mr. VEST. Where neither House has voted upon a duty, when the matter has not been considered, can a conference committee make a new bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly not. I have not claimed anything of that sort.

Mr. VEST. I want to ask the Senator if it is not absolutely true that a duty of 75 cents a ton upon iron ore was put in the act of 1883, when neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives had voted for any such rate of duty?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly iron ore was in the bill as it went from the Senate.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will yield to me a moment, I wish to say that the tariff commission reported in favor of a duty of 50 cents a ton on iron ore, and the House of Representatives had voted for a duty of 50 cents a ton—

Mr. ALDRICH. The House of Representatives had never voted upon any item of the bill which we sent to them.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator has already admitted in the statement he made a few minutes ago that the House of Representatives had reached to about the middle of the metal schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill from the Senate was never before the House of Representatives at all for consideration by items.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to finish my statement, which is this: I say the tariff commission recommended a duty of 50 cents a ton on iron ore; the House of Representatives, when it voted upon the bill of the tariff commission, fixed the rate of duty at 50 cents a ton; and the Senate in that bill fixed the rate of duty at 50 cents a ton; and you gentlemen of the conference committee reconciled the disagreeing votes, or you made a disagreement rather, between the tariff commission, the House of Representatives, and the Senate, by fixing the duty at 75 cents a ton.

Now, I want to know how any conference committee can go to work and put in a tariff bill a rate of duty which has not been agreed to by either House, and which is in excess of any rate voted upon by either House?

Mr. PLATT. Then, the position of the Senator is that the conference committee could not change any item of the bill as it left the Senate because the House had not acted upon it?

Mr. MCPHERSON. They could have changed it anywhere between the limits fixed by the two Houses, but they could not raise the rate of duty from 50 cents a ton, agreed upon by both Houses, to 75 cents, which had never been voted by either House.

Mr. PLATT. But, as I understand, the other House had taken no action upon the tariff bill, and, therefore, had not acted upon any single item in the bill which left the Senate; had not come to any action. If the Senator's position is right, then it follows that the conference committee could not change by either putting up or down any item which was in the bill as it left the Senate.

Mr. MCPHERSON. But the Senator is not exactly correct as to his understanding of the action of the House of Representatives. It will be remembered that when the tariff commission's bill was reported to Congress of course it was sent to the other House.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was sent to both Houses.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator from Rhode Island is quite correct in saying that they took up the bill and got nearly through the metal schedule before they came to a point where they could proceed no further. But in reaching that point they covered iron ore, and fixed the rate of duty at 50 cents per ton. The tariff commission had recommended 50 cents per ton. The Senate bill carried with it a duty of 50 cents a ton. The conference committee, when they got the bill in conference, fixed the duty at 75 cents per ton. Does the Senator from Connecticut claim for a single moment that it is within the competency of a conference committee to take such action?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly, I think so. If the other House had acted finally upon a bill, agreeing with the Senate upon an item, that could not be changed, but the House did not act upon any single item of the tariff bill. It considered a bill and in considering that bill it put the duty on iron ore at 50 cents. The bill never came to final action in the House and, therefore, so far as the conference committee were concerned there was no difficulty about making the duty whatever they chose.

Mr. ALDRICH. The action of the House was upon a bill which never reached the Senate at all. It had no more influence with the action of the conference committee upon the Senate bill than the vote which they had taken on the act of 1870, or any other tariff act that had been passed from the formation of the Government down to the present time. You might as well say that because the act of 1789 fixed the rate of duty upon something, therefore this conference committee were bound by that action. The bill, which was introduced in the House by the member from Pennsylvania, which was considered partly in Committee of the Whole, was abandoned by the House, and the action which they had taken on the abandoned bill had no more to do with the action of the Senate and of the House which was considered by the conference committee than any action taken in a previous generation.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It is very strange the Senator should make any such argument as that.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am stating the fact; that is all.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The conference committee usually consists of 5 members of this body. Inasmuch as that conference report, when it comes back into the Senate can not be taken up by paragraphs and sections but must be agreed to practically as a whole, does the Senator argue for a single moment that it would be competent for that conference committee to so change the bill that its friends would not know it? I do not think the Senator will argue anything of that kind.

Mr. ALDRICH. The conference committee could certainly do that, under the circumstances stated, and if the Senate and House concur in the action of the conference, the bill becomes a law. Take this bill. Iron ore, for instance, is put on the free list in the House, and 40 cents a ton is put on in the Senate. The conference committee can agree upon any rate between 40 cents and the free list on either extreme. There can not be any question about that, I suppose.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Truly, nobody questions that it may do it between 40 cents and nothing, but as to going above 40 cents per ton—

Mr. ALDRICH. They can not do it, because there is a disagreement between the two Houses from nothing to 40 cents a ton. That is the only question which goes into conference. In the case to which I alluded all questions affecting every item of that bill went into conference free from any such limitation, and there was absolutely no line of rates that the conference committee were bound to follow. There was no action which bound the conference committee on the part of the House or the Senate as to any particular rates. Now, what happened in the Senate? The usual conference was appointed, consisting of five members. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who was entitled by seniority on the committee to be a member of the conference, was also chairman of the Appropriations Committee then, and he was not able to serve upon the conference, and I was put upon the committee in his stead.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and myself represented the nominal majority, or the friends of the bill. Mr. Bayard and Mr. Beck, as I remember, possibly the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], were appointed to represent the Democrats—Mr. Bayard and Mr. Beck, I think, as they had had most to do with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. VOORHEES. In what year was that?

Mr. ALDRICH. In 1883.

Mr. VEST and Mr. VOORHEES. That is right.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Bayard and Mr. Beck the next day after they were appointed declined to serve. Then the Presiding Officer of the Senate tried to appoint in turn other Democrats as members of the conference, but they all declined one after another to serve. Then two Republicans were put on the conference, the Senator from Virginia, Gen. Mahone, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. McDill, I believe. We met, and after three or four days of conference agreed upon a report. That report was adopted by a majority vote in both Houses, and one member of that majority was the distinguished Senator from New Jersey who has so recently been addressing the Senate.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I freely admit I voted for the bill, and I thought I had good and sufficient reason for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt the Senator did.

Mr. MCPHERSON. We had been for two long years engaged in an agitation of the tariff question. We had tried to enact legislation in Congress. We were unable to do it. We then decided to appoint a tariff commission, and they spent an entire year in trying to get ready to make some report to Congress. The country had been practically convulsed; factories were doing nothing; fires were drawn out. Time was needed between the purchase of raw material and the time to manufacture and market the goods.

Of course unless some tariff bill was passed it would be absolutely destructive to the industries. Thereupon the Legislature of my State, I think almost unanimously, both the Democratic and Republican side of the house and senate and the governor or my State, instructed me by resolution to vote for the passage of the bill, and I obeyed their instruction.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was commending the Senator from New Jersey for his action on that occasion. I did not mean to criticize him at all.

The point I was about to make was that no question was ever made in either House or in the conference, as to the entire and absolute right of the conference committee under the circumstance to recommend in their report rates such as they chose. No criticism was made in the Senate at the time by any member on the other side of the Chamber as to our action on that occasion. The statement that the duties upon cotton and woolen goods were raised higher than those imposed by either House or by existing law I have shown time and time again in the Senate to be absolutely untrue. There is not a particle of truth in the statement that the conference committee raised the rates upon cotton goods above the existing law or above the law as it existed prior to that time.

Mr. MCPHERSON. You put iron ore upon a higher rate of duty than either the House or the Senate recommended. You put steel rails upon the dutiable list at a higher rate of duty than either the House or the Senate had recommended. You put certain qualities of iron—

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator persists in saying that rates were fixed higher than either the Senate or the House had adopted, in the face of my explanation, I do not know of any process by which I can make him understand the situation.

As to the action in regard to cotton and woolen goods, it is true that in two particulars, and only two, the rates on cotton and woolen goods were changed from the bill as it passed the Senate. A proviso was put in in the cotton schedule the effect of which was to reduce the rates more than 20 per cent below existing rates.

Now, as to the statement which the Senator from Missouri has read in the presence of the Senate to-day, that statement was contained in a report made by the late distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Beck], for whom no man in this Chamber had a higher respect than myself.

It was made in a statement prepared for adoption as a minority report on the act of 1888, the Mills bill, so called. That statement was prepared when the Senator from Kentucky was ill and away from the Senate. It was sent here and submitted to the minority members of the Committee on Finance. It was not agreed to by his associates. They chose to make a report for themselves. But it went into the public records and stands to-day uncontradicted as it appears in the report. That it was not contradicted at the time was owing to the fact I have just stated that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was in the last hours of his life, broken in health, broken in spirit, and awaiting for the final summons to come.

There was no man on this side of the Chamber who would have had the heart to have pointed out the inaccuracies of the statements which he made in regard to the report of that conference committee, but there was no man upon it who does not know that every act taken by that committee was in strict accordance with the rules of the two bodies and in strict accordance with the rules of parliamentary law which govern conference committees.

I regret that the Senator from Missouri should have felt obliged to bring this matter in here, because, as I said before, I believe it has no relevancy whatever to the consideration of the question now before the Senate, and no relevancy whatever in its application to the attitude of Senators upon the other side in regard to this question. There may have been some differences as to the rates to be imposed in that bill, but there were no differences on the part of the majority of the conference committee or upon the part of Senators sitting on this side of the Chamber as to the principles which should govern their action.

The Senator from Missouri has alluded to the fact that the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Edmunds, our late associate, took some position in regard to the duty on maple sugar. The position which the Senator from Vermont took was along the line of the policy which had been deliberately adopted by the Republican party.

Now, what is this case? You are proposing to put into the bill by this amendment a rate which is in direct opposition to the declared policy of your own party. You are admitting yourselves that these rates are put in the bill against the wishes of a large majority of your own party associates.

Mr. BRICE. Will the Senator from Rhode Island allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. BRICE. What item is the Senator now speaking of?

Mr. ALDRICH. Iron ore.

Mr. BRICE. Does the Senator understand that this duty of 40 per cent is a protective duty?

Mr. ALDRICH. I was simply saying, if the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. BRICE. Will the Senator allow me one more remark on that point?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will let me finish.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ALDRICH. I will yield after I have finished my sentence. I was alluding to a statement made by the Senator from Missouri that a large majority of the Senators sitting upon the other side of the Chamber were in favor of free iron ore, but that he had been obliged by somebody to put a duty of 40 cents a ton upon iron ore, in order that the bill might pass this body. Now, I will listen to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICE. I did not understand the Senator from Missouri to admit or state that the duty of 40 cents proposed was a protective duty. As I understand it, it is purely a revenue duty. I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the statistics found in this prepared copy of the bill bearing upon that question.

The importation of iron ore for the three fiscal years 1890, 1891, and 1892 averaged more than 1,000,000 tons of iron ore, with a duty

of 75 cents per ton. In other words, more than one-tenth of all the iron ore consumed in the United States was imported at the high protective duty, if you please, of 75 cents per ton, which amounted, calculated upon this value, to about 33 per cent ad valorem in the average of those years.

As I understand, the effect of levying duties upon imported products, if you reduce the duty one-half you will then be likely to arrive at purely a revenue basis. I believe that in this case you do come purely upon the revenue basis when you reduce the rate to 40 cents per ton. The calculation will be still more in favor of that theory if you act upon the importations of 1893, when the duties, owing to the lower value of iron ore, averaged 42.26 per cent.

If the duties upon iron ore at 40 cents a ton are calculated upon the same average valuation, you will find that the duty now proposed in this bill is only about 18 per cent ad valorem. I contend that a reduction of an average duty of 33 per cent to an average duty of 18 per cent is strictly in the line of the Democratic platform of 1892, and is purely a revenue duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator answer me a question? He states that the importations in 1892 were a million tons. What does he think they would have been at 40 cents a ton duty?

Mr. BRICE. I am unable to state what the increase would be owing to the differing rates of transportation—the different railway and ship rates—but I should think 3,000,000 tons of ore would have been imported instead of 1,000,000 at a duty of 40 cents per ton.

Mr. HALE. I should like to ask, by permission of the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Ohio a question. He does not often come into the debate, but when he does, as now, he shows a clear line of thought. He has brought out very clearly why it is that he believes upon one of these great products a certain rate of duty will just strike the medium ground where it will be revenue in its effect, where more or less would be the reverse, and he fixes the basis, ranging from 18 or 20 to 30 per cent.

That being so, he favors this duty, not high, as a revenue duty. Not as a member of the Finance Committee, but as high in the councils of his party and supposed to be largely influential in its deliberation, I wish he would tell me under what process of reasoning the duty upon lumber, which is about 23 or 24 per cent nearer to what is called a revenue duty than anything else, was taken off and the whole great body and product put upon the free list. I have been exercised upon that point and shall not only now, but elsewhere, if the basis here of excuse for a certain duty is as indicated, first by the Senator from Missouri, followed by the Senator from Ohio, that this lower rate of duty is revenue, and will bring money into the Government, I shall want somebody to explain to me why it was that a rate nearer to the revenue point on the great article of lumber was ruthlessly taken from the dutiable list and the money collected given up, and the whole thing placed upon the free list.

Of course I might go into wool, but I have lumber in my mind now, as distinctively an illustration in opposition to what the Senator has said. I wish he could tell me why it is that the rule has not been followed with lumber.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question.

Mr. BRICE. In answer to the question of the Senator from Maine, I will state that when the lumber schedule is under consideration will be the proper time to discuss that question. We are now discussing iron ore and the metal schedule, and the attempt has been made to discuss all other portions of the bill except the paragraph under immediate consideration.

Mr. HALE. I know; but the Senator understands that if a discussion on the tariff bill and upon the items in the schedules only related to the distinct subjects-matter, his rule might be a good one, but we are all the time told that certain things are done because a rule applies. We have just been told by the Senator that a rule applies to 40 per cent upon iron ore, and it is perfectly legitimate for me to ask him why that rule does not apply to lumber, which is less than half that amount.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Maine seems to be trying in his anxiety to get a duty upon lumber, even if it is called a revenue duty by the other side of the Chamber. It occurs to me that the same rule ought to be applied to wool. I did not know whether the Senator from Maine was discriminating between lumber and wool because lumber is a product of Maine and wool is a product of Ohio. I do not think the Senator meant that.

I concur with the Senator from Maine in his anxiety to get a duty on lumber, and I do not care what the other side call it provided it protects the industry. They may call it, as the Senator from Ohio does call it upon iron, a revenue duty. What I think might settle the whole controversy now before the Senate would be to put an adequate duty upon lumber and wool and

then we would have nearly everything protected that this country produces. We will call them protective duties on this side of the Chamber. The Senators upon the other side of the Chamber, including the Senator from Ohio, will call them revenue duties, and then we are approaching one step nearer getting this economic question out of politics.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have already alluded to the disposition on the part of Senators on the other side of the Chamber to call a duty which was put upon an article in which their own State was interested a revenue duty. The Senator from Ohio has followed that illustrious example with reference to the duty to be placed upon iron ore. The Senator makes another statement which is a very important one in the consideration of this bill. He states as his opinion (and I think his opinion is a very valuable one, especially in this connection), that the importations of iron ore by this reduction in duty will be trebled in amount. In other words, that instead of 1,000,000 tons importations we shall have 3,000,000 tons and the resulting revenue at 40 cents a ton of \$1,200,000 in place of \$750,000 collected under the law as it now stands. We have this result, then, an increase of revenue from \$750,000 to \$1,200,000, and an increase of importations from 1,000,000 tons to 3,000,000 tons.

Now, I think the people of Ohio interested in iron ore will be a little troubled about this statement of the distinguished Senator from that State, that the increase of importations is to be 2,000,000 tons per annum if this bill becomes a law, with a rate of duty of 40 cents a ton. Three million tons of foreign ore would amount to, I think, more than half of this year's production of iron ore. In other words, you propose to surrender one-half of the American market for this revenue duty of 40 cents per ton.

I should be glad to know if it is as true as has sometimes been intimated—I think it has been intimated several times in papers read in the Senate to-day—that the Senator from Ohio is responsible for the construction of this bill. We have been looking for a man who had an opinion as to the effect of the bill upon the revenue and what principles had been followed in its preparation. If the Senator from Ohio is at last willing, as the Senator from Texas said the other day, to come out into the broad sunlight and announce his responsibility for this measure, I desire to ask him what is the rule that has been applied in fixing revenue rates upon the various articles provided for in the bill.

Is 40 per cent ad valorem the correct revenue rate? Is it 50 per cent ad valorem? I hold in my hand a letter, which I ask the Secretary to read, bearing upon the equivalent rate upon the article which we have now under consideration. The author is an authority, which I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], whom I do not now see in his seat, will recognize at once on hearing the name read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Office of the Juragua Iron Company, Limited, 208 South Fourth street, PHILADELPHIA, March 9, 1894.]

SIR: I see by the published reports of the tariff bill as reported to the Finance Committee of the Senate that it proposes a specific duty of 40 cents per ton on iron ore.

The Juragua Iron Company Limited, a Pennsylvania corporation, of which company I am chairman, have invested in Cuba some \$3,000,000 of American cash to secure for Eastern blast furnaces a supply of cheap raw material.

The cost of our ore free on board ship at Santiago de Cuba was \$1.14 per ton for the year ending December 31, 1893.

Forty cents per ton specific duty on \$1.14 per ton is over 35 per cent ad valorem, while the proposed duty on pig iron and steel rails (of which this iron ore is the raw material) is only 22½ per cent ad valorem, thus making the proposed duty on the raw material 12½ per cent higher than it is on the finished manufacture.

On behalf of my company I have to ask your help and assistance in having this anomaly corrected.

Respectfully,

L. S. BENT, Chairman.

HON. NELSON W. ALDRICH,
Member of Finance Committee, United States Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Luther S. Bent is a gentleman whose authority has been frequently quoted in this Chamber in previous tariff discussions by the Senator from Maryland and other Senators. He told us that if we would put iron ore on the free list he would make steel rails and sell them in London and Liverpool in competition with English makers. Before this debate closes I intend to have read his statement in that regard, which was put in the RECORD two years ago by the Senator from Maryland.

As shown by Mr. Bent, the duty of 40 cents a ton on Cuban ores is equivalent to 35 per cent ad valorem. On Spanish ores it is over 40 per cent ad valorem. Now, if this is to be levied as a revenue duty, I hope that the Senator from Ohio will tell us whether 40 per cent is the ideal rate that ought to be imposed in all cases.

If so, I shall have frequent occasion in the course of the discussion which is to follow to ask why 20 per cent, 25 per cent, and 30 per cent have been levied upon finished articles of iron and steel by this bill, when it is proposed to levy a duty of 40 per

cent ad valorem upon the article which lies at the base of the whole industry. I do not know that I shall secure categorical answers to my questions; but I hope that the Senator from Ohio, who has at last emerged, I will not say from obscurity, but who has stepped into the bright sunlight and into the view of the Senate to defend this bill, will not again desert his post.

I fear, however, that this is but a sporadic effort on his part, arising from the necessity of defending a duty which had been assailed by every Senator who had addressed the Senate from his own side of the Chamber. I presume that the condition of the iron-ore industry of Ohio made it necessary that the Senator should say that he is in favor of a revenue duty upon iron ore, and I hope that the other interests of the country that need his protecting arm, and have received it to a considerable extent, will have the benefit of his powerful advocacy.

If we are finally to have the principle upon which this bill is constructed brought to light by one of its responsible authors, I am thankful. I hope the Senator from Ohio is ready to take the field and defend all the provisions of the measure from the attacks of the Senator from Missouri and all comers as valiantly as he has defended the duty which it is proposed to levy upon iron ore.

Mr. HALE. I do not want to interfere with the management of the bill upon the other side or to make any suggestion that would cut off debate, but I think I may say that we are ready to take a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas. There is a distinctive proposition, and I for one hope, owing to the pressure of business, as it is a late hour, that on this distinctive matter, which is a test in one degree, we may get the expression of the Senate. Then we can go on with the schedule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment of the committee. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, page 21, strike out the words "40 cents per ton" and insert in lieu thereof "shall be admitted free of duty," so as to read:

Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, also the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. HALE. Let us have the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. 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 am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in his seat, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. PALMER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH], and withhold my vote.

Mr. PATTON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], and withhold my vote.

Mr. VEST (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAFFERY. I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER].

Mr. BATE. Has the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted.

Mr. BATE. I am paired with him, and will not vote. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER. I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN. I am paired with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. I should vote "nay" if I were at liberty to vote.

Mr. GRAY. I am paired with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM].

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 46; as follows:

YEAS—4.			
Allen,	Hill,	Kyle,	Peffer.
NAYS—46.			
Aldrich,	Butler,	Faulkner,	Hawley,
Allison,	Cockrell,	Frye,	Hoar,
Berry,	Coke,	George,	Hunton,
Blackburn,	Daniel,	Gorman,	Irby,
Blanchard,	Davis,	Hale,	Jarvis,
Brice,	Dolph,	Harris,	Jones, Ark.

Lindsay,
Lodge,
McMillan,
Manderson,
Martin,
Mills.

Mitchell, Oregon
Pasco,
Perkins,
Platt,
Pugh,
Ransom,

Roach,
Sherman,
Shoup,
Squire,
Teller,
Turpie,

Vilas,
Voorhees,
Walsh,
White.

NOT VOTING—35.

Bate,
Caffery,
Call,
Camden,
Cameron,
Carey,
Chandler,
Cullom,
Dixon.

Dubois,
Gallinger,
Gibson,
Gordon,
Gray,
Hansbrough,
Higgins,
Jones, Nev.
McLaurin,

McPherson,
Mitchell, Wis.
Morgan,
Morrill,
Murphy,
Palmer,
Patton,
Pettigrew,
Power,

Proctor,
Quay,
Smith,
Stewart,
Vest,
Washburn,
Wilson,
Wolcott.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PLATT. I now renew my amendment.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Connecticut will allow me, as it has become settled that there is no chance for free iron ore so long as there is a Democratic Senate, I hope we will go on now and consider the schedules of the bill under the amendments to be offered.

Mr. PLATT. In line 4, before the word "cents," I move to strike out "forty" and insert "sixty."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Before the word "cents" in line 4, page 21, strike out "forty" and insert "sixty," so as to read:

Sixty cents per ton.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I move this amendment because I am a protectionist, and because I wish to vote for protective duties for all industries. As a New England man, since there has been so much said in this discussion about our desiring in New England to secure protective duties for ourselves with alleged indifference to the other industries of the country, I do not wish to let that suggestion pass without notice. We mine no iron ore to speak of in New England. There is a little mined in one county in my State, a little in Berkshire County, Mass., and a very little in Maine, but the production of iron ore in New England is so small that it cuts no figure in the great production of iron ore in this country.

We have been told that New England is for free coal, free iron ore, and free wool. If I know the sentiment of New England, the New England manufacturers, the New England workmen, and the New England merchants do not desire or ask for free raw materials, as they are called in this respect. We do not want free iron ore; we do not want free coal, and we do not want free wool, for the reason that we are protectionists, and we desire that there shall be extended to every industry in the United States, whether it be mining, farming, or manufacturing, the same protection which we believe to be good for our own industries in New England.

We believe in protection as a system; we believe that every industry in the United States carried on by American labor needs such protection as will enable it to fairly compete with the industries carried on by the laborers of other countries, and we propose to stand by it no matter what its immediate effect may be upon the particular industries in our section. We do not believe that protection is bad for any section of this country. We believe it is good for every section of the country. There is not a State in the Union which did not prosper in all its industries under the McKinley act as it never prospered before in the history of this nation. There is not a man in the United States, unless he is an importer, who did not prosper more under the McKinley act than he ever prospered under any other tariff legislation in this country. This talk about protection being for the benefit of the manufacturers and against the interests of the consumers is, to speak as respectfully as I can, an unmitigated humbug.

I wish to say a few more words about New England in connection with the tariff. New England can stand the pending bill as well as any other section of this country. New England can endure the general destruction or the general crippling of the business of this country as well as any other group of States; and my own State, the State of Connecticut, can stand it just as well as the State of Missouri or the State of Texas.

I am happy to feel that, ruinous as the bill will be when passed, and great as will be the suffering and the hardship of the people of my State as well as the people of all the States of the Union if the bill is passed, the very first persons who will emerge from the ruin and begin again to travel the road of prosperity will be the people of the State of Connecticut. I do not stand here to plead for New England or Connecticut. I stand here to plead for the whole country and for every industry in the country.

Senators upon the other side of the Chamber talk with open charges or admissions that the bill is leveled at New England, the rich people of New England, and the manufactures of New

England, who are making and have made such "immense profits." I do not know why they desire to pull them down, even if they are wealthy. I have never yet arrived in my consideration of economic questions to that condition of mind where I can suppose that this country will be any better off when all the wealth of the country is destroyed. I have never arrived at that condition of mind in considering economic questions where I have supposed that all the people of this country can have full employment at good wages when there is nobody to employ them, when there is nobody to carry on business, and when there is no capital to invest in business. I am astonished at the idea that the laboring man, the workingman, is in some mysterious way to be benefited and to be put on the high road to become a capitalist himself by a scheme which is openly avowed to have for its object the pulling down of capital that employs labor.

New England is not particularly interested in this matter as a manufacturing section of the country. The time was, indeed, in the early history of our country when the New England States took advantage of the established policy of the Government to protect manufactures, but any other section of the country could have taken advantage of it. The State of North Carolina or the State of South Carolina could have taken the same advantage of the established system of the Government to protect the manufactures and the industries of this country as Connecticut did, and they would then have been manufacturing States.

They would have had their inventors and their skilled mechanics; they would have been looking out in advance of the times to see what the wants of the people were going to be in the future and trying to antedate those wants and to supply them as they should arise. We are not to be taken to task because we availed ourselves of the policy of this country, of this American policy, to protect manufactures, and have built up manufactures and developed skilled workmen and skilled inventors; nor are we alone in having taken possession of this field. The years have gone by when those who would wage a war of extermination upon all the protected industries can level their shafts at New England alone.

I had the curiosity to see what proportion of the manufacturing industries of the country were carried on in New England, and I have to-day taken the census returns and made some calculations. I find that the whole capital invested in manufacturing in the United States is \$6,524,475,305, of which the six New England States have \$1,176,078,498, if I have made a correct footing, and the rest of the United States has \$5,348,396,807. About one-sixth of the manufacturing capital of the United States is to be found within the six New England States, while the other States have about five-sixths.

This is a very interesting subject, and I should like to pursue it a little more in detail. I will first give the capital in the New England States. Massachusetts has \$630,032,341; Connecticut, \$227,004,496; Maine, \$80,419,809; New Hampshire, \$79,375,160; Rhode Island, \$126,483,401; Vermont, \$32,763,291; in all, as I have said, \$1,176,078,498. Now, let us see as to the rest of the country. Alabama has \$46,122,571, more than Vermont; California has \$146,797,102, more than either Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, or Vermont. Yet Senators talk about New England manufacturing.

Colorado has nearly as much as Vermont, \$26,651,840; Delaware has more than Vermont, \$33,695,400; the District of Columbia, this little ten-mile square, has \$28,865,089; Georgia has \$56,921,580. Georgia is more interested in this matter than is the State of Vermont. Illinois has \$502,004,512, more than twice as much as Connecticut. Indiana has \$132,405,366, more than Rhode Island. Iowa has \$77,513,097. Iowa has practically the same amount of manufacturing capital as New Hampshire. Kansas has \$43,926,002. I think I heard some Senator—the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] probably—say that Kansas is not interested in the protection of American interests.

It has more manufacturing capital than has the State of Vermont. Kentucky has \$79,811,980, almost identically the same manufacturing capital as has the State of New Hampshire. Louisiana has \$34,754,121, a little more than Vermont. Maryland has \$119,667,316, nearly as much as the State of Rhode Island. Michigan has \$262,412,240, more than the State of Connecticut; Minnesota has \$127,686,618, more than Rhode Island. Missouri has \$189,236,422, more than Rhode Island and Vermont combined. Nebraska has more than Vermont, \$37,569,508. New Jersey has more than Connecticut, \$249,890,428. New York has \$1,130,161,195, twice as much as the State of Massachusetts. North Carolina has \$32,745,995, practically the same as Vermont. Ohio has \$402,793,019, much more than the State of Connecticut and a little less than the State of Massachusetts. I now come to Oregon. I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] said there was little manufacturing in his State, and yet the capital engaged in manufacturing in Oregon is equal to that of Ver-

mont, one of these New England States against which all the shafts of invective and ridicule are launched by the persons who are defending the bill.

Oregon has \$32,122,051; Pennsylvania has \$990,999,375, as much as Massachusetts and half as much more; and here comes South Carolina, almost up to Vermont in manufacturing capital, \$29,276,261; Tennessee has \$51,475,092; Texas has \$46,815,181; Virginia has \$63,456,799, twice as much as the State of Vermont; and Washington has more manufacturing capital than the State of Vermont. Washington has \$34,369,735; West Virginia has a little less than Vermont, \$28,118,030, while Wisconsin has \$246,515,404, exceeding Connecticut.

Mr. President, after this array of figures let no man talk about the protective system being sectional and for the benefit of New England. The manufactures which we established fifty, seventy-five, and one hundred years ago under the protective system adopted in the first year of our national existence under the Constitution grew and developed there, and then as the sons of New England went West and South the manufactures went West and South until they went beyond the Alleghany Mountains and below Mason and Dixon's line, and to day we manufacture but a very small proportion of the manufactured goods. Yet, because there is some prejudice against New England, the protective system is assailed because, forsooth, it is supposed it will inure particularly to the benefit of New England.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I propose to ask the Senator if the table which he has read shows also the percentage or proportion of increase of manufactures within the last ten years in the States outside of New England.

Mr. PLATT. It does not.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to know whether the manufactures in other parts of the United States form not only a very large comparative percentage of the manufactures of the country, but a constantly increasing one.

Mr. PLATT. The table does not show. I inquired at the Census Office whether the census statistics showed the center of manufacturing in the United States as they show the center of population. It will be observed by those who have been familiar with the census in decades gone by that the center of population has been moving steadily southwest, until ten years ago, if I am not mistaken, it was in the neighborhood of Cincinnati. When the statistics are tabulated and ascertained for the Eleventh Census it will be found that it has still been moving southwest. We might also apply to manufactures the verse of Bishop Berkeley—

Westward the course of empire takes its way.

This is the history of manufacturing in this country. When you strike down New England, Senators of the West and South, you are striking down your own people. Do not delude yourselves with the idea that this blow which you are aiming at the protective system will fall heaviest or with deadliest effect upon the people of New England. We shall suffer with you, but we shall not suffer as much as the States to-day represented by the Senators who are launching these blows because they think they will strike deepest into New England society.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Will the Senator from Connecticut tell me, as I do not know what the fact is, how much money if any is invested in the State of Connecticut in the manufacture of pig iron and pipe?

Mr. PLATT. There is very little pig iron manufactured in Litchfield County, in the town of Salisbury.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I wish it understood that I quite agree with everything the Senator from Connecticut has said in the last ten or fifteen minutes. I do not think that the question of protection is one in which New England alone is especially interested. One company in Oregon, within 6 miles of the city of Portland, has \$1,500,000 invested in the manufacture of pig iron and pipe.

Mr. FRYE. That is more money than the whole of New England has invested in that industry.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Perhaps that is more money than all New England has invested in the business. For this reason I am decidedly in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], but I should be in favor of it, if I do not disturb the Senator from Connecticut, whether there was a pound of iron ore in the State of Oregon or not, because, as the Senator has very well stated, there must be some principle about the matter, and it must be general and not sectional.

Mr. PLATT. I have referred somewhat to the supposition that there are in New England certain men who desire free raw materials in order that they may manufacture more cheaply and by retaining protective duties upon their products make more

money. That has been the motive at the bottom of every New England argument for free raw materials, but the true protectionist and Republican disavows and scouts any such argument. The doctrine of free raw material is, as was intimated, perhaps said, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] this morning, concentrated selfishness.

The man who thinks that by destroying the industry of mining ore in this country and transferring it to Spain, Africa, and Cuba he can make a little more on his product has an idea of business, of morals, and of ethics which I can not entertain and which I can not understand. Protection is based upon that old motto which ought to be dear to every American, "Live and let live." The manufacturers of New England and the workingmen of New England, though they suffer many disadvantages as compared with other sections of the country, are quite content that other persons, other manufacturers, and other workingmen in other sections of the country, and all persons engaged in any industry, in any occupation, shall have the same rights, the same protection from the Government, the same opportunity for advancement which they desire for themselves in New England.

If it be true that a duty of 40 cents a ton is such a revenue duty as will triple the importations of iron ore, as has been suggested here, and practically give away a half or a third of our industry, then it simply means that a half or a third of the men engaged in mining occupations in this country are to be turned out upon the cold charities of the heartless world. It does not mean that they are to take lower wages. When you reduce by one-half or one-third the mining of iron ore in the United States, you thrust out of employment, and the opportunity of employment, one-half or one-third of the men engaged in that occupation.

It is no longer a question with the miner whether he can get remunerative wages or higher wages; it is this result, that the work which he has been doing is transferred to Spain or Africa or Cuba, and is done there. I believe that is to be just the result of a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore. That is why I am opposed to it. I do not know what the rest of the Senators upon this side of the Chamber may do. I do not know how far I may conform my will to their judgment if they should decide to do otherwise than what I think is right and just in this matter, but for myself I do not want to vote for a duty of 40 cents a ton on ore any more than I want to vote for free iron ore.

The reason why I do not wish to so vote is because it is possible that under a duty of 40 cents a ton the industry may struggle along in some way in this country, but it will be at the expense of turning out of employment from a third to a half of the miners who are engaged in it and the reduction of the wages of the rest of them to a basis which will enable the mineowner to compete with the industry in Cuba and elsewhere.

A letter was read here showing how our people are investing their capital and have invested their capital in foreign countries in the mining of iron ore. Let a duty of only 40 cents a ton be put on iron ore, and you transfer not only labor, business, and industry but capital from this country to countries where iron ore may be more easily and cheaply mined.

For that reason, unless I should find a disagreement between myself and the other Senators upon this side of the Chamber, I propose, if the amendment fixing the duty at 60 cents a ton which I propose shall not be adopted, to vote against the duty of 40 cents a ton. It is a revenue duty; it is a revenue duty at the expense of American industries, American capital, and American labor. The pending bill is constructed just along the lines I have indicated by reference to this duty. I am out of patience with the talk that the bill is a protective bill.

The bill proceeds upon two lines scarcely denied, really confessed, and that is that where aggregated capital has been able to make itself felt in Democratic councils, it has obtained in some instances protective duties and in other instances duties with which the industries can struggle along; but where aggregated capital has not been able to make its voice felt, the industries are to be slaughtered and the workingmen are to be ruined.

In a paper which was read here this morning something was said to the effect that Mr. Rockefeller is behind the duty of 40 cents per ton on iron ore. He is a man of great wealth, I understand, but he does not seem to have had the success with the committee that the greater wealth represented by the sugar trust has had. They have got practically what they wanted.

If Mr. Rockefeller is back of the iron industry, he has got far less than he needs in order to carry on the business in successful competition with the business of other countries. I could not help recurring to the old story in the school books of Lord Chief Justice Hale in England, to whose information and understanding it came that down in a remote town in the eastern part of England justice was not properly administered, and

a younger son, destroying his father's will, had seized upon the estate of the elder brother, and had so worked upon the court and the judge, and corruption and bribery were so prevalent that it was quite probable that he was going to succeed and thus oust his brother out of his rights. The attorney in the case complained to Lord Chief Justice Hale, and the lord chief justice went down there and putting on a complete suit of the miller's best, disguised himself as a miller. I think I will read this account of his actions. It is very interesting.

Armed with a miller's hat and shoes and stick, away he marches to Chelmsford, and procured good lodging, suitable for the assizes that should come on next day. When the trials came on, he walked, like an ignorant country fellow, backwards and forwards along the county hall. He had a thousand eyes within him, and when the court began to fill, he found out the poor fellow who was plaintiff.

As soon as he came into the hall the miller drew up to him. "Honest friend," said he, "how is your cause likely to go to-day?" "Why," replied the plaintiff, "my cause is in a very precarious situation, and if I lose it I am ruined for life." "Well, honest friend," replied the miller, "if you will take my advice I will let you into a secret, which perhaps you do not know. Every Englishman has the right and privilege to except against any one juryman through the whole twelve. Now, do you insist upon your privilege, without giving a reason why, and, if possible, get me chosen in his room, and I will do you all the service in my power."

Accordingly, when the clerk had called over the names of the jurymen, the plaintiff excepted to one of them. The judge on the bench was highly offended with this liberty. "What do you mean," said he, "by excepting against that gentleman?" "I mean, my lord, to assert my privilege as an Englishman, without giving a reason why."

The judge, who had been highly bribed, in order to conceal it by a show of candor, and having a confidence in the superiority of his party, said, "Well, sir, as you claim your privilege in one instance I will grant it. Whom would you wish to have in the room of that man excepted?" After a short time, taken in consideration, "My lord," says he, "I wish to have an honest man chosen in, and looking round the court. My Lord, there is that miller in the court; we will have him, if you please." Accordingly, the miller was chosen.

As soon as the clerk of the court had given them all their oaths, a little dexterous fellow came into the apartment and slipped 10 guineas into the hands of eleven jurymen, and gave the miller but five. He observed that they were all bribed as well as himself, and said to his next neighbor, in a whisper, "How much have you got?" "Ten pieces," said he. But he concealed what he had got himself. The cause was opened by the plaintiff's counsel, and all the scraps of evidence they could pick up were adduced in his favor.

The younger brother was provided with a great number of witnesses and pleaders, all plentifully bribed as well as the judge. The evidence deposed that they were in the self-same country when the brother died and saw him buried. The counselors pleaded upon this accumulated evidence and everything went with a full tide in favor of the younger brother. The judge summed up the evidence with great gravity and deliberation: "And now, gentlemen of the jury," said he, "lay your heads together and bring in your verdict as you shall deem most just."

They waited but a few minutes before they determined in favor of the younger brother. The judge said, "Gentlemen, are you agreed, and who shall speak for you?" "We are all agreed, my lord," replied one, "our foreman shall speak for us." "Hold, my lord," replied the miller, "we are not all agreed." "Why," said the judge in a very surly manner, "what's the matter with you? What reasons have you for disagreeing?"

"I have several reasons, my lord," replied the miller; "the first is, they have given to all these gentlemen of the jury ten broad pieces of gold and to me but five; which, you know, is not fair. Besides, I have many objections to make to the false reasonings of the pleaders and the contradictory evidence of the witnesses." Upon this, the miller began to discourse, which discovered such penetration of judgment, such extensive knowledge of law, and was expressed with such energetic and manly eloquence, that astonished the judge and the whole court.

As he was going on with his powerful demonstrations the judge, in a surprise of soul, stopped him. "Where did you come from, and who are you?" "I came from Westminster Hall," replied the miller; "my name is Matthew Hale. I am Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench. I have observed the iniquity of your proceedings this day; therefore, come down from a seat which you are no ways worthy to hold. You are one of the corrupt parties in this iniquitous business. I will come up this moment and try the cause all over again."

If Mr. Rockefeller is really interested in this matter he is in the position of the miller on the jury. He has received only five pieces of gold while the sugar trust has received its ten pieces of gold, and he ought to remonstrate.

Mr. President, I wish to say one word about this matter of aggregated capital. We who desire that the protective system established in this country, under which the country has grown up and been developed, shall be continued have been told that we were trying to favor the trusts; that protection was controlled by trusts; that it had no reference to and no care for the people; that it was building up the few, the great robber barons, with their concentrated capital and their combinations; and the Democrats carried the election of 1892 because they made some people believe that their charges were true, when they were untrue.

I believe in protecting every industry. I would not discriminate against capital engaged in industry, nor would I discriminate for it. That has been the position of the Republican party, but the things which the Democrats have charged against us have come true in the preparation of the pending bill. It is a bill to protect and foster accumulated capital and concentrated business, and to destroy capital which has not greatly accumulated or combined. It is a bill to protect and enable the great corporations and the great industries, with their great accumulations of capital, to go on making money rapidly or in some instances to go on by the reduction of labor; but when it comes

to these small industries, which are the stay of our business society as of our social order, they have no consideration in the bill.

The greater the concentration of capital, the stronger the capitalistic influence, the more perfect is the protection proposed by the bill. It can be graduated by the extent of the capital invested. Capital has been able to make itself heard here. When you come to a man with \$10,000 capital or \$100,000 capital, he has no consideration whatever in the bill.

Mr. President, the great aggregation of capital in business and the dwindling opportunity, as it appears, for a man to emerge from the ranks of the workingmen and by commencing in a small way build up a business which shall be profitable and bring him a reasonable accumulation of capital, is one of the things in this country that may well engage the profoundest thought of the political economist.

That thing has been changing, not only here, but all over the world. The time used to be when the manufacturer employed a few hands, met the man who wanted to come and labor for him, met him personally, sat down and talked to him, went, perhaps, outside of the door and sat down on a log, and, like the Yankees, whittled a little, and came to a conclusion and made a contract; their minds met. There was the *aggregatio mentium* of the contract, and a certain social relation was established between the employer and the employed. The employer felt an interest in his employé, saw him every day, took an interest in his family. The employé took an interest in the welfare of his employer; and so there grew up between them that mutual understanding derived from mutual acquaintance and personal contact which, as it seems to me, was the best foundation of civil order.

But in these later days that is all changed. Manufacturing and all other business has been concentrating more and more into the hands of the few. Immense capital has taken up all kinds of business, whether it be manufacturing, or mining, or transportation, or merchandise, or even farming. The capitalist no longer meets the man who desires to be employed. There is no longer any mutual relations between the two. The capital perhaps is furnished by many men. The establishment is directed by an agent, and a man is employed by a foreman. He never sees the man who is carrying on the business, and so there arises friction. The interests of the two are not supposed to be identical.

The employé thinks that his interest and the interest of his employer are diverse. The employer does not stop to see whether his interest and the interest of the man whom he employs are the same. So there springs up disturbance between them. And the Democratic party that has been out of power has been seeking to ferment that disturbance by appealing to the prejudice of the man who is employed.

It is unfortunate to my mind that this condition of things became necessary. Aggregated capital carrying on business of any sort is not the result of protection. There is no protection in silver mining or gold mining; there is no protection in wholesale or retail merchandise; there is no protection in transportation; there is no protection in telegraphs; there is no protection in a large portion of the business which is carried on in this country. Yet capital combines. England is the home of combinations and trusts—free-trade England. That is the direction of the age. It has many advantages, but it has this one thing to be dreaded and feared, and that is that the workingmen will not respect the interests or the rights of the capitalists.

Now, the Democratic party, which has been trying to foment disturbance between the workingman and the capitalists and has been promising the workingmen that if he will put the Democratic party in power and elect its President and give it both Houses of Congress it would regard him rather than the capitalist, has prepared a bill here the inevitable tendency of which must be still further to blot out the minor industries and still further to augment the great capitalistic enterprises of the country still further to concentrate capital, still further, if we were to use the language which we hear so often, to enslave the workingman.

Is not that true? A duty of 40 cents a ton on coal is but an illustration of this whole bill, an illustration which will drive out the small mines, which will concentrate the business into a few hands. There have been a few free raw material men in New England; there are so still. They are Democrats and Mugwumps, but they are men who believe that with free wool they can crush out all the smaller woolen mills and practically control in one combined capital the woolen manufacturing business of the United States. That is just what this bill is framed to bring about.

I repel the charge that protection has been to enable combined capital and trusts to make money, with the assertion that this bill if it passes will compel the smaller industries to combine in order for self-preservation; and it will be lucky if by

further combinations of capital among the small and struggling establishments of the country they keep from bankruptcy. But this great aggregation of capital will go on under the bill with increased rapidity and with constantly increasing deleterious effects upon our social order.

How the Democratic party have come to this, how they have abandoned the professions of their lives, we may not inquire, but we may take the confessions made on this floor and we have the astonishing condition of things, the admitted condition of things, that here is the Democratic party, with a majority of Democratic Senators on this floor who desire free iron ore, surrendering to the few who will not have it.

Mr. ALDRICH. As the Senator from Connecticut has been speaking for some time and is not quite through, and as the hour of 6 o'clock has arrived, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut if it will be convenient for him to conclude his remarks this evening?

Mr. PLATT. It would be more convenient perhaps for me, and better for the Senate to conclude to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the Senate will stay with the Senator if it is convenient for him to go on. If not, for one I should be glad to adjourn.

Mr. PLATT. I prefer to go on in the morning. I am not quite through.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 22, 1894, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 21, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday was read and approved.

CORRECTION.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a correction of the RECORD. On page 4952, in a colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] and myself, it appears from the RECORD that he asked me whether I had not been absent a month, and that I answered in the affirmative. I did not understand the gentleman to say "a month," and I wish to correct my answer by stating that I was absent thirteen days of the month of February.

On page 5956 of the RECORD, in some remarks made by me in relation to section 40 of the Revised Statutes, occurs this sentence:

It might, perhaps, buy more members of Congress [laughter], but with the exception of members of Congress (if the newspapers are to be credited) a dollar would not buy as much then as it will buy to-day.

The phrase in parenthesis "if the newspapers are to be credited," ought to be transposed so as to make the sentence read:

It might perhaps buy more members of Congress, if the newspapers are to be credited.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I may say that of course the gentleman who heard me understood that that remark was not made with any serious purpose, or as expressing my real opinion of members of Congress; it was a mere passing humorous allusion to the reports in the newspapers about certain matters concerning which an investigation is now going on at the other end of the Capitol.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it be proper, I should like to rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman rose to correct the RECORD. The corrections he has indicated will be made.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I would like now to rise to a question of privilege in connection with what occurred between myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON]— [Confusion in the Hall.]

Mr. REED. I hope we shall have order, Mr. Speaker. This is very important. It concerns the views of a member as to his salary, than which there is no more sacred subject. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUTCHESON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] asked me a question upon which, of course, I can but put one interpretation. When I make my statement I will give the gentleman an opportunity to say whether or not I am to retain that interpretation.

As I understand the gentleman's language, his object was to put me in the attitude of insincerity in my utterance by showing that I was contending that the law was in force when in

February I had acted in contravention of that opinion by accepting my salary for time when I was absent.

I do not see the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] in the House, but I take the liberty of referring to him in the statement I am now about to make. About an hour before that discussion came up, I was approached by the gentleman from Iowa and asked what my position was in regard to this question. I replied that I had never examined the law, had never seen the report of the minority, and did not know how the law ought to be interpreted. In his presence I sent for the report of the minority, and after getting it I retired to the library and examined the question, and, with the books before me from the library, I presented what I had to say to this House. Every gentleman here knows that in February last this question—certainly to new members of the House—had never been presented. I had never examined the law, and in fact did not know its precise provisions.

Now, with this explanation, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he intended to convey, or would desire now to create the impression that in my expressions on this question I was insincere in what I said? I ask the gentleman the question because I may wish to say something in connection with his reply. I do not do this (I wish the gentleman to understand) with any purpose except to give him a fair opportunity, as one gentleman does another, of putting himself right and putting me right.

Mr. MAHON rose.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Did not the gentleman hear me?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

Mr. HUTCHESON. I ask the gentleman, did he hear my explanation about what transpired between the gentleman from Iowa and myself as to the time when my attention was called to the law on the subject and when my opinion was formed? If the gentleman did not hear, I will repeat what I said. I asked the gentleman whether his purpose was to impress upon the House the idea that I was insincere in what I was saying—whether after my statement as to the manner in which I came to my conclusion and the time at which it was done, the gentleman insists that there was any inconsistency between my act in February last and my act on the floor the other day.

Mr. MAHON. I will answer the question. I listened to the gentleman's speech in which he was condemning members for receiving salary for time when they had been absent from other causes than sickness of themselves or family. I found he had discovered that section 40 of the Revised Statutes was still in force, and should be enforced against members of the House. I then called his attention to the fact that he had been absent during the month of February—that is the month as stated by the gentleman, I did not state the month—that he had been absent some thirteen or fourteen days for some cause other than sickness; and as he had since discovered that it was a violation of the law to take pay under such circumstances, I asked him whether he would not put himself into more complete harmony with the position he took last Friday by returning that money to the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Then I understand the purpose of the gentleman; he simply wanted to know what my then position was in regard to the propriety of the return of that money. His purpose was not to reflect upon the sincerity of my position.

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

Mr. HUTCHESON. Mr. Speaker, I did intend to say to the gentleman—if his answer had been different from what it is (of course it would not apply to him now)—I did intend to state what Goldsmith was once told by Sam Johnson. He had been engaged in a controversy with a gentleman who, without any provocation (just as my language was free from provocation), in turn reflected upon the character of Goldsmith, who asked Johnson whether the man was a bad-tempered man. Johnson replied, "Oh, no; he is not a bad-tempered man at all; but whenever you touch his pocket he would assail Christ himself as a thief, if that was the occasion of the controversy." The gentleman from Pennsylvania has disclaimed any purpose to impugn my motives; and I know the remark does not apply to him. And as he does not impugn my sincerity, the incident will be dismissed with the above statement.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 6770) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange in behalf of the United States, deeds of land with the Pemaquid Land Company, of Maine, in settlement of a disputed boundary of the Pemaquid Point (Maine) light station; and Joint resolution (S. R. 443) to provide for the sale of new tickets by the street railway companies of the District of Columbia.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I present the credentials of Hon. Paul J. Sorg, representative-elect from the Third Congressional district of Ohio, for the unexpired term of my late colleague Judge Houk.

The credentials having been read, Mr. Sorg was escorted to the Clerk's desk by Mr. OUTHWAITE, and was greeted with applause from the Democratic side. The oath of office was then administered by the Speaker, and there was renewed applause as Mr. Sorg retired to his seat.

CHANDELEUR LIGHT STATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, providing for the reestablishment upon a safer site near by, the Chandeleur (Louisiana) light station, which was wrecked October 18, 1893; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ROBERT CALDWELL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copy of the findings of that court in the case of Robert Caldwell vs. The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:
To Mr. SICKLES, for one week, on account of sickness.
To Mr. HITT, for two days, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. CAMINETTI to print certain remarks in the RECORD on that portion of the agricultural bill concerning experiments in the manufacture of sugar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, I will not call for the regular order until there has been one recognition on either side of the House, after which I will insist upon it.

PUBLIC BUILDING, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1950) to authorize the construction of an additional story to the public building in Fort Worth, Tex.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to construct an additional or third story to the public building being erected in the city of Fort Worth, Tex., not to exceed in cost the sum of \$50,000.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report be read, which will fully explain the necessity for this action.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the report will be read.

The report (by Mr. ABBOTT) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1950) for the construction of an addition to the public building in Fort Worth, Tex., beg leave to report:

The committee finds that the city of Fort Worth had in 1883 a population of about 8,000, which had increased in 1893 to about 35,000.

The post-office receipts in 1883 were \$15,000; for 1893, \$54,654. In 1883 there were six employes in the post-office department; in 1893, twenty-four. At present there are 4,000 square feet occupied for post-office purposes, and there will, in the next few years, be required from 8,000 to 10,000 square feet of space.

The city has eleven outlets by rail, and is growing very rapidly, and it is the headquarters of the eleventh division of the Railway Mail Service. If the growth of the city should be in the future anything like as great as it has been in the past the building now provided for will be utterly inadequate to the demand. At present the first and second stories have been completed. An additional story can be added at a cost of \$50,000, whereas it would require a much greater amount than that to make the additions which will soon be necessary to the building unless the third story is added.

In view of these facts the committee recommends the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOMBS. I wish to reserve the right of objection until I can hear from the gentleman and ask one or two questions in connection with the matter.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a little explanation about this, after which I feel assured that there will be no objection to it.

Some years ago a bill was passed providing for the erection of a public building at Fort Worth. This work has been progressing very slowly, and the building has now reached that stage in its construction where they can add a third story without incurring any very great amount of additional expense.

If this bill, which increases the limit of the cost but does not make an appropriation, is passed, with the money that has been

already appropriated and unexpended they can add to the building a third story, and next year, or whenever it becomes necessary to do so, the additional appropriation can be made for the completion of the work. This addition to the building now proposed is necessary, as shown by the report of the Postmaster-General and others, and can be added at a cost of about \$50,000; whereas, if this work is not done now it will cost perhaps a hundred thousand dollars or \$150,000 to make the necessary addition after the building shall have been completed.

Mr. BURROWS. What was the original amount appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. BELL of Texas. One hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. BURROWS. Is there a United States court held there?

Mr. BELL of Texas. No, sir.

Mr. BURROWS. No court?

Mr. BELL of Texas. No; but I will state to the gentleman that this is the headquarters of the eleventh railway mail division.

Mr. BURROWS. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that an appropriation of \$175,000 just for a post-office ought to be sufficient.

Mr. BELL of Texas. It is not alone for a post-office, but for these additional quarters. As I have stated, this is the headquarters of the eleventh division of the Railway Mail Service, which requires forty-odd men. That division embraces the States of Louisiana, Texas, part of Arkansas, the Indian Territory and New Mexico. It takes up a great deal of space to accommodate the employes who have their headquarters and do their work there.

Mr. COOMBS. Have you a communication from the Postmaster-General recommending this?

Mr. BELL of Texas. There is a communication from the Postmaster-General; but the facts are all embodied in the report. We also took proof, which was submitted before the committee, in support of the increase asked, and this extension is unani- mously recommended by the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. What are the gross receipts of the post-office there?

Mr. BELL of Texas. In 1893, \$54,654.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost reluctance that I interrupt the gentleman in a matter that is no doubt very close to him and his locality. But after six years of constant effort—for I have steadily endeavored to get some appropriation or some recognition for a public building in my State where we have over \$100,000 of postal receipts, in one city where we have customs officers, a United States court, collector of internal revenue, etc.—I do not think it fair that we should yield to the demands of other parts of the country when ours are so much more pressing. We have been unable as yet to get a report from the committee as far as the Northwest is interested, and yet here is a gentleman coming up here, who is already supplied with a public building, and where they have no United States court, seeking an additional appropriation in order to put another story on the building in these times when nobody else can get recognition for a site.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I think the gentleman is mistaken—

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Now, if we are going to have any public buildings authorized by this Congress, if we are going to get any reports from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I think it will only be fair—it will only be just and right—to give some recognition to my State with its 70,000 square miles of territory, with four United States courts, but no public building whatever in the geographic boundaries of the whole State. [Applause.]

Now, sir, we have some rights as well as the gentleman from Texas, and if this committee is willing to go forward and report the bills before it and bring them here and ask for a day where we can all come in and stand on our respective merits and have the same consideration, I am willing that the gentleman should have whatever his ability, his industry, or his zeal will get for him. But I am not willing that Texas shall have a public building and that the State of Washington shall have none. [Applause on the Republican side.] I want that distinctly understood.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Let me ask the gentleman to allow me to make a little further explanation. Let us see if the cases are at all parallel. This building is in the course of construction. It has already reached the point where it is necessary to add the third story, if it is to be added at all, and it has been proven before the committee to be necessary.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I have not even got the foundation laid yet for a public building in Washington.

Mr. BELL of Texas. Let me explain that we have now got to that point where it is necessary to add this story, if it is to be

added at all. We are not asking for an additional appropriation, but simply to get the privilege to extend the building, for which an appropriation was made several years ago.

Mr. COOMBS. It will require an appropriation later to provide for this extra story?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Of course it will.

Mr. KILGORE. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand you to say this enlargement is necessary to accommodate the force employed there in operating the headquarters of the eleventh division of the Railway Mail Service?

Mr. BELL of Texas. For that and other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. That is already located there?

Mr. BELL of Texas. Yes, and it was proved to the satisfaction of the committee that in less than the time that will be consumed in completing the building, this enlargement will be absolutely necessary.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. How many railroads center there?

Mr. BELL of Texas. We have eleven outlets by rail.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I have eight railroads in my town.

Mr. BELL of Texas. You see this bill does not provide for the construction of a new building, but only for the extension of one now in course of construction.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. One word. I never object. I want every member upon this floor to obtain for himself and for his constituents anything that will advance their prosperity or their happiness; but I contend, sir, that after battling for six long years for only one public building in my State, it is not right that I should be turned down session after session, and that here in these times, when gentlemen on the other side are preaching economy, the first recognition for a public building should be to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I wish to repeat that this bill does not provide for a new building.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I hope we will soon have reports out of the committee. I have no doubt they are working hard and arduously, and in a short time bills will be reported from the committee. In the Fifty-second Congress no one received recognition for a public building, and therefore no one had just cause for complaint. This is the first in the Fifty-third Congress, and I should like to know if this is to be the last of the Mohicans? Is anybody else to be recognized? Are there any other reports to come? Are we to have any other public building except a third story upon a public building in Fort Worth, Tex.?

Mr. BELL of Texas. I hope it will not be limited to that.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I hope not.

Mr. BELL of Texas. I will help you get yours.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BELL]?

Mr. BURROWS. In the interest of the gentleman from Washington, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan objects.

Mr. BURROWS. I shall be glad to have this considered when other public-buildings bills are considered.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT ILLINOIS.

Mr. CHILDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5649) providing an additional district judge in the northern district of Illinois.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STALLINGS. I am trying to get another judge for my State, and I desire that they all come in together. I object.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

And then, on motion of Mr. DOCKERY, 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. 7097) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes, with Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, general debate on this bill is closed, and the Clerk will read it by paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely:

Mr. REED. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] if the provision in the first seven lines, which have just been read, does

not change the law in accordance with which the rest of the permanent appropriations have been made?

Mr. DOCKERY. It does not.

Mr. REED. That is, I understand that there are some changes made in salaries in this appropriation bill, and this clause will have the effect of not only changing the appropriations for this year, but of changing the law so as to conform to this?

Mr. DOCKERY. It does not. This paragraph only provides that the amount carried in this bill shall be in full compensation. It is the usual phraseology carried in all appropriation bills in all Congresses.

Mr. REED. Why, no; this full-compensation clause is not carried in all the bills.

Mr. DOCKERY. O, yes.

Mr. REED. It has been for some time, but it has not always been so, and the effect of it is—

Mr. DOCKERY. I will say to the gentleman from Maine that it has been in the law since 1887.

Mr. REED. I think that must be an error.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me, it went out on a point of order in the Forty-eighth Congress, made by Col. Morrison. It went out of all the bills, on the ground that the words were legislative, taken in connection with subsequent provisions; and I recollect very well Col. Morrison making the point of order.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman from Illinois is not quite accurate in his statement. I think he will find on examination that the point of order was made in the Forty-ninth Congress, and was sustained, because the Holman provision, what is now known as clause 2 of Rule XXI, was not then a part of the rule. I think the gentleman will find that to be the case.

Mr. REED. But this necessarily changes—

Mr. DOCKERY. The Senate restored it, and the conferees of the House agreed to the restoration.

Mr. REED. But this changes the compensation and changes the law. For instance, when a salary that is stated here for \$1,000 is for \$1,200, having—

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. It is simply impossible for me to hear the gentleman.

Mr. REED. This is one of the results of your fining people; we get so many of them here that we can not transact business. [Laughter.] If a portion of the gentlemen on the other side would go away there would be no trouble about transacting business; but now we can not hear each other talk.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not think I have anything further to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REED. Is it not a fact that this changes existing law so far as this bill is concerned? For instance, if a man getting a salary reduced from \$1,200 to \$1,000, he can not get the salary that belongs to him, and he can not bring suit for the balance in the Court of Claims.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is the effect; that is exactly what is intended.

Mr. REED. That is precisely what it is intended for, and must be contrary to existing law.

Mr. DOCKERY. And that is authorized by a fair construction of clause 2 of Rule XXI.

Mr. REED. And if it increases the salary it fixes it. Well, that is what I wanted to call attention to. Do you want to fix the salaries that are higher?

Mr. DOCKERY. To fix them lower.

Mr. REED. You fix them either way you do it.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not want to fix them so as to increase salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, \$417,258.90, namely:

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the words:

"For the compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, \$417,258.90," being lines 2, 3, and 4, of page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, \$250,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does my colleague intend to follow that up with amendments reducing all the items?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, sir; I intend to follow it up by amendments on all.

Mr. Chairman, it will be noticed in looking over the report that the Senate, consisting at present of 85 members, I believe, and when full of 88 members, requires the services of 303 employés.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. I can not hear my colleague two seats from him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Gentlemen will please cease conversation or retire to the cloakroom. Gentlemen do not pay any attention whatever to the gavel.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, it will be observed by looking at the report and the bill that the Senate, with 88 members, would seem to require the services of 303 employes, while the House, consisting of 356 Members and 4 Delegates, manages to get along with 300 employes. Now, I understand perfectly, Mr. Chairman, that the committee reporting this bill have followed the estimates made by the Senate itself, upon the theory, often stated here, that the Senate insists upon controlling the expenditures of that body.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will my colleague allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. They have followed the estimates of the Senate so far as the current law is concerned. The Senate asked for a very decided increase, which the House committee declined to give.

Mr. REED. Is it not probable that the committee, in giving the same number of employes to 88 Senators that it does to 356 members is because the Senators are more ponderous, and that it will require more persons to handle them. I hope the gentleman will address himself to that view of the case.

Mr. DE ARMOND. It might appear that way, Mr. Chairman, in certain views of it, but for the fact that the Senate is not so remarkably well handled at the present time. But it would seem that seven persons are required in these subordinate employments for every two Senators, while in the House the employes are not so numerous as the members.

Now, I have no doubt that the true explanation of all this is to be found in the fact that the Senate carries upon its pay rolls, and pays out of the public funds, numerous gentlemen whose services could well be dispensed with without detriment to the country and perhaps without serious inconvenience to individual Senators. This expenditure for the Senate, while it is such as the House can not perhaps control or correct, is unreasonable. The House itself is not suffering from lack of employes, nor, on the other hand, do I believe that the House has abused the power to employ assistants. But the mere statement of the proposition, three hundred and three subordinate employes in a Senate consisting of eighty-eight members, carries evidence of its own unreasonableness. It is hardly possible to conceive of any object that can require the employment of this number so largely in excess of the proportion in the House, unless it be that most of them are devoted in some way, directly or indirectly, to the maintenance of that strange, anomalous thing known as Senatorial courtesy.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. If I may interrupt the gentleman a moment, I will suggest that his colleague in charge of the bill [Mr. DOCKERY] can perhaps explain to the committee why it is that so large an appropriation as this has been put in the bill for the Senate.

Mr. DE ARMOND. It is no doubt on the theory that has already been stated.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I would like to have your colleague, who is in charge of the bill, make the explanation.

Mr. DE ARMOND. No doubt he will do it later if he thinks it necessary or appropriate.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask that the time of my colleague be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that whatever may be the final result with reference to this item, the House ought at least to express its condemnation of what I think can not be regarded as anything else than extraordinary and wasteful expenditure on the part of the Senate. There would seem to be no reason why seven persons are needed in that body to minister to the supposed official wants of two Senators. If the excess—the very large excess—be devoted to assisting in the maintenance of that hoary relic, of that worm-eaten, moldy, worthless, worn-out thing called Senatorial courtesy [laughter], which in all its long history has credited to it but one solitary good act, the defeat of the force bill, and which is responsible for a vast amount of misappropriation, useless appropriation, extravagant appropriation—if these extra employes are kept in the Senate for the purpose of seeking to maintain that relic, that memory, that reminiscence, that useless obstruction [laughter], "Senatorial courtesy," the House might here and now express an opinion upon the subject. It seems to me that now, when the question is before us, the House ought to express its opinion by reducing this appropriation.

If \$250,000 instead of over \$417,000 be appropriated, the appropriation for the Senate will still be vastly greater, when the need for it is considered, than the appropriation for the House.

There is no reason why the Senate should have almost unlimited command of the purse strings of the Government when the original intention evidently was that the controlling power in expenditures should be the House. I hope the amendment will be adopted, whatever may be its fate in the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. DINGLEY. Perhaps it ought to be said, in justice to the Senate, that the figures which are given in this report of 325 employes for the House and 303 for the Senate hardly state the facts fully with regard to the House. In the figures for the House the 325 clerks to members are not included, so that the correct statement would be 625 for the House and about 300 for the Senate.

This whole question of the amounts that shall be paid to employes of the Senate and to employes of the House has been often gone over in previous Congresses with one uniform result, that each House has been left to determine for itself, on its own responsibility, the number and the compensation of its employes. That has always been the ultimate result, and therefore any amendment that might be adopted at this time would simply lead to the usual delay and controversy, and to the final result which has always ensued, leaving each House to determine for itself on its own responsibility the number and the compensation of its employes.

Mr. REED. According to my recollection, the usual course has been that the House has voted against the Senate at about 4 o'clock p. m., and at about 10 o'clock the next morning it has yielded. [Laughter.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I think my colleague states pretty accurately the usual order.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let us have a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman will withdraw the amendment I will renew it.

Mr. DOCKERY. Very well.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman from Illinois will give me just a moment, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] to the fact that the dignity of the Senate is being encroached upon on his side of the House, and I think we ought to give some attention to the subject. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. For many years, Mr. Chairman, we have had lectures in the House and out of the House upon the extravagance of the Senate, of the House, and of the Administration. I know that at times within the last twenty years, under the eloquence of gentlemen upon the other side, my heart has absolutely gone out in longing for a restoration of the days of the fathers.

I recollect very well when, under the lead of such gentlemen as Judge HOLMAN of Indiana, I could almost see Thomas Jefferson riding with his breeches in his boots, coming up from Virginia on the 4th day of March to be inaugurated as President, hitching his horse to a sapling, and mounting the steps to the Capitol with his whip in his hand, all spattered with mud, saying, "Mr. Chief Justice, administer to me the oath of office."

But the Republican party being in power for many years we were assured by those gentlemen that we were getting away from the "fathers," and they pledged themselves that when they came back into power we would again have "the days of the fathers." At last they are in full power—with President, and Senate, and House. I rarely go to the White House, but I am told by some of my Democratic friends that when they go the Chief Executive is not quite so easy of access as in former Administrations. If the reports coming to me are correct, it takes about three days, through the instrumentality of a private secretary, to even get audience with the Chief Magistrate. I am not here to criticise anything of that sort; I merely speak of it on report as a condition—not a theory.

Never in the history of this country have the expenditures for the Senate—or for the House either—been as great as they are at the present time. With the Maltby Building, with the Senate stables, with the Senate employes, who it seems to me must sometimes get in each other's way, we find expenses still increasing, and under a Democratic régime. In the House, where we criticise the Senate and where we originate the bills that unlock the vaults of the Treasury, there never was a time when the expenditures of the House were running at such a rate as they are running now. Annual committee clerks—clerks to committees, many of which do not meet once a month—and almost day by day—at least week by week—we have further grants of annual clerks and assistant clerks.

Well, now, gentlemen [addressing the Democratic side], you are responsible; you have the power; you can run matters here as you please, and you will. I am not here in good faith to propose amendments to this bill, because, with your hundred majority, I am powerless in the premises. But I am here to "stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance," and to refer to the

multitude of promises you made when we were in power, and when your appeal was that you might achieve power so that you could bring the administration of the fiscal affairs of the Government back to the simplicity of the earlier and better days of the Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend at the opening of the consideration of this bill by paragraphs to be betrayed by the gentleman from Illinois into a political discussion. I will only venture this prediction, that when we reach the close of this session it will be found that so far as the representatives of the people in this body are concerned we have kept the faith, and have redeemed the pledges made to the people in the matter of economic expenditure.

I could not and would not intrude political matters at this point, for the reason that this bill comes here indorsed, at least as to this part of it, by the unanimous action of the subcommittee who prepared it—three Democrats and two Republicans. It has the indorsement of all these gentlemen; and I take it, that with such an indorsement it is probably about correct.

Mr. REED. I have had occasion from past experience to doubt somewhat the prophetic instinct of the other side in matters of economy. It seems to me, I remember that in the Fifty-second Congress gentlemen started out with considerable profuseness of promise, which resulted in a hundred millions more of appropriation than adorned the annals of the predecessor of that Congress. But having heard very often since that time that this increase was on account of legislation which had taken place in the Fifty-first Congress, I wish to ask how much of the appropriation in this bill is caused by the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. DOCKERY. In reply to the gentleman from Maine, I want to say that a good deal of the legislation of the Fifty-second Congress did not meet my approval. I think the record will bear me witness that I stood here consistently opposed to all contracts for river and harbor works. The record of that Congress was not as economic as I could have desired.

Mr. REED. The average of virtue was not up to your standard?

Mr. DOCKERY. Hardly. That is true. But in this bill there is very little of the liabilities entailed by the legislation of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. REED. I would like the gentleman to refer to the figures.

Mr. DOCKERY. One hundred and ninety thousand dollars for clerical force for the collection of the sugar bounty has been eliminated by the action of the committee, so that it does not appear in this bill. But if that \$190,000 had appeared in the bill, it would have been due to the legislation of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. REED. I submit that that suggestion is liable to be misleading, because we really get no benefit from what would have been in the bill if that had been there. Not being in the bill, it naturally is not there. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. It is not there; that is true. But there are some things in the bill for which the legislation of the Fifty-first Congress is responsible. For instance, the increase of the salaries of United States district judges to \$5,000 each, under the act of February 24, 1891. That increase is carried in this bill.

Mr. REED. How much is the difference?

Mr. DOCKERY. About \$88,000.

Mr. REED. That is the difference?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, sir; that is carried in here as the result of the legislation of that Congress.

Mr. REED. This bill is increased to that extent on account of the action of the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, sir.

Then there is another item. The act of June 27, 1890, involves about \$695,000 additional for clerical force—

Mr. REED. What is that item?

Mr. DOCKERY. In the act granting pensions in certain cases—the extension of the pension laws—of June 27, 1890, about \$395,000, if I remember accurately, was carried for clerical force in the Pension Office. That increase is due to that legislation. I am corrected by the official records; the amount is \$486,008.

Mr. REED. So that with the other amount, about \$80,000, the total, according to your estimate, would be \$560,000?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that, I think, covers the inquiry of the gentleman from Maine, who asked me what amount in this bill was due to the legislation of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. REED. Then we may take it, I suppose, for granted as correct that about \$560,000 is the whole amount that is attributable or chargeable to our ancestors, so to speak, in this bill?

Mr. DOCKERY. About \$576,000.

Mr. REED. To be charged to our unfortunate ancestors?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, on this particular bill.

Mr. REED. I have had various members of the Committee on Appropriations to furnish me with the items, because I was anxious to know how the hundred millions came to be added on to the billion-dollar appropriations.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think the gentleman is in error about the hundred millions.

Mr. REED. In what respect?

Mr. DOCKERY. Because it was about one hundred and fifty-four millions to which the gentleman is referring, I think, that is due to the legislation of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. REED. I was speaking of the increase of one hundred millions over the "wicked expenditures" of the Fifty-first Congress.

Mr. DOCKERY. What increase of one hundred millions? I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Why, the one we proved so often, and which you have so often undertaken vainly to deny. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not catch the gentleman's point.

Mr. REED. Why, do you not remember, the same hundred millions that you have so vainly undertaken to deny when we have submitted the facts before the people and the country. Do you not remember? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I am unable to identify the item by the statement the gentleman makes.

Mr. REED. Why, do you not remember the juggling up of figures that was resorted to in order to disprove the statement that the "billion-dollar Congress" had been exceeded by its immediate predecessor, if that word is not offensive all over Missouri? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I have no recollection of it. I hope the gentleman will be a little more specific.

Mr. REED. Well, suppose I say maneuvering of figures, and have that understood to be perfectly parliamentary and absolutely respectful. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly. But what has that to do with it?

Mr. REED. I will endeavor to be more specific for the gentleman's information. I refer to the hundred million increase that you yourself discussed so frequently on the floor. [Laughter.] Do you not remember during the session of Congress, immediately following the Fifty-first Congress all of the talk which was made by irresponsible persons occupying responsible positions about the "wasteful extravagance" of the Fifty-first Congress? [Laughter.] Do you not remember the fact that their appropriation of a thousand millions of dollars was regarded as a terrible outrage, and an extraordinary exhibition of the wickedness of the Republican party?

Mr. DOCKERY. I think there was considerable wickedness there. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. And do you not remember that we had, immediately following that, a Democratic Congress, and a number of gentlemen commenced business at that time with a resolution somewhat in the nature of an invocation; a resolution that my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE] has so well described; and we all voted, or at least those of us did who were not too wicked to adopt such a proposition, saying that we would be self-denying, virtuous, and economical in the future? [Laughter.] And yet when we came to foot up the figures at the end of that Congress it appeared that this virtuous body had increased the appropriations of its immediate predecessor about a hundred millions of dollars. Do you not remember also that the Democratic party, explicitly, from that time until now, has been endeavoring in vain to explain how it was that they succeeded in making so much larger appropriations?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not.

Mr. REED. I think I have indicated the matter with such explicitness that the gentleman will be able to recall it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to be led into any extended discussion of the comparative expenditures of the Fifty-first or Fifty-second Congresses. The facts are, and the country recognizes them, that the expenditures of both of the Congresses exceeded the amount required for an economical administration of the Government. That I admit to be true. The expenditures of the Fifty-first Congress amounted to about \$1,035,000,000. The expenditures of the Fifty-second to about \$1,026,000,000. There was but little difference between the two totals; only about \$9,000,000 in favor of the Fifty-second Congress, and I have no boast to make of the record of economy in that Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will my colleague pardon me? He has evidently forgotten his campaign speech. The appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress were, as was accustomed to be stated, \$1,007,000,000, and not \$1,035,000,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, no; these are the exact figures I used. I have the printed table here. It is a little ancient, it is true, but still these are the figures.

Mr. DINGLEY. Are those the figures prepared by the clerks of the committees which the gentleman holds in his hand?

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, certainly not, because those figures did not include the indefinite appropriations. Now, it is just as well for the gentleman from Maine and myself to be absolutely frank about this matter, because he is entirely conversant with it, and knows all about the situation. He knows that the table he quotes, which figures out, as I remember, \$988,000,000, do not include the indefinite appropriations. I know the gentleman will admit that.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the gentleman—

Mr. DOCKERY. Does not the gentleman admit that?

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman does not undertake to pretend for a moment that the appropriations of the Fifty-second Congress were less than the appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. DOCKERY. Why, I do; certainly.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think if I could call upon the clerk of the committee, which of course I can not do in this body, I would get a different answer.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an unprofitable discussion. The appropriations of the Fifty-second Congress were about \$9,000,000 less than the appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress. I think the records of both Congresses were not entirely creditable.

Mr. DINGLEY. However that may be, the appropriations made by the Fifty-second Congress exceeded those of the Fifty-first. That is a fact of history that I do not care to have the gentleman get away from.

Mr. DOCKERY. When you take into account the indefinite appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress and the indefinite appropriations of the Fifty-second Congress, the appropriations of the Fifty-second were less than those of the Fifty-first by \$9,000,000—

Mr. COOMBS. Including the indefinite appropriations?

Mr. DOCKERY. That statement includes the indefinite appropriations, and I shall be glad at this point to print the table in the RECORD without reading it, because I do not want to get into a political discussion here, which can not possibly influence a vote. I want to proceed with this bill. I shall be glad to include in the RECORD the table upon which I make the statement, and then if the gentleman from Maine desires to reply to it, he can do so hereafter.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from Missouri is entirely wrong—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has expired.

Mr. REED. I desire to address the committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] is quite wrong in supposing this discussion to be unprofitable. You see it is absolutely essential for the progress of the world that the Democratic party should be brought up to the truth of four years ago. Four years ago, when the Democratic party were declaiming against the extravagance of the Fifty-first Congress, we on this side knew that it was not so, because we had taken pains to ascertain the fact, and because we had every confidence in the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON].

Now, we have been gradually at work upon the Democracy of that period, and in some respects we have got them up very nearly to date, and we expect to do it in time, with respect to this matter of appropriations. After awhile, by iteration and reiteration of the truth, we will manage to kill the lies that were told four years ago; and so it is not unprofitable at all, because I have no doubt that Providence rejoices in the conversion of a Democrat to the truth as much as He does in the steadfastness of a Republican who is always there. [Laughter on the Republican side.] So that this is absolutely profitable, and it is profitable to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. I can see him gradually ameliorating under this treatment. [Laughter.] He is gradually becoming softer. He has reached the stage where he does not want to discuss it any more, because the subject has become painful to him.

I can recollect when it was tripping on his tongue, when he was glib with it, when he was anxious for an opportunity to say over something about it; but he has gotten by that stage. He has got to the stage where, looking a very little way in the future, he can see he has got to repent of things he has said. So the first he does is to back out of it and propose to put it in the RECORD, thereby showing that he has come to that reasonable fear of the truth which is the beginning of wisdom. Now, when we get the whole Democratic party up to the truth about this, and get that thing reduced to all comprehensions, so that everybody has agreed to it, why then the Republican party will be in a condition to take another step forward, and the country too, and then we will have to wait and bring up the Democracy again, and so on forever and ever. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to print in the RECORD, without occupying the attention of the committee further, a table which establishes the accuracy of every statement I have made with respect to the appropriations of the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses; and then gentlemen can reply to it if they desire.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if that is a statement from the Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Who establishes the accuracy of the table?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a table. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Now, I desire—

Mr. REED. What is it?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, I addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Maine, but other gentlemen are speaking at the same time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I simply desire to ask if the compilation of figures is a Treasury compilation.

Mr. DOCKERY. It is prepared in part by the clerks of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House, and where additions are made they are based on official statements and explained in that statement.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Additions by whom?

Mr. DOCKERY. By the gentlemen connected with the Committee on Appropriations; and if the gentleman objects to the printing of the table, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Not at all; I simply wanted to know where the statement emanates from, and how official it is in its compilation.

Mr. REED. Well, I will have to object, if it is going in without suitable ventilation and review.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked if there was objection to printing the table in the RECORD, and there was no objection.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the gentleman from Maine objects, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] correctly in some remarks that he made, I desire very respectfully to dissent from the purport and effect of his suggestion. I understood him to use some language which possibly might be distorted by some censorious persons to mean that he criticises the management of the Administration of the White House in the matter of interposing the obstacle of a private secretary between Representatives of the people and the head of the Democratic party. I have some views upon that subject which I desire to submit.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will say that what I stated was from reports being made to me by Democratic Representatives and not from any experience I have had myself.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Assuming, Mr. Chairman, that the reports are correct, and I will call upon the distinguished gentleman in charge of this bill, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], to verify if these reports are correct, it is a great step forward in the administration of the Executive Department of the Government made by a Democratic Administration imbued with Jeffersonian simplicity. These are days of training and education, and of fitness. The operation of the civil-service law has led the American citizen to a higher development; it has led to securing trained men to come between the Representatives of this country and their assaults upon the Executive of the Government. It is a great thing that you can hire for \$5,000 a year an individual supposed to be trained in the art of diplomacy and statesmanship, and can station him in an ante-room and have it so arranged that the wants and wishes of the Representatives of the people may be percolated through the wisdom of that trained statesman.

It is a great improvement of the coarse and vulgar processes by which heretofore gentlemen newly ordained to the walks of statesmanship have been permitted to approach face foremost the Executive of the Government and to retire from the room with their backs to the President—think of that. We have in this condition of things, therefore, a double guard against democracy. We have first the general purposes of the Administration itself, and then the representative of the people is compelled to make known his wants and to state them fully, distinctly, and definitely to a trained and skilled purveyor of political wisdom; and in his judgment that becomes a sort of a preliminary examination, and if there is any necessity for it going beyond a preliminary examination, if this trained statesman in his wisdom and judgment decides that the matter is one that ought not to be presented to the Executive head of the Government, if he

decides that matter, the representative of the common people of the country is to be content and he ought to go away without any complaint.

What is he but an ignorant and assumed representative of the common people of the country; what knowledge has he of statesmanship; what knowledge has he of the real questions of this time, this grand and awful time; and if you can hire some person, no matter where he comes from or who is the sponsor for his greatness, if you can produce for a pittance of \$5,000 a year, one man who knows as much, or is assumed to be a check upon the knowledge of 356 men, you have brought about a large result with a very small amount of capital.

It is a step in the direction of establishing the conditions of European authority and European administration.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. DE ARMOND, and it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper: For Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper, \$4,500; horse and wagon for his use, \$420, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for clerk to Sergeant-at-Arms, \$2,000; assistant doorkeeper, \$2,500; and \$500 additional while the office of assistant doorkeeper is held by Isaac Bassett, the present incumbent; acting assistant doorkeeper, \$2,500; three messengers, acting as assistant doorkeepers, at \$1,800 each; thirty-five messengers, at \$1,440 each; assistant messenger on the floor of the Senate, \$1,440; messenger to Official Reporter's room, \$1,440; messenger in charge of storeroom, \$1,200; upholsterer and locksmith, \$1,440; two carpenters to assist him, at \$960 each; eleven skilled laborers, at \$1,000 each; two janitors, at \$900 each; laborer in charge of the private passage, \$840; two female attendants in charge of the ladies' retiring room, at \$720 each; telephone operator, \$720; telephone page, \$600; twenty-five laborers at \$720 each; sixteen pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$2.50 per day each during the session, \$4,840; in all, \$115,084.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out the words, "and five hundred dollars additional while the office of assistant doorkeeper is held by Isaac Bassett, the present incumbent," being lines 15 and 16, on page 5 of the bill.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, an item the exact counterpart of this, I believe, appeared in the appropriation bill in the last Congress. An amendment was offered in this body and that provision was stricken out. Later on the conference committee, I believe, restored it.

It is agreeable to us all, Mr. Chairman, to be advised in an official way that that excellent old gentleman, Mr. Isaac Bassett, is still spared to the world and to the Senate. I have not a particle of doubt that he is a most estimable gentleman. I have not the slightest disposition to say a single word in disparagement of him or of his services. He is, indeed, a kindly appearing, venerable, dignified old gentleman.

We are, however, dealing now with the question whether the people of the United States, after paying him a handsome salary, shall make him a donation of \$500 per annum. I think, Mr. Chairman, that possibly this custom which has prevailed in the Senate for a good while—and for following it in this bill I do not find fault with the Committee on Appropriations, because they have had abundant warning that the Senate will insist upon it—I think, I say, that possibly this custom, apparently generous, seemingly praiseworthy at first blush, has grown up in the Senate in blissful moments of forgetfulness. These gentlemen, the Senators, by contributing, say, \$6 apiece, could give to Isaac Bassett a little over \$500; and the gift, made in that way, would be a graceful testimonial from the men whom he now serves and to whom he appears as a link with past events and with Senators of a past age.

I have not a doubt that it would be worth to each one of the Senators at least \$6 per year—it would be very cheap at \$6 per year—to have with them this venerable man, who has come down from a former and perhaps a more glorious age of the Senate; this man who served in the days of Webster, and Clay, and Calhoun. It would be worth, I say, much more than \$6 a year to each one of the Senators, as he looks into the kind and open countenance of Isaac Bassett, to fancy that he sees reflected there something of the majesty and grandeur that belonged to Webster, something of the grace and eloquence that distinguished Clay, something of the superb logician that resided in Calhoun.

Now, it would be ungracious for us to deprive the Senators of the glorious privilege that would be held out to them by the adoption of this amendment. It would be wrong to compel the people of the United States to donate \$500 to Isaac Bassett, after paying him well for his services, instead of leaving it to the generosity, the patriotism, the veneration for past things (including "Senatorial courtesy") on the part of individual Senators to make up this contribution. Let us strike the item from the bill, and let us soon read in the newspapers that these Senators have introduced a slight variation in "Senatorial courtesy," have made to it a trifling amendment by going down into their own

pockets and taking out \$6 apiece for a gift, a \$500 testimonial, to this old gentleman, instead of calling upon the United States, upon the overtaxed people of this country, to make the donation.

Let us hold out to these great, lofty, wise men, to these generous and munificent men, this grand opportunity, and certainly they will not allow it to pass unimproved. In no unkindness to Isaac Bassett, in no hostility to Isaac Bassett, but with a view of protecting the taxpayers against the injustice of a civil pension list and of giving to the Senators, individually and collectively, an opportunity to exemplify a practical phase and feature of "Senatorial courtesy" residing in Senatorial generosity, let us strike out this appropriation and turn over Isaac Bassett, with his \$2,500 of regular pay, to the generosity, the magnanimity, the splendor, and the glory of these dignified Senators. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Let us have a vote.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. DE ARMOND was agreed to; there being—ayes 45, noes 39.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, this bill originated with the committee of this House, and that committee is responsible for the present condition of the bill at least. The item of appropriation for the Senate alone—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa does not offer any amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move pro forma to strike out the last word. I was about to remark, Mr. Chairman, that the item of appropriations in this bill for the Senate alone aggregates \$1,456,541. If this sum be divided by 88, the number of Senators possible, the present number being three less, we have \$16,432 as the cost of each Senator to the country. The appropriations made in this bill for the expenses of the House of Representatives aggregate \$2,790,627. If this sum is divided by 356, the total number of Representatives, we find that the cost of each Representative is \$8,074. In other words, a United States Senator costs the people of this country something more than twice as much as a Member of the House of Representatives. Certainly it is not the purpose of our general legislation that this should be so, for the salary of the two positions is the same, the mileage is the same, and the functions, powers, and duties with regard to legislation, are precisely the same.

Now, the House committee is responsible for this bill as it now stands. It can not be said that the Senate is responsible; it can not be said that they control their own expenditures. They have had no voice up to this time in the preparation of this bill. These large and extravagant expenditures are by the grace of our own committee up to this time. I do not know what might happen in a conference committee where the weight of Senatorial dignity and Senatorial courtesy and all that sort of thing was brought to bear upon the conferees of the House; but up to this time this matter is solely within the volition of an organ of this House. And I would be glad if the gentleman in charge of this bill would explain why it is that he volunteers, or his committee volunteers, these extraordinary and extravagant expenditures for the Senate.

Why is it that as to employes more than four are required to care for the personal wants of a Senator? Why is it that, taking into account the clerks and various other employes, there is this number of officers for each Senator and so much smaller number for a Member of this House—less than one for each Representative, more than four for each Senator—\$16,000 and more of expenditure for a Senator; less than half that for a Member of the House? Putting it in another way, more than \$11,000 outside of salary is the cost of each Senator, while each Member of the House of Representatives costs less than \$3,000 outside of salary.

I would like the chairman of the committee or the gentleman who has charge of this bill to give us some light on this question. Later on, he might say that the Senate would insist upon its amendments; but there are no amendments yet; there is no question of conference now. This bill is voluntary and initiatory upon the part of the committee that has it in charge; and I want to know what excuse the gentleman has to offer for this feature of it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] is somewhat in error in his totals. The entire expenses of the House amount to \$2,504,579.54, or less than \$7,000 per member. The entire expenses of the Senate aggregate \$1,038,078.90—

Mr. HEPBURN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; he is in error there.

Mr. DOCKERY. Where does the gentleman get the figures he has given?

Mr. HEPBURN. I get them from the bill. I have taken item by item, the aggregate at the end of each paragraph.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think the gentleman will find (because I am using the figures of a gentleman who does not often make mistakes) that he is in error. The figures before me—which have been proved—show that the Senate expenses aggregate \$1,038,078.90, or nearly—

Mr. HEPBURN. Permit me to say that there are four items—

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me to complete this statement?—nearly \$12,000 per Senator. But conceding, as I do, the extravagance of another body which the rules of the House do not permit me to name, yet the comparison made by the gentleman from Iowa is hardly fair, and I am sure that he will concede this if he reflects a moment. The total which the gentleman makes includes mileage and includes salaries. Now, the Senate has but 88 members, the House 356. In order to get at a fair comparison (which is certainly adverse to the other body) the gentleman should include the expenses of the Senate exclusive of salaries and mileage, which are fixed by law. I think in that way he would get a fair comparison.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman will permit me, I wish to say that the gentleman's last statement makes the matter still stronger in the light in which I present it. There are four items in this appropriation bill which aggregate considerably more than a million dollars—\$440,000, \$417,000, \$19,000, and \$115,000. Then there are other items—one of \$64,000 and one of \$35,000.

Mr. DOCKERY. That statement shows the gentleman has not carefully considered or examined the figures. The \$417,000 is the total of the items which follow. Therefore you have duplicated these items.

Mr. HEPBURN. No; I think not. I have simply taken the items as I have found them in the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. I will show that the gentleman is mistaken. The \$417,258 includes all the items which follow, down to the heading "Contingent fund."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, for so far as I am concerned I do not care to detain the committee further. This is the old, old story. It is the old, old contest between the Senate and the House as to the control of their own internal affairs. I have stated on this floor, over and over again, that in my humble judgment the expenditures of the internal administration of another body are extravagant. But the other body is a coordinate branch of this Government. The Senate insists on the right to determine their own expenditures. That fight has been made between the two bodies for nearly a century, and the other body always wins.

On last Friday a gentleman asked me on this floor why it was that the Representatives of the people should in every instance yield these contests or differences of opinion with the Senate. I said that "I gave it up." I do not now know how to make any appropriate or suitable explanation of it. The fact remains, however—the naked and stubborn fact—that such is the case, and has been since the organization of Congress. It is no use to discuss it, for in every one of these contests the Senate always insists upon its right to control its internal affairs, and the House, under every administration, has ultimately yielded the contest.

Mr. DINGLEY. If my colleague will permit me, I will suggest in this connection, if it is any more true than on all questions of the internal management of the Senate and as to what the salaries of their officers shall be, the Senate insists upon its right to control than it is that the House, when we come to the question of our own internal management here and what the salaries of our officials shall be and their duties, always insists upon our right to determine that for ourselves? Is it not true that each House defers to the other in that regard; and can we get along in any other way?

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct. He has stated the matter clearly. They claim the right to manage their own affairs, and the House has also always done the same thing.

Mr. GROUT. If my colleague will allow me a moment, if I understood him correctly he said that it was fair to compare the expenses of the Senate with those of the House after deducting the salaries and mileage. Now, I think if my colleague will reflect for a moment he will admit that that is not a fair comparison. While it is a fact that the Senate is a body much less in membership than the House, yet it is also true that they have practically the same number of committees as the House with clerks and messengers; they have the same number of doors, nearly, as we have at this hall, and require an equal number of officials to guard them. In fact the Senate has practically the same list of employes throughout, although it is a smaller organization than the House; so I ask if it is altogether just to compare the expenses of the House with its 356 members, with those of the Senate with but 88 members, unless it be also understood that the Senate has practically the same organization as the House?

Mr. DOCKERY. Undoubtedly that would be a fairer comparison than the other.

Mr. GROUT. But is that even a fair comparison?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not know as to that, but I think the gentleman's point is a strong one. The Senate, as the gentleman says, has practically the same organization that we have.

But what I wish to say my friend is this, that in my judgment the expenditures of the other body are in excess of the requirements of an economical administration. But who is to control this matter? This bill embodies the estimates made by the Senate, except that we have stricken out all increases in their estimates.

Mr. GROUT. I only made reference to the matter, not for the purpose of entering into any defense of the expenditures of the Senate, because I have not looked into the subject specifically, but simply to show what I regarded as an unfair comparison against the Senate. It is unfair, I think, to compare the expenditures of the two bodies on the basis of per capita membership, and I have not heard any gentleman on the floor suggest anything to the contrary. It is manifestly absurd, though, in my judgment to make such comparison for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] recites a condition of things which shows a great disproportion between the cost of a Senator and a Member of the House to the country. Now, I wish to ask if this is an unusual condition, embodied in this bill, or if it is simply a continuation of what has existed for a long time?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, it has existed for a hundred years, and will most likely continue for a hundred years to come.

Mr. KILGORE. How was it in the Fifty-first Congress?

Mr. DOCKERY. The same disparity existed then. A Senator's worth was in the same proportion in the Fifty-first Congress as now.

Mr. KILGORE. I thought that was probably the case.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask the Clerk to proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk, resuming the reading of the bill, read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For compensation of members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from Territories, \$1,800,000.

Mr. HAYES. I desire to offer an amendment at this point.

Mr. BOATNER. I desire now to have read the amendment which I had read on Saturday, and which I wish to offer at this point.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, amend by adding in line 4, after the word "salary," the following:

"Provided, That the Secretary of the Senate and Sergeant-at-Arms of the House shall respectively deduct from the monthly payments of each Member or Delegate the amount of his salary for each day that he has been absent without leave of the Senate or House, as the case may be, unless he assigns as the reason therefor sickness of himself or a member of his family requiring his attention; and if any leave of absence be revoked the Member or Delegate shall, on receiving notice thereof, forthwith return by the ordinary route of travel under penalty of the deduction from his salary as above provided."

Mr. DE ARMOND. I wish to make a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to submit a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has already been made by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DE ARMOND. My point of order is that this will change existing law, and that it does not reduce expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman fully on the point of order.

Mr. BOATNER. Would it be in order for me to temporarily withdraw the amendment in order to permit the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES] to be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the amendment can be withdrawn temporarily, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES] will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend as follows: At the end of line 4, page 10, insert the following: "And it is hereby declared that section 6 of the act approved August 16, 1856, and section 40 of the Revised Statutes have been heretofore repealed."

Mr. DE ARMOND. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. HAYES. That is clearly not subject to the point of order, as held repeatedly by the present Chairman, as well as others. If the Chair desires any argument upon it, he can simply refer to his own ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, some time ago there was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] a resolution declarative of the effect of section 40 of the Revised Statutes, and directing the Sergeant-at-Arms to enforce the law. That resolution was referred by the House to the Committee on

the Judiciary. In due course of time a report was submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOLVERTON], who, I regret to see, is not now present in the Hall.

That report gave to the House the judgment of the committee that section 40 is in force. Later on a minority report was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE], concurred in by two of his associates [Mr. UPDEGRAFF and Mr. CHILDS]. Still later came another minority report, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], concurred in by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BRODERICK]. Later still a supplemental report was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOLVERTON]. Owing to some delay that report has not yet reached the document room.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that report submitted?

Mr. DE ARMOND. It was submitted on Friday, but owing to some delay, the cause of which it is unnecessary now to discuss, and which is foreign to the question before the House, it has not yet reached the document room, unless it has been received within a very few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. What did the gentleman state was the substance of that report?

Mr. DE ARMOND. It is a supplemental report by the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOLVERTON], and I think, when fairly considered, will hardly leave doubt in the mind of any man that section 40 of the Revised Statutes is in full force and vigor.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly.

Mr. HAYES. If that is true, can not the same argument be made now?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say that he can not hear what is being said. The Chair would like to hear what is being said on the point of order.

Mr. HAYES. I suggest to my friend from Missouri that if the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOLVERTON] was conclusive, the same argument could be made here now, just as well as to take it from the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask gentlemen who seem to be informed of this matter if this was a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DE ARMOND. No, there are two minority reports, one signed by three members of the committee and another signed by two; and to these five may be added the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] who expressed his views last Saturday upon the question. Now, the proposition from the gentleman from Louisiana, submitted by way of an amendment, and against which a point of order has been made, is to change existing law, if section 40 of the Revised Statutes is in effect. It does not reduce expenditures, and therefore can not be entertained under our rules.

As to the contention of the gentleman from Iowa, that it is the proper thing for this committee to declare that a particular provision upon the statute books is not the law, to make that legislative declaration, without any legislation dependent upon or connected with it, he is asserting that which I think he can not successfully maintain. I now address myself to the underlying question of whether section 40 of the Revised Statutes is now a part and parcel of the law of the land. I affirm that it is.

Mr. HAYES. I desire to say to the gentleman, if he will permit me, that at present we are only discussing the point of order. Why not limit the discussion to that, and let the argument upon the merits come up in its order?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I have not touched the merits of the proposition.

Mr. HAYES. You are asking whether it is the law or not, and that is the very question; but we can not discuss that upon a point of order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Why, of course, the gentleman simply misapprehends or misunderstands what I say. I say the inquiry before this House is directly and pointedly as to whether section 40 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is or is not a part of the law of the land. That is the exact inquiry.

Mr. HAYES. Not upon a point of order.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Oh, yes. If section 40 is not the law, the point of order which I made against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] is not good; and so, too, in that case, one objection to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES] would fail.

Mr. RAY. I desire to ask, in order that I may understand you clearly, whether you regard the point at issue to be whether section 40 of the Revised Statutes is in force or whether section 6 of the act of 1856 is in force?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Oh, well, that is a distinction without a difference. The question before the House is whether there is any law which, by the amendment of the gentleman from Louis-

iana, will be changed. That is a broad question. If so, then the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana is a proposition to change existing law.

Mr. RAY. If the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I do not wish to be diverted upon the point. I can not yield to the gentleman upon that triviality, for I am trying to address myself to the question we have before this committee, and as to the learned distinction which the gentleman makes, learned according to his standard of learning, he can elucidate and elaborate that when he gets the floor, and I do not care at this time to address myself to it. If there is any existing law (I do not care whether you call it section 6 of the act of 1856 or section 40 of the Revised Statutes of the United States) that contains a provision contrary to that expressed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, then that amendment, if adopted, would change existing law.

It is apparent also that it would not lessen expenditures; and, therefore, if my contention be true, the point of order made against the amendment is a good one. Now, my first inquiry is, whether or not the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary are correct in declaring that there is a provision of law under which a deduction shall be made for a member's absence otherwise than on account of sickness of himself or family. This provision first appears in an act passed in August, 1856. It will not be contended by anybody, I presume, that there has since been passed any act which purports to repeal it.

Then, if this provision of the law of 1856 is no more, it has been repealed by implication. Now, let me state, as a fundamental proposition, that repeals by implication are never favored. That is a very natural, a very reasonable, a very sound declaration of the courts and of the law. Why? Whenever anything has been made law, it is only common sense as well as law that it shall continue to be law unless absolutely repealed, or necessarily displaced by some other legislation which can not have its full force and effect if the former statute be allowed to stand.

In other words, when you have a provision of law it continues, in whole or in part, to be the law until it is expressly repealed, or until the passage of some other act which can not have force and effect except by the destruction of the former statute.

Mr. BOATNER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOATNER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the language of the act of 1856.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will the gentleman wait a moment for that? I am discussing now a fundamental legal proposition.

Mr. BOATNER. I ask the gentleman's pardon. I will try to take the floor when he gets through.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I have no objection to yielding to the gentleman later, but just now I am on a proposition which I think the gentleman does not dispute. When I come to the other point I will yield to the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to resume, I say that there is no express repeal of section 6 of the act of 1856. If it has been repealed and is no longer the law, wholly or partially, it must be because other laws have been passed which can not have force and effect with that section 6 or its equivalent, section 40, still operative. If that result has come, then section 6 of the act of 1856 was repealed by implication, by necessary inconsistency with, by necessary repugnance to, a subsequent enactment. If that condition has not come about then section 6 of the act of 1856 survives, in substance as section 40 of the Revised Statutes. Let us now look into this act of August 16, 1856.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to ask the gentleman a question with a view to getting at the salient point. The language of this amendment is that section 6 of the act of 1856, or section 40 of the Revised Statutes, has been heretofore repealed.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the difficulty in the mind of the Chair, to which he wishes the gentleman to address his remarks, is this: Can it be held that this amendment is a repealing amendment if the Chair should be of opinion that section 40 of the Revised Statutes has not been heretofore repealed?

If, as a fact, section 40 of the Revised Statutes, has not been heretofore repealed, does the gentleman insist that this amendment is a repealing act which would repeal that section if it had not been heretofore repealed? The answer to that might make a wide difference in deciding the question whether the amendment is parliamentary, apart from the question whether it is proper or not. In other words, the amendment might be parliamentary and still be one which in the opinion of the Chair ought not to be adopted. Might not this amendment be parliamentary in the view of the case which the Chair has suggested?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I was endeavoring to address myself more particularly to the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], understanding

that it was temporarily withdrawn in order that the other might be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana is not now pending. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAYES], and the Chair understood the gentleman [Mr. DE ARMOND] to make the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly. The point of order I made on that amendment and the point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER], being in part the same, and since both will come before the Chair to be passed upon, I thought it might be well to consider the question with reference to both; but I shall of course conform to the wish of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not object to that at all.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The broader question is the one raised by the gentleman from Louisiana. His amendment is a proposition which involves necessarily an inquiry as to whether the provision of law, referred to sometimes as section 6 of the act of 1856 and at other times as section 40 of the Revised Statutes, is or is not repealed. I submit, however, that the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa comes within the objection all the same, although it presents a narrower question. That amendment recites that these provisions are no longer the law.

Now, it is not germane to anything in this bill to declare what is or what is not the law. It is not a pertinent inquiry to submit to the House; for if it is, then it is proper for any gentleman, upon the same theory and philosophy, to offer a declaration that any particular provision of the statutes which he chooses to pick out or refer to, or anything which he chooses to imagine or assert is or might be, or is thought by somebody to be, a part of the statutes, is no longer law, and to have a declaration of the House upon that subject.

The question of the pending paragraph as to how much money shall be appropriated for the salaries of members of the House has nothing whatever to do with the question whether section 40 of the Revised Statutes or section 6 of the act of 1856 has been repealed or still survives.

The amendment would be equally competent upon an appropriation for contingent expenses of the House or for the office of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House, or for the payment of the Speaker's salary. Anywhere along in this bill it would be admissible, if admissible at all.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Does not this bill appropriate money to pay the salaries of members?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DALZELL. And is it not perfectly germane that the bill should contain a provision saying how that appropriation shall be made?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly that would be germane; but this does not do that. It asserts that a certain provision, alleged to be the law—and which, plain as the nose on a man's face, is the law according to the reading of the Revised Statutes—is not the law.

Mr. DALZELL. But if the proposition that is contended for on one side is valid, then this money will be appropriated in a certain way. If, on the other hand, this law is not in force, and this House has the right to say so, then the money will be appropriated in another way.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I do not so understand it. This amendment has nothing at all to do with the duties of the Sergeant-at-Arms; it has no relation to the duties of the Speaker of the House. Here is a bald, naked declaration, according to the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa, that a certain section appearing in the statutes as law is not law—has been repealed. Now, let us put this to the test.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me a single suggestion?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. Here is a declaration that section 6 of a certain law and section 40 of the Revised Statutes have been repealed.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. Now, the question on which I would like to hear the gentleman, while he is on the floor, is this: What authority has this committee to declare that a law has repealing force when the construction of the law depends upon the statute itself?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Well, I have been maintaining, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter which has nothing in the world to do with this bill; that this declaration is as foreign to the purposes and objects and effect of this bill as anything could be. Gentlemen might just as well undertake to declare by an amendment that a certain provision in the Constitution as originally written is no longer a constitutional provision—

Mr. COX. Because it has been repealed.

Mr. DE ARMOND. They might give any reason, or might give no reason. That is a mere matter of phraseology. Any gentleman on the same philosophy may pick out of the statutes any provision contained in them and stuff into an appropriation bill wherever he pleases the proposition that such provision of law has ceased to be law. You can go further and assert that a certain thing is law, although the courts may have decided fifty times over that it is not law. The affirmative declaration is just as good as the negative. It is just as competent to assert the one thing as the other.

Mr. MCCALL. Would not a declaratory act, concurred in by the House and the Senate and the President, declaring a certain thing to be the law, have the effect of repealing any law which might be in conflict with it?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think that is probable.

Mr. MCCALL. But it would not be within our power to amend the Constitution in that way; we have not that authority.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Of course not. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] is a correct one; and, Mr. Chairman, it bears upon an inquiry which the Chair submitted to me just before I was turned aside by yielding for questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and would be glad if the gentleman from Missouri would repeat it.

Mr. DE ARMOND. The suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts is, that if the House should adopt as part of this bill the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, and the Senate and the President should concur, so that it would be incorporated in the bill, the effect would be to repeal section 6 and section 40, if not heretofore repealed.

I think that is true. The repeal would come in an indirect way, by declaring in an act of Congress that those sections had been repealed. Such a thing, I take it, has never before been attempted from the foundation of the Government until this day. I imagine that never before did it occur to the ingenuity of a legislator to evade a rule against the repeal of a statute by an amendment to an appropriation bill, by giving to the repealing act the form of a declaration that the statute aimed at had been repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, if the gentleman will indulge the Chair. Assume that to be so, the question is, would this amendment then be obnoxious to the objection that it is not permissible under the parliamentary law—

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think so, and for the reason that it would be a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Not as to whether the amendment is a wise or a proper one for Congress to enact, but is it obnoxious to the rule?

Mr. DOCKERY. Obnoxious to Rule XXI; that is the fair question.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think so, and a discussion of that is involved also in the discussion of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana.

Now, if as a matter of fact you assume that these provisions of law have been actually repealed, I submit still that this declaration embodied in the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa would be open to the parliamentary objection of not being germane to the paragraph under consideration. So that in either event, whether the law survives and the assumption of the gentleman is incorrect, or whether it is passed and his assumption correct, the amendment is clearly amenable to that objection.

Either way, if the law is repealed or if it is not repealed, the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa must fall. If the law exists, it is an indirect attempt to repeal it and is obnoxious to the provisions of the rule; and if the law is repealed it is a declaration that is not germane to the bill and has no connection with it.

I come now again to the main proposition involved in the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana, and also in the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa. Can a provision similar to section 40 of the Revised Statutes, or section 6 of the act of 1856, exist side by side and as part of the law, with a provision fixing the compensation which the members of the House and of the Senate shall receive, as now provided by law?

That they could exist under the act of 1856, is clear beyond room or argument, clear beyond the possibility of doubt, clear beyond question. The act of 1856, in its first section, provides for the compensation of Senators and members of the House as clearly, as distinctly, as completely as any subsequent act changing the amount of compensation. The amount which was prescribed and fixed by the first section of that act was \$6,000 for each Senator and Member for each Congress.

It determined how it should be paid and when. I challenge any man to say that the act of 1866, the act of 1867, the act of

1873, or of 1874, or any or all of the subsequent acts did or do more than to determine how much salary a Senator or Representative should get, and when and how that salary should be paid to him. Under the act of 1856 it was perfectly consistent with the declaration of section 1 that Senators and Members of the House should each receive \$6,000 for a Congress, to be paid in a specified manner; to declare also by section 6 that the absence of either, except when occasioned by the sickness of himself or his family, would subject the absentee to a corresponding deduction of pay.

Section 1 fixed the salary of members of Congress in 1856. Section 6 provides for a deduction, in proportion to the amount paid, for absence not occasioned by the sickness of the member himself or some member of his immediate family.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. That is in the same section?

Mr. DE ARMOND. No, sir; different sections. Now, the fact that the two provisions can stand together is not challenged. I defy any man to challenge it. He must challenge the act itself, for in that act, now here before me, they do stand together, the one no more the law than the other.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Is not section 6 limited to the salaries referred to in section 1?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will come to that later. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will read this section 1 of the act of August 16, 1856.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman proposing to read?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The first section of the act of 1856, fixing the compensation of members of Congress. It is as follows:

That the compensation of each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress shall be \$3,000 for each Congress, and mileage as now provided by law, for two sessions only, to be paid in manner following, to wit: On the first day of each regular session each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall receive his mileage for the first session, and on the first day of each month thereafter during such session at the rate of \$3,000 per annum during the continuance of such session, and at the end of such session he shall receive the residue of his salary due to him at such time at the rate aforesaid still unpaid; and at the beginning of the second regular session of the Congress each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall receive his mileage for such second session, and monthly during such session compensation at the rate of \$3,000 per annum, until the 4th of March terminating the Congress, and on that day each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall be entitled to receive the balance of the \$3,000 not theretofore paid in the monthly installments above directed.

That is section 1. Now, I challenge contradiction of the statement that all subsequent legislation in regard to this matter has been legislation upon the subjects embraced in this section 1. The changes that have been made have been changes in the provisions of law as created by this section 1. This section 1 would to-day be the law but for those changes. Now, could there stand with this section 1 the provision of law which I say, and which the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary say, is still existing law? It could exist with this section 1, because it did. Now, let us read section 6.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You concede that section 1 was repealed?

Mr. DE ARMOND. The provision fixing the salary, of course. Instead of \$6,000 a Congress, we have now \$5,000 a year, and instead of payment at the times therein specified, we have payments at other times as well, as for instance, beginning a month after our term begins instead of not until after our service has begun.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. It was repealed by passing an independent act.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly, sir, as to amount of compensation. Now, let me read section 6:

And be it further enacted, That it shall be the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House and Secretary of the Senate, respectively, to deduct from the monthly payments of members as herein provided for, the amount of his compensation for each day that such member shall be absent from the House or Senate, respectively, unless such Representative, Senator, or Delegate shall assign as the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or some member of his family.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. What force do you give the words "as herein provided?"

Mr. REED. Substitute the words "therein provided."

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman address himself to the question how far this statute may have been repealed by the construction placed upon it for so long a period of years by both Houses and by the accounting officers of the Government?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will come to that later.

If a salary of \$6,000 to a member of Congress for a term can be fixed in harmony with a provision of law, such as is contained in section 6, that for certain absences deductions shall be made, then a law fixing the salary at \$5,000 per annum, or \$10,000 per annum, or \$20,000 a Congress, at any sum, will stand also in harmony with section 6 or section 40.

In 1856 a member got \$6,000 for the Congress, or \$3,000 a year, or at the rate of \$250 a month. In 1866 there was a change in the law, giving \$10,000 for the Congress, \$5,000 for the year, or at the rate of \$416.66 per month. If you could deduct under the

law (and there is no question of expediency) a day's pay from the \$3,000 per annum, why can not you deduct a day's pay, under specified conditions, from the compensation to be paid at the rate of \$5,000 per annum?

Mr. REED. Would the gentleman like an answer?

Mr. DE ARMOND. Yes.

Mr. REED. Because it said, "Shall be paid at the rate herein provided for," and that "herein provided for" having been repealed, there is nothing for it to operate upon. If the law had stated that there was to be substituted for the earlier provision of the law of 1856 the provision of the law of 1866, why, then, that would carry, by implication, a retention of section 6; but it did not so provide; and this section 6, having nothing to operate upon, falls of course.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Will the gentleman allow me to say the words "herein provided for" are just the equivalent of the words "as provided by law."

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will address myself to the inquiry suggested by the gentleman from Maine. I am not surprised that this construction has been put upon the words of the statute by others; but I am surprised that it has been put upon the statute by the very able gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not hear a word. Gentlemen must cease conversation or retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing myself to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Maine. I am not surprised at the construction which he suggests has been given to this provision of the law by some gentlemen, though I confess I am surprised that it is given to it by him.

Mr. REED. And given by all the gentlemen of the House and of the Senate for the last twenty-eight years; so that I am in very good company and very numerous company, too.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I am surprised that the gentleman from Maine, who is a lawyer and a man of very great ability, as we all know he is, commits himself to that construction, and I think that when I get through with section 6 he will also be surprised. Section 6 contains the words upon which the gentleman hinges his argument as to the repeal of the section.

And be it further enacted, That it shall be the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively, to deduct from the monthly payment of members as herein provided for.

I understand the gentleman hinges his argument for the repeal, by implication, of section 6 upon these words: "As herein provided for." The gentleman from Maine, perhaps quite incautiously, undertook to support his construction by the interpolation of, "at the rate herein provided for." There is the distinction. "At the rate herein provided for" is not specified, is not in the section at all. "As herein provided for" means what? Does it mean a fixed, specific amount? It does not. It has reference to the monthly payment provided for, rather than its amount.

Mr. BOATNER. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOATNER. My point of order is that the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order, but is addressing himself to the merits of the proposition.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Not at all. I am addressing myself to the question of order.

Mr. BOATNER. I understand that the question before the committee now is a point of order; and the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order, but to the merits of the question. I have not heard the gentleman refer to any rule of the House which the proposition violates or make any argument in support of that proposition.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Chairman and the members of the committee in general will agree with me that, whether clearly or otherwise, I have been talking strictly and directly upon the point of order.

Mr. BOATNER. My inquiry is, what is the point of order and the rule of the House that the amendment violates?

Mr. DE ARMOND. That it changes existing law and does not reduce expenditures.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana objects that I am talking about the merits of this proposition instead of addressing myself to the point of order. I have been discussing the question whether this is the law or not, which is the very point of order involved.

If I were to say that, after the attempt upon the other side of the House, by what they claimed to be a privileged resolution, to nullify this act, to render it nugatory, to set it aside; after this side of the House had decided upon its enforcement; after the Speaker from his chair had declared he would sign no certificate except in conformity with this law; if I were to direct myself to the question of propriety involved in these amendments, and say that from our standpoint upon this side, who asserted that the law existed and then demanded its observance,

from the standpoint of the Speaker, who has clearly and boldly declared in favor of its enforcement, the proposed legislation would be bad legislation, which would naturally be proposed and supported on the other side, and as naturally should be opposed upon this side, then I think I would be speaking to the merits, and not upon the point of order.

If I were addressing myself to the question of the merits, I would talk about the peculiar merit and the peculiar judgment and the extraordinary philosophy, political and otherwise, which would impel a gentleman on this side to beat down a law which has met with the approval of the country, with the sanction of his party, with the approval of the Speaker, and under which the House is now operating in a lawful, regular, honest, decent way. But I address myself to the point of order, and I trust the gentleman will now see the distinction between the point of order and the so-called merits of a proposition utterly without merit.

I was speaking, Mr. Chairman, to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Maine—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman's construction of the words quoted by the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Certainly. I ought, perhaps, to beg pardon of the Chair for having diverged, but having been speaking entirely to the point of order, and that not being apparent, for some reason unknown to me, to the gentleman from Louisiana and to other gentlemen near me, I thought that by way of a momentary diversion I would throw out a few suggestions as to what might be said upon the merits of a meritless proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOATNER. If the gentleman will permit me, I did not intend to cast any reflection whatever upon the strength of the argument he was making; but being convinced that if this law is still upon the statute book the pending amendment would not repeal it, and that if it is already repealed the amendment would add nothing to the force of that repeal, it appeared to me that the question which the gentleman was discussing related entirely to the merits of the law and not to the question whether the amendment was germane to the bill and did not reduce expenditures, and therefore was not in order.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York (to Mr. DE ARMOND). Do you claim that the act of 1866 fixing the salary of members of Congress at \$5,000 a year is not an independent act, but is a mere amendment of the first section of the act of 1856?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I say it had the effect to displace all the inconsistent, contradictory, and repugnant provisions of the act of 1856; that it went so far as to fix anew the compensation of members, but it had nothing to do with the question of deductions for absence.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. You do not, then, claim that the act of 1856 was merely an amendment of the former act.

Mr. DE ARMOND. No; it was not passed in that form.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. Do not you think it surperseeded that act and the whole of it?

Mr. DE ARMOND. No; that is exactly what I do not think. In answer to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Chairman, I repeat what I have already said, that an act providing that a member shall be paid \$5,000 per annum is as completely consistent with a provision of law that there shall be a deduction made for his absence as another provision of law that he shall be paid \$6,000, or \$3,000, or any other sum. That is my contention; and as any provision fixing the salary at any amount can stand with this section 6 or section 40 just as well as any other provision fixing it at any other amount, I say there is no such repugnancy or inconsistency as can work a repeal by implication. That is what I contend.

Coming now again to these words "as herein provided for," I say gentlemen give them a meaning which I submit is not the correct one. Upon reflection any lawyer must hesitate to concur in their construction. The words "as herein provided for" gentlemen make read "in that amount which would come to one per day at the rate hereinbefore specified." Now, the words "as herein provided for" have reference to the payments.

Every month after Congress began payment was made to the member of one-twelfth of his yearly salary under section 1, lessened under section 6 by a proportionate deduction for each day's absence during the month unless that absence was of the kind or for the reason specified in section 6. As suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] these words giving them their true legal significance, their proper construction as they are used in statute, mean nothing more than "as provided by law."

Now, to show that this construction is the correct one, I go further and say that if you leave these words out of the section entirely, precisely the same result follows as if they are incorporated in it. The section is not changed in its effect; it is not

changed in its substance. It has precisely the same bearing with those words left out as with them in, and when the section was incorporated in the Revised Statutes those words were left out by the codifier and by the Congress which adopted the Revised Statutes.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York. But leaving them in confines their force to that particular act.

Mr. DE ARMOND. It confines it to the monthly payment. But suppose the construction for which the gentleman contends were true, let us test it. If that were correct, Mr. Chairman, what would be the result? Somebody has figured out that the compensation per day, the one-thirtieth part of \$250 a month, would be \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$, and that would be the amount to be deducted under that law; not because it says "as herein provided for," but because it says, in effect, that a day's pay shall be deducted for a day's absence, and as a matter of arithmetic each day's absence would cause a lessening of the total amount of compensation by \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$, the one-thirtieth part of \$250, the compensation for the entire month.

But to show the absurdity of the construction that gentlemen contend for, suppose that, instead of it being provided by the law that there shall be monthly payments, such provision had been entirely left out, the effect would not be changed a particle. Suppose you give it a strained, unreasonable, unnatural, unauthorized meaning, so as to read that "there shall be a deduction made at the rate of \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$ for each day's absence?" Suppose that were the reading; what would follow?

Mr. Chairman, just as inevitably as anything upon earth, the result would be that under existing law there would still be the deduction of \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$ a day. If there is a provision that a man shall be paid a certain sum—I do not care what—and that a certain sum shall be deducted per day, all the changes made in the gross amount that shall be paid, all the changes made in the annual compensation of members or their compensation per Congress, can have nothing to do with the amount of the deduction for daily absence.

If you give that effect to the provision, then you must make the section read as though it said, "and for each day's absence except on account of sickness of himself or some member of his family, there shall be deducted \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$." That must be the reading, in effect, if the contention of the gentleman from Maine and other gentlemen who agree with him be correct. If that is the meaning that would be the law to-day. If you provide that there shall be deducted \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$ for a day's absence and then leave that law absolutely untouched—from that time on it is perfectly consistent to deduct \$8.33 $\frac{1}{3}$, whether you give as compensation \$3,000, or \$1,000, or \$50,000 or \$500.

Mr. MAHON. How would you apply that in another view of the case? The act of 1866 did not provide for monthly payments at all, but simply that there should be paid to each Congressman a salary of \$5,000 per annum. Would you have the Sergeant-at-Arms make the deduction under that law?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will tell you exactly what I would do. Under the act of 1866, which made no provision for monthly payments, monthly payments were made—

Mr. MAHON. I do not care what the Sergeant-at-Arms may have done. I want to hold the gentleman to the law. If the act of 1866 provided that each member of Congress should receive a salary of \$5,000 per annum, what right has the Sergeant-at-Arms under that act to deduct any part of the salary for daily absence?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will answer the gentleman frankly; and I think he will be content with the answer when he gets it. Before 1866 the law provided that a certain amount should be the compensation or salary of the member of Congress, and that such salary should be paid in a certain way.

Mr. MAHON. Monthly.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Monthly. Then the law of 1866 provided that the salary of a member of Congress, instead of being \$6,000 a Congress or \$3,000 a year, should be \$5,000 a year; but it left the law precisely as it was with reference to monthly payments.

Mr. MAHON. Would not any court, construing such an act as the act of 1866, declare that the member was not entitled to his pay until he had served a full year in Congress?

Mr. DE ARMOND. That is just precisely what no court would decide.

Mr. MAHON. How do you reach the authority for monthly payments? There is nothing in the law to that effect.

Mr. DE ARMOND. That is very easily reached. If the gentleman will wait a moment I will answer him. He may not be content with my answer, but upon reflection I am inclined to think he will be. Section 1 of the act of 1856 provided, we will say, two things upon this point; it provided how much a member of Congress should receive, and it provided when payments should be made to him. That is conceded, of course, by everybody.