

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

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

By Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 2136) for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church of Helena, Phillips County, Ark. (REPORT No. 1025.)

By Mr. RICHARDS, from the Committee on Claims: A bill (S. 73) for the relief of William J. Cornell and Joseph M. Cornell. (REPORT No. 1026.)

Also, a bill (S. 223) for the relief of Isham T. Owens, of Missouri. (REPORT No. 1027.)

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6052) granting a pension to Bernard Clark, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 7349) to provide for the appointment of a public administrator in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 7350) to regulate the practice in the courts of the United States in jury trials—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 7351) to provide for the peaceful arbitration and adjustment of difficulties between employers and employes, to establish a board of arbitration, and to prevent hostilities pending the settlement of questions at issue between the parties affected—to the Committee on Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 7352) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William J. Blain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 7353) for the relief of Christian Frederickson, Fredonia, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7354) for the relief J. N. Jacobs, of Coyville, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7355) for the relief of J. P. Swatzell, late postmaster at Elk City, Kans.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7356) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry Briody—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7357) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any statutory bar, of the claims of J. F. Bailey & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 7358) for the relief of Mary Sharp College, of Winchester, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7359) to pension Samuel F. Tenant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BAKER of New Hampshire: Petition of Albert M. Hardy and 45 others, of West Swanzey, N. H., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations operating upon the lodge system and providing for the payment of life, sick, accident, and other benefits to members, be exempt from the operations of any income tax which may be enacted—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of William G. Himrod, relative to filtering the Potomac water used in the District of Columbia, and proposing a plan therefor—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: Memorial of Joseph Holton, of Aspen, Colo., relative to coinage of silver, issuance of bonds, etc.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of William I. Blain, late of Company M, Sixty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, members of various fraternal beneficiary orders, in favor of the exemption of such orders from income or other tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE FOREST: Petition of Gerald H. Beard, for legislation to suppress lotteries—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of 73 citizens of Philadelphia and 15 of West Philadelphia, Pa.; 59 of Denver, Colo.; 42 of Rutland, Vt., and 30 of Chicago, Ill., for the passage of House bill 5804, an act to promote the safety of employes upon railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of Will T. Walker and others, of Kansas City, Kan., to exempt fraternal aid societies from the operations of the law relating to income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. M. McGiffin, for the enactment of a law placing the town of Miami, Ind. T., under Territorial or other jurisdiction—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Modern Woodmen of America, against the income tax on fraternal societies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of Lutheran Church, of Marengo, Iowa, against God in the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUK: Papers to accompany House bill 7346 for the relief of Henry Hubbard, of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KYLE: Resolution of Farmers' Alliance of Panola County, Miss., protesting against the extension of the time for the payment by the Central and Union Pacific Railroads—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition and resolution of laboring people at Portsmouth and Norfolk, Va., praying for permanent employment in navy-yard at Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OATES: Papers to accompany House bill 7338, to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the infantry regiments, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Resolution of the Union Veteran Legion, No. 72, of Bridgewater, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 5575—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: Memorial of dealers in leaf tobacco in Paducah, Ky., praying amendment to that section of the Wilson bill relating to leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITING: Protests of the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Utica, New Haven, Ruth, Kilmanogole, Sterling, and Port Hope, all of Michigan, against the passage of House bill 120—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 6, 1894.

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

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

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

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Congress of American Physicians and Surgeons, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation tending to interfere with the advancement of medicine by means of experiments upon animals conducted by properly qualified persons; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Congress of American Physicians and Surgeons, remonstrating against the proposed reduction of medical officers in the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HARRIS presented petitions of D. B. Johnston and sundry other citizens of Dyersburg; of A. J. Collinsworth and sundry other citizens of Alamo; of J. E. Hunt and sundry other citizens of Chattanooga, and of T. H. Lawrence and sundry other citizens of Eaton, all in the State of Tennessee, praying that the pending tariff bill be so amended as to exempt fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations from taxation; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PEPPER presented a petition of the Coxe Club, of Salem-Ohio, praying for the passage of the bill to permit public corporations, such as cities, to exercise the same privileges and rights in the way of issuing money as do national banks, and that cities be empowered to issue twenty-year bonds bearing no interest, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of W. R. Swift and sundry other citizens of Ottawa; of C. H. Brooks and sundry other citizens of Wichita; of George Leis and sundry other citizens of Lawrence, all in the State of Kansas; and of J. B. Merrell and sundry other citizens of Vinita, Okla., 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 were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of 44 citizens of York County, Me., and a petition of 10 citizens of Piscataquis, Me., 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 were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WASHBURN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Hennepin County, Minn., 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 were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of D. G. Huhn and sundry other citizens of Saranac, Mich., and the petition of Millard Mitchell and sundry other citizens of Ionia County, Mich.; praying for the enactment of legislation to enable the States to enforce State laws regulating the sale of substitutes for dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GORDON presented petitions of W. E. Hayne and sundry other citizens of Fulton County; of Polk Harris and sundry other citizens of Muskogee County, and of Rev. A. M. Williams, all in the State of Georgia, praying that the funds of mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Eagle and Phoenix Manufacturing Company of Columbus, Ga., praying that aniline colors be placed upon the free list; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented petitions of William T. Haines and 22 other citizens of Kennebec County; of J. W. Fairbanks and 16 other citizens of Franklin County; of F. E. Voter and 43 other citizens of Franklin County; of John L. Crosby and 42 other citizens of Penobscot County, and of George C. Upham and 72 other citizens of Aroostook County, all in the State of Maine, 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. VEST presented the petition of Henry Kemper and sundry other citizens of St. Charles County, Mo., praying that mutual life insurance companies and associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of L. W. Moody and 26 other citizens of New Haven, Conn., 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.

He also presented the petition of Charles Raymond and 11 other citizens of South Norwalk, Conn., praying that fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations be exempted from the proposed income-tax provision of the pending tariff bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of Local Assembly, No. 5539, Knights of Labor, of Krebs, Ind. T., praying that an investigation be made by the Interior Department as to the cause of the strikes of coal miners in that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I present the petition of E. E. White, of Washington, D. C., formerly special United States Indian agent in charge of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Wichita Indian Agency, Ind. T., praying that certain relief be granted him for the performance of duties whilst in charge of that agency. I move that the petition be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of N. D. Jones and 227 other citizens of Allegheny County; of Joseph W. Miller and 46 other citizens of Butler; of O. B. Fry and 65 other citizens of Luzerne County; of Alfred H. Love and 16 other citizens of Philadelphia County; of Robert P. Clarke and 22 other citizens of Allegheny County; of R. Mackenzie and 43 other citizens of Pennsylvania; of R. L. Orr and 21 other citizens of Allegheny County; of D. M. McFarland and 43 other citizens of Chester County; of G. B. Metzger and 87 other citizens of Philadelphia; of J. A. Taylor and 8 other citizens of Pittsburg; of W. H. White and 19 other citizens of Lackawanna County; of Charles J. Harrison and 91 other citizens of Somerset County; of T. C. Parsons and

19 other citizens of Blair County; of Albert Reynolds and 21 other citizens of Jefferson County; of J. S. Hall and 38 other citizens of Butler County; of T. P. Day and 43 other citizens of Allegheny County, and of W. J. Morgan and 65 other citizens of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, 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.

JOHN M. SWIFT.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1846) granting an increase of pension to John M. Swift, to report it adversely and move its indefinite postponement, and to submit a substitute bill for the one referred to the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Senate bill 1846 will be postponed indefinitely, and the original bill will be read by its title.

The bill (S. 2088) granting an increase of pension to John M. Swift was read the first time by its title.

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill proposes to increase the pension of an old soldier who is insane and in destitution, and I ask unanimous consent that it be now considered. It will take but a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read at length.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. Swift, of Oregon, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that which he is now receiving, payable to his legally constituted guardian.

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.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the order of business?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have just reported the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear just one word of explanation. What are the facts in the case?

Mr. GALLINGER. This soldier had an army service of three years. He had a hospital record for heart disease, and the disease has continued from that time to the present; and yet he never applied for an increase of pension. He might have had an increased pension for twenty-five years if he had applied for it. He alleges heart disease, rheumatism, and sunstroke received at Gettysburg, but he has been unable, the lapse of time having been so great, to establish to the satisfaction of the Bureau that he did receive sunstroke. He is now hopelessly insane, requiring the constant care of another person.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill is all right.

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

#### DEARBORN ARSENAL GROUNDS.

Mr. CAREY. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3715) granting to the village of Dearborn certain lands for village purposes, to report it without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

Mr. COCKRELL. Was the tract known as Dearborn Arsenal turned over to the Interior Department by the War Department?

Mr. CAREY. I will state for the information of the Senate that this grant has been reported upon favorably by the Secretary of the Interior. It is an old arsenal building, and has no value whatever except in a historical point of view, and the people of the village of Dearborn, Mich., are very anxious to have it reserved.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is an old abandoned arsenal turned over by the War Department?

Mr. CAREY. It has been turned over to the Interior Department, and they have reported that there is no objection to the passage of the bill.

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

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON RELIEF TO UNEMPLOYED PERSONS.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am directed by the Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the petition of Morrison I. Swift and other citizens of New England, praying for certain measures for the relief of existing public distress, to report a resolution; and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved.* That a special committee of five Senators on the existing public distress be appointed by the President of the Senate, to whom shall be referred the petition of Morrison I. Swift and others, and all other petitions for measures of relief of such distress.

## SENATORIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

Mr. GRAY, from the special committee appointed to investigate attempts at bribery, etc., submitted additional testimony taken by the committee; which was ordered to be printed.

## TARIFF BULLETINS.

Mr. VOORHEES. I report from the Committee on Finance Tariff Bulletins Nos. 40 to 44, inclusive, being replies to tariff inquiries in regard to agricultural products and provisions, spirits, wines, and other beverages, and cotton manufactures. I ask that the bulletins be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2089) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the name of Bartholomew Mulcahy and grant him an honorable discharge; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2090) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Helmuth F. Soeckel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2091) to preserve the purity of national legislation, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. TELLER 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.

## RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH INDIAN RESERVATION IN NEBRASKA.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to call up the bill (S. 1995) granting to the Eastern Nebraska and Gulf Railway Company right of way through the Omaha and Winnebago Indian Reservation in the State of Nebraska.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 8, after the word "Indian," to strike out "Reservation" and insert "Reservations;" so as to read:

That there is hereby granted to the Eastern Nebraska and Gulf Railway Company, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Nebraska, and its assigns, the right of way for the construction of its proposed railroad through the Omaha and Winnebago Indian Reservations, in said State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 9, before the word "feet," to strike out "seventy-five," and insert "fifty;" so as to read:

Such right of way shall be 50 feet in width on each side of the central line of said railroad, and said company shall also have the right to take from the lands adjacent to the line of said road material, stones, and earth necessary for the construction of said railroad.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 15, after the word "amount," to strike out "three," and insert "two;" and in line 18, after the word "said," to strike out "reservation" and insert "reservations;" so as to read:

Also, grounds adjacent to such right of way for station buildings, depots, machine shops, side tracks, turn-outs, and water station, not to exceed in amount 200 feet in width and 3,000 feet in length for each station, to the extent of two stations within the limits of said reservations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add to section 2 the following additional proviso:

*Provided further.* That said railway company shall construct and maintain continually all fences, roads, and highways, crossings and necessary bridges over said railway whenever said roads and highways do now or may hereafter cross said railway's right of way or may be by the proper authorities laid out across the same: *Provided further.* That said railway shall be constructed through said reservations within three years after the passage of this act, or the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to that portion of the road not constructed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as an additional section:

SEC. 3. That Congress may at any time amend, alter, or repeal this act, and the right of way hereby granted shall not be assigned or transferred in any form whatever, except as to mortgages or other liens that may be given or secured thereon to aid in the construction thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting to the Eastern Nebraska and Gulf Railway Company right of way through the Omaha and Winnebago Indian Reservations, in the State of Nebraska."

## HELEN L. DENT.

Mr. TELLER. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 1508) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent.

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

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars" to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Helen L. Dent, widow of the late Frederick T. Dent, colonel retired, United States Army, at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of the sum of \$30 per month now received.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

## LEECH LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. WASHBURN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2000) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota.

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

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

## MRS. ANN BRADFORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 237) to pension Mrs. Ann Bradford, mother of William K. Bradford.

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

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 4, to strike out "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws," and at the end of the bill to add "and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls the name of Ann Bradford, mother of William K. Bradford, late of Company B, Seventy-sixth Missouri Enrolled Militia Volunteers, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS IN THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. 1954) to amend section 1379, chapter 1, Title XV, Revised Statutes of the United States.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that the limitation as to age contained in section 1379 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to appointment of assistant paymasters in the United States Navy to fill vacancies that may now or hereafter exist in said grade, shall not apply to such of the graduates of the Naval Academy as were at sea upon duty at the time of the passage and approval of the act of Congress approved August 5, 1882, who were discharged thereunder at the end of their two years' cruise, after passing successfully all the examinations required of them; but this amendment shall not be construed as giving any preference in the appointment of assistant paymasters to the graduates except as to waiving the limitation of age.

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

Mr. HALE. Let the title be amended by adding the words "in relation to appointments of assistant paymasters in the Navy." I think that always the title should show the subject-matter of a bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection the title will be amended as indicated.

Mr. VOORHEES. I rose to ask for the consideration of the bill, but I will not trespass upon the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of half past 10 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O.

TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A 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; and

A bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also 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. 1424) to amend section 8 of "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Calumet River," approved March 1, 1893;

A bill (H. R. 82) to authorize the Missouri River Power Company of Montana to construct a dam across the Missouri River; and

A bill (H. R. 5779) to grant certain lands to the township board of Inwood Township, Michigan, for cemetery purposes.

#### THE REVENUE BILL.

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

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

The Secretary read as follows:

#### SCHEDULE F.—TOBACCO AND MANUFACTURES OF.

184. On all leaf tobacco, on such part thereof as is wrapper tobacco and suitable for cigar wrappers, if unstemmed, \$1 per pound; if stemmed, \$1.25 per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I propose, as an amendment to the paragraph which has just been read, what is printed in connection with it on page 41, in small type, leaving out the words "and fifty cents" after the words "one dollar," in line 9; and in line 10 striking out "two dollars" and inserting "one dollar;" so that the paragraph will have the same rate imposed as when the bill came from the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 184 and insert:

184. Wrapper tobacco, unstemmed, imported in any bale, box, package, or in bulk, \$1 per pound; if stemmed, \$1.25 per pound.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, to say that the proposition comes as a surprise at this time, without notice, is perhaps to express my astonishment mildly. If I understand the present proposition, it is to leave the duty as it was fixed by the bill as it came from the House of Representatives. Am I correct?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The same rate as proposed in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives.

Mr. PLATT. We used to have in New England when I was a boy a kind of giving that was called "Indian giving," which was to give and take back; and I do not know that we could say a meaner thing to one another as boys than to say, "You are an Indian giver." I do not want to say any mean thing about this matter just now, but it strikes me that this is what we used to understand as "Indian giving," and that the committee are "Indian givers" in this respect.

It will not only be surprising, but very sad news to the Democratic friends of the committee in Connecticut and Massachusetts and Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and Ohio, where leaf tobacco is grown which is suitable for cigars.

I think that I myself never had any conversation with the committee on the subject of this duty, but I know the representatives of the leaf-tobacco-growing industry in my State were here and presented their case to the committee; and, as I understood, the committee informed them that the amendment as it appears in the bill would be proposed, and they went home satisfied, or, if not satisfied, content, as they supposed they must be, it not being as much as they felt it ought to be.

This proposition, therefore, will come to them very much like thunder out of a clear sky. Of course, there is no criticism of the committee to be indulged in if, after having informed the representatives of that interest what duty they would recommend, they change their minds, and in the Senate take it back.

I do not know just exactly how to treat the subject, because, if I had supposed it possible that the amendment suggested by the committee on the 7th of May would not be adhered to, I should have been ready for a discussion of the subject, and to show that the amendment ought to be adhered to.

Mr. CULLOM. May I ask the Senator whether the amendment as reported in this bill was originally reported in the bill, or is it one of the four hundred amendments?

Mr. PLATT. It is one of the four hundred.

Mr. CULLOM. Did the bill as originally reported contain the provision as it came from the House?

Mr. PLATT. It did.

Mr. CULLOM. So the Senate committee reported in favor of the provision as it came from the House?

Mr. PLATT. They did.

Mr. CULLOM. Then the subcommittee reported an amendment in the batch of four hundred changing it, and now they propose to put it back.

Mr. PLATT. Exactly.

Mr. President, I shall venture to make some observations on this duty. Probably they will be fruitless; and I shall be unable to deal with the subject as I should if I had had any intimation whatever that the committee was not going to adhere to its amendment.

If there is any duty which is a revenue duty, it is the duty on tobacco. We had a discussion on the subject of the duty on sugar as to whether that was a revenue duty or a protective duty. That question might be open to discussion, but that the duty on tobacco is a revenue duty is scarcely open to discussion. It is a revenue duty. I will not say, however, that when a high revenue duty is placed upon tobacco it does not, to some extent, operate as a protective duty. It certainly operates to encourage the growth of leaf tobacco in this country, but it does not operate to largely diminish the importations of leaf tobacco.

The duty on unstemmed leaf tobacco at present is \$2 a pound. I may not be able to state exactly the amount of revenue which has been derived from that duty during the past year, but my impression is that it was about \$5,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1893, and that it will amount to \$5,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1894. Those figures are sufficiently accurate for the purposes of my argument, although I do not pretend that they are precisely accurate. The operation of this provision as it came from the House, and the acceptance of it as it is now proposed by the committee, is to throw away \$2,500,000 a year of revenue, without benefiting any human being.

Mr. CULLOM. In this country.

Mr. PLATT. This revenue harmed nobody in the country except the importers of high-priced Havana cigars, and the duty did not harm them; but an unnecessary and abnormal increase of duty on cigars made at the time when the duty was increased on leaf tobacco did somewhat diminish the importation of high-priced foreign cigars from the year 1890 up to this time, but the imposition of this increased duty upon leaf tobacco harmed no one, and the throwing away of half of it, the throwing away of from \$2,500,000 to \$3,500,000 of revenue every year for the Government will benefit nobody. So, in this respect, it is an absolute revenue duty.

We have been told that the Government needed revenue very much. Why should we throw away this revenue, Mr. President? As on all other items in the bill, we are afforded no explanation whatever. Does not the Government need revenue? Does not the duty on leaf tobacco yield a revenue, which is being received now daily?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator state how much it is proposed to reduce the duty?

Mr. PLATT. From \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000, the duty being reduced just one-half, from \$2 a pound to \$1 a pound. I speak from recollection only, but the amount I give certainly falls within the exact figures.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is that based upon the same quantity of importation?

Mr. PLATT. The same quantity of importation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will not the importations increase?

Mr. PLATT. I do not believe that importations will largely increase. The course of the market seems to show that this importation of leaf tobacco is anomalous. The increase of the duty did not largely diminish the imports, and it is doubtful, at least, if a decrease of the duty would largely increase them.

Do we not receive this revenue? Do we not need it daily? Are not our revenues running behind at the rate of \$6,000,000 a month? Why, then, should we diminish by \$200,000 a month, more or less, the amount of our receipts?

I can not understand it. Without explanation certainly no one can understand it. It is not according to any Democratic principle, if, indeed, there be a Democratic principle upon this subject; and I should like some explanation of the reasons why the committee have changed their minds. After having once changed their minds, subsequent to the report of the Finance Committee, by making this duty a dollar and a half a pound, they have now changed their minds again and gone back to a dollar a pound. The dollar and a half a pound which is recommended by the committee would be a decrease of 25 per cent on the present duty.

There is another view which this action seems very strange,

Mr. President. So far as the effect upon the industries of this country are concerned, the duty of \$2 a pound on leaf tobacco was for the benefit of an agricultural industry, for the benefit of the growers of leaf tobacco used for wrapping cigars. Why this blow should be aimed at an agricultural industry is a matter which may well be inquired into, and exactly why it is that having as it seems in the interest of the agriculturist proposed to raise this duty from a dollar a pound, as left by the House bill, to a dollar and a half a pound, and having proposed to raise the duty on other agricultural products in the bill, the committee should now take it back, unless they are going to take back all the other proposed increases of duty upon agricultural products, I can not understand.

If the committee would inform us that they have concluded that their proposition to increase the duties upon agricultural products in this bill above the rates in the House bill was wrong, was not advisable, and that the taking of this back was only a part of the general plan to take back all the proposed increases on agricultural products, then I suppose our Democratic farmers in Connecticut and elsewhere would say, as the Senators from Louisiana say, "Well, it is pretty hard on us, but we are loyal to the Democratic party, and we must take the medicine which is given us and be content with it;" but do the committee propose to take back all these proposed increases in the duties upon agricultural products which have been proposed by what are known as the Jones amendments? If not, why do they single out this agricultural industry to take back the proposed increase of duty upon it?

Mr. President, the only suggestion that I have ever heard in opposition to the duty of \$2 a pound is on the part of some small cigar-makers in the country who have been persuaded that in some way it operated to their disadvantage. It is not true. They admit, I believe, that it does not operate to the advantage of the large cigar-makers, but they think that in some way it requires a good deal of money to purchase the leaf, and that the small cigar-makers, who have not much capital, are perhaps somewhat embarrassed by having to pay out a larger sum for leaf by reason of the increased duty upon leaf tobacco. That is all I have ever heard in opposition to it, and there can not be very much to that, because the small capital of the small cigar-makers is turned over rapidly. It does not require capital to be advanced and remain a long time before it is turned.

The increase of the duty certainly did not increase the price of domestic cigars in this country. That was a bugaboo at the time the duty was put on, that every person who used cigars in the country would have to pay more for his cigars. That is not true, except in the case of those gentlemen who insist on smoking very high-priced foreign cigars. It is true that the increased duty put on cigars at the same time the increased duty was put on wrapper leaf tobacco increased the price of foreign-made cigars, but it operated to stimulate the American industry and it operated to do another thing. It operated to improve the quality of American-made cigars.

Unlike sugar, tobacco is a luxury. Cigars are a luxury, and men need not use them. A man need not use tobacco if he does not wish to. He can abstain from the use of it and be better off. It is not a food like sugar. It does not enter into universal use as does sugar. It is not used by man, woman, and child as is sugar. It is a luxury, but luxury as it is the American consumer of cigars has, since the imposition of the duty, got a better quality of American-made cigar for less money than he did before. I go a step further than that. He has been enabled to obtain as good a quality as the best foreign-made imported cigar for about half the price which he formerly paid for the best quality imported foreign cigar.

I think the proposed taking back of the amendment, which we had a right to believe had been fixed, will come with somewhat as much surprise to the Senators from Florida as it will to the Democratic farmers of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin, because upon the increase of the duty upon leaf tobacco, and the increase of the duty upon cigars at the same time, many cigarmakers in Cuba came over to Florida and established in Florida the industry of making precisely the same cigar which had been imported to this country under the highest prices paid for cigars.

If I am not mistaken, the Senators from Florida will say whether I am or not, the result has been the building up not only of the industry but of towns in Florida, until now in Florida they are making about half as many cigars as were formerly imported from Havana. In other words, half of the Havana cigar business has, by the operation of the present duty upon leaf tobacco and cigars, been transferred from Havana to Florida, to the benefit of the people in this country who smoke cigars; that is to say, they are now getting for a half, or a little more than half in price as good a cigar as they formerly got by im-

portation. The result of the proposed change in duty will be to break up all that.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me? The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. VEST. It is useless to disguise the fact that great difference of opinion exists upon this side of the Chamber even in regard to this duty. It is true, as the Senator from Connecticut says, that tobacco is an article of luxury and that it is largely a question of revenue. If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to make a very brief statement, the facts will justify the difference of opinion which exists.

Two dollars a pound on wrapper leaf tobacco will be an equivalent of 238 per cent, and that is the duty in the McKinley act. If we make it \$1 a pound, one-half, the duty of course is 119 per cent. We imported in 1893 \$1,979,657 worth of Sumatra tobacco. We exported in 1893 \$22,292,704 worth of leaf tobacco. We imported from the Netherlands 5,372,292 pounds. We exported to the Netherlands 13,528,530 pounds, and of stems and trimmings \$92,220 worth or 4,639,718 pounds.

Mr. PASCO. Has the Senator from Missouri the figures as to the duty collected upon the amount imported in 1893?

Mr. VEST. No; but they can easily be had.

Mr. PASCO. It amounts to \$10,749,530.

Mr. VEST. I simply read these statistics to show that, so far as the interests are concerned in this country, so far as protection, to speak plainly, is concerned, there is no necessity for these high duties. We export a vastly larger amount than we import.

Mr. PLATT. As the Senator from Missouri is interrupting me, will he allow an interruption from me right there?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. The export is of that kind of tobacco which is made into plugs, which this duty does not touch.

Mr. VEST. The exports include a large quantity of leaf tobacco that we export also.

Mr. PLATT. We export no leaf tobacco for cigars.

Mr. VEST. We export some leaf tobacco unquestionably.

Mr. PLATT. Not to speak of.

Mr. VEST. And we export a large quantity of plug tobacco and smoking tobacco cut up, used in pipes and otherwise. But I did not care to go into the discussion. A difference of opinion exists with us upon this side in regard to this duty without undertaking to say what exists upon the other side, and I make this suggestion—my colleague on the committee was entirely authorized to make the report—that we go back to the House provision; and I suggest that we now consider the amendments as made and before the Senate; in other words, that we go back to the House provision, and this matter afterwards can be considered if necessary in the Senate. I make this suggestion to go back to the House provision in order to save time and to prevent the lengthy debate which is inevitable if the motion to amend now made is pressed.

Mr. PLATT. I think that proposition is very right and fair. I would have made it myself if I had thought it would in any way be accepted. But to fix this matter now so that it is to remain, and there is to be no contention between the House and the Senate, and it is to be considered as fixed, I felt would be a very decided injustice. If the amendment of the committee can be adopted *pro forma* and let us look this matter up and get our statistics together and discuss it when the bill comes into the Senate, I shall be quite content.

Mr. VEST. I make the suggestion at the instance of my colleague on the committee for two reasons: First, to save time; and second, because the amendments were put before the Senate suddenly this morning and might have taken Senators interested in the matter upon both sides of the Chamber by surprise.

Mr. PLATT. It certainly did.

Mr. VEST. We can afterwards consider this matter if necessary in the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands from the Senator from Missouri that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas is withdrawn.

Mr. VEST. It is withdrawn, and we are to consider the text of the bill before the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not think the Senator from Missouri expressed it exactly.

Mr. VEST. Not all the amendments are withdrawn.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was directed by the majority of the members of the Finance Committee to change the proposed amendment and reduce the rate from \$1.50 to \$1 a pound, and instead of \$2.25 to make it \$1.25, retaining the phraseology of the amendment as it was proposed, and not returning to the phraseology of the House provision.

Mr. CULLOM. Simply changing the amount of duty?  
Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Restoring it to what was proposed by the committee in the first place.

Mr. PLATT. Can we have consent now that the amendment as originally proposed shall be pro forma adopted, with the understanding that this matter is to come up again when it comes into the Senate?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is exactly the proposition.

Mr. PASCO. The Jones amendment.

Mr. PLATT. I think that is fair all around.

Mr. VEST. That is now before the Senate in the text of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Yes; because we would have a struggle about this if it were insisted upon at this time.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am very glad to hear the proposition made by the Senator from Missouri. I think it is in the interest of fair play. That is all I desire to say about it.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am very earnestly in favor of returning to the bill on this point as it came from the House of Representatives; but when the Senator from Connecticut expressed his surprise it occurred to me for the first time that perhaps sufficient notice had not been given to those interested in a different view of the subject. I suggested then that it might be well that this matter in some way or form might go over until a later date, when we could take it up after fuller consideration than it has this morning and without impeding the progress of business. I say this much because I desire to define my own position in regard to the question itself.

I do not believe that the duty on this quality of tobacco ought to be as high as is proposed by the amendments which are before this body, and I would gladly return to the provisions of the bill as it came from the other House. At the same time I entirely concur with the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas as to the matter going over for the present.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to place on record a request of Cigar Makers' Local Union, No. 56, of Leavenworth, Kans., asking that in the arrangement of the provisions of the pending bill all leaf tobacco or such part thereof as is commonly known as wrapper tobacco and suitable for cigar wrappers, if unstemmed, shall be placed at \$1 per pound, and if stemmed at \$1.25 per pound.

Mr. PLATT. There have been quite a number of similar petitions from small local cigar unions in the United States, and, as I said, I believe they are based upon a total misconception of the facts.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not at all familiar with the business of cigar making nor with cigar smoking, indeed, but I thought it was fair to this union that their request should be placed upon record at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Connecticut yielded the floor?

Mr. PLATT. I have not yet, but if the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri can be adopted I shall be very glad to sit down.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume there is no objection to that.

Mr. ALDRICH. There seems to be more or less harmony in regard to this question, but the harmony is a little confusing to people not in the small circle who have been considering the matter. I should be glad to have the Secretary read the amendment which it is proposed to adopt in Committee of the Whole. I must confess that I was not able to follow the statement made by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 184 and insert:

Wrapper tobacco, unstemmed, imported in any bale, box, package, or in bulk, \$1.50 per pound; if stemmed, \$2.25 per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is that all the amendment?

Mr. PLATT. It is all as to that point.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is all of it.

Mr. PASCO. I am glad that this arrangement is going to be made. This is a subject which a great many people in my State are interested in. I wish to put into the RECORD a table of imports of leaf tobacco from The Netherlands since 1885, showing that the high duty upon tobacco has not prevented importation; on the contrary, the amount imported has for some time been on the increase, and the duty at the existing rate is really a revenue duty. The amount collected on the imports from The Netherlands in 1893 amounted to \$10,749,530. I should like to put the table in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. PASCO. I am glad the matter is going over. I submit the table.

Imports of leaf tobacco from The Netherlands during each fiscal year ending June 30, from 1885 to 1893, inclusive.

Years.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Rate of duty in cents per pound.		Duty.
1885	2,217,919	\$1,881,494	50	52	\$1,153,317.88
1886	4,000,519	3,394,156	55	52	2,080,269.88
1887	4,213,336	3,651,349	55	52	2,190,934.72
1888	5,861,472	5,634,765	55	52	3,047,965.44
1889	5,024,455	4,333,463	55	52	2,612,716.60
1890	9,734,999	9,037,388	55	52	4,003,199.48
1891	4,908,545	4,682,493	200	200	9,817,060.00
1892	2,661,932	1,899,721	200	200	5,323,864.00
1893	5,374,765	5,078,315	200	200	10,749,530.00

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which has been read.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to ask the Senator in charge of this bill whether the committee are agreed as respects the phraseology of the amendment, or whether it is the wish of the Senator from Indiana, who expressed just now a view in favor of the reduction of the rate to the House provision, to go back to the House provision or retain the phraseology of the Senate amendment, with the rates at \$1 and \$1.25 a pound? I think the phraseology is very important as respects this item.

Mr. VOORHEES. I have no criticism to make upon the phraseology of the Senate amendment. It is simply the rate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My understanding is that the phraseology of the amendment was prepared by officials of the Treasury Department to meet decisions that have been had in suits on the tobacco schedule as it exists in the present law.

Mr. PLATT. The phraseology of paragraphs 184 and 185 needs to be taken together as a completed whole.

Mr. ALLISON. The phraseology of the House provision, wherein it provides "on such part thereof as is wrapper tobacco and suitable for cigar wrappers" is entirely too vague. There is no doubt about the phraseology of the Senate amendment being the proper phraseology as respects the characterization of the tobacco. Wrapper tobacco has a distinct signification.

Mr. PLATT. As explained in the amendment to paragraph 185. It is supposed that it will prevent fraud?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. Of course the two provisions go together.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be glad also to ask the Senator from Missouri whether there is any dispute as to the amendment proposed to paragraph 185?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. None at all.

Mr. VEST. I do not know of any.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that it is very apt phraseology, and it ought to be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. BERRY and others. Question!

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas as a substitute for paragraph 184.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

185. All other leaf tobacco, if unstemmed, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out paragraph 185 and insert what follows, printed in small type.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 185 and insert—

185. Filler tobacco, unstemmed, imported in any bale, box, package, or in bulk, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound: *Provided*, That the term wrapper tobacco, whenever used in this act, shall be taken to mean that quality of leaf tobacco known commercially as wrapper tobacco: *Provided further*, That the term filler tobacco, whenever used in this act, shall be taken to mean all leaf tobacco unmanufactured, not commercially known as wrapper tobacco: *Provided further*, That if any leaf tobacco imported in any bale, box, package, or in bulk shall be the growth of different countries, or shall differ in quality and value, save as provided in the succeeding provision, then the entire contents of such bale, box, package, or in bulk shall be subject to the same duty as wrapper tobacco: *Provided further*, That if any bale, box, package, or bulk of leaf tobacco of uniform quality contains exceeding 15 per cent thereof of leaves suitable in color, fineness of texture, and size for wrappers for cigars, then the entire contents of such bale, box, package, or bulk shall be subject to the same duty as wrapper tobacco: *Provided further*, That collectors shall not permit entry to be made, except under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, of any leaf tobacco imported in any bale, box, package, or in bulk, unless the invoices covering the same shall specify in detail the character of the leaf tobacco in such bale, box, package, or in bulk, whether wrapper or filler tobacco, Quebrado or self-working bales, as the case may be: *And provided further*, That in the examination for classification of any invoice of imported leaf tobacco at least one bale if less than ten bales, and one bale in every ten bales and more, if deemed necessary by the appraising officer, shall be examined by the appraiser or person authorized by law to make such examination, and for the purpose of fixing the classification and amount of duty chargeable on such invoice of leaf tobacco the examination of ten hands out of each examined bale thereof shall be taken to be a legal examination.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the next paragraph.

The Secretary read as follows:

186. Tobacco, manufactured or unmanufactured, of all descriptions, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 cents per pound.

Mr. ALLISON. There seems to be a change from the existing law by the insertion of the words "or manufactured," placing unmanufactured tobacco of all descriptions at 40 cents a pound. The existing law provides for all other leaf tobacco manufactured and not stemmed 35 cents a pound, and if stemmed 50 cents a pound. There would seem to be a proper distinction in the law between stemmed and unstemmed tobacco, whereas in this paragraph tobacco manufactured or unmanufactured, whether stemmed or unstemmed, is to have a uniform rate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand that the suggestion to insert the word "unmanufactured" in the paragraph came about on account of certain administrative difficulties. I understand that there has been recently a suit decided about scrap leaf tobacco; that it has been held it was not manufactured tobacco and was not included under the paragraph relating to manufactured tobacco, though it had been so held by the customs officers and was perhaps so intended. The word "unmanufactured" was put in to include scrap leaf tobacco, which I understand is an article considerably imported and about which there has been considerable difficulty in the administration of the law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

187. Snuff and snuff flour, manufactured of tobacco, ground dry or damp, and pickled, scented, or otherwise, of all descriptions, 40 cents per pound.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out "forty" and insert "fifty" in line 25 after the word "descriptions;" so as to read, "50 cents per pound."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

188. Cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes of all kinds, including wrappers, \$3 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move to strike out paragraph 188 and insert:

188. Cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots of all kinds, \$4 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem; and paper cigars and cigarettes, including wrappers, shall be subject to the same duties as are herein imposed upon cigars.

Mr. PLATT. That is the present rate, is it not?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, sir; the same rate.

Mr. PLATT. It is the present rate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The Secretary read as follows:

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

Animals, live:

189. All live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HALE. I move to strike out the paragraph just read and insert instead paragraphs 247, 248, 249, and 250, as found in the large volume.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that the paragraphs in the present law be taken separately, in order that there may be some discussion on each one.

Mr. HALE. I am entirely willing to do that. The committee has reported one general sweeping clause covering all the animals which are provided for in the present law at different rates. I move first to insert:

Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

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

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 189 in the following words:

All live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem—

And insert—

Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HALE. After the vote is taken upon this amendment I shall move to follow it with hogs, cattle, and sheep. I will simply state that the duty proposed in the amendment which I have offered is the present rate of duty.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, under the provisions of the existing law the importation of horses has been constantly in-

creasing. The value of the horses imported in 1891 was \$772,600; in 1892, \$974,000, and in 1893, \$1,164,000. The revenue derived from the duty on horses in 1891 was \$228,000; in 1892, \$307,000, and in 1893, \$367,000. If the rate suggested by the committee should prevail, the revenue to be derived from the importation of horses will be reduced \$135,000 on the basis of the importations of 1893. I can see no good public reason why the revenue from the importation of horses should be reduced \$135,000.

Mr. CULLOM. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island believe that the duty ought to be increased even above the present law?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt that the interest of the people of the United States would be served by an increase of the duty over the present law, instead of the large reduction that is now proposed by the majority of the committee.

The quality and kinds of horses imported are brought in direct competition with the horses which are raised in the United States all along the Canadian border, and this change of duty is a direct blow to the farmers and other people engaged in the raising of horses in the United States. Senators upon the other side have been voting to impose revenue duties of from 40 to 80 or 100 per cent upon certain articles and products, but when we get to the agricultural schedule, the interests of the farmers of the United States, who have had no special representatives here pleading with the majority of the committee, are stricken down and a revenue duty of 20 per cent seems to be sufficient for their purposes. It is another of the glaring inconsistencies of the bill and an evidence of the determination of the Democratic majority in this Chamber to strike down the agricultural interests of the country whenever and wherever they can do so.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I live where I am compelled to know something about the matters now under consideration by the Senate, and I affirm without any hesitation that the existing law has worked admirably. No man to-day in Canada can afford to send to the United States a cheap horse, a poor one, one of low character, because he is compelled to pay \$30, and he knows that he must pay the \$30 every time. He never raises the question which is so frequently raised in the United States. The Canadian admits that there is a duty of \$30 on a horse, and when he sends a horse to the United States he pays the \$30. The consequence is that we are now receiving from Canada no poor horses.

There are very large numbers imported into my city. We are right on the line of the railroad from Canada. Every week consignments arrive, and the character of the horses has improved more than 50 per cent under the existing law. I can not see any reason why the duty should be reduced. More revenue will not be obtained. Take the duty provided for in the bill, 20 per cent. Hardly a horse will come that will be valued at over \$50. You will only get \$10 on a horse, and we shall go back to the cheap class of horses we were receiving from Canada ten years ago. I hoped that the committee would consent, if they believed the duty of \$30 required some reduction, to a duty of \$25 each on horses and mules.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, there is a good deal of pretense, to use no stronger term, in this solicitude for the agricultural interest of the United States, in the import duties upon agricultural products, and especially live animals. Every intelligent man, especially if he lives in a cattle and horse producing country, knows how much of this pretense there is.

The Treasury reports show very emphatically and distinctly what is the effect of any duty, and what are the relative interests of the United States and foreign countries in regard to these products. The reports show that of horses we imported in 1893 12,500 head, valued at \$1,252,185, which would be an average of about \$95 a head, the whole importation amounting to 12,500 head of horses. We exported \$718,000 worth. We imported 6 mules altogether in 1893 and exported 1,634. Of cattle we imported \$23,503 worth in 1893 and exported \$26,032,432 worth.

Mr. ALDRICH. Live animals?

Mr. VEST. Of cattle.

Mr. HALE. Live cattle?

Mr. VEST. Yes, live cattle; and I suppose this includes also the meat or flesh.

Mr. HALE. The Senator must be wrong.

Mr. VEST. Of animals we exported \$26,032,428 worth.

Mr. ALDRICH. That can not be live animals. It must be dressed beef.

Mr. VEST. I gave the amount in dollars. In number there were 287,494.

Mr. HALE. Of live animals?

Mr. VEST. I have read the report. The Senator can put his own construction on it.

Mr. HALE. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. VEST. The Treasury report, exports and imports. Of hogs we imported \$211,241 worth, and we exported \$397,162 worth. Of sheep we imported \$1,571,476 worth. We exported

\$126,394 worth. Of all other animals we imported \$39,025 worth and exported \$43,116 worth.

Now, in the McKinley act the duty imposed upon these different animals is as follows: \$30 a head on all horses up to \$150 in value, and on all horses above \$150 in value 30 per cent ad valorem; on cattle up to 1 year old \$2, over 1 year old \$10; on hogs \$1.50 per head; on sheep up to 1 year old 75 cents, over 1 year old \$1.50; on all other animals 20 per cent. We propose to make the duty upon all these animals 20 per cent. So the difference between the McKinley act and the proposed amendment on horses valued at \$150 is only 10 per cent.

Mr. President, I do not propose to go into the question as to what will be the effect of reducing duties on the amount collected. There is a vast difference of opinion amongst gentlemen who claim to be experts upon this question in regard to that matter. I am inclined to the opinion that the reduction of the duties would increase the imports; but very high authority can be found upon the other side. As to the protection generally to the agricultural interests of the United States it is a myth, not to say an absolute fraud. It is like the pretense of protecting wheat and rye and barley when we export, for instance, 100,000,000 bushels and import 1,000 bushels for seed. Yet our friends, in 1890, appealed to the agricultural interests of the country, because they said they had protected the wheat and barley and rye of the United States from foreign competition. It was a poor commentary upon the intelligence of the farmers of this country, and the result of the election in 1892 showed that the farmers of the United States had detected the imposture and resented it at the polls.

Mr. ALDRICH. How about the farmers of Oregon?

Mr. VEST. Oh, Mr. President, "the Dutch have carried Holland."

Mr. HALE. And carried it by a larger majority than ever.

Mr. VEST. Our friends upon the other side are now, I suppose, preparing to cackle over this egg which has been in their nest all the time.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me, I will state that there is not on this side, to use the elegant word of the Senator from Missouri, any disposition to cackle over the Oregon victory—

Mr. VEST. I thought I heard a cackle from the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HALE. Because it is simply one in a succession of triumphs which have been won by the Republican party ever since the Senator and his associates sat down to frame the pending bill; and we are so used to these returns, showing that what was claimed to be the political result that settled this question in 1892 is being considered now as a sober second thought by the people. The evidences are so great and so universal that this side is not inclined to cackle over it. It expects new victories every time there is an election, and will continue to expect them until next November.

The Senator from Missouri of course realizes, and his party associates do, that what they claimed to be the verdict of the people in 1892, to which he has referred and thereby opened this discussion—the voice of the people, the farmers, and otherwise in 1892—is now all being set back and reversed by the elections of this year.

Mr. VEST. After the very interesting stump speech of the Senator from Maine I hope we can return to business.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Missouri started it.

Mr. VEST. I did not start it. I said nothing about Oregon.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Missouri referred to the farmers.

Mr. VEST. I am perfectly content with the old maxim, which I believe we got from the Spaniards, "He laughs best who laughs last."

Mr. ALDRICH. We are laughing last at present.

Mr. VEST. We shall see what is the deliberate verdict of the people of the United States. Whether my career in this Chamber be long or short (and I am rather indifferent as to that), and without putting myself amongst the prophets, I wish to make this statement, and I believe it and am certain of it, and time will prove its correctness. Protection as advocated by the other side of the Chamber is doomed. Depression, financial and otherwise, may for a time retard tariff reform, but the system of protection is marked for destruction. It is as certain as that this country is in existence to-day and will continue to exist.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me?

Mr. VEST. I prefer, if the Senator pleases, with all courtesy to him, that he deliver his political address in his own time.

Mr. HALE. I shall not interrupt the Senator further. The Senator himself brought the discussion on by referring to the election of 1892, and stating how the farmers of the country had put their foot of disapprobation on what the Senator calls the

false pretense of protection in relation to them. I do not fancy that we shall be led into a long political debate on this subject.

Mr. VEST. I will yield the floor to the Senator if he wants a political debate. However, I shall not take part in it.

Mr. HALE. I merely wish to say in response to the Senator as to his firm conviction that protection is doomed in the future, that may be; time alone will tell; but we on this side of the Chamber believe that the doctrine of protection to American labor which is to be crystallized into formal and appropriate laws upon our statute books has gained more during the present session of Congress than in years past; that the manifestations which have come from the other side, the attempts which have been made on their part to make a bill not based upon protection, the utter and deplorable failure of their whole programme, are so firmly fixed in the minds of the people that not only the elections this year, but the elections in years to come will show that American protection stands higher and stronger in the minds of the American people than ever before. I say that in offset to the Senator's declaration. He is as earnest in his views as I am, and undoubtedly believes in them as strongly as I do in mine. Time alone can tell.

Mr. VEST. Just a single word and I shall be done. So far as the operations of the high import duties upon animals are concerned, they may have some effect along the Canadian border. As to the general agricultural interest of the country, they have no effect at all, unless it be (and it is quite an important one, especially in the great West, where I live) to exclude from the country animals which may be used in certain specific agricultural pursuits. For instance, take the effect of the McKinley act upon that peculiar breed of animals, of horses which are used in Texas and along the Mexican frontier. The Mexican ponies inherit the instinct of herding cattle just as the collie dog inherits the instinct for herding sheep. Every man who has any experience in that portion of the country knows that there is no animal so invaluable to the cattle herder in Texas as the Mexican pony, which can be bought for \$5, \$8, and \$10 a head.

What is the result of the McKinley act upon that specific interest? You can not bring into this country from Mexico, where those animals are bred, a Mexican pony for herding purposes for less than \$30. They are worth only \$5 and the duty is \$30, or six times as much. That is what the McKinley act did.

Mr. HALE. What is the duty on mules under the McKinley act?

Mr. VEST. Thirty dollars per head on horses up to \$150 in value, and then 30 per cent ad valorem above that. That is the present law. You can not introduce a Mexican pony worth from \$5 to \$10 into this country without paying \$30 duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the country suffering on account of the want of the introduction of Mexican ponies?

Mr. VEST. My facetious friend from Rhode Island always goes to the extreme. Now, he uses the word "suffering." I do not know that the people are emaciated and dying in the chaparrals along the plains, but I know one thing in my personal experience upon a ranch in Texas, which I am unfortunate enough to own. For three of those ponies I had to pay some \$35 apiece, when they were really worth \$10 apiece.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether they were worth that amount when he got them?

Mr. VEST. I think they were, because you can not get other horses to do the same work. Yet if I could have brought them into this country at a reasonable rate of duty I should have saved \$75. But I am a patriot, and I paid it as a tribute to the genius of my friend from Rhode Island, who invented the law of 1890. That is the only effect of the McKinley duties as to the farmers generally in the country. They understand it. It is a humbug from the beginning, and you can not sprinkle hay seed in your hair and go to the farmers of the West and by any such pretense win their votes.

Mr. COKE. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me for a moment?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. COKE. I will state that the McKinley act has completely suppressed all forms of commerce in live stock on the Rio Grande.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Texas is right, and I know what he says to be true.

Mr. COKE. It has completely suppressed it.

Mr. ALDRICH. We can not hear what the Senator from Texas says.

Mr. HOAR. Will not the Senator from Texas repeat his statement?

Mr. COKE. I stated that the duties under the McKinley law have completely destroyed all commerce in livestock on the Rio Grande. That is a well-known fact. We can not import cattle, horses, or any other sort of stock under the law without paying a heavier duty than the stock is worth.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator from Texas whether the production of those animals in Texas is not stimulated by the law, and do not the figures and the Senator's own observation show it is increasing in his own State by reason of that practical prohibition? Do not his people raise more horses and ponies?

Mr. COKE. We do raise stock of all sorts in Texas, but the people of Texas want commerce with their neighbors, so that they can exchange their products.

Mr. HALE. That does not precisely answer my question.

Mr. COKE. They do not wish to be entirely shut off from Mexico. I presume the people of New Mexico and California are similarly situated.

Mr. HALE. Has not the production of those animals in Texas increased very largely in the last three or four years?

Mr. COKE. I do not think it has.

Mr. CAREY. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to ask the Senator from Texas a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. CAREY. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether the prices in Texas of the class of horses he is speaking about are too high to suit the producer?

Mr. COKE. I am not an expert about the prices of stock there; but I state the general proposition to be a fact, that there is no trading on the two sides of the Rio Grande. Since the McKinley law has been in force no cattle, no horses, no sheep, no hogs, no live animals at all have been brought across the border unless they have been smuggled.

Mr. CAREY. Does not the Senator know that because of the increased production in the United States of cow ponies, carriage horses, coach horses, and all kinds of other horses in connection with the disuse of horses for many purposes, the price of horses in the United States has been reduced from 50 to 100 per cent during the last two years?

Mr. COKE. Does the Senator ask if I know that to be a fact?

Mr. CAREY. Yes.

Mr. COKE. My reply is that I do not know any such thing.

Mr. CAREY. The Senator does not know anything about the subject?

Mr. COKE. I know that all kinds of stock and property of every character and description have gone down in value, and I suppose horses have gone down in the same way, but in no greater proportion.

Mr. CAREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I am somewhat familiar with the prices of horses. I know of one herd of horses where there were four or five thousand head two or three years ago, bred with thoroughbred stallions, using what are known as the plain brood mares. For the last two or three months they have been retailing out fine horses, wellbred, with all the endurance of horses that are raised in Texas and on the plains, for \$20 a head. You can buy whole bands of horses similar to the kind that are raised in the State of Texas to-day for \$10 a head. I can show the Senator from Texas such herds of horses if he desires to buy them.

Mr. COKE. All I have to say in reply to the Senator is that he can not designate any sort of property in the South and West that has not fallen exactly in the same proportion. The decrease in value is not peculiar to horses, and not peculiar to any kind of stock. Cattle are as much depressed as horses, sheep are as much depressed as either, and hogs and all kinds of live stock, and indeed property of every description, have gone down in precisely the same proportion.

Mr. CAREY. With the permission of the Senator from Missouri I want to state—and I know this to be a fact—that in the State of Texas the average herds of cattle are worth all the way from seven to fourteen dollars a head. That is what the Northern purchaser has to pay in Texas. You can go into Mexico to-day and you can buy the same class of cattle, and just as good, for \$4 a head, and buy them in Mexican money; in other words, you can exchange your United States silver certificates on the border line of Texas for Mexican money, and buy animals in Texas for \$4 a head.

Mr. COKE. Perhaps you could exchange some wheat for them, too, which would increase the price of wheat.

Mr. CAREY. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. VEST. It seems to me the Senator from Wyoming proves too much for his side of the question. We were told in 1890, as I recollect very distinctly, that these duties were put upon live animals and other agricultural products in order to give a better market and better prices to the farmers of the United States. It seems that the McKinley act has not had that operation, according to the Senator from Wyoming, and that all these products have gone down until they are at ruinously low prices to-day.

I happen to know something about prices in Mexico and in Texas; and the Senator states the case too strongly when he

says you can buy cattle of the same sort in Mexico for \$4 that you pay ten, twelve, or fourteen dollars for in the United States. They are a different sort of cattle entirely. Climate makes the greatest difference in the world and breed makes all the difference everywhere; and it is the same way with Mexican horses. We never saw the time when we could raise ponies in Texas, in that great Southwestern plain country, for anything like the price they could be brought in from Mexico, leaving off the duty. I have seen the time when herds of ponies came into Missouri and you could take your choice for a five-dollar bill and take the best pony in the herd. All that went away when we passed the McKinley bill, and nobody could bring in ponies paying \$30 apiece in order to cross the Rio Grande. They were shut out of the country.

Mr. CAREY. You want to shut them out and produce the same kind here.

Mr. VEST. No; we do not raise the same kind, and we can not do it at the same prices. The result of the McKinley act was that you absolutely shut off all commerce and all commercial relations between the two countries, and the herdsmen who could previously buy these ponies, which were the finest animals in the world for the purposes for which they were used, for five, six, or eight dollars, could not buy them at all, and they had to take half-breed American horses or the cheap American horses which were raised in Texas. That was the only result of it.

It might be added to what the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] has testified in regard to the effect of the McKinley act upon horses and cattle, that it has absolutely destroyed all other commerce between the two countries. Mexico immediately retaliated by putting up her duties upon all American imports, so that we were shut off from that market, and it was made absolutely impossible to get necessary articles from Mexico, and this was hailed, *in triumph*, as a great commercial victory. I do not see it, and I have never been able to see it.

Mr. FRYE. As I understand it, in the interests of the ranchmen of Texas the interests of the upper tier of States—Maine, New York, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and so along the northern border—are to be sacrificed.

Mr. VEST. No, Mr. President, we put 20 per cent duty on all these importations. I would make the Maine man pay what the Texas man pays, and I would put the duty on according to value. I would not put \$30 on a five-dollar horse and \$30 on a one hundred and fifty dollar horse; but I would put the 20 per cent on all of them, and let the law operate, as it ought to do in every free country, justly and equitably.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator allow me to offer an amendment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to propose an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], which is to add at the end of the paragraph these words:

*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to that class of horses commonly known as ponies, raised chiefly in Mexico.

I agree with most of what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] have said, that this class of horses are not considered valuable for farming purposes. They are used chiefly for herding and by families for the use of the little people and the women, but they are not raised by the farmers of Kansas or of Nebraska or of Missouri, or any of the great grain-growing States anywhere in this country. So they might very safely be admitted free of duty, and yet not interfere with the business of horse raising or of farming anywhere in the country. The only reason why a duty might be imposed upon them at all would be for revenue purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the amendment:

*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to that class of horses commonly known as ponies, raised chiefly in Mexico.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the explanation of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] shows that we have struck another item where a Southern interest is cared for to the detriment of a Northern interest. This whole 20 per cent rate which is covered by the bill is important because it is needed to apply to that local, narrow industry in Texas, which the Senator has described and which has been certified to by the senior Senator from that State [Mr. COKE].

I suppose we shall find them all through the bill, but until the explanation of the Senator from Missouri, backed up by the Senator from Texas, I had not discovered what was at the bottom of this 20 per cent duty on live animals. It is to care for the herdsmen and the farmers, if you choose, the users of the small Mexican pony, which is a low grade animal and comes in cheap; and for that purpose the immense productions of valuable live ani-

imals and horses along our whole northern border are to be thrown open to the competition of our Canadian rivals.

Mr. COKE. I will suggest to the Senator, if he will permit me, that New Mexico, Arizona, and California are equally interested with Texas in this provision.

Mr. HALE. I do not know how far it extends, but certainly as shown here in the Senate it seems to be a peculiarly local matter applying to Texas, and the Senators from the far Western States do not agree with the Senator in this respect.

Mr. President, the main thing I rose to say is this: The Senator, in caring for his Texas friends, is overreaching himself in his provision when it is applied to horses on the Northern border. He will get no revenue out of this 20 per cent, for the reason that on all the lower grade horses which can be poured in, driving our own production out, the rate of valuation will be so small. There is nothing in which undervaluation is more practicable and can be more easily carried out than upon the article of horses.

The Canadian stock horses will be invoiced at \$20, \$25, or \$30 a head, and the duty of 20 per cent will amount to nothing; the Senator will get no revenue. He had better put the duty at some specific rate. If the amendment of the Senator from Kansas is carried, then, looking at the matter broad and large upon both sections, the Senator will get his revenue by specific rates upon the lower kind of Northern horses, and will get his 20 per cent upon the Mexican ponies which are brought over; but 20 per cent applied, with the system of undervaluation which will be found to be in vogue every day, will not only destroy the great and stimulated growth of horses which has taken place upon our side within the last three or four years, but you will get no revenue; the country will be filled with the Canadian poorer kind of horses, the Government will get nothing at all, and the 20 per cent will be of no account, and will not figure in the duties.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. President, I am somewhat surprised at the amendment as offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER]. I am familiar with the horse business of the West. In all the Rocky Mountain States, as well as in Western Nebraska and Kansas and in the Pacific coast States, they produce all kinds of animals, small and large, and ponies in all respects as perfect as any which are raised in Mexico. Indeed it has been made a business in some sections of the West to raise the small class of horses and ponies. I have bought hundreds of horses, which have been brought from Texas and sold as Texas horses, which I knew when I was buying them were Mexican horses. You can tell by the brands, which represent very much a map of the United States. I have no doubt that my friend from Texas [Mr. COKE] is familiar with the brands. The persons from whom I purchased sold them as Texas horses, and I bought them as Texas horses, paying Texas prices.

The reason Texas wants this barrier taken away is that the citizens of that State can import those ponies, I suppose, and sell them as Texas ponies. Any man who watches the market of live stock in the United States—not the price which is paid in the retail market, but the price which is paid in the wholesale market—must conclude that we do not need any more live stock, certainly of the common order, in the United States.

You have to pay high prices, it is true, in the retail market for your beef, but the man who produces it to-day scarcely gets enough money out of it to pay for raising it.

This is true of stock-growers and farmers in Missouri as well as in Texas and other places in this country. The meat market to-day is absolutely and entirely in the control of trusts; you may call them by the name of trusts, for four or five firms control the meat product of the United States. The meat is as much in the hands of a trust and combine as sugar will be after the passage of the pending bill.

We do not need any more cattle in this country at present, we do not need any more horses in this country at present, because there is a great overproduction of all classes of this kind of stock.

We raise in the West certainly as good stock as is raised in Mexico, and we raise some in the West just as poor as is raised in Mexico. We produce in California horses of exactly the same quality as are produced in Mexico; we produce them in Arizona, we produce them in Texas, we produce them in Wyoming, in Colorado, in Idaho, in Oregon, indeed in all of that section of that great stock-growing country. Only a few years ago there were no horses of any account in many of those Western States. Now there are great herds of horses, numbering thousands in each herd. The business grew up rapidly; men invested large sums of money in horses; they imported horses of expensive quality, which the McKinley bill was passed, as I understand, to encourage as much as it was passed to discourage the importation of the poorer class of horses.

Now, it is proposed to remove this duty, so that, as has been stated by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], you can go over

into Canada and probably get horses into this country at an expense of 20 per cent on a \$50 horse, which has been heretofore sold perhaps as high as \$200 or \$250 in the market. There is no way to regulate this valuation under the ad valorem system. I have explained that you can go into Mexico and get into this market the best cattle they produce down there, very much like the Texas cattle, for 20 per cent on \$2 a head, or 40 cents a head. So the result of this provision in the bill is simply that you break down the prices of live stock in the West, while you increase the prices of cattle and horses in Mexico.

I have as a citizen of the United States a great deal more interest in the people of the West than I have in those of Mexico. I have a great deal more interest in those people than I have in gratifying the desire of the people of Texas to be able to trade with a foreign country without the obstruction of tariff duties.

It is somewhat singular that under this bill framed by the Democratic party, which has talked to the farmers of the West about the outrages committed by the Republican party, that they have framed it all the way through, from the commencement to the end, against the interests of the West, and the only interests which have been served in the framing of the bill, so far as agricultural interests are concerned, are those which directly affect the Southern States.

We have heard much during the last four or five months about a great combination between the South and the Northwest. If anybody has ever been crazy enough to think such a thing was possible, I think when he reads this tariff bill, which will probably become a tariff law, he will banish every such thought, and will give up every such desire, if he has ever had such.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Democratic farmers of the country, when they contrast party professions and the promises of Democratic platforms and orators with the provisions of this bill, must have a very confused notion of the real nature of the tariff reform for which they have voted. This will be especially true of the Democratic farmers of the North, when they see that the knife has been applied mercilessly to every interest which they have, and that the duties upon the articles in which they are interested have been reduced enormously, while upon the articles which they buy in many cases the duties have been increased. When they compare the rates imposed upon Northern agricultural products with the rates which are imposed upon Southern agricultural products, certainly their faith in the party which they have supported must very greatly diminish.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to a few cases of the nature to which I have alluded. The duty upon horses is reduced from \$30 a head to 20 per cent ad valorem. I think it will be impossible for the Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator, to convince the farmers who are engaged in raising horses all along the northern frontier that an importation amounting in value to \$1,164,000 a year does not bring into the United States horses which compete with those they produce, and that a reduction of the rate of duty will not, to that extent, increase the competition and reduce the selling price of the horses which they put upon the market.

This bill imposes a duty upon sugar, a Southern agricultural product, of 40 per cent ad valorem, while the duties imposed upon Northern agricultural products are on an average 20 per cent ad valorem. This bill imposes a duty upon rice of more than 80 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. VEST. What did you impose in the McKinley law?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about the McKinley law. I am talking about the provisions of the bill the Senator from Missouri presents to the Senate.

Mr. VEST. You are complaining of the size of the duties we have reduced, and yet you say we are discriminating in favor of the South.

Mr. ALDRICH. You are discriminating in favor of the South, for the reason that you have reduced the duties upon the agricultural products of the North very largely, and in this case more than one-half.

Mr. VEST. How about rice?

Mr. ALDRICH. You have left it substantially as it now is.

Mr. VEST. Not at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. You have made no substantial reduction in the duty on rice.

Mr. VEST. That is a statement of fact which will be seen to be not true by turning to the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. We shall reach the duty on rice before a great while, and I shall then be glad to discuss that question with the Senator. I am only now calling attention to the great discriminations made in this bill in favor of the agricultural products of the South as against the agricultural products of the North.

Take another aspect of this question. When the intelligent farmer finds the duties upon all his products reduced, or that

they are placed upon the free list, and finds a duty imposed on coal of 40 per cent ad valorem, and a duty imposed upon collars and cuffs of 80 per cent ad valorem, and the duties placed on a large number of the articles which he buys of three, four, five, eight, or ten times as great as those imposed upon his own product, he will be likely to ascertain the reasons why these discriminations have been made.

It is the same old sectional question over again. The men who prepared this bill are the legitimate and proper successors of Robert J. Walker and the men who prepared the Democratic tariff bills before the war. This bill is prepared along the same line, and for the same purposes. The farmers of the country are intelligent, and I give greater significance than the Senator from Missouri seems inclined to give to the result in Oregon on the day before yesterday. It is true that Oregon has been a Republican State, but the extent of the victory now achieved in that State shows, as plainly as anything can show, that the farmers of the country are aroused, that they understand their real interests. Many farmers in Oregon who heretofore voted the Democratic ticket or the Populist ticket, in this case have supported the Republican party, standing, as it does, squarely upon a protective platform.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I feel it as a duty I owe to the Northwestern people and the people of my State to say a few words in regard to this provision of the tariff bill.

I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], which restores the old duty of \$30 per head on horses worth less than \$150, and of \$10 per head on cattle, ought to be adopted. The fact is that horses in that Northwestern country now are worth almost nothing. That is owing partly to the great increase in the number of horses and to the less use for horses in the cities on account of electrical appliances and cable roads. Through these improved, scientific methods of locomotion in cities and towns, horse cars have almost been abandoned, and the demand for horses greatly lessened in consequence. It is almost impossible for those people now to raise horses or cattle with any profit, as has been stated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY].

Another fact in connection with this industry in my State is that we border on British Columbia, where the conditions are almost identical with the conditions in my own State. They raise horses and cattle there and bring them across the border for shipment East and make the competition so much greater for us. Horses now are very cheap. I do not think that anyone would desire to have horses or cattle on the hoof cheaper than they are at the present time when bought by the head. It has come to such a pass that it is absolutely impossible for our people now to ship horses to the East and sell them with any profit, and if the duty which is now imposed is removed, that condition will be made permanent, thus working a great hardship to that whole Northwestern country.

As I say, horses and cattle on the hoof are now cheap enough to suit anyone. Beef in the Eastern markets is plenty high and will not be any lower if you remove the duty of \$10 per head on cattle. This is plain from the fact that no matter how cheap cattle on the hoof is, the price of dressed beef in Eastern markets maintains its high price. This is one of those items which should not be in the bill. It is one of those numerous items which discriminate against the Northwestern and Western country. The more you study the bill, the more convinced you are that very little consideration is shown to that section of the country, which, of all sections at the present time, needs encouragement by legislation. You will simply strike another blow at the far West without conferring any corresponding benefit on any portion of the country, unless it be, possibly, the Rio Grande, in Texas.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single word upon this proposed amendment.

New Hampshire is not quite so near the Canadian border as the State of Maine, but, nevertheless, the productions of Canada come in direct competition with the products of the farmers of my State; and if this proposed change in the existing law is made, it will necessarily result in serious detriment to the best interests of New Hampshire, however much good it may do to the State of Texas.

Some suggestions have been made of a political character in connection with this discussion, and I may be pardoned for a few words in that line. New Hampshire for a long time has been a very close State politically. Her people imbibed Democracy from some of the greatest men who have ever honored this country either in private or public station, and it has been a very difficult matter for the Republican party to wrest the control of that State from the great Democratic organization. From 1882 to 1892 we failed to elect a governor by popular vote, our constitution requiring a majority of votes to elect the chief executive; but, Mr. President, we had an election in New Hampshire in

March, 1894, for town officers, which ought to serve as an object lesson to our Democratic friends. The result, of course, was not quite as significant as it would have been had we elected State officers or had it been a national contest. But I want to say to Democratic Senators, who have been hoping and praying that New Hampshire might enter the Democratic column, that if this tariff bill passes, or if this schedule relating to agricultural products becomes a law, they may as well abandon future contests in my State.

In 1890 the two Congressional districts in New Hampshire elected Democrats to the House of Representatives. In 1892 those districts were recovered by a very small plurality; but in the town elections in March, 1894, we had things all our own way, and simply because of the threatened tariff legislation of the Democratic party. Why, sir, in one Democratic town, a town that ordinarily casts two or three times as many Democratic votes as Republican, not a single Democratic vote was cast at that election; and in another, a very strong Democratic town, every officer elected was a Republican, except that they did give the office of hearse-keeper to a Democrat, in which there seemed to be very great appropriateness.

The city in which the national Democratic committeeman from my State resides, for a great many years very strongly Democratic, gave a large Republican majority, and the returns from that election clearly indicate that if we could have a State election in New Hampshire at the present time—and the same will hold true in November next—instead of failing to elect our governor by popular vote, we should give the Republican ticket at least 10,000 majority.

Mr. President, stripped from all disguise, this is a contest between the North and the South; this is a sectional bill; there is no disguising that fact; and the people of the North are rapidly awakening to it. They appreciate the importance of the contest, and will make known their disapproval of this bill as soon as they can get an opportunity to register their verdict at the ballot box, as they did a day or two ago in the great State of Oregon, and as they have done, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] very pertinently suggested, at every election since this bill was proposed to the National Congress and the Democratic party announced its intention to enact it into law.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator be good enough to explain what he referred to about Oregon? It was not exactly understood.

Mr. GALLINGER. The information I have, I will say in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts, is—and I get it from the distinguished Senator [Mr. DOLPH], whom we all hope to see reelected to this body by the Legislature that is elected in Oregon—the information I receive is that Oregon, now having a Populist governor, has elected a Republican governor by at least 15,000 majority, and that the Legislature is probably three-fourths Republican.

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator not to revise his remarks for a day or two until he hears from the back counties. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall very gladly do that. I am not as much interested in Oregon as in another section of the country, but the statement I have made was made upon the authority of the Senator from Oregon, who probably knows more about the facts than the Senator from Kansas can possibly know. Evidently the unholy alliance between Democracy and Populism has received its deathblow in Oregon, as it will in Kansas and Nebraska next November.

Mr. President, from a political standpoint nothing would please New England better than to have this agricultural schedule enacted into law. If we were simply looking to the politics of the present situation we would hope that it might be passed without change; but I stand here to make an appeal, and a very serious one, for the material rather than the political interests of the people whom I represent.

Agriculture at the best in New England is not overprosperous, but we are doing something to our credit in that line. It is a matter of record that the little State of New Hampshire received the first prize for dairy products at the great Exposition in Chicago. We are doing something in raising horses and cattle and sheep; we are doing something in raising the necessities of life on our sterile soil; and I appeal to the Senators having in charge this bill and to the Democratic side of this Chamber not to strike down the interests of the people of the section of country from which I come.

It is a mistake upon their part from every possible standpoint; it will be a mistake on their part, in my judgment, looking at the future of political parties in this country, if they persist in discriminating against the North and in favor of the South, as they are discriminating in this bill, and undertake by lowering the duties, as they propose to do, on the agricultural products of New England, to bring into those States an influx of the

products of Canadian soil, thus doing great injury to the material interests of our people who are struggling to sustain themselves on soil less fertile than the great West can boast.

Mr. President, this is all I care to say. I make this plea for the people whom I in part represent; and I have reason to hope that as the Democratic side of the Chamber after discussion receded from their position when they proposed to strike down the great granite industry of New England, so they may, with equal justice, not to say magnanimity, see the propriety of receding from the proposed reduction of duties in the schedule we are now considering. If they do not, they will live to regret their injustice; and the sectionalism of this bill will react upon them to their utter dismay and overthrow.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, horses are to quite an extent a special production of my State and it is a production in regard to which I am personally in sympathy with the people of the State. I am in favor of specific duties on the entire schedule of live animals, but if not applied to all, the rates upon horses should certainly be specific.

I have been familiar with the importation of horses for fifty years, living for years directly on the line and in the household of a customs officer. I have seen the operations of the law under ad valorem and under specific duties. I know that under the ad valorem system fraud and undervaluation is the rule, and that it drives honest buyers and importers out of the business of importation.

Besides this, as a revenue matter it is entirely a give-away to the Canadian farmers. They have endeavored since the McKinley law went into operation to send horses abroad, but it has been a complete failure, as can be seen from the returns since that law went into effect. The trade will go to the near market and to parties who see the animals, and the number sent abroad is therefore trifling.

So, as a matter of revenue, it is a complete surrender of the revenue, and it is an encouragement of fraud and undervaluation. If the ad valorem duty applies at all on this schedule, it might apply, with less objection, to cattle and sheep. Although still very objectionable as to them, it is much more so in regard to horses, because it is more difficult to determine their value.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, some of my associates have been kind enough to speak for Oregon this morning, but Oregon does not need any one to speak for her. She speaks for herself. Advice received by me from the State indicate that the Republican State ticket has been elected by large pluralities, if not majorities over all, and that the governor has been elected by a plurality of somewhere from 10,000 to 15,000 votes; that the joint plurality for the Republican candidates for Congress will not be less than 10,000, and that the entire opposition, Independent Republicans, Populists, and Democrats, have elected less than 20 out of the 90 members of the legislature, and I now predict, for the benefit of my friend from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], that when the back counties are heard from the total results in favor of the Democrats, Populists, and Independents will not exceed 10 members of the legislature.

Mr. President, Oregon has set her seal of condemnation upon the free-trade policy of the Democratic party. The people of Oregon came to know that every industry of that great State was threatened with destruction, and, as a matter of self-defense, they have given their votes in favor of the party which believes in the protection of American industries, the party which would, if it could, protect the lumber industry, the wool industry, the hop industry, the horse-raising industry, and all the agricultural industries of the country.

I had expected to submit some remarks upon the question of our relations with Canada, and we are now entering upon the threshold of that question. This proposed reduction of the duties upon horses is a proposition which affects injuriously a great industry in my State. Oregon is a great horse-raising State. We raise the finest of horses for beauty, for endurance, and for speed, and the Indians raise what are denominated in this discussion ponies, the cayuse horses, in abundance for our use. The reduction of the duty upon horses will not only affect injuriously the people of my State, but, as has been said, the principal result of it will be to take revenue from the Government of the United States and put the difference between the present duty and the reduced duty into the pockets of the horse-raisers of Canada and of Mexico.

But by far the most indefensible and injurious provision of this bill is the provision found in the next paragraph, the provision by which certain agricultural products from Canada are to be admitted free of duty into the United States, because if Canada can get our markets free for her agricultural products, whatever duties may now be imposed upon similar products that are imported from the United States into Canada will be removed. Agricultural products are not shipped from Canada to this country to any great extent, and Canada will gain by this bill should it become a law what she has been for years desiring and what she would be willing to make great concessions to this country to secure.

Mr. PLATT. May I interpose a word there?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. I do so because my attention has been called to the next paragraph of the bill, and I desire to say now that, so far as the Argentine Republic is concerned and so far as Russia is concerned, it provides for free wheat and free corn and other articles free immediately, because they have now no tariff in those countries upon those articles.

Mr. DOLPH. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for the suggestion that the moment this bill passes we shall have free trade in these products with Russia and with the Argentine Republic—with Russia, where her agricultural products are raised by cheap labor, and with the Argentine Republic, where they have more vacant land and quite as rich soil and cheaper labor, and where they can produce agricultural products to any amount.

Mr. President, the question of our relations to Canada is one of great interest to the people of the United States, and especially to the people of the State I have the honor in part to represent. The Canadian Dominion, with a territory greater than our own, extending from ocean to ocean, separated from the United States for 3,000 miles by an imaginary line, with similar soil, mines of the same useful and precious metals, forests of the same valuable trees, a sparse population, a large unoccupied territory of arable lands, is dependent for its prosperity largely, I might say entirely, upon its commercial relations with the United States.

For the sake of securing free access to our markets and being able to share in the prosperity of the United States, there has been in recent years, and is now, a strong annexation sentiment in the Dominion, which has manifested itself in public meetings, public speeches, and in the public press, and has even controlled the result of elections.

Eminent statesmen of the past in the United States have predicted that the United States would one day extend from the Arctic Ocean to the Isthmus of Darien. Many people on both sides of our international boundary believe that manifest destiny points to political union between the United States and Canada.

But serious consideration of the subject of political union has hardly been entered upon by the people of either the United States or of Canada. Future events may force the question upon the attention of the people of both countries, but it is certain that the people of Canada will be ready to ask admission into the American union quite as soon as the people of the United States are ready to admit them.

The United States is not seeking for acquisitions to its territory. Many people believe that territorial extension is dangerous to the perpetuity of our republican institutions, and if Canada were knocking at the door of the Union, it is more than questionable whether a majority of the voters in this country would favor her admission. Some have advocated commercial union between Canada and the United States.

But commercial union is impractical.

It receives no favor from those who believe in the protection to American industries, to American capital, and American labor. It is the producers of Canada who are seeking the markets of the United States, who are seeking enlarged commercial relations with us either by—

First. The placing of her natural products upon our free list. This is what she most desires and this is what it is proposed to do by the pending measure; or

Second. By a reciprocity treaty by which she could gain some advantage of the United States, for all such treaties are but dickers between nations by which each hopes to get the advantage.

Third. By commercial union by which the custom-houses along our international boundary would be removed and she would possess free and unobstructive access to our markets, but would be compelled to adopt similar tariff legislation to our own as to other nations.

Fourth. As I have said, there are many Canadians who, if they can not gain free access to our markets by any one of the foregoing schemes, are ready to become a part of the United States for the purpose of reaching our markets and sharing our prosperity.

The first of these schemes for securing to the people of Canada the markets of the United States for their natural products, viz, by placing the natural products of Canada upon the free list, which is substantially the provision of the pending bill, is wholly in the interest of the people of Canada and secures nothing in return to the people of the United States.

It would result, if adopted by Congress, in—

First. Relieving the people of Canada from the payment of many millions in duties at our custom-houses, requiring additional taxation of our own people to make up the loss of revenue.

Second. It would make Canadian farming profitable, the Canadian farmer prosperous, and more than double the value of all farming lands in Canada along our northern border, at the expense of the people of the United States.

Here I will call attention to the effect of the provision in the next paragraph of the bill. All the farmers along our Canadian border, within the States of Oregon, of Washington, of Idaho, of Montana, of the Dakotas, of Minnesota, of Michigan, of New York, of Vermont, of New Hampshire, and of Maine, pay taxes on their

farms. They pay taxes on their farming implements; they pay taxes on their crops; they pay taxes upon the earnings of their farms; they help to support the National Government, their State governments, the county organizations, public schools, and help to construct and maintain highways.

You cross over an imaginary line and the farmers all along the Canadian border in Canada from British Columbia to the Atlantic Ocean do not help to support the Government of the United States unless it is by duties levied at the custom-house. They pay no taxes upon their farms, or upon their farming implements, or upon the products of their farms, or upon their savings to maintain State governments; to maintain territorial organizations, to maintain public schools, and make and improve highways. The duties levied upon their products that enter into the United States and come into the American markets have been supposed to be an equivalent for the taxation which our farmers pay. But by the provisions of the pending bill the Democratic majority of this body and the Democratic party propose that these Canadian farmers shall be relieved from all manner of taxation for the support of our Government, and their products shall be placed upon an equality in the American markets with the products of American farmers.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VILAS in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts suggests that there is no quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich,	Davis,	Jones, Ark.	Platt,
Allen,	Dolph,	Lindsay,	Proctor,
Allison,	Dubois,	Lodge,	Pugh,
Berry,	Faulkner,	McLaurin,	Quay,
Blackburn,	Frye,	McMillan,	Ransom,
Brice,	Gallinger,	Manderson,	Roach,
Caffery,	George,	Martin,	Sherman,
Camden,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Wis.	Shoup,
Cameron,	Gray,	Morrill,	Teller,
Carey,	Hale,	Murphy,	Turpie,
Chandler,	Harris,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Coke,	Hoar,	Patton,	Walsh,
Cullom,	Hunton,	Peffer,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Jarvis,	Perkins,	White.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. BATE] is absent under an order of the Senate. Upon any question that may arise he is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. I make the announcement for the day, and will announce it no more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Oregon is entitled to the floor.

Mr. DOLPH. Third, the placing of agricultural products on the free list would stimulate agriculture in Canada and cause rapid annual increased importation of agricultural products into this country from Canada to compete with the products of American farmers in our own markets.

Fourth. Every additional bushel of wheat, or rye or buckwheat, and every additional foot of lumber imported into the United States would represent labor furnished to Canadians and loss of employment to American citizens.

Reciprocity between the United States and Canada in any form must be advantageous to Canada alone.

Reciprocity in national products alone, as largely proposed by the pending measure, would be wholly one-sided.

Canada would be given the markets of nearly 70,000,000 of people for her lumber, minerals, wood products, and agricultural products in exchange for her markets of five or six millions of people. But, as Canada has a surplus of all these products, her markets would be of no value to us.

Even unrestricted reciprocity would still be an unprofitable arrangement for the United States.

If our export of manufactures to Canada were slightly increased, by it our imports of natural products would be greatly increased. Any gain to the manufacturer would be several times offset by loss to our agriculturists—a disastrous arrangement, in my judgment.

In some remarks of mine in the Senate March 11, 1892, I discussed the question of reciprocity with Canada, and, with the consent of the Senate, I will insert in my remarks a quotation from what I then said:

The provisions of the reciprocity treaty with Canada of 1854 are familiar to all American fishermen secured the right to take fish from British waters and cure them on British shores, and British fishermen were accorded similar rights in our territory north of latitude 36°. The natural products of each country were admitted to the other free of duty. The British were admitted to the free navigation of Lake Michigan and the use of our State canals, and we were to have the free navigation of the St. Lawrence and the use of Canadian canals.

No one familiar with the results of this treaty will deny that they were very unsatisfactory. The Canadians sent us their agricultural products and coal, lumber, grindstones, and fish, and took from us breadstuffs and a limited amount of manufactures; but while our exports to Canada before the treaty took effect were more than twice the value of our imports and under the treaty our exports were doubled, our imports were much more increased and the balance of trade was against us. Canada greatly increased the duties on our leading manufactures, which caused a large reduction in value of our exports. Of the \$239,000,000 worth of imports from Canada during the continuance of the treaty 94 per cent

came free of duty as against 58 per cent of our exports to Canada admitted duty free; our entire exports to Canada aggregating in value less by \$36,000,000 than the value of imports into this country.

The rights of navigation to Americans in the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals were inadequate compensation for similar privileges granted to Canada. Canada doubled her exports of fish to the United States, and our fishing industries received a severe blow by Canadian competition. The United States lost in duties remitted on Canadian fish alone \$3,000,000. The prosperity of Canada under the provisions of the treaty appeared by the increased value of her cultivated lands, the great increase in her agricultural products, and the increased value in her export of lumber. The growth of her fishing industries was marked. The Canadian Dominion is naturally desirous of renewing a commercial treaty which resulted in such marked benefit to her.

Our people became satisfied that a commercial treaty which secured reciprocity in the natural products of the two countries but allowed heavy duties on our manufactures was calculated to benefit Canada at our expense. Although there were other reasons which had weight to terminate our treaty of 1854, no doubt one of the principal reasons was the unwillingness of Canada to extend the reciprocity provision to manufactures. That a commercial treaty might be negotiated between this country and Canada which would prove advantageous to both parties is probable, but in the light of our past experience it is not probable that the United States will be willing to enter into a reciprocity treaty with Canada upon the basis advocated by the predominant party in the Dominion, a reciprocity limited to the natural products of both countries. There are so many objections, political and economic, to commercial union at the present time as to make that impracticable.

The ruling party in the Dominion has been endeavoring, and I think wisely, for years past, by the adoption of what they term the national system, a protective tariff upon imports which come into competition with home products, to build up Canadian manufactures, develop her natural resources, and make her commercially independent. She will no doubt be very reluctant to abandon a system which has already produced good results, and promises so much in the future; and while they, the Canadians, greatly covet the enlarged market which the free admission of her natural products into the United States to supply the demand of 65,000,000 of people would give them, they are unwilling to permit their manufacturing industries to meet the competition of the manufacturing industries of the United States, which would follow the admission of American manufactures into Canada free. For one, believing that our agricultural interests are of prime importance, demanding all the protection that can be afforded to them by just legislation, I do not think that any reciprocity treaty which can be at present devised would compensate the United States for the admission into this country free of duty of all the agricultural products of Canada.

The United States is the natural market for the surplus agricultural products of Canada. The great extent and productiveness of her agricultural land, her extensive forests and mines, render her, so long as our agricultural, lumbering, and manufacturing interests require protection, a formidable competitor of the United States. Even with the increased tariff upon the products of Canada imported into this country, she sent us in 1891 more in value of the products of her industries than in 1890 by the sum of \$37,555. She contributed to our national Treasury, to defray the necessary expenses of our Government, largely increased amounts in duties paid upon her exports to this country. Everyone admits, I think, that whatever the general rule may be, the price of the articles imported from Canada is fixed by the supply and demand in this country, and that the duty is paid by the Canadian producer.

Those who are clamoring for enlarged markets through reciprocity with Canada should also bear in mind that the market of Canada, on account of her comparatively small population, is a limited one; that we largely control it now, and that under the broadest reciprocity we could not expect to monopolize it. The exports of our manufactures to Canada might be increased by full reciprocity, but her exports to this country of her agricultural products and the products of her fisheries and mines to supply our large markets would be greatly increased. The increase of our imports from Canada would largely exceed the exports of this country to Canada. In view of this fact, it is not to be wondered at that the sentiment in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with Canada is mostly confined to merchants and traders, and that the farmers of the country as a rule are opposed to it.

It is apparent that whatever advantage this country would derive from reciprocity with Canada would inure to the benefits of the manufacturers and traders, and whatever advantage Canada would receive would be at the loss of the farmers of this country. The time may come when the production of this country will not be sufficient to supply the home market, and it may be to our interest to open our markets to the free importation of breadstuffs and raw material from Canada. But we have not reached that point in our history and do not need to anticipate it. One thing is certain, Canada need not hope that the United States will admit free the products of her fisheries, her farms, her mines, and forests without opening her ports to the free admission of our manufactures, or their admission at greatly reduced rates of duty, and just and liberal modifications of the present commercial restrictions imposed upon our commerce.

Commercial union contemplates uniform duties on foreign products imported into either country. This is impracticable. Under the Constitution Congress is intrusted with power to levy duties. The House has sole power to originate revenue legislation. Uniform duties on imports could not be secured unless the Canadian Parliament would surrender to the American Congress power to fix rates of duties for both countries—an impossibility. The scheme is impracticable.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] put the question in substance to some Senator on this side of the Chamber the other day when addressing the Senate (I think to the Senator from Iowa) "Would not the effect upon the industries of Canada with political union be similar to reciprocity in natural products?" Of course it would. But then Canada would be ours. In building up her industries, in increasing the value of her property, in promoting the prosperity of her citizens we would be but increasing the value of the property and promoting the welfare of our own citizens.

Mr. CULLOM. Who says that?

Mr. DOLPH. I say that now.

Mr. CULLOM. How does Canada happen to be ours?

Mr. DOLPH. I did not say she was ours.

Mr. CULLOM. The statement seems to have been made that way.

Mr. DOLPH. No, I said the Senator from Delaware put the question to some Senator on this side of the Chamber (I think the Senator from Iowa) the other day, with political union would not the result upon the prosperity of Canada be similar to that with unrestricted free trade in natural products. I say of course it would be; but in that case, with political union, with Canada a part of

the American Union, when we promoted the prosperity of Canada and of her citizens we would be promoting our own prosperity.

Mr. CULLOM. I agree with that, but I do not see exactly how Canada was ours yet.

Mr. DOLPH. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. CULLOM. I should be very glad if it were, but, Canada not being ours, in taking the duties off of these agricultural products it seems to me we are helping Canada and injuring ourselves.

Mr. DOLPH. We are proposing to do for Canada what, as I quoted the other day, was said by Mr. Erastus Wiman, a man who has discussed this question of our relations with Canada more than any other man in the United States and who has discussed it intelligently, would be accomplished by political union between the United States and Canada. I put the question to him, when he was before the Committee on Canadian Relations, what would be the effect upon the value of property of Canada of political union, and he answered me, "It would make every dollar's worth of property in Canada worth \$100."

Mr. GRAY. Then, according to the philosophy and logic of the Senator from Oregon, that would be a disaster or a detriment to the rest of the country if Canada became ours. I should like to see how he escapes from that conclusion.

Mr. DOLPH. I am not talking about the conditions when Canada becomes ours. Mr. President, this country is one country. Maine and Washington and Texas and Florida are all parts of the Federal Union. When we build up Oregon or when we build up Texas or when we build up Florida or build up Maine, we are building up our own country. When we make the citizens of those States prosperous, we are making prosperous citizens of the United States. But, sir, when we come to legislate for foreign countries, when at the present time we come to legislate in the interests of Canada or legislate in the interest of the Argentine Republic or of Russia, as it is proposed to do by the next paragraph in the bill, we are legislating for foreigners; we are building up foreign countries. Every day's work we give to a citizen of a foreign country takes just one day's work from the citizens of the United States.

The Senator from Delaware appears to think that the relations between the States of the American Union are the same as the relations between foreign governments. He is oblivious to the fact that the United States is one country, with one constitution and one flag. That the power to regulate commerce and to protect American industries and American labor has been intrusted solely to Congress, and it holds this power in trust to use it for the equal benefit of every State of the Union.

Mr. President, I am surprised at the suggestions that come occasionally from the other side of the Chamber in regard to the effect of the protective system and concerning the alleged free trade between the States of this Union. You might as well talk about protecting a county in a State or any municipality of a State or free trade between local subdivisions of a State of this Union. All the industries of this country are connected together, and the interests of every State of the Union are bound together. You can not hurt a State of this Union without injuring the entire nation. You can not benefit a State in this Union without helping to build up the prosperity of the entire nation.

You can not strike down the lumber or the wool industry or the fruit industry or any industry of this country but every industry in the country will feel the effect of the blow. It will affect every industry in the country. I do not see the soundness of the argument that because the States of the Union prosper with free trade between them, being mere parts of one common country, their citizens being but a part of the people of the entire Union, we would not be injured by building up other countries at the expense of our own. If Canada were a part of our country to-day, when we built up the agriculture of Canada we would be building up an industry of our own country. If we made every dollar's worth of property in Canada worth a hundred dollars, as Mr. Wiman says would be the case with political union, we would be increasing the value of our own property a hundredfold. The citizens of Canada would have become citizens of the United States and our own citizens would cross the line, retaining their citizenship, taking possession of the vast resources of Canada and developing them for their own prosperity and for the prosperity of the entire nation.

But while Canada remains a foreign country, I repeat, in building up her industries, in increasing the value of her property, in promoting the prosperity of her citizens, we would be but increasing the value of the property of Canada and the prosperity of her citizens. With political union, her forests, her mines, the vast area of her unoccupied soil, would be open to our citizens. Canada would become a part of us and entitled to share in the benefits of the American union and would no longer be a dependency of our most formidable rival for the commerce of the seas and the trade of the world, no longer a commercial rival.

The relations between Canada and the United States would become that which exists between the States of the Union instead of the present relations of competing interest, commerce, and trade.

The question to be determined by this Congress is whether we shall legislate in the interest of the peoples of England, Europe, and Asia, of the Argentine Republic, or of those of the United States.

The policy of every foreign country is to force upon our markets

all their products they can. To furnish all they can of the products of their own laborers for consumption by our people. To care for their industries and their people, and not for ours. To buy as little of us and sell as much to us as possible. Our policy should be to buy as little abroad and to sell as much abroad as possible.

No nation will buy more abroad than it needs for consumption by its people, and it will buy that where it can buy cheapest.

It will buy what it wants of the products of other countries, whether it pays for them in gold or in commodities.

If any nation refuses to buy of us, it will buy of other countries and leave us a larger market in other countries.

We have been told here time after time that if we pursued a policy which would prevent the free importation of the products of Great Britain, for instance, into this country, Great Britain would retaliate by levying duties upon our agricultural products, or by refusing to buy them. Let her do it. If Great Britain buys wheat of Russia and of the Argentine Republic instead of sending to the United States for it we will sell ours in the other markets of the world. There could be nothing done by the countries of Europe that would destroy the market for our surplus agricultural products unless every country in Europe united, and they never will unite in a policy of that kind so long as they need our breadstuffs.

I repeat, if any European country wants to discriminate against our agricultural products let them do it. They will simply use the breadstuffs from other countries of the world which supply the market and they will leave us other markets.

There never was anything in the proposition that unless you buy of a nation you can not sell. The truth is that we do not buy of any nation, and no nation buys of us. Citizens of other countries buy of American citizens and American citizens buy in foreign markets. Whenever a citizen of any country wants to buy something abroad he buys it where he can buy it cheapest and get the most of the article and the best quality for his money.

It is the law of self-interest that controls, and no question of tariff or condition of trade between the two nations. If we buy more of a nation than we sell we simply have to send gold for it, and if a nation buys more of us than they sell to us as the representative measure of all commodities and all property they will send gold to us, and they will continue to do it, no matter what our tariff legislation may be.

Our employed and prosperous citizens have not complained of the McKinley law. It is foreign countries which are complaining.

The Senate will recollect that the other day I read from an address of a distinguished member of the Cobden Club, who came over here as a committee to represent French interests before the Congress of the United States in connection with this Wilson bill. I read from correspondence between Chairman Wilson and this French gentleman showing how France and other European countries are interested in the Wilson bill. Do they urge the passage of the Wilson bill and more liberal trade with foreign countries on the ground that the interest of America would be promoted? Not at all. They claim that the McKinley law has restricted importations, cut down the amount of importations from foreign countries, and show how our exports have increased while our imports from those countries have decreased; and that was the argument used before a committee of the American House of Representatives. I repeat there is not a producer in the United States claiming that the McKinley law should be repealed or modified. The clamor against that legislation comes from foreign countries and is from citizens of foreign countries.

When Mr. Cleveland issued his famous free-trade message of 1887 British newspapers were fulsome with their praises of him and his message. American sentiment was divided upon the subject of his message, but European countries were unanimous in its praise. They hailed it as a declaration in favor of free trade. They saw in it the promise of increased exports to the United States; of increased production in their own countries; of increased employment for their laborers; of a policy on the part of the United States which would promote the wealth and prosperity of those countries. I repeat, that the complaints concerning the McKinley law have come not from American citizens but foreigners.

It is pressure from other countries that is seeking to reverse our protective policy. Shall we yield to the demand of foreign countries; shall we legislate in the interests of foreigners and foreign countries; shall we open our markets under this pressure to the free importation of foreign products; shall we build up foreign industries and permit our own to be beaten down?

I know what the answer of the Senate will be. The Democratic majority of the Senate will answer, "Yes; we will have free trade; we will build up the agriculturists of Canada; we will build up foreign industries; we will give labor to foreigners, taking it from American citizens; we will take bread from the mouths of American laborers and their families and give it to foreign laborers." I know what answer the people of the United States would make to this question if they had an opportunity. I know what answer they have made to it whenever they have had an opportunity. I know what answer Oregon made on Monday last to this question. The people of Oregon said: "As for us, we are for America; we are for American labor; we are for American industries against any and

all foreign countries." That will be the declaration of every Northern State in November next.

Mr. CULLOM. May I interrupt the Senator a moment right there?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not think it is out of place for me to enforce what the Senator is saying in reference to the present sentiment of the Northern States. For instance, in my own State on Monday last we had an election for a judge of the supreme court. Both parties nominated their candidate, one a Republican and the other a Democrat. Every county in the district in which the judge was to be elected was a Democratic county except one, which I think gave a very small Republican majority. The district was composed of the counties of Adams, which in 1892 gave Mr. Cleveland 1,673 majority, Brown, 688, Cass, 559, Fulton, 305, Hancock, 739, Mason, 596, Menard, 467, Morgan, 535, Pike, 743, Schuyler, 317, and Scott, 276, leaving McDonough, which gave Harrison 83 majority. Adding those majorities together and deducting the county going Republican the district gave Mr. Cleveland a majority of 6,810. I received just a little while ago a dispatch from that district stating that—

The twelve Democratic counties of this supreme judicial district elect Joseph N. Carter supreme judge—

Mr. Carter is the Republican nominee—

by forty-five hundred, a forecast of what is to come in Illinois this fall.

I only throw this in, by leave of the Senator from Oregon, to show that not only has Oregon expressed its views upon the present situation, but Illinois, too, in the same line, whenever it has an opportunity.

The change in this judicial district is in favor of the Republican party, and amounts to about 11,000 votes.

Mr. DOLPH. At every opportunity the people of this country have had since the last Presidential election to express their sentiment in regard to the question of the tariff they have condemned free trade. They have either taken a sober second thought and changed their minds concerning the tariff since the Presidential election, or that election was not a test of the sentiment of the people on that question. Even the majority in the Senate has been affected by this sentiment. The Democratic party has become a party afraid of its platform. It has abandoned its platform in the amendments now proposed to the pending bill. They think they can ignore Oregon and the other Western States where the wool industry is a great industry, and where the lumber industry is a great industry. They abandon all political hold on those States, and claim to be consistent because they put lumber and wool on the free list, and at the same time amend their bill so as to give protection to the very people they have denounced on this floor for the last twenty years.

As I said the other day, we no longer hear anything about robber barons. I have not heard that expression during the present session of Congress. It was flip on every Democratic tongue three years ago when the McKinley bill was under consideration. The robber barons have come to be a favorite class. Carnegie is protected by the bill, and so are all the producers of manufactures of steel and iron. You do not hear any more about the great profits of the woolen manufacturers or the cotton manufacturers. They are all to be favored. The Democratic majority of the Senate have foreseen what the political effect of the proposed Wilson bill, if it became a law, would be in this country, and they are endeavoring to hedge against it. They have ignored their platform, ignored their principles. They assert now that the bill fairly protects American industries—a party that by two-thirds of the delegates to its national convention in its platform declared that protection was robbery now advocates the passage of the pending bill on the ground that it is a protective measure.

I hold in my hand the report of the Finance Committee made on March 3, 1891, upon a resolution directing the committee "to ascertain in every practicable way, and to report from time to time to the Senate, the effect of the tariff laws upon the imports and exports, the growth, development, production, and prices of agricultural and manufactured articles, at home and abroad; and upon wages, domestic and foreign; and for this purpose they are authorized to sit by subcommittee or otherwise, etc."

The report was made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. I will not quote at length from, but I will ask leave to insert in my remarks a quotation marked on the first two pages, if there be no objection to that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VILAS in the chair). If there is no objection the matter will be inserted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

From the beginning to the end, all the places visited by us in our own country were increasing in population, while on the other side of the line, as we were informed, the population was everywhere diminishing; St. Johns, opposite to Eastport, had 4,000 less population in 1891 than in 1881. From the testimony taken it was clear that the United States offered better markets and higher prices for anything and everything that Canadian farmers had to sell than could be obtained in the Canadian Dominion, and the price or value there of horses, cattle, or sheep, hay, pease, beans, potatoes, butter, eggs, and poultry was invariably as much below the selling price in the United States as the amount of duties imposed and the cost of transportation. When the duty on imported horses was increased the price of horses fell in Canada. It was the same with eggs and barley. When the duty on pine lumber was reduced \$1 per thousand feet, that

amount was at once generally added to the price of the lumber in Canada, so that no advantage was derived by the United States from the reduction of the duty. So far as the Canadian Dominion is concerned there is no doubt they bear the entire burden of duties imposed on their exports into the United States.

It was also ascertained at Eastport, Me., from the owners of the sardine factories, who are among the largest consumers of tin, that the increased duty thereon has increased the price to the amount of \$1 per box—amounting to 1 mill on each can of sardines—but that it had not affected their business nor the wages of their workmen, but that consumers were supplied with sardines at less cost than ever. Some of them, however, admitted that, in consequence of the much cheaper labor elsewhere, they could not sustain their sardine business in the absence of a protective tariff. They did not favor the abrogated reciprocity treaty.

More or less of emigrants appeared to be entering into our country from the Canadian Dominion all along the border line, and at some points it was stated that large numbers in the spring of the year, as at Newport, Vt., of 800 per day, often came in to find employment for the season and returned in the autumn. Others for the same purpose came in the autumn and returned in the spring.

That wages were much less in the Canadian Dominion was stated everywhere, ranging in amount from 15 to 33 per cent and in some cases even to 50 per cent. In some places the greatest difference was in common labor, in others it was in skilled labor. When border towns were in close proximity, or only separated by a river, the difference appeared to be less, in consequence of the competitive action and reaction of the towns upon each other. It was declared, however, that by going farther into the Dominion wages would be found to diminish, but by going farther into the United States they would be found to increase. The average difference of all kinds of labor between the two countries may be reckoned at more rather than at less than 25 per cent.

Mr. DOLPH. While engaged as a member of the special committee appointed to inquire into our relations with Canada I assisted in taking much testimony upon the subject of our trade with Canada. We found many people who were engaged in merchandising and in the commission business in large cities along the Canadian line favorable to some commercial arrangement with Canada by which our manufactures should be admitted into that country free. Their object was to obtain a larger market for the goods in which they dealt. I took occasion to question some of them as to the probable character of our trade with Canada under reciprocity, and invariably, I believe, when questioned upon that subject, it appeared that they expected that the increase of our exportations to Canada under any reciprocity arrangement would be of our manufactured products, while the imports from Canada would be largely agricultural products and raw materials; in other words, that the farmers of the country, the lumbermen of the country, the workers in our mines, would pay the consideration to Canada for an increase of our trade in manufactured articles with her; that they should suffer this ruinous competition with the agricultural products of Canada, the raw materials of Canada, for the purpose of increasing the exportation of manufactured articles. That they were correct in their understanding of the effect of reciprocity with Canada is apparent from the following statement, showing the character of our imports of dutiable articles from Canada for the year ending June 30, 1887, which I will insert. It is an old statement, but it illustrates the case as well.

Articles.	Values.	Average ad valorem rate of duty collected.
		<i>Per cent.</i>
Animals .....	\$4,374,039	20
Barley .....	6,171,660	16.20
Wheat .....	218,551	17.16
Coal, bituminous .....	1,152,604	24.21
Fish:		
Cod, haddock, etc. ....	237,179	17
Herring, pickled .....	128,611	14.32
Mackerel, pickled .....	638,312	23.13
Flax, raw .....	298,078	8
Hay .....	789,129	19.39
Provisions .....	163,115	24.44
Vegetables .....	987,232	24.05
Wood, and manufactures of .....	7,995,840	18.28
Total .....	23,154,350	
Total dutiable merchandise .....	25,997,113	

The Senator from Maine the other day inserted in his remarks a table showing the agricultural products which were exported into this country in 1890 and 1892, showing the decrease under the McKinley law, which I will submit and have inserted in my remarks.

Articles.	1890.	1892.	Decrease.
Horses .....	\$1,887,895	\$1,094,461	\$793,434
Horned cattle .....	104,623	21,327	83,296
Poultry .....	105,612	44,537	61,075
Eggs .....	1,793,104	494,409	1,298,695
Wool .....	235,436	290,125	55,311
Flax .....	175,563	112,300	63,263
Apples .....	149,479	27,661	121,818
Barley .....	4,582,561	1,354,485	3,228,076
Split pease .....	74,215	20,460	53,755
Hay .....	922,797	598,567	324,230
Malt .....	149,310	20	149,290
Potatoes .....	308,915	41,886	267,029
Vegetables .....	80,976	68,948	12,028
Totals .....	10,570,486	4,079,246	6,491,240

Also, in this connection, I submit a table showing the duties on agricultural products under the law of 1883, the law of 1890 (the McKinley act) and as proposed under the Wilson bill. I think this was made up before the recent amendments were proposed, but it will answer my purpose quite as well.

Products.	Law of 1883.	Law of 1890 (McKinley bill).	Wilson bill (1894).
Dairy products—			
Butter	4 cts. per pound.	6 cts. per pound.	4 cts. per pound.
Cheese	do	do	25 per cent.
Milk	10 per cent.	5 cts. per gallon.	Free.
Beans	do	40 cts. per bushel.	20 per cent.
Pease	do	do	Free.
Hay	\$2 per ton.	\$4 per ton.	\$2 per ton.
Honey	20 cts. per gallon.	20 cts. per gallon.	10 cts. per gallon.
Hops	8 cts. per pound.	15 cts. per pound.	8 cts. per pound.
Onions	10 per cent.	40 cts. per bushel.	20 cts. per bushel.
Potatoes	15 cts. per bushel.	25 cts. per bushel.	10 cts. per bushel.
Poultry—			
Live	10 per cent.	3 cts. per pound.	2 cts. per pound.
Dressed	do	5 cts. per pound.	3 cts. per pound.
Horses—			
If valued at less than \$150.	20 per cent.	\$30 each.	20 per cent.
If valued at \$150 and over.	do	30 per cent.	Do.
Mules	do	\$30 each.	Do.
Cattle—			
One year old or less.	do	\$2 each.	Do.
More than one year old.	do	\$10 each.	Do.
Hogs	do	\$1.50 each.	Do.
Sheep—			
Less than one year old.	do	75 cts. each.	Do.
One year old or more.	do	\$1.50 each.	Do.
Barley	15 cts. per bushel.	30 cts. per bushel.	Do.
Barley malt.	45 cts. per bushel.	45 cts. per bushel.	30 per cent.
Buckwheat	15 cts. per bushel.	15 cts. per bushel.	20 per cent.
Corn or maize.	10 cts. per bushel.	do	Do.
Corn meal.	20 cts. per bushel.	20 cts. per bushel.	Do.
Oats	15 cts. per bushel.	15 cts. per bushel.	Do.
Rice—			
Cleaned	2 cts. per pound.	2 cts. per pound.	1½ cts. per pound.
Uncleaned	1½ cts. per pound.	1½ cts. per pound.	1 ct. per pound.
Rye	10 cts. per bushel.	10 cts. per bushel.	20 per cent.
Wheat	25 cts. per bushel.	25 cts. per bushel.	Do.
Cabbages	10 per cent.	3 cts. each.	Free.
Cider	25 per cent.	5 cts. per gallon.	Do.
Eggs	Free	5 cts. per dozen.	Do.

Statement showing imports of agricultural products before and after the passage of the McKinley act

Imports (both free and dutiable) of—	Year ending June 30, 1889.		Year ending June 30, 1892.	
	Quantities.	Value.	Quantities.	Value.
Animals—				
Cattle.....number	61,991	\$703,469	2,168	\$47,466
Horses.....do	58,714	4,888,862	14,074	2,455,868
Sheep.....do	404,817	1,259,000	380,814	1,440,530
All other animals.....		392,712		307,752
		7,224,043		4,251,616
Cereals—				
Barley.....bushels	11,368,414	7,773,838	3,146,328	1,592,040
Corn.....do	2,401	1,216	15,260	10,752
Oats.....do	22,310	10,178	20,268	8,224
Rye.....do	16	24	63,537	67,507
Wheat.....do	130,649	119,017	2,459,602	1,955,385
		7,854,273		3,633,908
Hay.....pounds	105,395	1,082,885	79,715	715,151
Hops.....do	4,176,158	1,155,472	2,506,224	883,701
Dairy products—				
Butter.....pounds	178,851	24,577	114,187	16,549
Cheese.....do	8,207,026	1,135,184	8,305,288	1,238,166
		1,159,761		1,254,715
Rice.....pounds	132,245,963	2,601,149	85,112,164	1,933,447
Tobacco, leaf.....do	20,106,881	10,868,226	21,988,535	10,332,433
Beans and pease.....bushels	765,483	786,343	874,050	957,824
Potatoes.....do	883,380	321,106	188,871	186,006
Eggs.....dozens	15,918,809	2,418,976	4,188,492	522,240
Total values.....		35,472,234		24,671,640

Decrease, \$10,801,193, or 30 per cent.

I hold in my hand a newspaper clipping calling attention to the expressions of leading trade journals in England concerning the effect of the Wilson tariff, which, if there be no objection, I will insert without reading.

TRADE CONGRATULATIONS IN ENGLAND.

The leading trade journals that are now coming to hand from England indicate, more and more every week, how interested, and how excited even, the British

manufacturers are becoming over the prospects of securing their lion's share of our manufacturing industries. When the Wilson tariff was first made public, it was considered advisable to muzzle the British bulldog, and it was evidently prearranged that the barking should be done behind the kennel at any rate where it would not attract the eye of the American eagle. But the anxiety, the desire, the eagerness to snatch our business from us proved too much for their discretion, and we learn from one paper, about the woolen trade, that the "prospect of an increased business with the States is, however, very hopeful." Again, further: "Should it [the new bill] pass in its proposed form, it will make a greater difference in the export of the lower classes of woollens upon which the specific or weight duty weighs so heavily. This will be a crucial point in the discussion of the bill. Nothing can be fairer than an ad valorem duty, but the difficulty always exists that there are unprincipled people who invariably under-declare values, and those who make honest declarations are made to suffer for the faults of others."

This will be cheering news to our woolen manufacturers, particularly as the fact is recognized abroad "that there are unprincipled people who invariably under-declare values." But we like to keep the best news till the last, and that is what the Bradford, England, correspondent writes to The Textile Manufacturer, which is published in Manchester. This bold Bradford man throws aside all pretences and hypocrisy. He intimates the straightforward policy of Cousin Ben Folsom, when he, July 4, 1893, congratulated the cutlery manufacturers of Sheffield that they would again secure control of the American markets, a policy that it appears has been also adopted by Mr. Meeker, the American consul at Bradford. The conclusion at which the Bradford expert in the English worsted trade arrives is that the proposed Wilson tariff measure will give to the manufacturers of Bradford "far easier access than they have ever had to a market representing a population of 70,000,000 people."

Further analyzing what free wool really means to the American manufacturer, this English expert asks: "How, under such circumstances, can the free-wool clause hurt the Bradford manufacturer?" This expert opinion is remarkably interesting reading, and would enlighten the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, if they are really capable of comprehending the actual intricacies of the business of manufacturing woolen goods.

In the hope that some of these tariff-binkers, destroyers of American farming industries, murderers of American manufacturing industries, and stranglers of American labor, may be able to see beyond the length of their noses, and may be able to grasp the actual conditions of some subject that exists beyond the country hamlets whence they emanate, we reproduce this Bradford correspondent's remarks in full, as published in The Textile Manufacturer:

There is no doubt that the slight infusion of buoyancy into this market has been the result, to a partial extent, of the publication of the new tariff proposals in America. A good many opinions have been expressed and some figures given as to the favorable character of that tariff from the point of view of Bradford wool staplers and manufacturers. But a good many opinions and a good many valuable figures have been kept back because Bradford men fear that capital will be made of them by American Republicans. Some even say that such statements might prevent the bill from passing. There is no adequate ground for this fear, which is entertained chiefly in fair-trade quarters. In the first place, Mr. Meeker, the American consul, tells me that there is not the slightest doubt the bill will pass, and, in the second place, every man who reads his newspaper thoroughly knows that Mr. McKinley and other Republicans have dosed the American public *ad nauseam* with forebodings as to the injury the new tariff will inflict on American manufacturers and the benefit it will confer on English manufacturers.

What is more, the Committee on Ways and Means, which drafted the bill, took evidence for weeks, and among it a mass of evidence as to how the tariff would affect the worsted trade. The fact is, the American farmers and the ordinary American consumer have begun to see that protection raises the price of commodities and only confers benefits on the manufacturers of the Eastern States, who are bound by no human law to share those benefits with anybody. In short, the deep-set desire in America for an ameliorated tariff will not be balked by the repetition of the stale story that that tariff will benefit a few English towns. So I shall have my say.

To exemplify what the tariff will mean to the Bradford trade, I will, just in a sentence, show how it will affect worsted coatings, which form half of the Bradford exports to America. A worsted coating, costing in Bradford 2 shillings a yard, will, under the new tariff, cost in New York 35 per cent more. Under the present McKinley tariff it costs in New York 150 per cent more, and under the tariff which preceded the McKinley duties 1133 per cent more. These figures have not been previously stated, nor have others which I am going to give. A good deal has been made out of the fact that the American manufacturers, under the new tariff, will get their raw material free, and statements have been made that this will almost nullify the benefits conferred by the tariff in the shape of reduced duties. Now, free wool to America—for the first time since America has been a country—must mean to wool staplers in Bradford—and Bradford is the center of the wool trade of the world—a larger increase of business. They will have far easier access than they ever had to a market representing a population of 70,000,000. Free trade in wool with America can not but be to the advantage, therefore, of one branch of the Bradford trade.

Now, take the Bradford manufacturers, and how free wool to the American manufacturer will affect the Bradford makers is a question that has not yet been thoroughly gone into. Sixteen pounds of greasy wool will produce 10½ pounds of top. That 10½ pounds of top will spin into 9 pounds of yarn. To make a 16-ounce cloth requires 16 pounds of yarn, which represents about 32 pounds of wool. The American manufacturer, under the new tariff, will get in 2 pounds of wool free, upon which he will receive 11 cents per pound reduction, i. e., 22 cents on the 2 pounds. The McKinley tariff makes the American pay for that piece 150 per cent on the Bradford cost. The new tariff will make him pay 48½ per cent on the Bradford cost. There is 100 per cent less duty on the manufactured article from Bradford, and the American manufacturer will only get 22 cents concession on his wool—for the 2 pounds that produces a yard of cloth. That wool costs, say, 8½ pence a pound in Bradford. Under the new tariff the American manufacturer will pay about the same. There will be no duty. He will give 17 pence, therefore, for his 2 pounds of wool. At the present time he pays 17 pence plus 11 pence duty, or 28 pence. He will get his raw material, therefore, for 66 per cent less under the new tariff, but then the importer in New York will pay for the cloth of the Bradford manufacturers 100 per cent less than he does now. How, under such circumstances, can the free-wool clause hurt the Bradford manufacturer? It is a matter not yet clear, from the American telegrams, whether tops and rovings will come under the class of "crude" materials, which, like raw materials, are to be admitted free. If tops and rovings are admitted free, that involves a new set of considerations, but only with the same conclusion. If American manufacturers are going to allow Bradford to carry out the first processes of manufacture for them, well, all the better for Bradford.

Our Democratic friends are proposing to pattern after the revenue policy of Great Britain without taking into consideration the different conditions of England and the United States. One a sea-girt island with a large population compared to its area, with great wealth concentrated in a few hands, with great manufacturing establishments built up by generations of protection, with a

large merchant marine built up under and maintained by subsidies; the other with a territory extending from ocean to ocean and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, composed of 44 States and several Territories, possessing every variety of climate and soil and capable of untold resources. What might be advantageous to England might be disadvantageous, yea, ruinous to the United States.

But I deny that the tariff policy of Great Britain is advantageous to her. I denounce it as the worst crime any nation has inflicted upon its own people during the nineteenth century, if not since the morning stars sang together on the day of the completion of creation. It has brought poverty, ruin, and starvation upon her. It has increased the hoards of the rich, but increased the poverty of the masses.

It has built palaces, transformed farms into deer parks, helped to build up a great merchant marine, sustained great manufacturing enterprises; but it has destroyed agriculture, made farming unprofitable, thrown labor out of employment, driven capital out of the country to seek foreign investment, created 7,000,000 paupers, one to every five of the population, forced 14,000,000 more to work for 10s. 6d. per week. It helped 2,000,000 of British subjects, but it impoverished 32,000,000.

It has destroyed Ireland. Her once prosperous and happy population of 9,000,000 has been reduced to 5,000,000 starving poor. Four million have been driven into exile to avoid starvation, or into the grave by the free-trade policy forced by Great Britain on Ireland.

Her people are naturally industrious and economical. Ireland, under a protective system, has been made to bud and blossom as the rose and her people to prosper. Under such a system contentment, happiness, and good order reigned. All her poverty and all her woes to-day can be traced to the commercial policy of Great Britain. A writer, discussing the processes by which Ireland has been impoverished, says:

Ireland has an extremely rich soil and is pre-eminently adapted to the raising of cattle, sheep, and all kinds of grain. She has the richest pasture land in Europe, has an abundance of cheap fuel, is rich in mineral resources, and has many of the finest natural harbors in the world.

The Irish, at a very early date, devoted their attention to the raising of cattle for English markets. In the seventeenth century it became a very lucrative business and the first great source of Irish wealth. But Parliament, in obedience to the demand of English landlords, passed a law prohibiting the importation from Ireland of all cattle, sheep, and swine, of beef, pork, bacon, mutton, butter, and cheese.

The source of Irish industry having been destroyed, the Irish having a few ships built others, and betook themselves to commerce, establishing a large and flourishing trade with the colonies, with the East and West Indies and the continent. But again England interfered, and Parliament, to please English ship-builders and traders, passed the celebrated navigation laws, prohibiting the Irish from carrying on trade with the colonies, and thus Ireland's flourishing colonial trade was cut off and forever destroyed.

Ireland was now completely at England's mercy. Forbidden to raise cattle for English markets, forbidden to build up a merchant marine, forbidden to trade with other nations, they were still determined to live on the beautiful soil God had given them. Though crushed in spirit and discouraged they still had the indomitable pluck so characteristic of the Irish race, and they turned their attention to the raising of sheep and manufacturing wool, and it soon became a flourishing industry. "Irish wool," says Froude, "was the finest in Europe, and Irish cloth was eagerly sought after." All were for a time prosperous, but England became alarmed and jealous at Ireland's prosperity, and Parliament again crippled them by prohibitory laws.

The Irish wool industry was wiped out and the ruin was absolute and complete. At the time of the destruction of the woolen industry it afforded employment to fifty thousand families. They were thrown upon the land; rents rose to a ruinous state; thousands had no employment, and those who had work earned only their board. Many emigrated to America.

What did the Irish do next? They developed their fisheries, but as the industry became profitable they were once more pounced upon by England, and the poor Irish fisherman, blessed with an abundance of fish in his own waters, was by statute compelled to fish in English ships manned by English sailors. No wonder the spirit of the people was for a time broken—their commerce swept from the seas, their manufactories closed, their operatives perishing from want and famine, or fleeing to other countries to find a home.

But soon after, a few leaders came to Ireland's rescue. Grattan, Flood, Charlemont and others worked for this downtrodden people. The Irish Volunteers with Grattan, supported by Flood, made demands of England which were granted, and once more Ireland was free. One of the first acts of the newly-emancipated legislature was to introduce measures for the protection of Irish industries by placing heavy duties on all imported goods. Then sprang up a wonderful spirit of enterprise, and soon Ireland's industry and prosperity was the greatest she had ever known. The island was dotted over with busy hives and marts of industry. Her ports were alive with commerce, her ships visited every sea, her flag floated in every port, her people were peaceful, contented and happy; landlord and tenant were alike satisfied.

There was a ready home market for produce, and a continually increasing demand for the wares of the manufacturer. The laborers had steady employment at high wages; they were well fed, comfortably housed, and decently clothed. This was Ireland under "protection." But, alas, it could not last long. English monopolists and landlords could not brook such growing prosperity. Pitt came upon the scene, and by one of the foulest acts known to history, Ireland was drawn to England, and England's free-trade was forced upon her. Thus again was Ireland robbed of her prosperity. English manufacturers glutted the Irish market, undersold them, crushed them. Five million of operatives were thrown out of work. Almost all manufacturers closed their doors, and sought elsewhere a living.

According to the Government report, in 1802, the first year of English free trade under the "act of the Union," there was a population of 8,000,000; employed, 2,000,000; unemployed, 6,000,000. These without work had to seek it somewhere, and many, as in 1699, went upon the land. Rents rose from one pound to ten. There being no home consumption, the price of produce fell almost to nothing. The tenants could not pay the rent; the landlords were bankrupt; the whole island was in gloom and despair. Then came the famine with all its horrors—

whole families laid down and died. Over 2,000,000 perished by famine and 2,000,000 more came to America. And so it has continued to this day.

Ireland is a down-trodden country, and Irishmen at home are suffering want and poverty and degradation, and simply for the want of self-government and the right to adopt and maintain a protective policy.

Quite as an appalling example of the blighting and blasting influence of free trade is presented by the condition of India. With the same relentless disregard for the welfare of the inhabitants of British India she always exhibits when dealing with her dependencies, she forced free trade upon India and destroyed its prosperity and impoverished its people. Like a blighting frost, which in an hour scorches the blossoms and destroys the hope for the season's fruitage, free trade touched the manufactures of India and they were annihilated; her factories, and they dwindled away; her commerce, and it was destroyed; her agriculture, and the tillers of the soil were plunged into the hapless slavery of abject poverty.

Every one of the dependencies of Great Britain, having the legislative power to do so, have repudiated free trade and have adopted the protective system. Canada imposes duties upon importations from Great Britain, and is protecting and building up her industries. Australia has adopted protection, and the policy has greatly stimulated her industries and increased her prosperity. England forces her policy upon her dependencies where she can, and where she can not do that they repudiate the policy and adopt the only policy by which the prosperity of a people can be secured, the policy which keeps labor employed and thus increases wealth.

Something like a decade and a half ago Germany, under the lead of Bismarck, adopted the protective policy, and protection in Germany has produced the same beneficial results it has everywhere else. Her industries have been stimulated, new industries have been built up, labor has been employed, wages have advanced, and the general condition of the country, and especially of her laboring classes, has been improved.

If you would have an object lesson of the effect of protection upon the laboring classes, contrast the condition of the laborers of Great Britain with those of France.

In Great Britain tenement houses, poverty, ignorance, a badly clothed and worse fed laboring class. In France, where protection has prevailed for three-quarters of a century, where by her tariff laws the importation of many articles is absolutely prohibited, where the smallest industry is protected as well as the greatest, the masses are comparatively well clothed, well fed, intelligent, industrious, and happy. Indeed, so well off financially that when France was called upon to raise the great war indemnity to Germany she received it largely from the poorer classes of her own citizens.

I here refer as to the effect of free trade in England to the report of a commission that was appointed on the 29th day of August, 1885. On that date Victoria, "by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, defender of the Faith," issued a commission to certain "trustworthy and well-beloved cousins and councilors" and others, numbering twenty-six, the Earl of Iddlesleigh being the first and the Earl of Dunraven being the second, the object whereof is set forth in the commission, as follows:

"Whereas we have deemed it expedient that a commission should forthwith issue to inquire and report upon the extent, nature, and probable causes of the depression now or recently prevailing in various branches of trade and industry, and whether it can be alleviated by legislative or other measures."

Sir James Caird, the senior land commissioner for England, and a great authority, testified before the commission to the continual depression and ruin among the agricultural classes of England. After giving the result as to the different countries, he was asked:

Have you made any generalization of the result?  
Answer. Yes, I have. The present, as compared with ten years ago, as deduced by me from these figures which I have already given, would show on an average that the landlords have lost 30 per cent, the tenants 60 per cent, and the laborers 10 per cent, and putting that into figures, it brings out that on £65,000,000 of rental for the United Kingdom the landlords' loss of 30 per cent would be equal to about £20,000,000 and the tenants' 60 per cent, inasmuch as their income may be taken at half the rental, would be just the same; that is to say, 60 per cent, on half the rental is also £20,000,000. With regard to the laborers there was a difficulty in estimating the amount of reduction, but I will place before your lordships the way in which I endeavored to arrive at it.

The following is from the final report:

With very few exceptions trade is reported to be depressed, and in many cases it is considered to be more depressed than at any previous period. The number of workmen out of employment at the time when the answers were drawn up showed considerable variation according to the districts and trades to which they belonged, but there appears to have been a greater want of employment among the unskilled than among the skilled workmen. The rate of wages for time work appears on the whole to be slightly higher than the average of the last twenty years, but it is not now at its highest point. The rate for piecework has diminished for nearly all cases. A reduction is reported in hours of work of from three to four hours a week during the last fifteen years. Both the quantity and the quality of the work produced have largely increased. Summarizing very briefly the answers which we received to our questions, and the oral evidence given before us, there would appear to be a general agreement among those whom we consulted—

A. That the trade and industry of the country are in a condition which may be fairly described as depressed.

B. That by this depression is meant a diminution and in some cases an absence of profit, with a corresponding diminution of employment for the laboring classes.

C. That neither the volume of trade nor the amount of capital invested therein has materially fallen off, though the latter has in many cases diminished in value.

D. That the depression above-referred to dates from about the year 1875, and that with the exception of a short period of prosperity enjoyed by certain branches of trade in the years 1880 to 1883, it has proceeded with tolerable uniformity and

has affected the trade and industry of the country generally, but more especially those branches which are connected with agriculture.

As regards the causes which have contributed to bring about this state of things, there was, as might be expected, less unanimity of opinion, but the following enumeration will, we think, include all those to which any importance was attached:

- First. Overproduction.
  - Second. The continuous fall of prices caused by the depreciation of the standard value.
  - Third. The effect of foreign tariffs and bounties and the restrictive commercial policies of foreign countries in limiting our markets.
  - Fourth. Foreign competition, which we are beginning to feel both in our own and neutral markets.
  - Fifth. An increase in local taxation and the burdens of industry generally.
  - Sixth. Cheaper rates of carriage enjoyed by our foreign competitors.
  - Seventh. Legislation affecting the employment of labor in industrial undertakings.
  - Eighth. Superior technical education of the workmen in foreign countries.
- Those who may be said to represent the producer have mainly dwelt upon the restriction and even the absence of profit in their respective businesses. It is from this class, and more especially from the employers of labor, that the complaints chiefly proceed. On the other hand, those classes of the population who derive their income from foreign investments, or from property not directly connected with productive industries, appear to have little ground of complaint. On the contrary, they have profited by the remarkably low prices of many commodities.

We may therefore sum up the chief features of the commercial situation as being:

- A. A very serious falling off in the exchangeable value of the produce of the soil;
- B. An increased production of nearly all other classes of commodities;
- C. A tendency in the supply of commodities to outrun the demand;
- D. A diminution in the profits obtainable by production; and
- E. A similar diminution in the rate of interest on invested capital.

The diminution in the rate of profit obtainable from production, whether agricultural or manufacturing, has given rise to a widespread feeling of depression among all the producing classes. Those, on the other hand, who are in receipt of fixed salaries, or who draw their incomes from fixed investments, have apparently little to complain of, and we think that so far as regards the purchasing power of wages, a similar remark will apply to the laboring classes.

We are disposed to think that one of the chief agencies which have tended to perpetuate this state of things is the protectionist policy of so many foreign countries, which has become more marked during the last ten years than at any previous period of similar length. The high prices which protection secures to the purchaser within its protected area naturally stimulate production and impel him to engage in competition in foreign markets. The surplus production which can not find a market at home is sent abroad, and in foreign markets under-sells the commodities produced under less artificial conditions. The natural growth of the industries of foreign countries, possessing in many cases the population and other resources required for successful manufacturing enterprise, has also contributed to produce the same result.

We have, as above pointed out, suffered a serious loss in our purchasing power by reason of the deficient or unremunerative character of the produce of the soil. Sir James Caird estimates the loss in purchasing power of the classes engaged in or connected with agriculture at £42,800,000 during the year 1885, and the loss in several of the preceding years must, no doubt, have been equal to or even greater than this. This amount has been lost to the markets in which it was formerly agent, and can not fail to have had an important influence upon the demand for manufactured goods.

I hold in my hand a clipping from a recent paper which is headed "A False Prophet," and is as follows:

English agriculturists are not satisfied with their experience of free trade. A correspondent in the Mark Lane Express, of January 8, Mr. James Hunt, 12 Hampton Park, Bristol, wrote:

"If we are to compare nation with nation, we can give proofs that American protectionist artisans are earning and saving more money than English free traders are."

The writer concludes his communication with the following significant parallel:

A FALSE PROPHET.

<p>Some of Cobden's assertions that converted Peel and Gladstone:</p> <p>"Land would not be driven out of cultivation by the repeal of the corn laws."</p>	<p>Proofs of false prophecy:</p> <p>Nearly 2,500,000 acres have been driven out.</p>
--	--

That is a statement which nobody will dispute, and it shows that Mr. Cobden was entirely mistaken in regard to the effect of free trade on agriculture. The parallel proceeds:

COBDEN'S STATEMENT.

"Land-owners have nothing to fear from free trade in corn."  
 "In a country growing in population and advancing in prosperity, land always increases in value and without any help from the owners."  
 "The land of England would produce 25,000,000 qrs. of wheat per annum."  
 "We should always have a natural protection of 10s. 6d. per qr. on wheat in the shape of carriage from abroad."  
 "We might as well doubt that the sun would rise on the morrow as doubt that in ten years every civilized nation on earth would have followed our free-trade example."

THE FACT.

Rents and agricultural land values have fallen from 30 to 50 per cent.  
 If all the land in cultivation twenty years ago was worth £50 an acre and has fallen 40 per cent, that is a loss of £20 an acre.  
 In 1862 we grew 17,000,000 qrs.; in 1892 about 7,000,000.  
 Freights for wheat are now below 2s. a qr., and it has been carried free as ballast.  
 Not a single nation on earth has followed our example, and all are heavily taxing our goods in return for a free market here.

It seems that Great Britain was not entirely satisfied with the working of free trade.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—  
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have had in my possession an extract from Temple Bar, a celebrated English publication, relating to English taxation, which I have wanted to put into the RECORD, and with the permission of the Senator from Oregon I should like to insert it now.

Mr. DOLPH. I shall be very glad to have it inserted.

Mr. GALLINGER. That great English newspaper, in discussing the question of English taxes concerning the English people, says:

Birth is taxed, death is taxed. Commodities are taxed, manufactures are taxed, trades are taxed, houses are taxed, incomes are taxed. We are taxed for our butler, if we are prosperous enough to keep one. We are taxed for our footman, groom or gardener. The carriage we keep is taxed, the omnibus we take is taxed, the cab we hire is taxed, the railroad train we travel by is taxed. The house dog is taxed, and so also is the heraldic device on our note paper.

Everything we drink is taxed—beer, spirits, wine, tea, coffee, and even the water we drink; there is the water rate. Light is taxed through the medium of the gas rate. The land we walk upon is taxed, the tobacco we smoke is taxed, the gold or silver jewelry we wear, the eau de cologne perfuming our handkerchiefs, the figs we eat on Palm Sunday, the Christmas plum pudding, these are all taxed. Even our antibilious pills are not free.

All these, and they are but a few of the taxes that exist, are mostly Imperial taxes for the purposes of government—some of them, however, are assigned to the county councils. There are also local rates, which are but local taxes, for the poor, county council, police, voting lists, street lighting, paving, watering, etc.; sewers, school board and vestry, householders, lodgers, married and single men, women and children, are all taxed in some form or other, for taxation is devised to reach every one.

The late Lord Sherbrooke (Robert Lowe) when chancellor of the exchequer, calculated that one-ninth of our income is taken from us for Imperial taxation; but the proportion is more now, and is growing. Local taxation is much less.

That is all I care to put into the Record on this subject, but it corroborates what the Senator from Oregon has been so forcibly stating, that under free trade the burden of taxation is much greater than it is under the system of protective duties which exists in the United States.

Mr. DOLPH. Before I reached this point as to the effect of free trade with England and her dependencies I was discussing the question as to who is demanding free trade with the United States and the repeal of the McKinley law. I then had misplaced a report of a meeting, a free-trade demonstration held at Sydney, Australia, immediately after the news of the last Presidential election was received. I clipped it from an Australian paper. It is as follows:

The Presidential Election.  
 Free-trade Demonstration.  
 Congratulations to Mr. Grover Cleveland.  
 An Immense Gathering.

I will quote from two or three speeches that I think will be entertaining to the Senate and the country, and I will insert the matter, if there be no objection, in the RECORD.

I introduce it to show the rejoicing in a foreign country at a public meeting over the election of Mr. Cleveland for the single substantial reason that they deemed it a large step in advance toward free-trade, breaking down the citadel of protection and opening our markets to the free introduction of foreign products:

A mass meeting of free-traders was held last evening in the Protestant Hall in celebration of the election of Mr. Grover Cleveland as President of the United States of America. By ten minutes to 8 o'clock the hall was crowded to excess by some 3,000 persons, while over a thousand persons failed to gain admission. The preparation made for the meeting included the decoration of the hall with bunting, in which happy effects were produced by combinations of the English, American, and Australian flags. The proceedings throughout were marked by great enthusiasm. Sir Henry Parkes, on making his appearance on the platform, was greeted with loud and prolonged cheering, and there was a renewed outburst whenever he rose to his feet in discharge of his duties as chairman. There were also present on the platform the Hons. A. J. Riley, J. Davies, S. A. Joseph, G. Campbell, and W. H. Suttor, Ms.L.C.; Messrs. Reid, McMillan, Burdekin, Haynes, Eve, Jeanneret, Campbell, Fuller, Inglis, Wise, Allen, Dale, Farnell, Want, Lees, Martin, Neild, Young, V. Parkes, Cotton, Bavister, Hindle, Molesworth, Danahy, and Dr. Cullen, Ms.L.A.; Messrs. H. Gorman, R. H. Reynolds, A. K. MacKellar, T. W. Warren, J. E. Garbett, George Pile, E. Pulsford, J. B. Olliffe, J. T. Wilshire, J. H. Newman, Alfred Cane, J. F. Burns, C. H. Hayes, Russell-Jones, R. P. Abbott, T. A. Hinchcliffe, R. J. Dunford, James Lees, E. W. Foxall, R. J. Black, Thomas Rowe, B. Rhodes, E. M. Saddington, E. J. H. Knapp, J. B. Johnston, and other gentlemen. Lady Parkes likewise occupied a seat upon the platform.

Sir Henry Parkes said that he was present equally with a feeling of duty and a deep sense of pleasure. They had met on an occasion which might be truly called one concerning the whole human race. [Cheers.] The meeting was called to enable the people of Sydney to send their congratulations to the American people [cheers] on the occasion of the noble election of Mr. Grover Cleveland. [Cheers.] Might he detain them for two or three minutes to state what this meant? Mr. Cleveland was a comparatively new man. He was still in the prime of his manhood. He first was tried in the great position of sheriff. He then was tried as mayor of the city of Buffalo, and he was then tried as governor of the mighty State of New York. New York, with its six or seven millions of people, was in itself a nation. In these capacities of sheriff, and mayor, and as governor of the State of New York, Mr. Cleveland disclosed a calm and regulated courage. Not the courage of the bulldog or the savage, but the courage which could do what was right, not only in the face of danger, but in the face of ridicule, and would do what was right, fearing nothing but the giving of offense to the principles of truth and justice. [Cheers.] Mr. Cleveland disclosed a faculty of rare discernment in the men around him, and wherever he found abuse without fear or favor he rooted it up; and wherever he found favoritism at the expense of his fellow-men he corrected it; and wherever he was required to do what he thought wrong he refused to do it. [Cheers.] That was exactly the man which a great people wanted as its chief ruler. [Cheers.] Well, Mr. Grover Cleveland's fellow-countrymen, seeing these fine, unpretending, but noble qualities, nominated Mr. Cleveland eight years ago to the great office of elective sovereign of the American commonwealth. When he was waited upon by those commissioned to advise him of this momentous turn in the fortunes of his life the gentleman who acted as spokesman used these remarkable words: "This choice carries with it profound personal respect and admiration, but it has been in no manner the fruit of these sentiments. The national Democracy seek a President, not in compliment for what the man is, or reward for what he has done, but in a just expectation of what he will accomplish as the true servant of a free people, fit for their lofty trust." [Cheers.] It would be difficult to find a finer or nobler passage of eloquence descriptive of the work for which Mr. Grover Cleveland had been selected.

Well, Mr. Cleveland's four years of office passed away. He made a few mistakes, but they must remember no man was perfect. They all remembered how, with

some few mistakes, Mr. Cleveland nobly fulfilled his duties. In the next contest the Republican party beat him. He wished to be just, and so he would say that he thought that General Harrison, the choice of the Republicans, during his four years' reign had shown himself a high-minded and worthy citizen. [Cheers.] But the time had come again, eight years after his first election. The time had come for another election; and they knew now what most of them foretold, but what none of them ever dreamed of in all its triumph—they knew now that since the days of Washington there had been no such universal expression of choice as that which had fallen on Mr. Cleveland. [Cheers.] What did it represent? It represented that the people of America had declared that henceforward money should only be taken out of the pockets of the people for the just purposes of just government. [Cheers.] It meant that the last day of scarcity and dearth had dawned [cheers] that it had more than dawned; that it was in the full blaze of the rising sun. Without exaggerating the event of the election of Mr. Cleveland as the greatest event since the emancipation of the slaves, he could say it would be regarded as a battering ram at the citadel of protection in every land benighted and bowed down by that blackest of all curses. [Cheers.] It meant more than that. It meant a great awakening light to all the nations to show them the broad road to human freedom and human progress; and it would be hailed in every land where freedom was understood and where the rights of a free people were respected as blessings given to the world by a divine hand. [Cheers.] Mr. Cleveland was, if anything, a great American citizen. He was a free, moral, high-minded, clear-minded, true-hearted, and courageous honest man. [Cheers.] And in office—the highest office which a free man could hope to obtain—as in the smaller offices which he had filled, Mr. Cleveland, they might rest assured, would, while he studied the interests of America, do his utmost—and that utmost would be great—to preserve, foster, and promote friendly intercourse among the nations. [Cheers.] But far beyond the mere attainment of the blessing of that election was the spectacle of unparalleled magnificence—a mighty people awakening in their quiet consciousness to their power and, scorning the machinations of schemers and traffickers, rising to the full sense of patriotically serving their country.

While they could not but admire from their inmost souls the great reward that Grover Cleveland had attained, still they must not forget that the people of the mightiest Republic under the sun had set their seal on free trade [loud cheers] and liberty in the face of all attempts to bring about the worn-out theories of protection, though the persons who were proposing them might be robed in the ceremonies of the grave. [Cheers.] They were there to offer their congratulations to the people of their own blood, to the people inheriting their own aspirations and faith, the people who spoke their language, and were, with them, and others speaking that language, destined to rule the world. [Cheers.] He could not detain them any longer, because the business was urgent and the speakers were many. He had to apologize for the nonattendance of Mr. R. B. Wilkinson and Mr. Dan. O'Connor, and he begged to call on Mr. George Reid to move the first resolution. [Loud cheering.]

Mr. G. H. Reid, who was received with prolonged applause, moved, "That this meeting offers its congratulations to the American people on the triumphant election of Mr. Grover Cleveland as President of the United States of America [cheers] and regards that event as the opening up of a new epoch of freedom and human progress." He thought that vast assemblage would confirm that resolution with enthusiastic sincerity. [Cheers.] In that magnificent electoral revolution which had effaced Harrison and placed Cleveland upon the highest pinnacle of national confidence, which had shipwrecked the Republican party and given to the Democrats their grandest opportunity, they saw born again the grand and fearless spirit of the founding fathers of the American Constitution [loud cheers] who abhorred injustice, and for liberty's sake braved death in a thousand forms. [Cheers.] Just as precious to mankind as any victory of Washington was the glorious triumph of Grover Cleveland, and the long dark spell of industrial suffering on the American continent was about to be broken at last. [Cheers.] The awakening consciousness of the American people had sealed the doom of the protectionist monster [loud cheering] and it had sealed the doom of the mammoth capitalistic combination that had so long under the cloak of patriotism sought to rob the masses of the commonwealth. [Cheers.]

Looking back upon the history of the United States, the change seemed phenomenal in its suddenness and completeness, the industrial and political energy of that great country had been perverted to serve so many purposes of fraud and corruption. [Cheers.] The favored industries had acquired tremendous power, which they used with marvelous skill without any scruple. Year after year party politics had been turned more and more in the interests of monopolists for their dishonest ends; year after year the people seemed to become more and more entangled in the meshes of the plutocracy. [Cheers.] Just as the sky was darkest, just as every evil influence seemed to move successfully against the prayers of those who longed for honest government, for a more equitable fiscal system, for a more enlightened commercial policy, freedom had come. Four years ago Cleveland, by his noble Presidential message, electrified the American people and the rest of the world by a deliverance worthy of the greatest and most patriotic leader of a free nation. [Cheers.] The protective party rashly put the faith of their policy to the test by placing it on an extreme but perfectly logical conclusion known as the McKinley tariff. Revealed in all its naked repulsiveness, the millions of American taxpayers had swept away that relic of barbarism [cheers], although some people of intelligence still called it protection. [Cheers and laughter.] Then followed a universal awakening on Tuesday last, which promised to cause full free trade over the United States, and enable her to assume her rightful place in the van of human freedom. [Cheers.]

The Australian free traders could now look across the Pacific and see 70,000,000 of the Anglo-Saxon race engaged in tearing down the discredited banner of protection [great and prolonged cheers] and hoisting in its place the flag which could never be destroyed—the flag of freedom and equality. [Loud cheers.] According to the statistical methods of their protectionist friends they could now summarize the Anglo-Saxon race as comprising 110,000,000 of free traders [great cheers and laughter] and six or seven millions of protectionists. [Great cheers and laughter.] The 38,000,000 of Great Britain had been grandly reinforced by the magnificent addition of 70,000,000, whose President in Congress had denounced protection as an unconstitutional outrage, and had pledged himself to reform the national tariff in the direction of free trade, which, as they knew, in the immortal words of Cobden, really meant "peace and good will amongst all men." [Great cheering.] Just as the happiest omen of the closing years of last century was the dawn of American independence, so they could now see that the closing years of this century would witness the dawn of an independence nobler still, which would enfranchise the majestic power and progress of the American people, and enable them to become the honored chief of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the opening to all mankind of new powers and mutual prosperity. [Cheers.] Could they doubt that the example of the United States, in which protection had had so magnificent a trial, and had come to so stupendous a fall [hear, hear] would be felt in every quarter of the globe [hear, hear] especially in Europe, where already, from the Baltic Sea to the Mediterranean, over all Germany, Austria, and Italy, there reigned comparative free trade. [Hear, hear.]

In offering their congratulations to Grover Cleveland and the American nation, he thought the free traders of New South Wales occupied a very proud position. [Great cheering.] Through all the darkest days of the great cause the mother colony had shared with the mother country the distinction of leading the world. [Great cheering.] Through all their trials they had carried the flag of free trade, and they would remember that in these arduous battles there had always been two great examples held up to them—the United States and the great colony of

Victoria. [Great cheering.] Now he thought their friends would have to search for new examples of protectionist grandeur amongst the South American republics. [Loud laughter and cheers.] The United States, which knew protection well by this time [hear, hear] had arisen against it as if it was a new form of cholera [laughter] and as for Victoria, on a smaller scale they saw the beginnings of a similar end. [Hear, hear.] He was glad to say that the progress of recent events had removed from his mind many misgivings which he had had with regard to Australian federation. [Great cheering, prolonged for some minutes.]

Convinced as he had been, and was still, that freetrade meant something vastly more than mere freedom of commerce [hear, hear], that it was essential to every honest system of government, and that protection opened a thousand doors to fraud and corruption [cheers], he confessed that he had used any influence he possessed to put a block on the federal movement, because he felt immediate federation meant an evil beginning in respect of the fiscal question for the new Commonwealth. [Hear, hear.] But he had hoped that the march of events would improve the prospects of free trade; and in view of the tremendous march of events in the last few days—which no one could well have foreseen in all their magnitude—he felt that when the great American Commonwealth was turning round to pursue the path of free trade no Australian federation would adopt protection [great and prolonged cheering], and he felt the way open to him to join hand in hand with those whom he saw around him in the great and patriotic enterprise of replacing provincial differences by a loyal and perpetual union. [Loud cheers.] But they must not be turned aside from the great and pressing duty which they owed to themselves and Australia. They must efface the mischievous work of that accidental government [great cheers] which had never faced the people. [Loud cheers.] It would be the duty of the free-trade party to appeal at the earliest possible day to the people [loud cheers] and carry the flag of free trade to an early and decisive victory [cheers] and when they had won the victory they must honestly perform the pledges they had given. [Cheers.] They should really and honestly reform their fiscal system; fearlessly readjusting the burdens of the people as humanity and justice require; acting fairly by all classes, pandering to none, and oppressing none. [Cheers.]

Mr. McMILLAN, who was received with loud cheering, said the magnificent and orderly demonstration which he saw before him that night had given him courage, as it would give to others, who through almost despair had fought the battle of freedom for the last twelve months [cheers], and he would urge them not merely to look on the interests of the great Republic of America, whose cause had been put before them that night, but he urged them to take the events that have occurred for them not only as a warning but as an inspiration. [Cheers.] The greatest political man England ever had said, "Slavery is a weed that grows on every soil." Slavery had grown in America; slavery had grown in Victoria. It had been planted here, but, please God, they would never grow it! [Cheers.] If they deprived him of his liberty, or infringed his liberty for any other purpose than the common good, they made him a political slave. [Cheers.] Protection must always represent the interests of a minority of the people; and if protection was such, he was deprived of his liberty, not for the common good, but for a minority of the people. [Cheers.] There was one thing with regard to the victory in America which stamped it above all other victories of the Presidential elections in the past. This victory was not a victory of the Executive; it was not a victory of the Senate; it was not only a victory of the House of Representatives, but of the whole people of the great Republic. [Cheers.] And just as he said that this should be an inspiration to them, he said that when they fought this battle again—as it must soon be fought—let the victory be not the victory of Sydney, or of a section of the people, but a victory of all New South Wales. [Cheers.]

America had unfortunately trammelled herself with protection at the very moment that she did the greatest work ever done by any civilized people—abolishing slavery. [Cheers.] But the exigencies and financial exigencies arising out of the abolition of slavery brought in by a side wind, and against the spirit of the American Constitution, the political slavery of protection. [Cheers.] And the same nefarious way had been used with them, for protection had never been the policy of the people of this country. [Cheers.] He was glad that night to recognize, not merely the old free traders of East Sydney, but he was glad to recognize the reconverted protectionists. [Cheers.] They had had a number of gentlemen who had been proclaiming themselves as protectionist Democrats, and amongst them had been the cabmen of Sydney. These gentlemen said it was not the consumer but the importer and the merchant who paid the duty, but these doctrinaire Democrats had now found out that the price of hay and the price of corn had gone up, and these Democrats were now free traders to a man. [Cheers.]

Rising above the mere petty localism of New South Wales, there was one thing that stood above all others in the solemnity of this question that night. For the last thirty years, since the great republic of America, that people had isolated themselves by the protectionist policy from the rest of the civilized world. They had destroyed the marine enterprise which had always been at the root of the greatness of the British people. They had put a China wall round their own country; but this great monster had been done away with, and the influence would be spread throughout every quarter of the globe. [Cheers.] And although free trade in America might affect the commerce of England, there was no British subject with a true heart of a Briton throughout the world but would welcome the power of the United States of America. He did not intend to take up their time much longer; but he wanted to say this, that just as America had awakened from the lethargy of political right, he trusted the people of New South Wales would rise to the full dignity of the political situation. He said—and he cared not whom he might offend—that during those months in Parliament when the free traders were fighting the battle of the people the people did not respond. He said the moment the protectionist tariff became law and was threatened on the heads of the people, they should have arisen like a man and said, "We will have none of this." There was not a town or hamlet throughout this great country that should not have held public meetings, and the air should have resounded with the cry of the people against the enormity of the Government. Let the great example of the American people take root amongst ourselves, and let them recollect this, that if they returned to free trade the free trade of New South Wales would preserve the freedom of all Australia. [Cheers.]

Mr. James Inglis said that he must recognize the importance of the occasion. We had pride in the wonderful history of the Anglo-Saxon race, and even protectionists in their calm moments, if they ever had any—[laughter]—would agree that the desire of all was to advance humanity. The victory in America taught us a great lesson. It showed that the Americans were our neighbors. We were proud to think of the great sentiment of "Advance Australia." The leaders on the other side—Mr. Lyne and others—doubtless thought they would advance Australia by placing impediments between the different colonial states. But that was never done in America even in its palmyest protectionist days. [A voice: "We don't want that."] These fetters and shackles were not put on in the interests of the people generally, but in the interests of few monopolists who pulled the strings. [Loud cheers.] This American victory ought to teach our workmen in thousands that the heart of human brotherhood was wider than any geographical border or line. [Hear, hear.] We were now beginning to see some glimmering of light on the horizon; and the kindly feeling which was rising between the nations would do much to raise the moral and spiritual elevation of our race. Let us, then, send a brotherly greeting across the waves, and with "Advance Australia" combine the sentiment "Hail Columbia." [Applause.]

The chairman then put the resolution, when a forest of hands was held up in its favor, whilst against it there were only a few. The resolution was, amidst general enthusiasm, declared to be carried, with five dissentients only.

Mr. B. R. Wise (who was received with applause) said that the resolution that he was asked to propose was: "That the chairman be empowered to dispatch a telegraphic message to Mr. Grover Cleveland embodying the sentiments of this meeting." He said that if he were asked in the fewest possible words a sufficient reason why, in addition to the resolution already passed, that great gathering of the citizens should add a message of personal congratulation to the President-elect, he would cull one passage from the letter in which the President announced his determination to accept nomination. "The question of the tariff," he said, "is not merely a question of markets; it is a question of morals." That splendid gathering was a most significant commentary upon the world, embracing power of liberal sentiment. Could we imagine our opponents gathering together in this or any other country to congratulate a foreign power because at a great national crisis the advocates of their policy were successful. ["No, no."]

One might just as well imagine a man's friends congratulating him because, when he paid a kindly visit to a person, the door was slammed in his face. Nothing was more striking than this that Grover Cleveland, following in the footsteps of Richard Cobden and Henry George, had recognized that this question must be fought upon higher grounds than the mere argument that was furnished by figures and appeals to the pocket. The policy of free traders had always been to argue the matter out on moral grounds. The policy of separating nations one from the other by means of hostile tariffs had never been, and could never be connected with any maxim of morality. It was, on the contrary, a defiance of all Christian teaching, and it rested avowedly on selfishness. Could they appeal to any recognized ethical standard to justify the policy which endeavored to separate nations the one from the other. Instead of regarding commerce as a process of peaceful cooperation between distant nations for a common good, protectionists regarded it as a field of conflict, and strove their utmost to create an opposition between the interests of one nation and the interests of others.

The nationalist who rejoiced over the distress which the McKinley tariff had caused in the tin-plate industry in South Wales, and who claimed every dislocation of foreign commerce and every injury to foreign traders as being a worthy triumph, evidently stood upon a different moral plane from those who held that every nation found its own true strength in a joint and peaceful progress with other countries. "Peace on earth, good will among men," which was the motto of the Cobden Club, could have no meaning in the ears of men who waged an internecine warfare with other countries by the means of hostile tariffs. For let anyone but remember through every detail how a tariff acted, and how every interruption to trade meant empty homes, starving children, and all the other sad accompaniments of "out of work," and he would see at once that a tariff was a means of warfare which only differed from that of murderous weapons because it did not leave its victims mangled on the ground. [Cheers.]

Fortunately that policy must win in the long run which rested upon a basis of sound morality. The broad fact which stood out beyond dispute in the record of human history was that, in spite of temporary checks and drawbacks, notwithstanding the passing triumphs of reactionary forces, the progress of civilization meant a continuous increase of international dealings.

Every improvement in the means of locomotion, every new development in our mechanical contrivances, every fresh mastery which man's intellect obtained over the blind forces of nature brought nearer together peoples that were formerly apart and made intercourse between men easier. Tariffs might impose their puny opposition for a time, and in their defense protectionists might empty all armies of darkness and fanaticism—the mighty onrush of human progress had never yet been stemmed by such expedients. [Cheers.]

But there were other reasons why they should extend their congratulations to their brethren across the sea. The downfall of protectionism in America meant the triumph of free trade in Australasia. [Cheers.] Further, the triumph had been won by means of the Australian ballot. [Cheers.] It was we who had given to the workman in America the first opportunity which he had ever had of recording an effective protest against the injustice and corruption of the protective system. Finally, we might congratulate Mr. Cleveland, not only as Australians, but as Englishmen. [Cheers.] We belonged to that race which had erected a monument in Westminster Abbey to the American poet Lowell, and which held a funeral service in that most glorious of English churches in honor of an American President; and, therefore, we might fittingly display another evidence of our unity by forwarding our congratulations to the brave and honorable leader on whom had now been laid the mighty task of dealing a deathblow throughout the English-speaking world to the greatest and most depressing superstition of modern times. [Cheers.]

Mr. Caruthers said that some three years ago, whilst speaking in that hall, he used words which, taken in the light of subsequent events, could be taken as almost prophetic. He would repeat the words. He said three years ago: "Within five years the nation which shed its best blood, the blood of its first-born and best citizens, to give freedom to the black slave, will have fought and decided its battle, and will have proclaimed liberty and freedom throughout the United States. When you hear the trumpet sound proclaiming freedom of men, then let New South Wales resound the sentiment, and New South Wales cry: 'We have borne the torch of freedom in these lands—sons of England with you, yet Australians determined to be free men in this free land—we greet you, freemen of England, America, and Australia, as fellow-citizens of the grand nation of the Anglo-Saxon race free from one end of the world to the other, from the rising to the setting sun.'" [Cheers.]

When he spoke these words it did not enter into his most sanguine anticipations that within five years he would be seconding a resolution which had for its object to reciprocate the joy which was felt by the citizens of America, and congratulating them upon having accomplished the great boon and won a great battle in the cause of liberty. They regarded Grover Cleveland's victory not merely as the victory of the American people, but as a victory for New South Welshmen in New South Wales. It had been pointed out by Mr. McMillan that great apathy had been displayed; no doubt the depression had had much to do with that, but the apathy would be removed from that night by the enthusiastic zeal which would be given to the free traders and mass of the people by that which had been done in the cause of liberty in the United States. He regarded the victory of the Democratic party as being something more than a victory for the free-trade cause. It was a victory in the cause of good government throughout the world. [Cheers.]

Six years since the American Democratic party met and framed a great platform. One of the great planks in that platform was, "We do specially deny the right of the Government to surrender the taxing power to corporations and individuals, which is the result of the theory and practice of the Republican party, and denounce the present tariff, which burdens the people with an excessive war tax in a time of peace." That platform condemned the tariff as unjust and inequitable, and in addition to placing burdens on the people cost the taxpayers five times as much as it yielded, and led to fraud.

It was denounced as placing bankrupt merchants above honest ones, and it was claimed that taxation should be exclusively for revenue purposes, and no more revenue should be collected than was required to meet the expenses and obligations of the Government economically administered. [Cheers.]

That was the platform on which that great battle had been won in America, and it could be adopted as the platform of the free-trade party throughout the world. Another aspect of the case which commanded itself to him—and he was sure, to all of them—was that Mr. Grover Cleveland began his second term as President as the sworn advocate of purity in public life, and he had time after time refused to dismiss Government officials because they belonged to the opposite party. In the past the Republican party had regarded office as the spoil of the victors; and they had recently in this colony seen offices given to men whose only

claim was that they had served their party well. The hearts of the people of New South Wales, however, beat just as truly in the cause of freedom that day as ever they did in times gone past, and when the time came they would express through the ballot boxes their desire for the restoration of the policy of freedom and liberty in New South Wales. [Cheers.]

Just as their message would be flashed to America congratulating Grover Cleveland and the American citizens they would give a further token, when the time came, and set their seals upon the actions of some of their public men and the acts upon their statute books. [Cheers.]

Sir Henry Parkes said that before calling on the next speaker he desired to read a telegram he had just received. It was as follows: "Free traders of West Maitland join you in congratulations to the United States." [Cheers.] He desired also to state that before he came to that meeting he had received a letter from a distinguished public man in Melbourne saying that a movement with the same object as that great meeting was being organized in that city [cheers], and he had no doubt from that and other indications that their example would be followed throughout Australasia. [Cheers.] He would now call upon Mr. J. C. Neill.

Mr. Neill, who was received with loud cheers, said they had met that night to congratulate the new President of the United States, and to congratulate the great Republic upon his election; but he thought they might also have a word of congratulation for New South Wales at the same time, because in the tremendous event of the past few days in the great Republic across the sea they had an indication of the fact that the heart of the Anglo-Saxon people was after all true to the great principle of commercial and industrial freedom. [Cheers.] And those who had in that colony, in season and out of season, in the day and in the night, from the platform, in the press, and in Parliament, maintained their fiscal views and their faith in freedom for all men, had just cause for congratulation that across the seas came the tremendous alliance of the most numerous body of the Anglo-Saxon race. [Cheers.] While they congratulated America and New South Wales he thought they might also spare a sympathetic thought for their unfortunate protectionist brothers [loud laughter] because they had lost their main prop and argument in favor of commercial and industrial slavery. [Laughter and applause.]

They must also remember that their great victory in America had been won by the Australian system of ballot. For the first time the Presidential election has been free from the influence of the political wire-puller. ["Hear! Hear!"] The Australian ballot system has won free trade for America, and in a short time they would have an opportunity of causing the ballotbox to win back free trade for New South Wales. [Great cheers.]

Mr. Cotton, who was received with loud cheering, said he must confess that his thoughts that night were not so much with the triumphant and successful politician, Grover Cleveland, magnificent man as he was, for he could not help remembering that in all great triumphant reforms there were three stages: First, the great-hearted reformer standing alone and caring nothing for public opinion; then the little circle of earnest followers, the propagandists; and then lastly, as the tide swelled and deepened and there came the hurried awakening of the people, the politician came. His thoughts that night went back to the men who had stood in the advance guard of light and freedom in America for many a weary year past, at least one of whom he was proud to call his personal friend. [Cheers.]

These were the men who had leavened the American people [hear] and made that victory possible. He had seen these changes coming; he had read the burning words of the men who had done the work, the true Democrats, the men who worked not for office, not for gain, but for love of truth and truth only. He was prepared to give to Grover Cleveland every meed of praise—and he deserved much at the hands of the American people for the bravery and loyalty to the right—but he would like to go back to the men who had made Grover Cleveland's election possible. The lesson which the world was learning everywhere to-day was that progress did not come by encouraging the hatred of class against class, people against people, nation against nation, but that the signal of progress was freedom, and equal freedom to all. That was the lesson everywhere throughout the world recognized labor was learning. This great victory to him sounded like the first note of further victories. He believed it to be the crowning of the last breastwork between labor and freedom. When that a protectionist superstition died—and it was dying fast the wide world over—then, and then only, labor would stand in its own right and majesty, and claiming not protection, not privilege, not patronage, only freedom. [Cheers.]

He believed that they had seen the worst of industrial slavery. Though much remained to be done, he believed the world was now moving with quicker footsteps, moving on broader lines, and moving toward nobler aims. [Cheers.]

Mr. Fuller said he did not expect when he left home that night to attend that meeting that he would be called on for the first time in his life to address an audience in the city of Sydney, but as a young Australian it was with feelings of pride and pleasure that he stood there to witness one of the grandest movements in the cause of freedom that ever took place in the world. As long as he had been able to think for himself on this great matter he had done his best to establish free trade on a good basis in New South Wales, and so long as he had a voice to raise it would be raised in the interests of freedom and in defense of this, his native country. He was glad that the leader of the opposition declared himself in favor of the cause of federation. He believed the day was not far distant when they would have established throughout Australia a great, a vast, and a growing nation. [Cheers.]

The chairman then put the resolution and declared it carried with one dissentient vote only.

Mr. James Martin moved a vote of thanks to the chairman. They had met to-night, he said, to do honor to the greatest man in America, and he now asked them to do honor to the greatest man in Australia. [Cheers.] No one, he was sure, was more proud of President Cleveland's victory than Sir Henry Parkes. For fifty years he had labored in the free-trade cause, and he was glad that Sir Henry Parkes had lived to see the shackles of protection cast off from America. [Applause.] Why, Sir Parkes was the author of the very ballot scheme under which the American victory had just been won. All he could add, in conclusion, was that he hoped that their chairman would live to see a federated Australia and be its premier. [Loud applause.]

The motion was seconded by Mr. Molesworth, and carried with cheers. Sir Henry Parkes, in responding, said that he thanked them heartily for the vote of thanks. For fully thirty years he had never lost an opportunity of advocating free trade. He had been a protectionist during his career for only a few months; whilst the reigning protectionists in this country had mostly been free-traders until they "saw protection coming." [Laughter.] He was a free-trader because it was morally impossible for a protectionist government to be a pure government. This was so, because their source of strength lay in political corruption and a pandering to the self-interest of a class against the welfare of the general people. ["Hear! Hear!"]

The proceedings concluded with cheers for the Queen, called for by Sir Henry Parkes, and also with cheers for President Cleveland and the United States, and the utmost enthusiasm prevailed.

I hold in my hands a clipping entitled, "Of course England rejoices," in which the writer says:

It required not the gift of prophecy to foretell that a Democratic success at the polls would be hailed in England as a distinctively English victory. The English press has taken no pains to disguise its joy over the triumph of free-trade principles. John Bull, from purely selfish motives, rejoices that the first step has been

taken in the direction of throwing open the American market to British goods. The Pall Mall Gazette faithfully voiced English sentiment when it declared the day after the election that "both the merchants and the unemployed workmen of England have reason to rejoice at the Democratic victory, as with the possibility of the reopening of the American markets to the goods of Birmingham, Bradford, and Manchester capitalists will get a chance to procure some returns on their money invested, and workmen will have an opportunity of getting a decent price for their labor without the necessity of striking."

That is to say, capitalists in England and workmen in England, not workmen in the United States.

It will be noticed that the Pall Mall Gazette views the late Democratic victory from a purely English standpoint. It sees that that victory will open the American markets to the goods of Birmingham, Bradford, and Manchester. But the products of these great English manufacturing centers can not take their place in our markets without displacing the products of Lowell, Fall River, and other American manufacturing towns. Consequently England's gain will be America's loss. We have no desire to have English capitalists or English workmen suffer. But neither have we any wish to see their suffering alleviated at the expense of American capital and American labor.

It is because Englishmen believe that such alleviation is near at hand, as a consequence of the election of Grover Cleveland, that they rejoice over the recent Democratic victory. The intensity of their interest in the verdict rendered at the polls on November 8 is well described in the following cable dispatch:

"LONDON, November 11.

"There is everywhere great enthusiasm over the result of the American election. Advices from Wales state that tin-plate workers held a jubilee, and at Bradford many remained up till late yesterday morning to hear the figures from America. There has not been such excitement for a long time in the industrial centers of Great Britain."

This enthusiasm over Democratic success is easily explained. It has its source in the conviction that every Democratic vote was a vote for England and England's interests. It is not the first time that America's greatest commercial rival has rejoiced over the triumph of a political party whose antiprotective principles have ever endeared it to John Bull. The rejoicings that resounded throughout England on November 10 were the echoes of similar rejoicings that have been heard there for the last forty years whenever the free-trade Democracy scored a victory at the polls. In 1852 England hailed the election of Pierce, whom the London Times described as "a valuable ally of our (English) commercial policy," with almost as much enthusiasm as she now evinces over the election of Grover Cleveland.

It shows that there was great rejoicing in foreign industrial centers over the result of the Presidential election. It was not alone in the cities of the United States; it was not alone in the capital of the nation that the people staid up until the next morning to get the news of the election. They staid up in the great industrial centers of Great Britain to get the news of the election.

I hold in my hand a clipping from an English paper entitled, "Agricultural Depression and Free Imports." Mr. Sibson S. Rigg, of Manchester, writes:

We have at the present time a royal commission holding inquiries throughout the country relative to the conditions of agriculture. This industry, to say the least of it, is by far the greatest we have. We are told—besides, we know from bitter experience—of the deplorable and wretched plight this industry is in at the present moment. With your permission, I beg to put before you figures from the statistical abstract, confirming the almost unanimous vote given at the large agricultural meeting held in London, which affirmed that foreign competition is the sole cause for the depression, or, in plainer words, our rotten system of free imports.

I will insert this table, as it will be tedious to read it. It shows a great increase in the importations of agricultural products into Great Britain:

	1892.	1855.	1886.	1892.
Cows, oxen, etc.....number	502,237	£1,333,763	£5,066,846	£9,224,011
Sheep.....do	79,048	282,844	2,010,194	125,659
Swine.....do	3,826	.....	63,357	12,465
Horses.....do	20,994	.....	189,901	425,401
Bacon and hams.....cwt.	5,134,510	617,423	8,402,828	10,893,833
Beef.....do	2,355,031	482,802	2,178,677	4,801,736
Butter.....do	2,183,009	2,449,522	8,141,438	11,965,190
Margarine.....do	1,305,350	inc.w.but.	2,962,264	3,712,884
Cheese.....do	2,232,817	1,027,784	3,871,859	5,416,784
Eggs.....1,000's	1,336,730	236,865	2,884,063	3,794,718
Poultry and rabbits.....	.....	.....	639,704	888,692
Hops.....cwt.	157,507	171,935	447,253	990,260
Lard.....do	1,239,051	310,036	1,544,632	2,233,011
Pork.....do	350,461	489,935	631,538	616,427
Maize.....do	35,381,224	2,640,250	7,617,470	9,425,211
Potatoes.....do	3,008,336	10,196	799,265	950,332
Tallow.....do	1,375,679	2,647,173	1,298,214	1,747,968
Meats, salted, etc.....do	850,074	.....	1,281,245	2,286,710
Mutton, fresh.....do	1,699,960	.....	1,405,383	3,447,102
Milk, con.....do	451,374	.....	.....	930,288
Onions.....bushels	4,420,270	.....	506,710	724,040
Vegetables.....	.....	.....	540,670	1,016,280
Total.....	.....	12,700,538	52,486,011	75,607,022

1892 over 1886, increase 44 per cent.

Flour.....cwt.	22,106,009	2,304,106	8,228,051	12,267,453
----------------	------------	-----------	-----------	------------

Increase, 47.8 per cent.

This large import of flour, instead of grain, deprives British millers of wages.

Corn, exclusive of maize and flour, hundredweights.....	163,429,894	13,644,544	27,702,658	37,041,428
Total.....	.....	28,649,188	88,416,720	124,915,903

Increase, 33.6 per cent.

	1892.	1855.	1886.	1892.
Population.....	.....	.....	36,312,715	38,104,973

Increase, 5 per cent.

From the above it will be seen with an increased population in 1892 over 1880 of only 5 per cent, that we have, at the same time, an increase of agricultural imports, apart from corn, 44 per cent, flour 47.8 per cent, and wheat, oats, and barley 33.6 per cent, together in value some £36,500,000 of an increase.

Mark that! With an increase of only 5 per cent in population there has been an increase of almost 50 per cent of agricultural products within ten years in Great Britain. The writer proceeds:

Surely this is foreign competition with a vengeance, especially when considered with the decreased production of coal, iron, etc., in this country, all of which go to prove a most ruinous state of affairs. Royal commissions are utterly useless, unless we are going to learn. In 1886 we had a royal commission on depression of trade.

I have already quoted from that report—

And then the unanimous verdict was that foreign products were being sold under cost in our markets, which they could easily do, being protected in their markets, thus ruining British producers, and after that they enjoy both markets (not even name cheaper wages and longer hours worked). I am very much afraid that the present condition of things will continue to go on until greater disaster befalls us; then protection will be reinstated in no half fashion.

This is a British writer in a leading British journal.

The late Lord Derby, the former prime minister, said: "The cruel injustice of free imports on agriculture would recoil itself on all the other industries of the land." Is not this coming true?

Two or three years ago in a speech I made upon the tariff as it affected agricultural interests I quoted several extracts from a very remarkable little volume entitled "A Forbidden Subject, or Protection to British Industries," which was written by a titled citizen of Great Britain. It was written by Sir Edward Sullivan, a man who had studied this question, and expresses his opinions in no uncertain manner. I have marked several quotations running through this volume which I desire to have inserted, but I will ask the Secretary to read a portion, commencing on the first page, and see what this English baronet has to say about the effect of free trade on Great Britain, so as to show whether I was correct when I assumed that the free-trade policy of England had been the worst crime that any country had committed upon its citizens in the nineteenth century.

The Secretary read as requested:

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD some brief quotations from this little book, part of which has already been read. What will be quoted will convince anyone who will examine it that public opinion in Great Britain in favor of free trade is not at all unanimous. Baronet Sullivan has written a series of essays which are contained in this little pamphlet and every sentence is a text upon the question of protection and free trade. It is one of the most remarkable pamphlets on the subject that I ever happened to have the pleasure of examining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection the request of the Senator from Oregon will be complied with.

The matter referred to is as follows:

What ostriches we are, sticking our heads in the sand and fancying the world does not see us, clamoring for cheapness with our lips, but in our hearts praying for higher prices! "Thank God that wheat is 27s. per quarter," we cackle, but every goose amongst us knows perfectly well that the community—agricultural and manufacturing—would be doing better with wheat at a permanent price of 45s. or 50s. per quarter, land in cultivation, and labor in demand, than with wheat at 27s. a quarter, land going out of cultivation, and labor standing idle. "But thank heaven," says Mr. Gladstone, "the masses have now got the franchise, and they will soon scatter to the winds the heresies of protection." I don't know about that. I don't suppose the working classes in the United Kingdom differ very much from their fellow workers and fellow countrymen in the United States, and I know that any workingman in America who advocated the heresy of free trade would be regarded as a poor creature past praying for. We are all of us profuse in our thanks to heaven, when our wishes seem uppermost; in fact, the readiness with which we thank heaven for giving us what we want must be rather confusing. One thanks heaven for rain; another for dry weather; one thanks heaven the masses have got the franchise, because they will vote down protection; another thanks heaven they have got the franchise, because they will vote down free trade.

But let us put a bold face on it. Yes, there are actually idiots going about the country talking scandal about free trade—and I am one of them—and this is what I say: That after forty years' experience of one-sided free trade the condition of labor in the United Kingdom is very alarming. That many industries have died out, or removed to other countries; that in nearly every industry English labor is undersold by foreign labor; that in most industries four days is now considered a week's work. That agricultural wages are dropping to a point never before reached; that in many counties the laborers are competing for work at 10s. and 9s. a week. That, in spite of excessive cheapness, there are millions in the country who only taste fresh meat once a week, or once a fortnight, and milk never.

That the pauper class number 7,000,000 in a population of 24,000,000; that there are 14,500,000 of the community receiving less than 10s. 6d. per week; that flesh and blood never was so cheap; the sweating system never so cruel; that land is rapidly going out of cultivation; that every year, with a rapidly increasing population, we are growing less food; that agriculture in all its branches is rapidly declining; that whilst our lands are going out of tillage those who are ready and anxious to till them are standing idle. The landowners, tenants, laborers, county tradesmen, represent 10,000,000 or 12,000,000, directly or indirectly, dependent on agriculture.

That agriculture, the growing of food for the people, must always be the most important interest in every community. That all of the ways in which capital

can be employed, agriculture is by far the most advantageous to society. That no equal capital puts into motion so much productive labor as that of the farmer. That to impose conditions under which the land can not be cultivated is devising the most gigantic "lockout" ever conceived. That the United Kingdom is the only country in the world that is going out of tillage. That everywhere else, in France, in Germany, Belgium, tillage is extending. That to advocate a return from tillage to grazing is like advocating a return from express trains to stage wagons. That tillage produces eight times the amount of human food, employs three times the amount of human labor that grazing does. That, therefore, the return from tillage to grazing means the emigration of one-half of the population. That all production that does not pay its cost ceases. That, therefore, if growing food does not pay its cost, it will cease.

That employment, not cheapness, is the mainspring of national prosperity and contentment. That the way to make a nation happy and prosperous is to give everybody an opportunity of being employed. That the idea of supplying a population of 34,000,000 with everything at a lower price than they can produce it is probably the most preposterous nonsense that ever entered the human mind. That this is actually what free trade pretends to do. We are attempting to supply ourselves with everything cheaper than we can produce it. That, in other words, we place before our workers cheap food, but put it out of their power to earn the money to buy it. That there is hardly an article in the world that can not be produced cheaper in some other country than in England.

That freight and transport are so cheap that nearly everything will now pay the cost of transport to England. That, owing to her insular position, surrounded on all sides by ports and harbors, England is more vulnerable to industrial invasion than any country in the world. That, owing to the extravagant and unthrifty character of her people, England is the one country in the world that requires to protect its labor. That it is impossible the price of labor can be maintained in the face of the labor competition of the whole world. That England is now suffering from industrial invasion. That foreign labor is driving out English labor, as the brown rat has driven out the black rat. That as it is the duty of the Government to protect us from an armed invasion, so it is the duty of the Government to protect us from an industrial invasion. That an armed invasion means temporary disgrace—that an industrial invasion means ruin.

That protection means protection to labor, protection to native industry, protection to those who eat their bread in the sweat of their face. That free trade means untaxed foreign competition. That foreign competition means competition in cheapness; competition in cheapness means competition in cheap labor; competition in cheap labor means competition in flesh and blood; and competition in flesh and blood is slavery. That excessive competition is the greatest curse that can be imposed on a working community. That the unrestricted labor competition of the whole world is rapidly making the conditions of English labor impossible. That cheap clothing and cheap food are of no value if human labor is cheaper still. That excessive cheapness is of no value to the community without employment. That employment means cheapness. That those who have employment can buy; that those who have not employment can not buy. That the first and paramount duty of every Government is to encourage conditions under which everyone can find employment. That we import manufactures and export manufacturers; import agricultural produce and export agricultural laborers; export strong men and import helpless paupers. That to advocate emigration with our fields untilled and 7,000,000 of our population half clothed is monstrous.

The board of trade returns are mere flapdoodle, the food of fools. That foreign imports and foreign exports alone are no proof of national prosperity. That internal production and internal consumption are the only proofs of national prosperity. That free trade has ruined Ireland, and protection alone can restore it to prosperity and contentment. That the cheapest countries are those most unfavorable to labor. That free trade means cheapness to the rich, the idlers, those with fixed incomes; but longer hours, lower wages, harder work to the workers. That the workers are 20 to 1 to the idlers, and, therefore, free trade sacrifices the interests of the 19 to the interests of the 1. That in no other community in the world has the Government ventured to impose the tyranny of unrestricted foreign competition on the workers. That foreign competition cheapens everything the working classes produce, but cheapens nothing they consume except food. That protection raises the price of one article they consume, but also raises the price of everything they produce. That higher prices for what they produce means higher wages, less grinding competition, a higher standard of life. That 5s. spent on the produce of English labor benefits the working classes more than 50s. spent on the produce of foreign labor. That it does not follow we eat more corn because we import more corn; we may grow less. That it does not follow we consume more silks because we import more, if we give up producing silks. That it is home trade enriches the working classes. That 25,000,000 of the population depend on the supply and demand of home trade. That they consume no foreign articles whatsoever. That it is manifestly unjust, as between class and class, to make everything the poor produce artificially cheap. That, indeed, the tendency ought to be the other way.

That the agricultural classes are the best customers of the manufacturing classes. That they consume no foreign manufactures. That, with the exception of food, foreign competition does not cheapen one single article the working classes consume; as a rule they consume entirely goods of English manufacture. That when the agricultural classes are doing well they buy; that when they are doing badly they "do without." That the wealth of a nation is the value of what it produces. That under foreign competition the value of everything we produce is decreasing every year. That to say under these conditions we are getting richer is absurd. That every year the balance of foreign trade is £100,000,000 against us. This has to be paid. Economists may argue till they are black in the face how it is paid; it does not signify twopenny, it has to be paid somehow. That one-sided free trade is a game of heads I lose, tails you win. That everyone is getting poorer who deals in labor, and every one is richer who deals in money. That unrestricted foreign competition is so evidently destructive of the vested interests and rights of labor that out of England no single statesman has ever considered it worth a moment's consideration. That in America the working classes believe to a man that in England the aristocracy have forced free trade on the working classes in order that they may buy their foreign luxuries cheap. They can not conceive that any working community can be such fools as to invite unrestricted foreign competition, that is killing their industries and driving them out of their country. The thirty-nine fortieths of mankind look upon free trade as absolute nonsense, unworthy a moment's serious consideration. That it is only a question of the majority. If 5,000 desire protection and 20,000 do not, it is monopoly. If 20,000 desire it and 5,000 do not, it is common sense. When the majority are for protection, protection is right; when the majority are against it, protection is wrong.

That free traders conceal the truth from the working classes. They tell them that labor is in a worse condition in America, France, Germany, and Belgium than it is in England, which is not true. They tell them that under any circumstances they can beat the foreigner, which is not true. They do not tell them that under protection the wages in France, Belgium, and Germany have nearly doubled. That forty years ago these countries had no manufacturing industries. That now they are teeming with them; that fifty years ago America had no manufacturing industry whatever; that now she supplies the entire wants of 50,000,000 of people, besides exporting everywhere. They do not tell them that in every country in the world, except England, agriculture is progressing. They do not tell them that for every sovereign that was in circulation forty years ago there are three sov-

eigns to-day. That it is the increased circulation of gold and the spread of steam—not England removing her import duties—that have caused the increased trade of the world. They do not tell them that English laborers, with 14s. a week (it ought to be 20s.) can not grow wheat as cheaply as Indian ryots, with 2s. a week. That English operatives working fifty-two hours for 25s. can not produce as cheaply as French, German, or Belgian operatives, working seventy hours for 20s. The working classes do not know the truth, and those who want their votes have not the courage to tell them.

England is the only country in the world in which what is called political economy has been treated merely as a question of party politics. It is hopeless. If a Conservative talks any scandal about free trade, the Radical shouts "Yah, yah, the cheap loaf! The cheap loaf!" If the Radical talks scandal about free trade, the Conservatives are equally ready to enlist votes with the cry of the cheap loaf! It has come to this—that it is the cheap loaf that is consuming the laborer, not the laborer the cheap loaf; because he does not grow it himself, but stands idle and pays the foreign laborer to grow it cheap for him. If a farmer was to take a farm of 10,000 acres and cultivate it with coolie labor at 2s. a week, the laborer would immediately understand what the cheap loaf meant; or if Messrs. Krupp were to open works at Birmingham and employ 15,000 Germans or Belgians at 15s. a week, the operatives would immediately understand what foreign competition meant. At present it is cheaper for Messrs. Krupp and for the Indian farmers to employ their cheap labor at home, and to send their cheap product to us than to bring their labor to this country, but the competition is the same, it is even worse. In the former case the money spent in producing would remain in the country, and now it all goes abroad.

These are some of the reasons why we idiots go about the country talking scandal about free trade. It would be easy to give a hundred more but they are enough for one dose.

In every branch of British industry the products of foreign labor are driving out the products of English labor. Employment and wages are fast falling. Agricultural laborers are competing for work at 10s. and 9s. a week. Those who live by labor say, "Why stand we here idle all the day? Why doth no man hire us? How is it that in the largest consuming community in the world, with consumption daily and hourly increasing, the work of the producers is daily and hourly decreasing?" "Why can't we get work?" say the workers, and the answer is coming back to them with hourly increasing distinctness, "Because the foreigner is doing your work." "Why then does the foreigner do our work?" asks the English worker. "Because he works for less wages," says the free trader; "because he works longer hours; because he is more thrifty; because he produces cheaper." But again asks the English workman, "If we work for less wages and longer hours, and are more thrifty and produce cheaper, shall we keep our work?" "No, indeed," replies the free trader. "The foreigner will work for still lower wages and still longer hours, and be still more thrifty, and produce cheaper still. It is entirely a question of cost, and in cost they can always beat you." "Then we must be protected, or leave the country," say the English workers. "Leave the country you may," reply the free traders, "in fact, it is probably the very best thing you can do; but protected you never shall be—not indeed unless you make it a condition of giving your vote."

If English consumers are to be supplied by foreign producers, how are English producers to live? How can they buy if they have not got any money? And how are they to get any money if they don't earn any wages? And how are they to earn any wages if they don't get any work? How can they consume unless they first produce? Did the folly of man ever conceive more suicidal nonsense than a scheme for supplying an industrial community of 34,000,000 with everything they consume from abroad cheaper than they can produce it themselves? It is simply a scheme for depriving our workmen of work. It is only political economists run riot who could have conceived it."

The question of protection to native labor is no longer one of theory but of fact. The time has come when the industrial classes will say to the financial classes, "Capital is your birthright, and very carefully you have looked after it. Well, labor is your birthright and it is time we began to look very carefully after it, too. You have taken our birthright out of our hands, because you said you were wiser than we were, and what have you done with it? You have muddled it away in attempts to bolster up your vain theories. You have thrown away our industrial defense and imposed upon us a competition under which we can not live and thrive in our own country. This is absurd. You have been entirely selfish in this matter, but we can be selfish, too; but if we are we shall have an excuse that you have not, the excuse of necessity. You encourage foreign labor in order that you may get luxuries. We protect native labor in order that we may get necessities, for we can not live unless we can earn. You say that things can not be too cheap for you; but they can be a great deal too cheap for us, if they are cheaper than we can make them. Free imports mean luxury to you, they often mean want to us. Protection means fewer luxuries to you, but it means more employment to us. Of course, you don't care much for our being out of work, the foreigner supplies you with all you want. But, to tell you the truth, we shouldn't care much for your being out of luxuries, in fact, we think that in every way it is better that you should be short of luxuries than that we should be short of work."

A great change has come over this country as regards the employment of capital. A generation ago England and Scotland offered the best field for the investment of capital. Everywhere capital was invested with industries of every kind—in agriculture, in manufactures. England was the great field for industrial investment. Now, this is all altered. Everywhere capital is being withdrawn from British industries, agricultural and manufacturing, and employed in finance, in foreign loans and foreign industries, and foreign undertakings of every kind. British agriculture and British industries no longer pay and, therefore, capital is removed from them to other investments that do pay. Now, this is very bad and very serious. In every community capital and labor are more or less antagonistic; but in England, owing to free trade, the antagonism is complete.

There are, in fact, two Englands—financial England and industrial England—and they are completely separated. Industrial England concerns the existence of about 30,000,000 of people; financial England concerns the comfort and luxury of about 4,000,000. In our population of 34,000,000 about 30,000,000 represent labor and about 4,000,000 represent capital. During the last ten years capital has been steadily, latterly very rapidly, flowing from the former to the latter—from labor to capital. Money attracts money; labor is getting poorer every day; capital is accumulating beyond the dreams of avarice. The capital of England keeps 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 in affluence, some in excessive wealth. We see a millionaire and assume he is an index of the wealth of the country, but he is not. His wealth does not necessarily, very likely not at all, proceed from English industries. On the contrary, his wealth very often represents money withdrawn or withheld from English industries and invested in foreign industries. How many mills closed, how many parishes gone out of cultivation, may go to make one city millionaire! Formerly it was the employer of labor who grew rich. Then the interests of capital and labor were united. Now it is the financier, who employs no labor at all, who grows rich and the employer of labor grows poor. Capital and labor are completely divorced by free trade. "What a bore you are," says capital to labor, "with your strikes and your complaints. They don't concern us one little bit. You need not cultivate an acre of land or produce anything whatever. We shall go on just the same; we can get everything we want from abroad. We really

have no interest in you whatever. If you strike and don't produce what we want it makes no difference whatever to us. We only buy more abroad."

If an industrial community insists upon being supplied with everything it consumes cheaper than it can be produced at home, there will soon be no work for that community to do. It must leave the country or starve.

Emigrate, emigrate, emigrate, emigrate, cackle our free-trade geese; but what do they mean? It is immigration, not emigration, that makes a country rich. The rats leave a sinking ship, but they swarm to a full one. It is population that enriches a country. It remained for our "long ears" to make the glorious discovery that a country must be depopulated to be enriched. But what is the use of theorizing with the facts before your eyes? Ireland had a population of 8,000,000, and she exported largely corn and cattle. She has now a population of 5,000,000, and she imports largely corn and cattle. Of course this must be so. With every workingman who has left Ireland her production has *pro tanto* diminished, and she has become poorer. Three million of her children have left her, and to that extent she has become poorer, and now we are called upon to apply the same remedy to England.

Emigrate, emigrate, emigrate, cackle the geese again. Get rid of the workers, drive out the working bees, and leave us only the drones, and see how high the hive will become. What a lot of honey we shall make! This is no exaggeration. It is the able-bodied, the workers, those who produce, who leave the country; it is the old, the puny, the sick, the infirm, the idlers, the loungers, those who produce nothing who remain. Do they add to the wealth of the country, or do they drain it? We are told that we must not discuss the question of protection to native industry lest it may encourage home rule. Ye gods; are not the vital interests of 30,000,000 of workers of more importance than the wishes of 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 of political agitators? And besides protection to native industry, protection to labor, is the cry of Ireland, just as much as it is the cry of England. What has killed down every industry in Ireland, driven half her population to leave the country? Foreign competition; English competition. What alone can restore her prosperity? Bring back her people; the revival of industries; the protection of native labor.

But I will give you a few reasons why it is, in my opinion, a disgrace, after forty years' experience of its ruinous results, any longer to advocate one-sided free trade: Because after forty years of one-sided free trade the condition of labor, in all its branches, in this country is frightful; because the number of the unemployed is alarming; because we have 1,000,000 of paupers; because 1 out of every 5 of the population is toeing the line of pauperism; because 14,000,000 of the population average less than 10s. 6d. per week; because agricultural wages are down to 10s. and 9s. a week; because in most industries four days is considered a week's work; because the sweating system never was so cruel; because the workers are leaving free-trade England to find work in protectionist America; because millions who can't live and thrive under free trade in England do live and thrive under protection in America; because we export our workers and import what our workers produce; because free trade says to the English worker go and to the foreign worker come.

Because free trade insists on the admission of foreign labor, even though it throws our own labor out of employment; because free trade preaches that water is thicker than blood; that the interests of the foreign workers are of more importance than the interests of the English workers; because free trade promotes the interests of 4,000,000 of capitalists at the expense of the interests of 20,000,000 of workers; because under free trade English and Irish workers can not live and thrive in their own country; because free trade advances the interests of foreign labor at the expense of the interests of English labor; because free trade has driven 3,000,000 of people out of Ireland; because free trade in no way concerns itself with the interests of labor.

Because free trade defends bonuses on foreign manufactures, and advocates preferential railway rates for foreign products. Because free trade encourages the free importation of foreign manufactures into English ports, and excuses the exclusion of English manufactures from foreign ports. Because under free trade the consumption increases with increasing population every year, and production diminishes with increasing population every year. Because free trade places the interests of capital before the interests of labor. Because under free trade the land is going out of cultivation, and the hands ready to cultivate it are standing idle. Because in all directions the land is relapsing from tillage to grazing. Because numerous industries have died out in England under free trade, to expand into vigor and prosperity in other countries under protection.

Because under free trade agricultural industries are conducted at a loss, and manufacturing industries without profit. Because one-sided free trade is a sham; it is not free trade at all. It is dishonest, because it preaches cheapness, and prays for higher prices. Because it promotes the accumulation of wealth, and prevents the distribution of wealth. Because it proclaims that cheapness is of more importance than employment. Because under free trade capital is accumulating in the hands of money dealers, passing from the employers of labor to the bankers, brokers, financiers, etc. Because free trade by depreciating British investments, has encouraged foreign investments. Because wages have increased far more rapidly in Belgium, France, and Germany under protection than they have in England under free trade. Because workmen get 50 per cent more wages under protection in America than they do under free trade in England. Because free trade conceals the truth. Because it imposes on the ignorance of workmen. Because it tells them a great deal that is not true. Because it gives them the wrong causes for their depression, instead of the right ones. Because it exaggerates the disadvantages of protection and minimizes the disadvantages of free trade. And last, but not least, because under our present system of one-sided free trade, a revival of British industries and employment is an absolute impossibility.

Sir Lyon Playfair illustrates the wealth of the country by pointing out that we derive an income of £100,000,000 a year from our foreign investments, and all this, he says, is owing to glorious free trade. Does he tell us that a few years ago Mr. Caird calculated that the agricultural interest had lost £500,000,000—that in one year (1885) the loss of agricultural income was £48,000,000—that since he made those calculations the loss of agricultural capital and income has gone on with frightfully increased acceleration—that the capital loss on agriculture is now more nearly represented by £1,000,000,000, and the loss of agricultural income is not less than £60,000,000 per annum, and the loss of other industries perhaps three or four times as much more. He does not tell us that this also is the result of glorious free trade, but it is all the same. Oh, dear no! *Nisi bonum* is the motto of free trade. Enumerate, reiterate, exaggerate, yell from the house-tops all the benefits you can claim for free trade; but as you value your political life, don't venture to hint at any of its failures. One hundred million pounds of income from foreign investments represents £2,000,000,000 or thereabouts of English capital invested abroad. All this splendid investment of £2,000,000,000 is the result of glorious free trade, say the free-traders.

Are we to allow the effacing fingers of protection to touch it and impose on it a tax of 10 per cent? Never, never; revolution rather. And the working classes cry hysterically, Never, never; revolution rather. And revolution will come, if we don't protect our labor, as certainly as I am writing at this moment. Of this enormous capital of £2,000,000,000 invested abroad, do we suppose the working classes own 2,000 shillings; that of this £100,000,000 of income they ever touch

the value of one brass farthing? We appeal to figures and decline to accept their teaching. We magnify the increasing wealth of a few great capitalists and minimize the ruin of thousands of producers.

If ten millions of iron-workers, glass-makers, woolen, silk, cotton workers, etc., from Germany, France, and Belgium settled in Lancashire and Yorkshire and worked seventy hours a week, including Sundays, for 30 per cent less wages, they would, of course, undersell our workmen working fifty-two hours a week and demanding 30 per cent higher wages. Well, these Germans and French and Belgians are not working long hours for low wages in England, it is true, but they are working long hours for low wages in their own country, and are sending their products over to our markets, duty free, at a lower rate of transit than it costs the English workmen to send their products to their own markets. To all intents and purposes, the German or Belgian workman, who is working long hours for low wages in Germany or Belgium, is just as direct a competitor with the English workman as if he was working in Lancashire or Yorkshire.

In every industrial country in the world except England it is recognized that the first duty of the Government is to promote the employment of the people; in other words, to protect their industries. In every other industrial country but England the industries of the people are protected. Is it so certain that all the whole world is wrong and England only right? In every country, except England, it is allowed that the interests of those who both produce and consume are greater than the interests of those who only consume. In every industrial community out of England it is allowed that employment is of more importance than mere cheapness. In England alone it is maintained that cheapness is of more importance than employment. Are even free traders infallible?

Is there any doubt which is right? Employment gives the means of buying; cheapness does not give the means of buying. The penny roll is now down at a half-penny, and thousands of the unemployed would be much better off with the penny roll at twopenny if they had twopenny half-penny to buy it with. When a cry goes up from the unemployed in England it is met by an assurance from the Cobden Club that workmen are far worse off in foreign countries. The information I have gathered on this subject with much care satisfies me that this statement is absolutely untrue; that it is, in fact, the actual reverse of the truth. There is industrial distress in other countries, no doubt, but nothing like the industrial distress that exists in England. There is this immense difference. Other nations suffer chiefly from the results of their own overproduction, whereas England suffers from the overproduction of the whole world.

We can buy abroad for £26,000,000 what it costs us £37,000,000 to produce at home; we actually make or save £11,000,000 by the transaction; bene! It seems cruel to knock over such a pretty house of cards, but it is nothing else. To repeat, for the £26,000,000 sent abroad we get £26,000,000 worth of wheat; nothing more whatever; whereas, for the £37,000,000 spent at home we get £26,000,000 of wheat, £11,000,000 of straw, and £23,000,000 in the shape of wages, rates, taxes, rent, etc.

Now, of course, what is true of wheat is true of all other grain, of all agricultural produce, and all manufactured produce. In every industry, agricultural and manufacturing, the wages directly paid for producing the article vary from 12 to 30 per cent of its value. In 1877-'78 our total imports averaged £378,000,000; of this £100,000,000 was in grain, meat, butter, cheese, eggs, etc. Now, with the exception of maize and rice the whole of this produce could have been grown at home, in which case £70,000,000 or £80,000,000 (deducting the maize and rice) would have remained in the country, paying wages and turning over and over and fructifying and enriching the community, in addition to the straw and the hides and the wool and the manure and the other valuable by-products of agriculture. Now, these £70,000,000 or £80,000,000 have gone abroad to pay wages and rates and taxes and turn over and fructify and enrich a foreign community, without yielding us any of the straw or by-products of agriculture.

What is true of the agricultural is even still more true of manufacturing industries. The cost of manufactured articles consists in wages and material. Direct wages for making the article average from 12 to 30 per cent of its value, and the other 70 to 88 per cent represent materials; but from 12 to 30 per cent of the cost of every one of these materials is again represented by wages. Every material represents a distinct industry on which wages are paid, so that even in those manufactured articles where direct wages are low, the indirect wages will represent an immense proportion of the whole value. Neither the artisan, nor operative, nor agricultural laborer eats his wages or buries them; his 12s., or 30s., or whatever it may be, is spent in food, in clothes for himself and his family, in rent; but every farthing he spends represents, directly and indirectly, in some shape or another, interest on capital or wages paid to some other industry.

If anyone will select any article he knows anything about, and will carefully go through all the various industries that directly or indirectly contribute to the production of this article, however small and insignificant, he will soon understand why home industries, home production, home consumption, enrich the community twenty times more than foreign trade. Take a pin, for instance. Commence with the extraction of the iron ore, of the smelting, of the coal, of all the implements and utensils used in each operation, the machinery, the tools, the plant, the wire-drawing, the polishing, the finishing, the packing, each one representing a trade and wages, and he will see that the business of making even a pin is divided amongst hundreds of the community, and that if it is made at home is the English community that profits, whilst if it is made abroad it is the foreign community that profits. It is this general employment, this general circulation of wages that makes the wealth of a community.

Our total imports (1879) were £378,000,000. If we were to return to the practice of common sense and of "civilized mankind," and admit, duty free, tea, coffee, cocoa, sugar, tobacco—that we can not produce at home—and put a high duty on all foreign luxuries, wine, spirits, and on all agricultural and manufactured produce that interfere with employment at home, we should, if the importation continued, relieve our taxation to the extent of £30,000,000 a year; or, if the importation ceased, and we produced these articles ourselves, we should, without exaggeration, add £60,000,000 or £70,000,000 directly and indirectly to the wage-earning class of the community. Now, this is no exaggeration. The nightmare of one-sided free trade, in which England has given away everything and received nothing in return, is passing away. The sleeper is already half awake and asking himself, uneasily, is this true or is it only a dream. Alas! it is no dream. May the awakening be complete and soon; it cannot be too soon.

The greatest benefactor to industrial mankind is the legislator or economist who diminishes competition, and the greatest curse to industrial mankind is the one who artificially increases it. "But," say our instructors, "competition is not a cruel god that delights in a necklace of skulls," etc. Let us see. A wretched woman stitches shirts at fourpence a dozen, her very life all the time passing through her fingers into her work. "You must look alive, my good woman," says the shopmaster; "you must stitch a good deal harder than you have done if you wish me to employ you. I have been paying you fourpence a dozen for stitching these shirts, but now I find I can get them stitched as well in Belgium, Saxony, and Italy for 3d. per dozen. You must do them for 3d. a dozen or lose my work." "But I can't stitch them for 3d. a dozen," answers the poor woman; "already I stitch 16 hours a day, often more; my fingers are sore; I have to pay for my light and for my needles and thread, and all I can earn is 3s. 6d. per

week. I will try to stitch cheaper, I will, indeed; but for God's sake don't take away my work, or I starve." "I am very sorry," says the shopmaster, who realizes her misery, "but what can I do? Business is business, competition is so severe that I must have the cheapest labor. If shirts can be stitched for 3d. a dozen abroad I must get them stitched for 3d. a dozen at home or lose the trade." And so another skull is added to the necklace of Siva.

The same with chain makers or nail makers. "Now, then, my man," we say to the foreman or gangman, "you must make these women and children of young work harder than they have been doing. I find I have been paying you too much. I can get the work done cheaper abroad." "But," says the gangmaster, "I can't get any more work out of them. I work them as long as the law allows me, and longer, too; and if you look at them I think you will see by their appearance that I do not allow them to waste their time." "Well, I don't know anything about that; all I know is that unless you can supply me with chains and nails cheaper than you have done I shall be obliged to buy my chains and my nails abroad." And so there is another turn of the screw and more skulls added to the necklace of Siva.

Sooner or later the competition for cheapness becomes competition in cheap labor, and competition in cheap labor means competition in flesh and blood. Flesh and blood is plenty, pennies are scarce, and, therefore, the holders of the pennies have the game in their hands. They get a great deal of flesh and blood for their pennies. And then flesh and blood has no claim on them; they have not to replace it. You buy your horse, and if you work him to death you must buy another, but you don't buy the women who stitch your shirts, or your chain makers, or your nail makers, or those who make cheap clothing in the sweating dens. They cost you no money; if they work themselves to death it is no loss to you; a hundred others are always ready to take the vacant place. When men, women, and children can work no more they go to the hospital or the workhouse to die, probably too many of them the happiest hours of their poor, joyless lives, to learn, perhaps, alas, too late, that there are conditions under which life is worth living. But does it signify? Who cares!

Rattle his bones over the stones,  
It's only a pauper that nobody owns.

It's only a few more victims on the altar of competition—a few more skulls added to the necklace of Siva. This is not the fault of the employers of labor. They may be and very likely are as kind-hearted as their neighbors, but they have no choice. It is the fault of those vain theorists who have artificially stimulated competition till the conditions of labor have become fatal.

The prosperity of an individual community like England may be summed up in the two words, general employment. General employment means contentment, sobriety, and self-respect, and the general progress and improvement of the working classes. The want of it means the very reverse of all this. General employment is of far greater importance to an industrial community than cheap food. The cheapest food will be dear if there are no earnings wherewith to purchase it. It is of far more importance than cheap luxuries. It is of far more moment to the community that the producing class should have general employment, should be able to earn wages to keep themselves and those depending on them in health, comfort, and respectability, than that the owners of realized and fixed incomes should be able to buy their luxuries at a somewhat cheaper rate.

Employment increases population, and population increases national wealth; therefore employment is the great-great-parent of national wealth. But we must stop, or we shall evolve some other relationship. These are platitudes. "The great art to make a nation happy and what we call flourishing," says the old "fable of the bees," "consists in giving everybody an opportunity of being employed." All legislation, therefore, that directly or indirectly tends to promote employment is good; all legislation that directly or indirectly tends to diminish employment is bad. "Nonsense," says the Cobden Club, "employment or no employment, wages or no wages, thank God for free trade, that gives us the cheap loaf."

This again, sounds very plausible; but if the workmen find out or suspect that free trade destroys employment, and therefore destroys wages, and therefore deprives them of the power of buying, is it so certain that they will continue to advocate it as an unmixed blessing? It's all very well for the theorists and romancers of the Cobden Club to say that the cheap loaf is better than employment, but the workers don't think so. The question for the country to decide is not the question of cheap food, but the question of employment. "If your land goes out of tillage," asked Grattan, "what are you to do with your population?" "Oh, emigrate, of course," is the reply of the wise men.

But, again, oh, wise men! does it add to the wealth of your country to export the bone and sinew that creates your wealth? What is the first step to develop a country? To import population. What is the first step to impoverish it? To export the population. When our laboring population, operative or agricultural, emigrate, who go? The old, the young, the maimed, the ne'er-do-weels? No, indeed; the best men in the country. To advocate emigration in the interest of the individual is one thing; to advocate it in the interest of the country is the sheerest folly.

The income of the working classes, operative and agricultural, I presume, is put roughly at £400,000,000 a year; every shilling—except what goes in tea, coffee, tobacco, and foreign food—is spent at home on home produce, manufacturing and agricultural. This money is made in the country and spent in the country; this is internal trade as distinct from foreign trade. No trade returns give us any idea of it, but it is by far the most profitable trade the country possesses. Like blind mice, we consult our board of trade returns of exports and imports to see if we are doing well, but this is merely the venous system; whereas our internal trade, of which we have no returns, is the arterial system of the country. A duty of 20 or 30 per cent on foreign manufactured goods would increase the cost of luxuries to the rich, but it would not in the slightest degree increase the cost of necessities to the poor.

Employment is what makes our industrial community prosperous, not cheapness. When the jargon of words is put on one side, we come to the fact that employment is the large loaf, want of employment is the small one. Employment gives you money to buy the large loaf; without employment you have no money to buy even the small one. What is the use of the penny roll being down to a halfpenny if you have only a farthing to buy it with? It is employment, not protection or free trade, that makes the difference between the large loaf and the little one. If free trade promotes employment, then free trade is best for those who labor. If, as I believe, it is destroying employment in every branch of industry, then protection is best for those who labor.

The question of the large loaf and the small one is not only a question of price. It is a question of what makes that price. The loaf grown at home may be dearer than the loaf grown abroad; but it may be cheaper to the community; because it has given employment to produce it; because from its cost you must deduct the wages paid to grow it, the proportion it has contributed to taxation, etc.; the wages paid to grow the foreign loaf do not profit us in the least; on the contrary, they have to be added to its cost, because it is money withdrawn from this country to pay foreign labor, which should have been paid to English labor. In

order to grow the English loaf English capital is paid to English laborers at home; in order to grow the foreign loaf English capital is paid to foreign laborers abroad. Now this is a difference. Shall we pay foreign laborers to grow our corn abroad, or shall we pay English laborers to grow our corn at home? Shall we pay the ryots in India 14s. a week, or English laborers 14s. a week? We can not do both; which shall it be? As far as the community is concerned the large loaf is the English loaf, the small loaf is the foreign loaf; the cheap loaf is the loaf paid for by English money to English laborers, the dear loaf is the loaf paid for by English money to foreign laborers.

Mr. DOLPH. I also beg leave to have inserted a brief quotation from a memorial of the Union League of Philadelphia remonstrating against the passage of the Wilson tariff bill:

Unfortunately for the country, and most unfortunately for the workmen of the country, who are the first to be affected by business reverses, the result of the elections of 1892 was a Republican defeat. As a consequence of that the Democratic party is in power; and the Democratic party, as represented by Mr. Wilson and the gentlemen associated with him, has brought in a bill which is to unsettle everything that has ever been settled in the economic policy of the country. In reading that bill, line by line, I have been reminded of that which Henry Clay said in 1820, that these gentlemen "make up for their deficiency of practical good sense by the store of learning which they collect from theoretical writers."

Mr. President, the tariff question should be considered from the standpoint of practical experience. The history of the free trade movement in England affords valuable lessons for us. At the beginning of the free trade movement in England, a gentleman who had had a long experience in public life, and who had, with credit to himself and with honor to his country, filled high office, thus wrote of the proposed change: "I do not think it wise," said Mr. Croker, "to overthrow and destroy, on mere theoretical prospects, a system under which the nation has risen to a state of grandeur, power, and happiness unparalleled in the world." You will observe that that which he said of the condition of England is identical in expression with that which the committee of the League said, in 1892, when speaking of the condition of the United States. What has been the result of that change in England's commercial policy? Under the operation of the free trade system in England, the rich have grown richer and the poor have grown poorer; there has been an accumulation of capital in London, but the condition of the workmen of England has not been brought to the high level of the condition of the workmen of the United States.

Sir, this is not a matter of conjecture. This is a matter susceptible of absolute and positive proof. I see before me, to-night, a member of this league who has had practical experience as a manufacturer in England and as a manufacturer in this country; and I have his authority for saying that not only is the condition of American workmen, in many respects, far superior to the condition of English workmen, but that it is a fact that the wages of labor in this country are more than 50 percent greater than the wages for precisely similar labor in England.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a letter written to me by the head of the largest manufactory of a particular description in this city. That gentleman is in intimate relations with two establishments, the one in Scotland and the other in this country, owned by the same firm, and making the same line of goods. He has furnished to me, as taken from the books, a comparative statement of the wages paid for the same amount of work at the two establishments, the one in Scotland and the other in this country. The figures for the Scotch mill are for a week of fifty-six hours; the figures for the American mill are for a week of fifty-five hours. I quote the statement:

Wages per week.

	Scotch mill.	American mill.
Laborers.....	\$4.00 to \$4.50	\$7.50 to \$9.00
Mechanics.....	7.00 to 7.50	11.00 to 15.00
Printers.....	4.50 to 6.00	12.00 to 22.00
Engineers.....	5.00	12.00 to 16.00
Firemen.....	5.00	12.00 to 15.00
Boys.....	1.50 to 2.00	3.50 to 4.00
Assistant foreman.....	7.00 to 10.00	12.00 to 24.00

No scholastic disquisition upon free trade can answer those figures.

I also ask leave to insert an extract from a petition and protest of the manufacturers of woollens presented by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Aldrich). I have marked two brief quotations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The allied industries represented at a meeting held at the Metropolitan Hotel, New York, January 10, 1894, including all branches of the manufacture and sale of woollen goods, carpets and knit goods, and the wholesale clothing and cloak manufacture, speak for an investment of capital exceeding \$500,000,000, embarked in business under the laws of the United States, on the good faith of the Government that its citizens shall be duly guarded in their vested property rights. As American citizens we have assembled to petition and protest against the enactment of a law which threatens to destroy a large part of this capital and to render it uncertain whether the remainder shall be productive.

The provisions of the wool and woollen schedule of the Wilson tariff bill compel this protest, which is made in the belief that its framers have no adequate conception of its practical effects. It is so drawn as to entail upon the American manufacturer the maximum of loss and embarrassment, and offer to foreign competitors the possession of the American market at the minimum of risk and effort.

We protest against this measure as the sole cause of the prolongation of business depression, which would at once disappear but for the menace of its future enactment. The Wilson bill has disorganized the business and commerce of the country, and its enactment is opposed by every branch of industry and the entire body of American producers.

We protest against a measure which, while ostensibly one to raise revenue, would create an enormous deficit in the national revenues at a time when these revenues are already insufficient and the National Treasury depleted.

We protest against a measure that creates a deficit by reducing or removing duties almost exclusively upon articles of foreign manufacture or production that compete with American products; and we especially protest against that adjustment of the bill which creates nearly 40 per cent of this deficit, amounting to \$28,000,000 annually, by removing or reducing duties upon wool and woollens which enter into competition with the products of American farms and factories.

We protest against its passage at a time of profound industrial depression and collapse, the most unfortunate that could be selected, when the business of the country is in no condition to withstand the universal readjustment of values it will compel.

We protest against these radical reductions of duties at a time of industrial depression among the great manufacturing nations of Europe, when their markets are glutted with surplus goods and the difficulties of American competition are greatly accentuated.

We protest against the date fixed for the Wilson bill to take effect, because it destroys an entire season's business.

We particularly protest against the treatment accorded the wool-growing industry and all branches of the wool manufacture in this bill as harsh in the extreme and mere radical and proscriptive than in any other schedule.

Mr. DOLPH. I also ask leave to insert a quotation from a pamphlet that I believe was called the protest or petition of business men of New England under the head of "A Deadly Blow Against the Wool-growing Industry."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A DEADLY BLOW AGAINST THE WOOL-GROWING INDUSTRY.

The wool growing industry is one of the most important and noblest of all our industries. It has contributed more to the comfort of man in his achievements in the north temperate zone—the great field of action on this planet—than all the combined industries. It has furnished food and clothing which no other industry could or has within itself ever accomplished, and taken the lead in civilizing the human race.

The hunter of wild beasts became the pastoral shepherd. The agriculturist, the student, the philosopher, in the evolution of man from barbarism. His flocks were esteemed his greatest blessing; and the choicest were devoted to sacrifice, to propitiate his deities and secure their good will; because, he was, in his child-like devotion, desirous of returning to his God, the most valuable of all his possessions, as the act of worship and holy submission to the higher power which intelligence recognized in the great book of nature.

This was his first domestic possession secured in the chase; because the hunter was swifter of foot than the tender lamb of the wild sheep; and from that date, the sheep became the companion and servant of man. The increase furnished him food, no longer necessitating the hardships of the chase; and its wool became his clothing, which was required to protect him from the rigors of a climate which environed the most vigorous of our race and produced all the progress of man.

Among the people of our own blood, Edward the Third of England in 1337, inaugurated the protection of the sheep industry fostered by the Anglo-Saxon race, and laid the foundations of England's greatness in commerce and manufactures by stimulating woolgrowing and the manufacture of the product, and thus became the first patriot English King who was devoted to the welfare of his people.

The first patriot President, whose devotion to the welfare of the people of the Republic he established, whose revered name will never cease to remind us of the love and devotion which our country claims from its citizens—Washington—was the first to lead in the development of the woolgrowing industry in this country. "Immediately after the peace of 1783 and his return to the occupation of a farmer, he paid particular attention to his breed of sheep, of which he usually kept from 700 to 800, and from which he realized upon the average over 5 pounds of wool to each sheep." Zealous as in all his occupations, he pointed out the importance of encouraging this industry, in a letter to a friend as follows:

"So persuaded am I of the practicability and advantage of it, that I have raised near 200 lambs upon my farm this year. I am glad to find that you are likely to succeed in propagating the Spanish breed in England, and that the wool does not degenerate; for the multiplication of useful animals is a common blessing to mankind."

He continued in his encouragement of the woolgrowing industry upon every opportunity and was inaugurated as President in a suit of American cloth, manufactured in an American factory, from American wool.

From the time of Washington our nation has steadily advanced as a woolgrowing country, until it stands third among all nations or sections in its production of wool. The improvement in weight and quality has equalled its increase in quantity. In 1840, the average weight of the fleece was barely 1.9 pounds; in 1850, it was 2.4 pounds; in 1860, 2.7 pounds; in 1870, 3.5 pounds; in 1880, 4.8 pounds; in 1891, 5.5 pounds.

The Merinos constitute the principal and characteristic race in the United States. This is the most important fact in the enumeration of our resources for sheep husbandry, and the wool manufacture. England has no Merinos except in her colonies; Russia with 65,000,000 sheep; in 1879, "has but 12,000,000 Merinos; France, but 9,000,000. Although the numbers in this country can not be exactly given the Merinos and grades in the United States probably exceed 25,000,000."

"Merino wool is for clothing what wheat is for food; it is the chief material for cloth at the present day, entering into the coarsest as well as the finest. While the softest, it is the strongest, of all wool fibers, from the number of filaments which may be spun in a yarn of a given diameter. From its fulling and spinning qualities, or what is sometimes called its carrying power, it is the best adhesive for the cheaper fabrics—coarser wool, cotton, or shoddy—the mixture of Merino wool increasing indefinitely the materials for cheap clothing."

"Abundant Merino wool is the greatest boon the world has received from the animal kingdom in the last century. It is literally, in its extended culture, the product of the last century. A hundred years ago, all the Merinos in the world, confined exclusively to Spain, did not, it is believed, number a million. It is worthy of especial notice that our Merinos were directly derived from the best flocks of Spain, before their decline; and that the new characters, impressed upon the original Spanish race, are all our own creation."

The value of the woolgrowing industry of this country is too great to imperil its existence by competition with other nations, for the following reasons:

(1) The product of our sheep industry constitutes nine-tenths of all the card and clothing wool consumed by our mills.

(2) The woollen mills are almost entirely confined to the manufacture of woollens and dress goods, which are consumed, as we have shown, by the great clothing industry of this country.

(3) The product of our clothing industry clothes our people almost entirely—certainly the masses—at prices lower than ever before known in the history of the country.

(4) Free wool will destroy the woolgrowing industry of the United States, and thus cut off the supply of our mills, which to-day control our home market, and if our mills attempt to run this will compel our manufacturers to experiment at great cost with foreign wools, with which they are unfamiliar.

(5) The destruction of the wool product of the United States, means, the annihilation from the world's wool product that of the third woolgrowing country in the world.

(6) The curtailment of the production of wool to such an extent will immediately result in the increase of the price of wool throughout the world, and increase the cost to the manufacturer of the woollen product, to the manufacturer of clothing, and to the people of this country; so that our clothing at the first influx of importations will be cheaper temporarily and then rise suddenly with the price of wool, and we will find the experiment costly to our people.

(7) The passage of the same law unmodified, which proposes free wool, will close most of our woollen mills, and all the cotton-yarn mills, and thousands of establishments engaged in industries which will be overwhelmed with importations.

(8) The closing of mills will throw out of employment many millions of our people by the interrelation of all industries and trade, and cut off the purchasing power of the people, compelling the unemployed to confront want without resources to purchase food or clothing, and entail such suffering as will necessitate the permanent establishment of charitable bureaus to feed and clothe our fellow-citizens to the disgrace of our civilization.

(9) The destruction of our wool-growing industry is certain if all foreign wool is admitted free of duty, which will annihilate over \$300,000,000 in the value of the sheep, throw out of employment thousands of employes engaged in that industry, and destroy all our progress in the culture of sheep and fine wools, which is one of our proudest achievements in the animal industry.

(10) The hope that free wool will stimulate manufacturing under the provisions of the proposed law is fictitious and without basis in fact or reason, because, under the same law, importations will flood our market at prices which will absorb all demand for woollens and worsteds, and leave our manufacturers without a market; which fact will paralyze instead of stimulate the manufactures of this industry.

(11) The attempts to contest the ground with foreign manufacturers will at first necessitate the reduction of wages, and strikes with attendant consequences will only herald the closing of our mills.

(12) The past history of attempts at free wool or reduction to a point of no protection, with simultaneous reduction of the tariff to the point of stimulating heavy importations, all point clearly to the results as set forth above.

Mr. DOLPH. I present also to have inserted in the RECORD a quotation from the late Mr. Blaine, his prophetic words in regard to the coming of the time when the South would control the Democratic party, and this question of free trade or protection would be brought directly before the American people.

BLAINE'S PROPHETIC WORDS.

I love my country and my countrymen. I am an American, and I rejoice every day of my life that I am. I enjoy the general prosperity of my country, and I know that the workmen of this land are the best paid, the best fed, and the best clothed of any laborers on the face of the earth. Many of them have homes of their own. They are surrounded by all the comforts and many of the luxuries of life. I shudder, however, at the thought that the time must come when all this will be changed, when the general prosperity of the country will be destroyed, when the great body of workmen in this land, who are now so prosperous, will hear their wives and children cry for bread; that the day must come when the great factories of the land will shut down, and where is now life and activity there will be the silence of the tomb. And the reason why this must be is this:

The great Southern wing of the Democratic party are determined to establish the doctrine of free trade in this land. They will be assisted by their Northern allies. There is a great body of visionary but educated men who are employed day by day in writing free-trade essays and arguments in favor of the doctrine, which find their way to every newspaper in this land. The great body of our people have never experienced themselves the sufferings which always result when the protective principles are laid aside. Poisoned and excited by the wild statement of these writers and the demagogic appeals of the Democratic speaker, the result will be that in the very near future these forces which are now working will be strong enough to defeat at the polls the party advocating the doctrine of protection. It must inevitably follow that uncertainty and doubt will ensue.

The business men of the country, fearing the destruction of the principles of protection, will decline to engage in business, consequently mills will shut down and workmen will be thrown out of employment. The people will then see as they have never seen before that they can not be prosperous and have work while this principle is threatened. In the midst of their sufferings they will learn that the only way they can be prosperous and happy is to vote for the party that has built up the industries by which they have gained a livelihood; because they will then see clearly that when the manufactory is shut down there is no demand for the only thing which they have to sell, and that is their labor.

I now desire to direct attention to another cognate feature of the bill. While by the provisions of the bill which I have been discussing it is proposed that we shall have free trade in agricultural products, reciprocity in natural products between the United States and Canada and other countries, it is proposed, as I understand the measure, that the provision for reciprocity with other countries contained in the McKinley law shall be repealed.

I repeat, by the pending measure it is proposed that we shall have free trade with Canada in most agricultural products, and that on others the duties shall be greatly reduced. That Canadian producers shall be relieved from the payment of duties imposed upon their natural products by the McKinley law, and such products shall be admitted to share our home markets with our own farmers, lumbermen, and other producers.

It is, on the other hand, proposed to abrogate our reciprocity treaties with the South American countries, by which, in exchange for the admission into our ports free of duty sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, from countries producing such articles, we have secured the removal of duties, or a great reduction of duties, upon our exports to those countries. Our trade with them has been increased, and our producers, especially our farmers, benefited; these treaties must not be confounded with free trade. They are entirely dissimilar to the proposed admission into this country free of certain agricultural products from countries which levy no import duties upon similar products.

Reciprocity under the McKinley law is the securing of the admission of our products into foreign countries free of duty, or at reduced duties, in return for the admission free into this country of products we must import, which we do not produce at all or do not produce in quantities sufficient for our consumption.

One of the most important provisions of the McKinley law was the reciprocity provision. By the McKinley bill Congress was about to put sugar on the free list; and coffee, tea, and hides were already on the free list. Mr. Blaine conceived the idea that with such concessions to the sugar and coffee producing countries some return beneficial to our producers should be secured.

An amendment, prepared, it was said, at the State Department, was introduced by the senior Senator from Maine, which is as follows:

And the President of the United States is hereby authorized, without further legislation, to declare the ports of the United States free and open to all products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed, whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports, free of all national, provincial (State), municipal, and other taxes, flour, corn-meal, and other breadstuffs, preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits, cotton-seed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food, lumber, furniture, and all other articles of wood, agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery, structural steel and iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street cars, refined petroleum, or such other products of the United States as may be agreed upon.

This amendment did not meet with favor. It was too sweeping in its character. It would have admitted into this country many articles which would have come into serious competition with American products. It would have if Canada had accepted the conditions, which she would have undoubtedly have done, giving her free of duties the market of 65,000,000 of people for the products of her soil, her mines, her forests, and her fisheries, a thing which the present Democratic majority of Congress is now proposing to do without any concessions on the part of Canada, except that in exchange for the markets of our larger population for her lumber and her wheat, and other agricultural products we shall have the markets of her 5,000,000 people for similar products of ours, of which they produce a surplus and which they do not buy of us at all.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment known as the Aldrich amendment, which is as follows:

Sec. 3. That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the 1st day of January, 1892, whenever and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the Government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncurd, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country, as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic tests as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test, two-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional.

All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely: All sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 2 cents per pound.

Molasses testing above 56°, 4 cents per gallon.

Sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty either as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

On coffee, 3 cents per pound.

On tea, 10 cents per pound.

Hides, raw or uncurd, whether dry, salted, or pickled, Angora goatskins, raw without the wool, unmanufactured, asses' skins, raw or unmanufactured, and skins, except sheepskins, with the wool on, 1½ cents per pound.

This amendment was adopted in the Senate by a vote of 38 yeas, all Republicans, to 29 nays.

In discussing this measure in the Senate on the 11th of March, 1892, I said:

Whoever is entitled to credit for this provision or the success of the efforts to enlarge our foreign trade under it, none will be claimed by the Democrats in Congress. It will be observed that the reciprocity proposed by this provision is a restricted reciprocity, limited, so far as the admission of articles into this country is concerned, with the exception of hides, to tea and coffee, which we do not produce at all, and to sugar, of which after years of protection and encouragement we produce only about one-eighth of the amount that we consume; and it will be borne in mind that all of these articles except sugar are articles which we had prior to the passage of the McKinley law deliberately placed on the free list, and that sugar was put upon the free list by the McKinley law for the purpose of reducing the revenue and cheapening an article of necessity universally used, and with the conviction that for the purpose of building up the sugar industry in the United States the protective policy had been a failure.

It will also be borne in mind that the placing of sugar upon the free list was accompanied with a provision for the encouragement of our citizens engaged in the industry. Power was conferred upon the President to demand of countries producing these articles concessions concerning the admission into those countries of our products which, in his judgment, would be a fair equivalent for the benefit they would receive from the removal of duties upon their products above enumerated, and if the demand was not granted to suspend the law placing them upon the free list and make them subject to duty. Notwithstanding the administration has had to meet the predictions of our Democratic friends that no President would dare to reimpose duties upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, and the influence of the Democratic press belittling the reciprocity clause in the McKinley act, the provision has proved to be very valuable, and much has been accomplished under it in the way of securing a reduction of duty upon our exports to various countries and extending our markets for the products of our farms and of our manufactures.

I can not consider the details of the several agreements which have been made under this provision. Suffice it to say that an agreement was early reached with Brazil, with which our trade was very unsatisfactory, the balance of trade against us having been for many years nearly \$50,000,000 per annum. By this agreement Brazil gave free admission to many valuable American products and largely reduced duties upon others. Under it our trade with Brazil has increased within the last eight months \$2,000,000, and promises to increase until the balance of trade against us is removed or largely reduced.

With more difficulty an agreement was reached with Spain for the purpose of increasing our trade with Cuba and Puerto Rico, with which our foreign trade was also unsatisfactory. The difficulty in securing such an agreement arose from the evident belief of the Spanish authorities that a provision for the restoration of duties on sugar, if just concessions could not be obtained from foreign countries exporting sugar to this country, would not be executed; but when convinced that Cuba could not enjoy the benefits of free sugar without reciprocal concessions, an agreement was made which secured large concessions in the remission and reduction of duties upon articles of American production, especially agricultural products. A similar agreement was entered into with the Dominican Republic. A valuable treaty has also been negotiated with Germany, by which a reduction of duties upon an important list of our products into that country is made. What has already been accomplished under this provision, what is likely to be accomplished, shows that it is a valuable provision for securing an extension of our foreign trade and opening up foreign markets for our varied products, and especially the products of the farm.

It is this scheme by which our exports to the West Indies and to the Central and South American republics have been so greatly increased that the majority of the Finance Committee and of the Senate propose to strike down. With utter disregard of the interests of our producers, to the prosperity of our farmers, agreements, which under a proper revenue system cost us nothing, but inure greatly to our benefit, are to be abrogated. A statement of our increased exports to two of the countries with which we have reciprocity treaties will serve to illustrate the beneficial results of reciprocity.

Under reciprocity with Cuba our exports to that island have been increased from \$11,000,000 to \$24,000,000, and under our reciprocity agreement with Brazil our exports to that country have been increased from \$7,000,000 to \$16,000,000. The Senator from Maine in his recent speech quoted from Mr. Samuel Weil, a merchant from Bluefields, a statement concerning reciprocity, which will bear repeating.

Mr. Weil said:

It is not generally understood in this country that Americans have interests in the community valued at \$2,000,000, and that the amount of the export and import trade between that country and the United States reaches the sum of \$4,000,000 annually. Not only that, but this trade has been increasing by leaps and bounds. It will, with anything like protection for ourselves, reach an enormous sum annually in comparatively few years. It is really a trade worth cultivating, and we think that this Government, which has been pronounced for reciprocity and encouraging Pan-American Congresses, can carry out those ideas in no better way than to protect its citizens who have gone there and invested their all in trade which is to benefit not only themselves, but that country and this country.

Mr. President, I wish now to contrast the provision for reciprocity with Canada and other countries in agricultural products with the provision for the repeal of the reciprocity provision in the McKinley law, and the provision for continuing the reciprocity treaty with the Sandwich Islands. The committee propose in the same bill that agricultural products shall be admitted free from Canada and other foreign countries; they propose to give this boon to the producers of Canada, exacting nothing in return to the United States, because, as I have said, Canada exports to the United States her agricultural products, while we export scarcely any agricultural products to Canada.

No one heretofore has proposed any such trade relations with Canada. Even those who have advocated reciprocity have proposed that we should secure from Canada the free admission of our manufactured products into Canada in return for the admission of her agricultural products into the United States. They have proposed, for some extension of trade, some benefit to our manufacturers, to our commission merchants and our wholesale dealers, that the farmers of this country should pay to Canada a consideration, and that Canada should pay a consideration to our manufacturers for the admission free into this country of her agricultural products. But now comes the Democratic majority in the Senate, and propose to remove virtually the custom-houses along our Northern border so far as agricultural products are concerned, to relieve Canada from the payment of duties, and at the same time they propose to strike down a provision which has cost us nothing, but which has benefited us greatly.

As I have just said, the provision in the existing law for reciprocity is a provision that, while we admit free from other countries the articles we wish to admit free, the products already on the free list by the McKinley law, we will exact from those countries some reduction of duties, so as to increase our exports. But the committee, while proposing unrestricted reciprocity in natural products with Canada, proposes to repeal that provision and to destroy those treaties. They propose to make a gift to Canada. They propose to refuse to longer receive what we have exacted from the South American countries without cost to ourselves.

Then, with great inconsistency, they propose to continue to remit to the Sandwich Islands duties to the amount of four or five million dollars annually, perhaps more. I have forgotten what the figures are, although I examined it once. They propose to remit this sum for the benefit of whom? For the benefit of Claus Spreckels; for the benefit of a few speculators in sugar; for the benefit of a few American sugar planters in the Sandwich Islands? I examined this question some two years ago, and presented in the Senate a statement of the amount of duties remitted by us under this treaty, which, I think, ran up to some seventy or eighty million dollars.

According to my recollection the amount of duties remitted upon sugar imported from the Sandwich Islands alone was greater than the whole amount of our exports to that country for the whole

period of the treaty. Now the Democratic majority repudiate and wish to get rid of the reciprocity treaties with other countries, which work to advantage without loss to ourselves, and propose to admit, as I have said, the agricultural products of Canada free, and to perpetuate the unequal and unjust reciprocity treaty with the Sandwich Islands. There never has been any excuse for that treaty except that the payments of this large amount of money was justified by political reasons, in order to maintain our political hold on those islands. If we want the sugar of the Sandwich Islands to come in free, and that is pretty much all they export, we had better take the islands into the American Union, and then when we build up the sugar industry in the Sandwich Islands we will be building up our own country. These several propositions are inconsistent.

Mr. President, I have occupied more of the time of the Senate than I expected to occupy when I took the floor. I have been intending for some time, when we reached the question of our relations with Canada, to present my views upon it, and I have now done so.

The pending measure is without question the most important measure which has been considered by Congress in a quarter of a century.

It is a sectional measure, designed to cripple and destroy the great industries and degrade the white labor of the North.

It is a measure framed for the purpose of opening the ports of the United States to the free admission of the products of cheap labor from every country under the sun.

To thus bring the intelligent free labor of American citizens, of the men who control the destinies of the nation, and who will shape its future, into competition with the pauper and servile labor of other countries.

Should it become a law the present demoralized condition of our industries will be continued indefinitely. There will be two idle men in this country where there is employment for one. Instead of doing our own work; instead of producing the things in this country we consume, employment will be given to the laborers of foreign countries in the production of products which we consume, and they and their families will earn and eat the bread which should be earned and eaten by American laborers.

The splendid progress in national and individual wealth which the nation made during a third of a century under Republican rule has already been checked by the threat of a reversal of the policy which produced it.

With the passage of the pending measure a period of adversity, of stagnation, and even retrogression will be entered upon; a period like that which followed the Declaration of Independence and continued until the adoption of the present Constitution; like that which we passed through after the great fall in prices in England in 1819, which caused this country to be flooded with cheap British goods like that which followed the compromise tariff act of 1833, or that which was caused by the free-trade legislation of 1857. Against legislation so un-American, legislation so pregnant with disaster to all classes of our people and all sections of our country, I raise my voice and shall oppose by my vote.

As I said substantially on a former occasion, if I did not regard country above political success, the prosperity of the people of the whole country above party, I would not attempt to prevent the Democratic party committing suicide by the passage of this bill. But in view of the widespread disaster already brought upon the country by the threat of its passage, and the greater injury to American interests which would follow its passage, I am constrained, although I feel that I am in a measure serving the Democratic party by endeavoring to save it from itself, to oppose this measure.

The object lesson presented to the country by the present conditions of our industries has already been learned by our people. If, to-day, the question could be submitted to the Democratic voters of the Northern States whether the Democratic doctrine upon the tariff should be protection to American industries, American capital, and American labor or a tariff for revenue only, the great majority would declare for protection, and in many of the Southern States, if the same question could be so submitted, the same result would be reached. The trouble is that there is no opportunity given to Democrats, as such, to vote upon the question.

President Cleveland in his free-trade message of 1887 committed the Democratic party to free trade. By the use of Federal patronage he stifled the sentiment to a large extent prevailing in the House of Representatives in favor of the American system. He whipped those who differed with him into accord with his views or drove them out of the party. Randall was read out of the party and driven to the grave.

The few Senators to-day, who have the moral courage to oppose some of the iniquitous provisions of the pending measure, are denounced by free traders, who now control the party, as traitors, as Benedict Arnolds. And so, everywhere, protests against the extreme tariff views of the old South, which controls the Democratic party, are met with intolerance.

But this condition of things can not last forever. Throughout the North there is already an open revolt. If Democrats can not in the Democratic party cast their votes for reasonable protection to American industries, for a policy which prefers the United States and United States citizens to foreign countries and their subjects,

they will unite with a party which prefers the interests of our own country to the interests of other countries.

Some of the growing industries of the South are imperiled by the pending bill and the ineffectual protests of those who manage them have reached the halls of Congress.

The cloud to-day may look to our Southern friends on this floor no larger than a man's hand, but it is portentous with disaster to the party of free trade.

The time is not far distant when it will increase and spread, and like a cyclone sweep from the Gulf to the Potomac, and carry away the antiquated, illogical, unpatriotic, un-American doctrine that we should buy where we can buy cheapest, although that be to buy the products of the paupers of India and China.

Let our Democratic friends make the most of their accidental power. It will be short lived. In November the people will set the seal of their condemnation on this Democratic administration, on the Democratic party, and on this iniquitous bill under consideration.

What will be the result of the policy of the party in power? There can be but one result. Capital can not be driven into unprofitable enterprises. Capital can lie idle, but the laborer dependent upon his daily labor for his daily bread must work or starve. The surplus of the products of human industry in this country will be soon consumed.

However cheaply we may be able to secure foreign products after the passage of the pending measure, our people can not buy them without the means to pay for them. Our people must work, and if our industries can not be conducted with the old rates of wages to labor our laborers will be compelled to accept reduced wages, even though it may be the standard of wages prevailing in other countries. This result is inevitable.

I shudder when I contemplate the consequences of such a condition upon our laboring masses. It means less employment, less wages, fewer of the comforts of life, tenement houses instead of homes of their own, children in factories instead of in school, less education, less refinement, the slavery of poverty instead of the independence of competency, the increase of those who are discontented with existing conditions, impatient of Government restraint, and hostile to those whose duty it is to enforce the laws and maintain the public peace, and danger to our republican institutions and the perpetuity of republican government.

Our duty is first to our own people. Labor is the source of all wealth. It is the only capital of the great majority of our citizens.

Ordinary prudence and good business management, not to speak of patriotism, should induce us to legislate so as to enable our own citizens to market their labor at the best advantage.

Mr. President, let no one suppose I despair of the Republic. I have faith in the perpetuity of our institutions and of republican government.

Liberty is the birthright of humanity and it shall never be wrested from this people. Our temporary discomfiture may be a blessing in disguise. It will educate our people. It will bring capital and labor into more satisfactory relations. It will show laborers that to furnish them employment the laws must be such as to invite capital into industrial enterprises, and common losses, common experience, common suffering will make capital considerate of the rights of labor.

There will come a time when the intelligent voters of this country, by the peaceful ballot, will bring about a change of conditions, will purge the National Congress of free-traders, and will again start the country upon an era of national and individual prosperity and make our "winter of discontent glorious summer." For such a change, for a time when the prosperity of the country shall be again assured, for the perpetuation of our free institutions, for the enjoyment by all of our people of the blessings of liberty and the spread of the principles of equality, justice, and liberty throughout the world, I hope. I close by quoting from the recent utterances of an eminent divine a sentiment which, whatever we may think of his religion, is worthy of being repeated by any American citizen.

"Noblest ship of state, sail thou on, over billows and through storms, undaunted and imperishable. Of thee I do not say 'Cæsarem vehis—thou carriest Cæsar.' But of thee I say, 'Liberatem vehis—thou carriest liberty.' Within thy bulwarks the fair goddess is enthroned, holding in her hands the dreams and hopes of humanity. Oh, for her sake, guard well thyself! Sail thou on, peerless ship, safe from shoals and malign winds, ever strong in keel, ever beautiful in prow and canvas, ever guided by heaven's polar star! Sail thou on, I pray thee, undaunted and imperishable!"

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask for the reading of the pending proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 189 and insert:

Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will likewise

report the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add the following additional proviso to the amendment:

*Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to that class of horses commonly known as ponies, raised chiefly in Mexico.

Mr. SHERMAN. I invite the attention of the Senators having charge of the bill to an amendment which I shall offer to substitute specific duties for the ad valorem duty contained in the bill as it was sent to us by the other House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there are two amendments pending. No further amendment would be in order at the present time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will offer the amendment later. I will say a few words about it now, or I will wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the amendment may be read for information.

Mr. HALE. Let us know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated for information.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to offer instead of paragraph 189 what I send to the desk.

The Secretary read as follows:

Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Cattle, more than 1 year old, \$10 per head; 1 year old or less, \$2 per head.

Hogs, \$1.50 per head.

Sheep, 1 year old or more, \$1.50 per head; less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head.

All other live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I offered an amendment this morning in precisely those words, and then at the suggestion of several Senators divided it, because they said they wanted to debate each proposition by itself. I had offered the provisions of the McKinley act in one clause, but of course any Senator has a right to have the question divided; and then I was obliged to offer one paragraph at a time. I propose to go on and offer one after another as we reach it, not being able to have a vote taken upon all together.

Mr. SHERMAN. Therefore I shall not offer my amendment, but will allow the vote to be taken on these different clauses separately.

I wish to call the attention of Senators, especially from the Southern and Southwestern States, to the very grave importance of this provision. We are brought into very close competition with Canada along the border for 4,000 miles. The question of live animals is a more interesting one to the people of New York and of Ohio than probably to those of any other States, because animals are not grown to any large extent west of the Lake Superior region.

The largest exporting article into our country from Ontario and along our northern border there is live stock. It is generally not of a superior kind. It is a kind we ought not to encourage. The farmers of northern New York, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois are deeply interested in this matter. Owing to the gradual change of our industry our people are raising more live stock than ever before. In wheat we can not compete with the Western country. It is utterly impossible for us to raise the cereals in the large and productive States I speak of in competition with the Western States. Any one who is at all familiar with the subject will know that wheat is produced now in Minnesota, Iowa, and all the States west in great abundance, and even there it is brought into very sharp competition with wheat produced in the region north and west of Lake Superior in Canada.

Now, I think specific duties afford a great relief in this respect. I notice with great pleasure that as the committee have reported the bill in nearly all of the subsequent items the rates on agricultural products and provisions are converted from ad valorem to specific duties. I am very glad they have done it. The variation in the price of agricultural products is so great from year to year, and almost from month to month, that an ad valorem rate would not be satisfactory and could not probably be enforced, as sometimes grain and especially animals fall to a very low rate and a specific duty ought to be applied. It is utterly impossible to fix the correct value of a horse by an appraisal.

The person called upon to act in such a case should be a skillful horseman, and even then he can not tell. The value of horses varies from \$30 to \$1,000. Very few, however, go above \$200, which is a very high price for a horse. It is therefore absolutely essential in order to secure anything like revenue from live stock to have a specific duty.

Mr. MILLS. How would the Senator manage a specific duty on a horse worth \$40,000, and on another worth \$150?

Mr. SHERMAN. Horses that are worth \$40,000 I should be very glad to have come in free. They would only be introduced for stock-raising purposes and to improve stock.

Mr. MILLS. And race horses.

Mr. SHERMAN. Sometimes horses like the Morgan breed are imported, which is a breed from Canada, and largely from Vermont. On breeding stock of high value I do not care much what rate is put.

Mr. MILLS. The specific duty that you put on under the McKinley act of \$30 kept out the ten and fifteen and twenty dollar ponies that come from Mexico. Does the Senator think that is a proper course to pursue, and then let in the fine race horses for comparatively nothing?

Mr. ALLISON. The McKinley act provided a duty of 30 per cent in addition.

Mr. SHERMAN. And the proposition now is to impose on all animals 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FRYE. The McKinley act provided an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent on horses valued above \$150.

Mr. ALLISON. That is now reduced to 20 per cent, so that the \$40,000 horse of the Senator from Texas will come in at 10 per cent of \$40,000 less than under existing law.

Mr. MILLS. I was answering the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. The paragraph in the bill before us reads—the provision which it is proposed to strike out—

All live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

It is very difficult to fix an ad valorem duty on horses and live stock. The grade of horses is from very low to very high. The average value would be forty or fifty dollars. A fair custom-house rate on a horse at 20 per cent would be \$10. It seems to me it would be better to fix a specific sum on the various classes of animals.

The McKinley act was never complained of, so far as I know, in this particular feature. It had a tendency to keep out the lower grade of horses. Horses worth twenty, thirty, or forty dollars could not be brought in, because the duty of \$30 would exclude them. It seems to me if there is any subject upon which there ought to be a specific duty rather than an ad valorem, it is upon live animals, which vary in price from month to month, and vary in degree to an extent that is probably equaled by no other product.

A horse such as mentioned by the Senator from Texas would be imported merely for stocking purposes, and I do not care whether the duty is high or low. But the general grade of horses, cattle, hogs, etc., that would be brought into our markets would tend to deprive the farmer of that region of the country from raising these necessary animals.

As to the production of animals in the United States our farmers are largely compelled to change their mode of farming and look to the raising of live animals for the profits of the farm. Indeed, in many cases whole farms are turned from the ordinary raising of wheat, barley, and other products of that kind to stock raising. Many farmers in Ohio owning farms that were formerly good for corn, good for wheat, and good for almost any such purposes find they can not compete with our own people in the Western States. It so happens that transportation from the far West, especially from Minneapolis and St. Paul, to the Eastern markets is very little more than the transportation from Central Ohio to the Eastern markets. The Western farmers have the benefit of the Great Lakes in the transportation of their products, and they have the benefit of the great vessels that have been constructed for that purpose, so that the transportation really from great points like Minneapolis, Omaha, and St. Paul is so small that we can not compete with them.

If our farmers can change their industry to stock raising we can send pork, beef, etc., pretty rapidly to market. The meats are generally sent in cars, where they are preserved by cold. I think that industry is rather to be encouraged than otherwise. It is not right that our people should be brought into competition with Canada on articles that we ought to and can produce to the largest extent.

This is about all I desire to say. I hope that whatever form this tax on live animals may assume it will be a specific duty. I would rather have a lower specific duty than any ad valorem duty that could be named.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator from Kansas will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the persuasive manner in which the Senator from Maine suggests that the amendment be withdrawn, I will do so for his accommodation.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Maine is obliged to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 189, and insert:

189. Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HALE. Let us have the yeas and nays upon that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas for my own information—I am not very well acquainted with the matter—what is the process by which the officers ascertain the ad valorem value of the Canadian horse at the custom-house? I suppose there is some process. Of course it is very familiar to the Senator from Arkansas, but it does not occur to me.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume the process is the same as that by which they ascertain the value of any other article. The invoice of the price of the horse is first submitted, and then the question of value has to be determined by the appraiser according to what he believes the horse to be worth.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that, of course. I remember when I was once in a law school the professor asked a student what the law was upon a certain point, and he replied very sagaciously that that would be for the court to say. I suppose it would be for the appraiser to say; but I should like to know how the appraiser ascertains the value. For instance, suppose the horse is vicious, suppose he is unsound, suppose he has any of the thousand defects that deceive the very elect. How does he ascertain the value? Suppose he has remarkable speed or any other mark of excellence.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I suppose he would ascertain the value in that case as in the case of anything where there was a possibility of fraud or of the concealment of defects or where the excellence of the article could not be easily discerned on its face. The method of ascertaining the value of the horse has to be determined by the appraiser.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Arkansas go a little further and say how he applies in ascertaining the value of a horse the method of ascertaining the value of anything else? There must be some method. The Senator says he does it in the same way he does anything else. I do not know what "anything else" the Senator has in his mind: What does the man do when a drove of two or three hundred Canadian horses arrive at the custom-house on the Vermont or New Hampshire or Maine border? You see droves of horses coming down through our cities and towns from Canada in the season. Every year there is a great number. Now, here is a drove of 300 horses, and they reach the custom-house. What does the appraiser do to determine whether those horses are worth \$25 apiece or \$125 apiece? He does something.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I presume a man of ordinary intelligence who is an appraiser would know whether a horse is worth \$500 or \$150.

Mr. HOAR. I did not say \$500; I said \$25 or \$125.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. He would make up his judgment of the value of horses by such means as would be satisfactory to him, just as he would ascertain the value of anything else. I am aware that the Senator from Massachusetts believes that the value of no article can be ascertained in the custom-house, and that values ought to be measured by weight and tariffs ought to be levied by weight and number alone.

Mr. HOAR. Where did the Senator get that knowledge as to my belief?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I believe it is an easy matter for an intelligent American citizen, whose duty it is to ascertain the value, to find out what the value of any article is when his duty requires him to do so.

Mr. HOAR. I undertake to say that the intelligent American citizen with whom I am acquainted, including, I suspect every member of this body with one or two exceptions, can not fix the value of a horse that he is going to buy unless he knows something of the history of the animal.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then the Senator would not be selected as an appraiser to value horses.

Mr. HOAR. I do not know anybody who would be selected. I suppose they do not have a special appraiser for horses and nothing else in the custom houses? I suppose the appraiser is appointed through the civil service or in some other way.

Mr. SHERMAN. If my friend from Massachusetts will allow me, I will state that there is usually only one appraiser at any of the smaller custom houses in the country.

Mr. HALE. The real answer to the Senator is of course that under the difficulties he has so accurately portrayed the appraiser has to take the valuation of the man who brings in the horses. There is no doubt about that. There is no such opportunity for fraud on any single article or animal as upon the horse.

Mr. HOAR. The citizens of Massachusetts almost without

exception, so far as I know, are absolutely defenseless in the matter of purchasing horses unless they know the history of the animal, or unless they trust either the warranty or the word of the seller. Ordinary men are almost entirely helpless.

Now, the Senator who is making himself responsible for the conduct of a great measure of civil polity and administration has put into the bill, I suppose, a hundred specific duties (I have not counted them), on the ground that an ad valorem duty will not do. We have just had a long debate, and he has got a specific duty on sugar. Then when he is asked as to a great article in which some of our States are interested (my own State not so much as the States in New England north of us, or the States in the Northwest), how an ad valorem duty can be applied by the appraiser with any protection either to the revenue or the the American producer he answers, "The appraiser does it just as any intelligent citizen does anything else," and that is all the answer he is willing to give me.

I suppose, therefore, it is all the answer he can give me. The Senator nods his head. It is all the answer he can give me. Why do you have a specific duty on sugar? Why do you have a specific duty on rice? Why do you have a specific duty on coal? Why do you have a specific duty on Tennessee marble? Why do you have a specific duty on iron? Why do you have a specific duty on lead and a hundred other things in this bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Potatoes and everything else.

Mr. HOAR. I do not know that they have a specific duty on potatoes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, they have specific duties all through.

Mr. HOAR. I think the American people have a right—I think the people I represent have a moral right and a constitutional right to know, if it is to be known, why it is that in making this law these things have specific duties and this other product has an ad valorem duty. If there is a drove of five hundred horses brought to the custom-house at St. Albans or whatever port at the extremity of Vermont, or a custom-house in Maine or in Northern New Hampshire, I undertake to say that the citizen with average intelligence, I undertake to say that four-fifths of the members of this body can not tell in regard to that drove its value within thousands of dollars. I should like to appeal to my friend from Maine [Mr. HALE], who comes from a State where they could be brought in, if that statement is the least exaggerated.

Mr. HALE. The appraiser can not judge it. It is just exactly as the Senator from Massachusetts puts it. A drove of horses, perhaps not five hundred—

Mr. HOAR. Two or three hundred come in very often.

Mr. HALE. A horseman frequently brings two or three hundred. He bring them up to the custom-house, and there is not a man in the custom-house who has the slightest qualification for estimating the value of those horses.

Mr. HOAR. Or who can acquire it in any way.

Mr. HALE. Or can acquire it in any way. There may be one hundred horses worth not over \$30 apiece, another hundred worth \$60 apiece, another worth \$90 apiece, and no man can make that discrimination. The point the Senator from Massachusetts makes is the practical point.

Mr. VEST. With the consent of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] I should like to ask the Senator from Maine, who speaks rather as an expert, how the appraisers estimate the value of horses over \$150 in value, upon which a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem is imposed in the McKinley law?

Mr. HALE. I was just coming to that point.

Mr. VEST. And the Senator from Maine proposes that rate now in his amendment.

Mr. HALE. When you get up to a grade of horses above \$150 in value, you find very few horses. You soon then get into the domain of the thoroughbred horses, the horse that is worth anywhere from \$200, \$300, \$400, or \$500 to \$1,000. A horse of that kind is valuable; he has his antecedents and is known; he will not be admitted until inquiry is made about him, and it is learned. His pedigree will be brought, it will be presented, it will be shown what he is.

It is an article that speaks for itself, and the valuation can be arranged. That is the merit of this provision. When you come to the class of horses which can be distinguished by value an ad valorem rate can be put upon them. That is the only safe way to do it. It would not do to put on so much a head, say \$60, because it might be a \$5,000 horse. Its value is easily told; but on the lower class, ninety-nine one-hundredths of all that will come in, no man can tell whether a horse is worth \$40, or \$60, or \$100.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator permit me a word?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HOAR. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to state that race horses are not

brought into this country in droves. They are brought ordinarily in private cars.

Mr. HALE. That is what I have said, that very few are brought in. They are not brought in in large numbers. Valuable horses do not come in in droves. The Senator from South Dakota is right about it.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to state further that in almost any county in the United States you can get a man who, within \$5 or \$25, can tell the value of any horse.

Mr. HALE. But you will not find him in a custom-house.

Mr. KYLE. They do not put lawyers or merchants in the custom-houses to value horses.

Mr. HALE. Neither do they put horse jockeys in custom-houses. They will not be found there.

Mr. KYLE. They find plenty of practical men for that practical work.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator from Maine is mistaken. I think they will find a great many horse jockeys in the custom-houses under the proposed law. They will have droves of horses under their charge, and they will be Canadians.

The idea of the Senator from Arkansas, in his sweet simplicity, thinking that the single appraiser in a custom-house on our Canadian border, who has to deal with every department and every article, is to be safe against the combined ingenuity of a man who is both a horse jockey and a Canadian! Either of these taken alone would cheat the average American citizen out of his eye teeth. You talk about the shrewdness of Yankees. When we get a little in Massachusetts we think we are shrewd in some things, but there is not a Massachusetts citizen who can safely buy a horse of a Vermont man; a Vermont man can not buy one of a man from Maine or New Hampshire, and none of them undertake, with any sort of security, to buy one from a Canadian.

Mr. HALE. Or a "bluenose?"

Mr. HOAR. Or a "bluenose." I do not use that phrase disrespectfully, because the Nova Scotia people are among the most highly respectable people we have on the coast.

Now, the idea of so framing a tariff bill if you want to get either honest revenue or honest protection, or want to get protection with incidental revenue, or revenue with incidental protection, or revenue without protection, or protection without revenue! It will excite the universal derision of all mankind when you send this act out to the country with an ad valorem duty on horses, and then say that the representative of the Committee on Finance of the Senate said you would find out their value just as you would find out the value of other things, and that any intelligent American citizen can do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to give in a brief sentence or two the answer of the farmers of Oregon to the propositions contained in the pending bill:

The whole Republican State ticket elected by large pluralities. HERRMANN and ELLIS by increased majorities. Latest figures on Legislature are:

Senate—Republicans, 18; Democrats, 7; Populists, 3. House of representatives—Republicans, 47; Populists, 7; Democrat, 1.

Mr. HOAR. That is the voice of the average American citizen.

Mr. ALDRICH. One Democrat pulled through for the house of representatives.

Mr. DOLPH. In explanation of the senate it should be stated that the seven Democrats in the senate are seven holdovers [laughter], and they were not elected at this election.

Mr. ALDRICH. The press bulletin continues:

Strong Democratic counties for the first time in their history give Republican pluralities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not quite understand why the committee having in charge the pending bill has not made some increase as respects this paragraph. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] this morning read some statistics showing that horses to the value of about \$1,200,000 were imported into the United States last year. He stated that the average ad valorem was 30 per cent on those horses and that they were worth about \$100 each. So it seems that under the specific duty of \$30 per head the Canadians who have imported their horses into our country have paid about 30 per cent ad valorem on the horses.

If we were to make the duty 30 per cent ad valorem, we would receive from it no such revenue as we have received from the specific duty. It certainly must be known to everyone who has been in Canada or lives on the border of Canada that the Canadian market for horses outside of the United States is a limited one. We at one time, if I recollect correctly, put a 20 per cent ad valorem duty upon horses, and when we did so, if I remember

the tables in former years, the average value of Canadian horses was about \$50 or \$60. The same horse, as soon as he got into a city on our side of the line, was sold in the wholesale markets at \$100 to \$125.

Now, if I were to frame a project or a scheme whereby the Canadians—I was about to say could swindle, but I will not say that—could take money out of the Treasury of the United States, and also out of the pockets of our people illegitimately, I should propose the provision suggested in the bill. If we are to have a duty upon horses at all let us have it specific. I take it, the object of this duty is to raise some revenue; I think so. I have a great deal of sympathy with the Senator from Missouri, who smiles at my observations. I was very sorry he had to pay into the Treasury \$75 for \$15 worth of ponies. I am rather sorry that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] has withdrawn his amendment, because I suppose it was in sympathy with my friend from Missouri, who was obliged to pay a large revenue to the Government for the sake of importing two or three ponies from Mexico.

But I think there is something a little beyond the mere question of 20 per cent on horses, as respects the first paragraph or series of paragraphs. Every Senator on this floor knows, as respects this paragraph and the subsequent paragraphs, that among the farmers of the United States the production of these animals is such that they have rapidly diminished in price from that cause and for other reasons. I know that in my State very good horses can be bought now for about one-half the price that was obtained for them three or four years ago.

Now, with that situation, why is it that we are insisting upon a provision which will allow the Canadian farmers to bring in their horses in close competition with ours and give them especially the benefit of the best market as against the farmers of the West and the Northeast.

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that in 1893 the value of all horses exported from Canada was \$1,461,000, and the value of those sent to the United States was \$1,123,000. So nearly all the horses they export come to this country.

Mr. ALLISON. I am obliged to the Senator from Michigan for calling my attention to that fact. It is perfectly well known that the Canadians have no other market for horses except ours. Nevertheless, with an area such as we have, with opportunities for raising horses and food for horses in our country without limit, it is proposed in the pending bill to allow \$1,000,000 worth of horses from Canada, probably to be enlarged in value to a million and a half, to come in in competition with our farmers.

If there is any reason why we should sit here and legislate for the benefit of the Canadian Dominion against ourselves, I should be glad to have the Senator from Arkansas explain what it is. Does anybody believe that the general range of prices of horses will be diminished by this importation? Will the importation of \$1,000,000 worth of horses from Canada affect the price of horses to those who are to purchase them? I do not believe it will. Therefore there is nothing in the paragraph except a concession to the Dominion of Canada, which has no market, and the proposed provision gives to the Canadians a market of 68,000,000 people. If I were to characterize a provision in the bill as an absurdity it would be this one, and if I should say that it is an unjust provision against every farmer who tills the field I should tell the truth. So I should prefer to have a specific duty upon horses put in the bill, and I should put it so high that the Canadian who gets the benefit of our market should pay for it.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator from Iowa explain why he wants a duty of \$30 per head on horses?

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to have a duty of \$30 per head in order that we may swell to a limited degree the revenues which yesterday the Senator from South Dakota voted to postpone on sugar for a year. That is one reason. Another reason is that if we are not to prohibit the importation of horses, I should put such a duty on them as would bring it at least within 10 per cent of the duty which the Senator voted for yesterday upon that essential article used by every family in the United States, called sugar, and which has been characterized on the other side of the Chamber as a revenue duty. I should be glad to have some Senator on the other side who yesterday voted for 44 per cent revenue duty upon sugar, an article of absolute essential consumption, tell me why he now proposes a duty of only 20 per cent upon horses, which are raised upon the farms, requiring two, three, and four years of care before they are fit for the market.

That is one reason why I would put \$30 a head on horses, but I would put it on the horses that come from Canada in order to give our own people an opportunity of raising horses in competition with Canadian horses, and thus give them the advantage here as against the men who raise horses in Canada.

Mr. KYLE. The point I wish to get at is, how it is that a

Canadian in that northern climate can raise horses at \$30 a head less cost than we can?

Mr. ALLISON. That is perfectly obvious. The Canadian has no market for his horses except in the United States and a small market on the southern shores of the Northern Lakes, so called. If we do not give the Canadian our markets of Boston, New York City, Buffalo, and the interior cities of New York State, and Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago, and so on farther west, he will not have a market for his horses.

I should be glad to know of the Senator from South Dakota if he desires that the Canadian horses shall come in competition in the markets of Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and St. Louis with those raised in South Dakota, or whether he would prefer that the people of South Dakota, who are beginning to raise horses, and fine ones, shall have the opportunity of sending those horses into these great cities?

I agree that this is not a very important matter, because the number of horses that will be imported, compared with the great number of horses produced and used in our own country, will be relatively small; but I can not see why the Senator from South Dakota desires to cast a vote here which will be solely and wholly for the benefit of the Canadian producer, and, to the extent of the importation, will be to the disadvantage of every American producer of horses.

So, Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be agreed to, and that following it, the other amendment may also be agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. By reference to the tables, which have been furnished us, I find that the average value of the horses imported is \$50.

Mr. ALLISON. As to horses in Mexico, as suggested by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Missouri, I have no doubt there is a large number of very low-priced horses on the Mexican border. I do not see why the people of Texas, having their immensely extended area, and the people along the southern border, should not be able to raise their own horses, even though they be bronchos or ponies.

If they do not choose to do that, I think it is not a very hard thing for them to pay four or five or six times \$30 for the few horses that are imported. I do not think we ought to make an exception in their case, although rather than lose this amendment, I would yield to their wishes and vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], I suppose, in deference to the suggestions made by the Senator from Missouri respecting his own experience.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] made a statement which I think may lead to some misconception upon this subject. If I understand him correctly he intimated that the effect of the adoption of the amendment proposed here would radically reduce the revenue as far as it relates to the tariff upon horses.

I hold in my hand the latest edition of Imports and Exports, and, turning to page 6, I find that from 1872 to 1891, when the McKinley act went into operation, the tariff rate was 20 per cent ad valorem, the rate now proposed.

Mr. ALLISON. I so stated.

Mr. WHITE. I propose to read from the compilation mentioned regarding this point upon which I differ from the Senator from Iowa.

In the year 1882, for instance, I find that there was realized from the duty on horses \$572,499.42; for the year 1883, \$379,702.73.

Mr. ALLISON. Do the tables give the number of horses imported?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, sir; and I can give them to the Senator if he desires.

In 1892 the number of horses imported was 38,518, and the tariff collected \$572,499.42; in 1883 there were 39,299 horses imported, and the tariff collected was \$379,702.73; in 1884, 27,253 horses were imported, and the tariff collected was \$302,106.44; in 1885, 20,759 horses were imported, and the tariff collected was \$265,942.85; in 1886, 37,232 horses were imported, and the tariff collected was \$382,970.20; in 1887, 38,800 horses were imported, and \$490,152.69 was collected; in 1888, 52,454 horses were imported, and \$535,112.13 was collected; in 1889, 50,141 horses were imported, and \$429,302.90 was collected; in 1890, 37,675 horses were imported, and \$376,595.27 was collected. In 1891, the McKinley tariff act having gone into operation, the importations are given under the head of 20 per cent ad valorem, as 7,965 horses imported, and the revenue collected \$70,863.23; and for the remainder of the year, under the McKinley act, at \$30 per head, the number imported was 7,631, and the amount collected \$228,930.

If we recur to the period covered by the McKinley duty we find, taking the full years, that in 1892 there were imported 10,255 head of horses, and the amount of duties received was \$307,650; and in 1893 there were imported 12,248 horses, and the

amount of duty received was \$367,440, thus showing that the effect of the imposition of the \$30 duty has been to reduce the revenue; and yet the Senator from Iowa argued that, if the tariff was changed as proposed here, the revenue would be proportionately reduced. I do not omit to remember his argument that the value of horses has been reduced, which is no doubt true; but my conclusion is borne out by the returns for 1893, for in that year the amount of money which passed into the coffers of the Treasury was less than the average under the 20 per cent duty. I think that I heard a Senator upon the other side of the Chamber denominate the 20 per cent ad valorem an absurd duty. If so, it is an absurdity under which the dominant party labored for many years, and which was of their creation.

I care but little, so far as my own locality is concerned, with reference to this horse tariff matter, but I do believe that it would be much better for us if the entire tariff were removed from cattle. I am absolutely opposed to taxing an article that is as necessary as beef. If we should admit cattle free, I believe it would be for the interest of the part of the United States that I especially represent. As far as the tariff upon horses is concerned, I have drawn attention to this particular matter because it seemed to me that there were statements made which were hardly in accordance with the record.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I wish to follow up what my friend from California has said in showing that the duties which have been paid under the McKinley act have reduced the importations into the country. That was the object of it. On the Mexican border it has absolutely obliterated the importation of horses. The small, cheap horse that was formerly brought in for ranch purposes has passed away. It may be argued by our friends on the other side that this is a very good thing to do, to compel people to purchase American horses and better horses, but the fact I wish to impress upon the Senate and upon the country—and it can not be stated often enough, certainly not too often—is that every time you keep something from coming into this country you keep something from going away from the country. All of our trade is an exchange of commodities, each person parting with that which he does not want and receiving that which he does want.

The horses that were coming in from Mexico were paid for by the flour of the farmer and by the exports of manufacturers, iron and steel manufactures, machinery, locomotives, steel rails, and all those things. Every dollar's worth of the surplus products of Mexico that we keep from coming to this country keeps from going to Mexico an equivalent amount of value from the United States.

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

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. If that be true, I ask the Senator to explain why it is that we exported \$48,000,000 worth to Canada last year and only imported \$38,000,000 worth? What would make up that difference?

Mr. MILLS. That is the old story. There is no difficulty about that. The Government of the United States closes its business on the 30th day of June each year, but the Government of the United States is not carrying on this trade over the world; it is the 70,000,000 people of the United States who are carrying on the trade. They are closing their accounts sometimes all through the whole year, and sometimes they run four or five years, buying in advance.

Mr. ALLISON. But I understood the Senator to say that if we brought bronchos from Mexico we would send them flour in payment?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. I supposed that trade was conducted in a little different way; that we exported a certain amount to a certain country, and if we did not import an equivalent amount they sent to us coin or its equivalent.

Mr. MILLS. They send to us the value, it may be in coin, which is simply the instrument of exchange, but at some time either during that year or the next year—or perhaps they may have paid for it in the year preceding—they will pay something just in proportion to the amount we send to them. There can be no getting away from that.

Some of our old protectionist friends of the Whig party used to say, in answer to that argument, that we must send our products out to the world and take in exchange gold and silver. That is an impossibility, because if we were to exact gold and silver for all the exports we send to foreign countries, we would soon have all the gold and silver of the whole world in the United States. It is impossible to carry out that idea, for there are only about eight thousand millions of gold and silver in the entire world. We have got about \$1,000,000,000 of it, speaking in round numbers, and our own country exports, say, in round numbers, about a thousand million dollars worth a year, and at

that rate in eight years we would have every ounce of silver and gold now in the world in the United States.

I ask what would we do for the payment of our exports for the ninth year? Our trade would have to stop and remain closed through all time, if we depended upon exporting and selling for gold and silver. Gold and silver are but the instruments of exchange, just like a ship or a railroad train. It is commodity for commodity. My friend was saying a while ago that he wanted to keep the Canadians from coming here and having our markets in Boston, New York, and Chicago. I say to him whenever he keeps the Canadian from coming and selling his horses in the markets of Boston, New York, and Chicago, he keeps the people of Iowa from selling wheat and flour to the people of Canada for the payment of those horses; and for every dollar's worth of stock which is kept in Canada from getting to this country, you keep an equivalent amount of wheat and flour of the surplus produced in the United States from going there and paying for it. We give market for market; and it can not be otherwise than that.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall go back to the old manner of levying duties on horses. Twenty per cent is enough. There is no use of putting a \$30 tax on a \$10 horse to prevent him coming to this country. If my friend from Iowa does not want a \$10 horse in Iowa, and if his friends do not want him, they need not buy him, but he can buy finer horses. These low grade horses may not be needed in his section of country, but they are needed in mine; and I hope the 20 per cent tax will be restored, instead of the \$30 tax.

Mr. KYLE. Mr. President, after all the remarks of the Senator from Iowa, I can not yet see the justice of a tax of \$30 a head upon horses. We raise a great many horses in South Dakota. To be sure, some of those horses are worth but \$10, \$12, or \$15 a head. In Wyoming to-day you can buy horses for \$15 and \$20 a head, and in Arizona and other States you can do the same. Therefore the tax of \$30 per head is absolutely out of proportion. Again, we raise some horses in South Dakota, as they do in Minnesota, in Wyoming, in Arizona, and in various other States, which are worth \$2,000 per head. A tax of \$30 per head on such horses would be out of proportion.

So far as I can see, an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent will raise just as much revenue, or more revenue, than a tax of \$30 per head will raise, and at the same time the ad valorem tax will be a great deal more just and equitable.

It is a very easy matter to determine what is the value of a horse. We have men in the New England factories—I have been through there and noticed the fact—who will tell you at a glance the character of every kind of cloth; they will tell you whether it is made of wool or of cotton, or of a mixture of wool and of cotton. The ordinary farmer of the West might perhaps go into one of those factories and examine that cloth for a period of a month and not be able to determine the character of the cloth as an expert can determine it. So an expert in a watch or a knife factory can determine the exact value of a watch or a knife at a glance.

We have in all the States of the Union men who are experts as judges of horseflesh, men who can tell at a glance whether a horse is a broncho or an Indian pony or a blooded horse; they can tell whether a horse is a trotting horse, a running horse, a draft horse, or what not; and they can tell you almost within a dollar what that horse will bring in the market. These are the kind of men we are going to have in our custom-houses as appraisers; we are not going to have men who are physicians or lawyers or statesmen. It matters not whether a Senator here is able to determine the value of a horse or not, though I presume there are Senators here on the floor of the Senate, like the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] who can tell you almost to a dollar what a horse is worth the moment they look at it.

It seems to me the most equitable duty that can be assessed is the one of 20 per cent ad valorem. It is sufficient to cover the business interests between the commerce of this country and of Canada, and between the lower borders of the United States and Mexico.

Mr. PLATT. I simply desire to say a word in reference to what the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has said.

I believe if any man is all wrong on the question of protection and free trade, it is the Senator from Texas; and I believe that his mistake is in his primal proposition—and that is that all the trade between different countries consists in the exchange of the productions of the different countries. If he would abandon that dogma, erroneous as it seems to me, I certainly should have some hope that he might be converted from the terrible delusion of free trade and become somewhat of a protectionist.

We pay for nothing that we buy of a foreign country by an exchange, by sending them other products. There is nothing which is more clearly settled in political economy than that; and

it is only necessary to refer to the instance of our trade with Brazil to show that what I state is absolutely true. We buy the largest proportion of our coffee from Brazil. I have not the figures by me; but from recollection I think we buy \$60,000,000 worth of coffee, or thereabouts, every year from Brazil.

Mr. TELLER. Nearly \$100,000,000 worth.

Mr. PLATT. The Senator from Colorado says nearly \$100,000,000 worth; and we export to Brazil only a few million dollars' worth perhaps—for the sake of illustration, I will say not more than \$10,000,000 worth—of our products, and we pay for coffee not in actual gold and silver, but in exchange based upon gold and silver. Brazil pays to us for the productions which we send to her not in actual gold and silver coin transferred, but in exchange based upon gold and silver. How it is possible for a Senator, for a political economist, or for anybody who has studied this question, to suppose that we pay for the coffee which we buy from Brazil by sending our products to Brazil, passes my comprehension. That is the fatal error of the free trader, or, as he likes to be called, the tariff reformer.

The net balance of trade against us with certain countries which were alluded to in the speech of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETIGREW] the other day, was \$208,000,000, including Brazil. The net balance of trade against us with Cuba was \$63,000,000. So with Cuba. The net balance of trade against us with Cuba was \$55,000,000. If the proposition of the Senator from Texas and those who believe with him is true, how is it that we paid to Brazil \$63,000,000 balance and to Cuba \$55,000,000 balance last year. If all trade is an exchange of products, is barter, then how do the countries who send us more than we send them get their pay? No, Mr. President, barter has nothing to do with trade between foreign countries, and exchange of products has nothing whatever to do with the trade between foreign countries.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to make a suggestion in this connection as to our trade with Great Britain. I take from the Statesman's Year Book, an English publication, the figures I am about to give.

Great Britain bought of all her colonies during the year 1892 £97,768,304 and sold to all her colonies during the same time £74,630,169, or a difference of £23,138,135; that is, she bought more of her colonies by that amount than she sold to them. She sold to us £26,547,234 and bought of us £108,186,317; in other words, she bought of us £81,639,083 more than she sold to us—about \$400,000,000 worth.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, to illustrate: Coffee is an article which we will have, and it would not make any difference if we did not send one dollar's worth of our products to Brazil, coffee we would have, and we should buy it of Brazil, as we should buy any other commodity which we could not raise here. We should purchase of other countries articles which we needed, whether they took one dollar's worth of our products in exchange or not. That is so with regard to the trade of all countries with us. If Great Britain wants anything of us, she will buy it of us. If the people of any other country want our petroleum, they will buy it of us unless they can find some other country where they can buy it cheaper. If we have a monopoly of raising anything we can sell it, whether we take anything from another country in exchange or not.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator mean to be understood as asserting or as arguing to the conclusion that if we should prohibit importations altogether, or cease to import altogether from other countries, our exportations would still remain what they are?

Mr. PLATT. If other countries wanted them they would.

Mr. FRYE. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. PLATT. There is no question about that. We might prohibit the importation of anything into this country, and if we had anything that another country needed and could not get anywhere else they would buy it of us. Can there be any question about that?

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, Spain has practically done that with us in relation to Cuba. For the last fifteen years she has prohibited almost everything being exported from this country to Cuba, and yet we have bought of Cuba right along nearly all that she had to sell.

Mr. PLATT. The argument that trade between countries is an exchange of products has been exploded over and over again, until no reputable professor of political economy, so far as I now know, maintains it.

Mr. LINDSAY. I ask the Senator, then, what are the virtues of the reciprocity provisions of the McKinley act?

Mr. PLATT. The virtues of the reciprocity features of the McKinley act are just these: That we make agreements with

countries that, if they will admit free our products which they want, we will take their products which we want, and which we can not produce. That is all there is to it.

Mr. LINDSAY. That is exchange.

Mr. PLATT. It does not affect this question at all. What we want from other countries we shall buy from them, and what they want from us they will buy from us.

If you can make an arrangement whereby we will receive those things we want here and other countries will receive the things from us which they want, it is to the advantage of both countries and extends the trade of both countries, but it does not at all touch the question of how things are paid for which are bought from foreign countries; it does not touch the supposed idea that if one country buys anything from another it pays for what it buys by the exchange of a similar amount of products of its own.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether this delusion can ever be eradicated from the mind of the free trader, it does not seem possible that an old, exploded, and impossible doctrine should so maintain its hold upon any set of people.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has said will probably be misunderstood. I do not think he explained himself fully.

In a general sense we pay for all we buy with commodities, and when we trade with the world generally, and buy more than we can pay for with commodities, we must settle in some other way, and pay in money, and thus we get into debt; and when a nation gets on that basis it very soon becomes bankrupt.

The only object of international trade is the exchange of international productions. It is very likely that in one country they may buy more than they may sell another country, or sell more than they buy; but if the general balance is not equal, so that the exports equal the imports, they will soon get in a bad way.

I have heard a great deal said about paying international balances, and that for that purpose you must have an international money. There is no greater fallacy than that. There ought to be no international balances. The United States is not engaged in exporting or importing. It is individuals who are engaged in that business; and if they buy more than they can pay for, if they buy commodities that are exported from other countries and not raised in this country, let them find some way to pay for them.

I do not know why this country should regulate its currency to accommodate importers of foreign luxuries who buy more than the people want. We ought not to have any more than we can pay for with our products. If we do, just like an individual, we shall be getting into debt, and the country is now getting into debt and getting poorer and poorer. That is our condition. We are buying now more than we can pay for, and we are borrowing money to tide over our difficulties for the present.

Italy has been buying more than she can pay for, and we are following in the footsteps of Italy. Twenty years ago Italy had a different government. Now she has a military despotism and is in the last stages of revolution. Italy was told that if she would agree to pay in gold, her bonds could be sold, and she agreed to pay in gold, and issued her bonds. Speculators and dealers in bonds took them, distributed them among the community at large, and kept doing it so long as Italy could pay the interest. Italy could only undertake to pay the interest by increasing taxation; and it had to be increased from time to time. This process was continued until finally, I am informed, Italy has an income tax of 24 per cent, and she had a deficiency last year of over \$30,000,000.

There is a deficiency staring her in the face for the next fiscal year much larger, and she can not further increase her revenue by increasing taxes. She is now discussing, to prevent going into insolvency, the propriety of selling her art treasures, which she has carried through all her difficulties and trials and tribulations, and which she has clung to through all the ages, and has revered them so much that she prohibited by law individuals selling them. She has a large military force, which is becoming daily more and more necessary to keep the people in subjection. There is a case where a country has been buying more than it sold, and has been going into debt. If this country follows that example and buys more than it can sell, it will reach the same condition.

I believe it is true that it does not make any difference whether we trade with a particular State or country. If we want anything we will buy it, and if they want anything they will buy it of us if they have the means of paying for it, and we will transfer the credit we get by selling to another country. But the general proposition that we can have trade and buy more than we sell, and go on and prosper is absurd. Many countries have been bankrupted and many people have been ruined by overtrading.

Now, it is said that an international money is needed to settle

international balances. We ought to have no international balances in the aggregate; but, if we have, we ought to have more money to settle them. If John Doe buys luxuries for the rich, let John Doe find the means of paying for those luxuries. International money, if there could be such a thing—but there is none now—would be a curse. The reason why gold has disturbed the whole civilized world is because it is worth as much uncoined as coined. In that sense it is international money, a commodity; and when it goes abroad it is sold as a commodity, and having a fixed value by all the nations who coin it, one nation is subjected to all the vicissitudes of every other; and here we are. If there is trouble in any country they have to make sacrifices to get gold; and we have to make equal sacrifices, and we are making them now.

The tariff is not the trouble; and I have taken no interest in the pending tariff bill, because whatever tariff bill you pass it will not change the general conditions. The general conditions are downward as long as gold goes up, and the larger use you make for gold, the more gold contracts you make; the more bidders you have for gold, the higher gold will go. The quantity of gold can not be increased; but there is the gold pool, strong enough to draw it to them. Their accumulations of interest give them the power to call for it, and they are calling for it. They are piling it up for war purposes.

There are \$550,000,000 in Russia; \$150,000,000 in Austria; \$900,000,000 in France; \$450,000,000 in Germany; \$450,000,000 in Great Britain. You can not get that. Conditions are against you; and while gold is pooled the demand for gold is increasing; the price of gold is advancing; the price of property and the price of men and the price of labor must decline; the price of living must decline; the price of existence must decline. That is the condition you have upon you. The idea is absurd of spending a whole session in discussing the difference between a quarter and a half of a cent, a little bit of a duty on a particular article, on collars and cuffs and little things which are of no account whatever.

Even the sugar duty I do not care anything about. What difference does it make what they are doing in sugar? I do not care if a few men get rich or get the advantage out of the general purse by their schemes and monopolies. It is but a drop in the bucket to the general drain which comes by the appreciation of gold, which stops industries. The loss to this country in the last two years by the stagnation of business and by enforced idleness has been thousands and thousands of millions of dollars of wealth to the country. That wealth has been produced by labor in the last few years. If you destroy the means of employing labor, labor will never be employed on a scale of falling prices.

Nobody wants property which is falling, nobody wishes to acquire property which is depreciating. It is only upon a stable or a rising market that property will be purchased. Everything people go into is losing, and it is a warning for men to do nothing. Those who attempt to do business fail. You have in this country destroyed the great captains of industry, who had more genius than any set of men in any country, who were developing the resources of the richest country in the world. If they are engaged in any kind of business whatever, they are ruined. Only those who are the drones of society and who do nothing are succeeding. Every young man is warned now to keep out of business, because to enter into business means ruin; he is warned to keep out of enterprise because enterprise means poverty.

That is the condition of this country, and while we have universal calamity and universal distress throughout the country, here we are discussing the question of a duty on penknives, on collars and cuffs, and other little trinkets that a few men can make a few dollars out of. That is what we are discussing, and the country is excited over this tariff. What difference does it make to the country at large whether sugar is 10 cents a pound or 10½ cents a pound? The farmers can not buy the sugar unless they can sell their wheat and cotton and corn and pork, and if they can sell their products they will not feel the difference.

This country can never grow rich until you avail yourselves of what makes a country rich. What makes a country rich is the employment of labor in developing its resources. Labor can not be employed while gold is appreciating and property depreciating. If you go on here in the midst of the calamities that are falling upon the world and discuss nonessentials, you are only making the matter worse.

My Democratic friends will be disappointed in the result of their legislation; matters will grow worse; and the people will attribute it to their legislation. My Republican friends, if they come into power, if they follow the same course, will again disappoint the people, as they disappointed them in the last Administration. They were not turned out because the people thought the Democratic party was better, but because they believed the

Republican party was worse; and the next time it will be not because they think the Republican party is better than the Democratic party, but they will think that the Democratic party is still worse than the Republican party.

So you will go on as long as you allow a few men to monopolize the gold of the world and deprive the people of money and continue to have enforced falling prices. The people will be against the party in power, whichever it may be, and however they change, it will make no difference, so long as this policy is not to be changed.

It appears both parties are so wedded to the policy of gold contraction that they can not give it up; and so long as they adhere to it we shall have hard times; and I say, furthermore, and say it with emphasis, if this policy is maintained for ten years, our civilization will be so changed that it will bear no comparison with the civilization of twenty years ago; there will be classes in this country, as there are in every other country; there will be the nobles, the rich, and the very poor, and under such conditions republican institutions can not be maintained. Republican institutions can only be maintained by allowing the masses of the people to prosper, to be independent, and self-reliant. They can not be maintained under your present policy.

I speak of the policy of the two parties, because while there may be honest and sincere men who differ from this policy in both parties, the ultimate result of the action of both parties is the same. That is the reason why I can not act with either of the great parties. The action of both these parties leads to the same lamentable result; it leads to the same ruin to my country. I can not stand by and see my country ruined by the appreciation of gold, the falling of prices, and starvation in the land without raising a word of protest against it and against the discussion by this Congress of nonessentials while this cloud is hanging over the people.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] enunciated what I regard as a correct principle, but I differ with him as to the application of the principle.

All international trade is an exchange of commodities, must necessarily be so, and always has been so; but the Senator from Texas assumes that it must be an interchange between the same nations. There is where he is in error. He has got hold of a half truth and not the whole. His theory is that if we trade with Great Britain, and sell Great Britain a large amount, we are bound to buy of Great Britain or Great Britain will cease to buy of us.

There is another principle, which is well recognized in the economy of trade, that a nation only buys where it buys profitably. We buy of South America a large amount of coffee, rubber, and various other things. We buy there because there is where we can buy the cheapest and the best, and there is the greatest profit for us to deal with those people. Every year, as shown the other day by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], there is a large balance of trade against us in the South American republics. We trade with Great Britain every year. Great Britain is our greatest customer. We trade more with Great Britain than with any other country. We sold Great Britain last year, in round numbers, \$400,000,000 worth of articles more than we bought from her.

How did we pay the South American people to whom we had run in debt a couple of hundred million dollars? We drew our draft upon the London houses, where our credit was on account of our exports from this country, and transmitted it to South America. That is the way we paid it. So, in the end, it was an interchange, but not of commodities. As the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] truthfully says, whenever a nation begins to buy more than it sells, then it is on the high road to disaster. We have settled our balances for a great many years, not with money, but with a money metal. For many years we bought of Great Britain a larger amount than we sold to her; and if we did not of Great Britain, we bought of other nations of the world, and we sent over there nearly fifty or sixty million dollars of gold, the output of California, for a long time.

We have sent to Europe within twenty-five years at least \$400,000,000 of silver, not as money, but as a metal, as a commodity; yet that is all an interchange after all of commodities; that is, not a payment in money. You do not pay in money, you can not pay in money, unless you get what the Senator says is an impossibility—an international money.

Great Britain will buy of us those things which she needs, whether we buy a dollar's worth of her or not. The illustration the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] made as to the trade with Cuba and Brazil is a fair illustration. Cuba wanted nothing we had except flour, meat, and a few other articles, and she put a prohibitory duty upon them and excluded them from her ports; yet we continued to buy of Cuba year in and year out just exactly as if she had been receiving our goods.

We got the benefit of having bought in the best market. So

Great Britain bought of us last year to the amount of \$400,000,000 nearly of agricultural products. She bought them of us because she could buy them cheaper here than she could buy them anywhere else. Does anybody believe she would have bought them of us if she could have bought them for a hundredth part of a cent on a dollar less anywhere else? Of course not.

There is not any sympathy or sentiment in trade. Great Britain will buy from us just as long as it is to her interest to do so. It is possible that you can make a reciprocity treaty with a country by which you may say to them, "We will give you advantages which we do not give to anybody else if you buy of us." In that way you may secure some trade; but that is contrary to the principle of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], because he believes in free and unrestricted trade; he believes that everything which embarrasses trade in any way is improper. That is the free-trade doctrine. Trade unrestricted, unhindered, is the free-trade doctrine, and it is a beautiful theoretical doctrine. As I said the other day, it is absolutely unassailable from a theoretical standpoint. It is only when you come to make a practical application of it that you find difficulty.

Mr. GRAY. Will it interrupt the Senator if I ask him a question?

Mr. TELLER. Not a bit.

Mr. GRAY. Is the Senator quite sure that when you make the practical application of the theory of free trade you come to fault?

Mr. TELLER. No, I am not; because the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Delaware, who I admit are just as patriotic and just as anxious to serve the country as I am, differ with me. I would not say that I am absolutely certain of that when so many men whose judgment I respect, whose integrity and patriotism I never would impugn, think otherwise; but in my judgment I am satisfied enough about it for my convictions to control my course. I shall not say more than that.

Mr. GRAY. Of course the Senator understands, if he understands anything of me, that I never impute anything to those who differ with me, as the Senator from Colorado sometimes differs with me, and never claim that they have less honesty than I claim for myself; and this question about free trade and protection is a matter about which I recognize we honestly differ. I am not, of course, speaking of anything but the position of the Senator as it appears from my standpoint; but I would call his attention to the fact, when he says that theoretical free trade is all right and is perfect so far as theory is concerned, but when you come to practice somehow it will not work, that is a contradictory position.

I would call the Senator's attention to the fact that nowhere on the face of the earth has any one economic theory, whether of free trade or of protection, been so thoroughly experimented with, so thoroughly tested and tried, as practical free trade, and no economic doctrine has been so thoroughly vindicated by experiments as free trade. In the United States of America, between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, between the Lakes and the Gulf, there is a larger contiguous area dedicated to one theory, and that theory free trade, than is dedicated anywhere on the face of the globe to the practice of any other economic theory; and no one, I think, will contend that the prosperity, such as it is, of the United States is not largely due to the absolute free trade of economic forces here, unhindered, unfettered, and unshackled by law.

Mr. TELLER. That would take me into a discussion of a question which I do not propose to enter upon at this time.

In the first place, the free trader must go upon the theory that he owes the same obligation to every man on the face of the earth which he owes to his own country; that every other country must have as much of his benevolence, his care, and his attention as he gives to his own. I have never been able to get big enough and broad enough to do that. I can never divest myself of the idea that I owe to my own country something that I do not owe to any other; and I can never divest myself of the idea that I have an interest in my own countrymen which I never can have in those of any other country.

Mr. President, the idea of theoretical free trade and of the theoretical free trader is that all the world is akin, that all obligations are equal, that my obligations to Englishmen are equal to my obligations to the Americans. That I deny. I insist that nations are like families; that a man has the right, by the law of God and of man, to look after his own family as he does not look after his neighbor's family; and that he has a right, as a citizen of this Republic, to look after the interests of the Republic; that he is not called upon, either by the law of God or the law of man, to look after the interests of foreign countries.

Mr. GRAY rose.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me now. Mr. GRAY. I shall not interrupt the Senator. I beg his pardon.

Mr. TELLER. I do not wish to be interrupted just now.

There is the theory, I repeat, and that theory applied to this country, in accordance with my judgment, is that I owe to this country, that I owe to the people of Delaware, what I do not owe to the people of Great Britain; that I owe to the people of Massachusetts what I do not owe to the people of France; and therefore the application made here is made upon an entirely different principle from what it is made when you spread out your sympathy all over the world. That is why I say that free trade theoretically is a beautiful theory. It is based upon the other everywhere, but the application can not be made. I want brotherhood and the universal interest which men have in each other everywhere, but the application can not be made. I want to say to the Senator from Delaware now that there has been no application of free trade anywhere in the world which has been followed with such prosperity as the protective system has brought to this country.

Mr. President, the doctrine of free trade is a modern doctrine. I know a great many Senators and a great many people believe that free trade is an ancient doctrine. It is comparatively a modern doctrine. Ancient political economists never asserted the doctrine of free trade. It is within the last one hundred years that it has taken hold of the public mind of the world. It did not get hold of the English mind until a little more than fifty years ago; it never has taken hold of France and Germany and many other nations of the world, except of the minds of the doctrinaires. The practical men of those countries have never been free traders and are not now. As a student of political economy I discovered that the countries which adopted free trade were not being as much benefited as those who provided by special legislation, if you may use the term, for their own interests.

I am sufficient of a socialist—not a socialist in the sense which many understand the term—but I am sufficient of a socialist to believe that laws may properly be provided and enacted looking to the protection of the industries in a country; that is to say, that it is not contrary to the genius of our Government or any other properly constituted government, that you shall legislate, having in view what may be the influence of your legislation upon labor and upon capital, if you choose.

Mr. President, I do not propose to go into any dissertation on the philosophy of the tariff question. I realize how difficult it is for a man who starts out with the idea that you owe the same obligation to Englishmen which you owe to your own countrymen to answer the proposition, and say you can not treat him as you treat your own; but, I repeat again, that I deny that I am under such obligation either by natural law or by any other law. I claim that nations are organized just as families are organized, for the benefit of the race, and it is as absolutely essential that you maintain nationality as it is that you maintain families. Communities must exist which are organized and homogeneous. You can not make all the world one community, and regulate them all by the same law. It is utterly impossible; it is utterly impracticable, and no practical statesman will attempt it. The question here is, what is good for this country?

Great Britain, having strengthened her manufactures by one hundred and fifty years of absolute prohibition, having closed her ports to the manufactures of the world, having made it a crime for her mechanics to teach their art to other people, having made it a crime to export machinery to other countries, found herself at last with capital so great and skill so great among her people that they said, "We can now defy the world." Then they started in on free trade, and Great Britain did have prosperity. She had for a time the markets of the world, but she is fast losing them to-day.

Mr. President, the era of free trade has passed; the trend of the best minds of the world to-day is against free trade. That is the case even in Great Britain. The scholarly men of the world to-day, the men who write on political economy, the men who have studied this question, who have talked about it, and who have delved in it for years, are, as a rule, changing their views upon this subject. I know the Senator from Delaware was in college at Princeton and, like the rest of us, he did not hear anything but free trade. Nobody thought then of anything but free trade.

Mr. GRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon. It was not taught then, but the theory of protection was. That only confirms what the Senator from Colorado has said, that free trade is the result of the advancement of society and that it is not an ancient doctrine.

Mr. TELLER. I did not recall when I made that statement that the Senator from Delaware is a very much younger man than I. If he had been as old as I, he would not have heard the doctrine of protection taught in any college. When I entered college there was not, I venture to say, an American college anywhere which taught protection. It was difficult when I was 20

years of age to find a book written anywhere in favor of protection. The old doctrines were still extant, but after England had changed on this question, then all the doctrinaires and nearly all the political economists of the world flopped over and went to free trade; and I venture to say you can not pick up the curriculum of any single college in 1850 where you can find a textbook in favor of protection—not one.

So our college boys grew up, as to some extent they are now growing up, under free-trade notions. The Senator from Delaware came in a little later, after there had been a little common sense and practical sense applied to this subject. He went to college when protection was taught, but I venture to say that if they taught protection in Princeton, they did not teach it in Yale or Harvard.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will pardon me, Prof. Bowen, at Harvard, taught protection.

Mr. TELLER. If so, that was an exception, and everybody realized that it was an exception.

I repeat again, if the Senator will take the best thought and utterances of the presentage—I mean within five years—he will find all over the world that they are raising questions about whether this doctrine of free trade is after all the proper doctrine. There is a very large departure from it.

Mr. President, I did not get up to make a speech on the tariff and I do not intend to do so; I did not want to delay this debate, I only wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that he has adopted a general rule which is true, but that he has been making a misapplication of it.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion or to enter upon the economic theory which lies at the bottom of the difference between the Republican and the Democratic parties, but I wish merely to reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

The Senator from Delaware says that the United States is an instance of free trade on the largest scale in which it was ever applied.

Mr. GRAY. In contiguous territory.

Mr. HOAR. This planet is an instance of protection on the largest scale in which it ever was applied. It is but a speck as compared with the solar system, the system of worlds, which astronomy reveals to us, and yet the world is confined to its own resources with eight hundred or a thousand million inhabitants, and the world has been constantly growing wealthier, more civilized, more happy, more free; and in recent years, where the doctrine of protection has been applied in particular nations, those nations to which it has been applied have been growing rapidly and constantly wealthier, more intelligent, more free.

The lesson of that fact is that when you have a nation with a variety of resources, an extent of territory, an intelligence of its people, and a race governing and controlling it capable of looking out for their own best interests and understanding them, that nation can in and of itself and its own resources be constantly growing wealthier. The wealth of the single farms and of the farmer is not measured by what is sold, and the profit is not measured by what is bought. It is measured by the improvements, by the new walls that are laid, the new fences that are built, the new barns that are erected, the drainage, and the improvement of the soil. So that the cultivation of the internal resources, whether of State or nation, just as the cultivation of the internal resources of the entire planet, is the method by which wealth and comfort are created.

There is another thing, Mr. President, that the Senator from Delaware said, and that is, that free trade had been the law in this country. That is very far from being practically true. It is true that no State is at liberty under our Constitution to impose a commercial barrier against any other, and that no State is at liberty under our Constitution, nor is the United States, to prohibit exportation to foreign countries; but the family, upon whose prosperity and development that of the country is dependent, applies the rule of life and of economy and of Scripture, that he who provideth not for his his own household is worse than an infidel.

The New England or the Western farmer, with half a dozen boys growing up, does not hire his labor where he can get it cheapest and send off the farm for hired men to do what he can bring up the boys to do for themselves, and send them off where, perhaps, they can get a little more wages than they would receive at home. He puts the boys to doing upon the farm everything which their hands can find to do, everything which their brains or labor or skill will enable them to do; and in that way the trained and skilled brain and muscle and finger of the child make the wealth of the whole family. If the Senator has a son or a brother who is a physician or a lawyer he employs him, and does not go where he can get work done the cheapest. He prefers the clergyman, the physician, the grocer, the lawyer, the

manufacturer, the tradesman of his community; and public sentiment, unerring, but as inexorable as if it were enacted into law and into Constitution, which no smuggling and no ingenuity and no free-trade sophistry can overcome, goes in that direction. Every community seeks its own prosperity and advancement, and is looking out for itself.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] said truly that the doctrine of free trade is dying out the world over. The Senator from Delaware says that his college instructor taught him the doctrine of protection, and that he had become a free trader later when he became a Democrat. That may not be the precise phrase he used. I will not put to that Senator the cruel question whether he thinks, after all, he is wiser than the learned professor of Princeton, who instructed him in his youth.

The Marquis of Salisbury, just before he laid down power in England, confessed the truth of what the honorable Senator from Colorado has so well said. He said that England was getting lonely; that it was a case of one nation and one community against the entire world which held this doctrine of protection. He compared it to Athanasius *contra mundum*—St. Athanasius against the world. I had the honor of suggesting, when that statement of the Marquis of Salisbury was first made, that he could not have selected a more felicitous comparison.

Athanasius was the author of the most cruel, narrow, bigoted creed ever known among men, which reserved a few human beings for bliss and consigned the bulk of mankind to perpetual misery, just as the Democratic doctrine of economy inures to the benefit of a few monopolists and importers and sugar refiners, and dooms the remainder of the American people, if carried into effect, to poverty and distress. The same Athanasius, who was against the world, was the patron saint of Egypt, and Egypt is a melancholy example of the adoption of English Athanasian economic policies.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I am not going to prolong the debate for more than one minute; but the Senator has quoted what was said by a distinguished English statesman, Lord Salisbury, as he was going out of power. It may not be out of place to read a sentence from another English statesman, no less revered and admired in this country than Lord Salisbury. I read a letter written by Mr. Gladstone to the chairman of the Midlothian Liberals at Brighton, within a year, and only this sentence, as the letter is somewhat long. He says:

Now is the time for every true friend of this country to remind the masses that they owe their present political elevation to no principles less broad and noble than these: Love of liberty for all, without distinction of class, creed, or country, and resolute preference for the interests of the whole people to any interest of narrower scope.

And that great sentiment of that great statesman lies, as I think, at the very foundation of the economic principles in which I have come to believe.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not think my honorable friend from Delaware has been absolutely felicitous either in the authority which he has quoted or the sentiment which he has read.

With all our reverence for Mr. Gladstone, everybody who has witnessed his illustrious career must admit that Mr. Gladstone was never able to look beyond the interests of England to the interests of mankind. Whatever is good for England is good for him. Mr. Gladstone, I suppose, more than any other public man of this generation, has been obliged by this habit of his of standing up for the existing English condition of things, to retract, to exchange, and to take back his public utterances. He began life with an essay in defense of the Established Church. He was the rising hope of the young Tories. He ends his life with a measure for church disestablishment.

Later he welcomed and predicted and exulted in the dissolution of the American Union as something for the benefit of Great Britain. He was obliged afterwards to say that he thought the American Constitution was the greatest product that the human mind ever struck off in a single generation. He began by opposing the enfranchisement of Ireland. He ended by being its principal champion. And if Mr. Gladstone's great political career should be, or could be prolonged, before the close of it he would come around to the great doctrine of protection, to which the American people has owed its prosperity and its glory.

But, Mr. President, there is a greater living authority even than Gladstone. There is one name so illustrious that the name of every contemporary, whether it be prince or noble or statesman, save that of Abraham Lincoln alone, must pale into insignificance—that is the great German statesman now living in an honored old age, who took sixty states, quarreling, estranged, separate, feeble, and bound them together in a single lifetime, and made of them the mightiest nation on earth. When Bismarck had accomplished that great work, he himself has told us that he set himself to study what further good he could accomplish for his beloved German Empire, of which he had been the political creator; and he said his attention was turned to the

great career of the United States of America; that nothing upon earth had ever equalled, nothing upon earth had ever resembled the splendor, the glory of that gigantic advance which this great and free people had made; and Bismarck said he looked for the cause of that wonderful prosperity, and he found it in our system of protection to American industry, and declared that it was the one remaining hope of his life that the benefits which this policy had conferred upon America, he might be instrumental in conferring upon his beloved Germany.

I put the authority of Bismarck, who has accomplished everything, against the authority of Gladstone, who, though great he is, has as yet accomplished nothing. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I yield to nobody in my admiration of Gladstone. I have regarded him as one of the greatest of the English-speaking race; but, after all, those who are familiar with his career and his character have to confine their admiration to two things; first, his great intellect, and, second, his great devotion to England. There is not a chapter in Mr. Gladstone's history which indicates that his sympathy has ever gone beyond Great Britain. He is unable, and has been unable, to extend it even to the British provinces.

Can the Senator from Delaware forget the spectacle in the British Parliament—one which I say here has no example for selfishness, for narrowness—when Mr. Gladstone stood before that Parliament and declared that because Great Britain held the credits of the world Great Britain was interested in the gold product, that Great Britain was interested in buying with the income from the money that it loaned twice what it would buy when the money was loaned? He is not a fit illustration for us.

When he spoke of the interest he spoke only of the interest of Great Britain. He did not intend his sympathies to go out even, I repeat, to the colonies of Great Britain. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], in making a speech here last summer, said, speaking of the English policy, which is represented by Mr. Gladstone better than by any other man now living, England was supremely selfish. If India suffered, India must be allowed to suffer. Mr. Gladstone had no thought for the 290,000,000 or 300,000,000 of Indians, who are being oppressed and ground down by the policy of Great Britain. He simply inquired, "What is the interest of the people of these islands? What is the interest of Great Britain at home?" Not what is the interest of the English-speaking people of the world, nor what is the interest of the subjects of the Queen. He confined his sympathies, I repeat, entirely to that narrow circle—Great Britain.

If Mr. Gladstone had even a record which entitled the Senator to claim that he referred to all the world, it does not follow that we are to imitate or to be influenced by his statement. Unless, as I said before, the Senator from Delaware is willing to stand here before the American people and declare that, in his judgment, he owes the same duty to every man who wears the human form, that he owes to the American citizen or the American people, then there is no application whatever of his theory to be made.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator had paid close attention to the extract read by the Senator from Delaware from the letter of Mr. Gladstone he would have seen that it was the interest of the whole people of Great Britain, and not the interest of any other part of the world, that he had in view.

Mr. TELLER. That is just what I said; that it applied only to those islands, and not to all the subjects of the Queen, not the Indians, not the Canadians, not the Australians, but simply to the subjects of the Queen in Great Britain—England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. That is as far, I assert, as Mr. Gladstone has ever gone. He is one of the greatest statesmen of Europe, but I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that he has a superior in the great German.

It is a practical question, as I said before, and not one of theory, as to how you are going to maintain the present prosperity. I do not speak of the immediate present; I speak of the condition existing in this country prior to 1893. How are you going to maintain the prosperity that was then in existence in this country? That is the concern of the American legislator; that should be the concern of the Senator from Delaware and myself, and I have no doubt it is his concern. Can you maintain the prosperity of the country by putting the American laborer in competition with all the world? Trade is very good; but we have a market here which is better than any other market under the sun. We have 70,000,000 people, soon to be 100,000,000, and are we to surrender that market to any other people?

Mr. President, we can maintain our market ourselves. There is not a thing which the skill of man can make which we can not make. We are only under disabilities when we come to buy

some tropical production such as coffee. We have not been able to raise sugar, or to raise it in sufficient quantities at least, for our own consumption; but everything which the skill and ingenuity of man can construct can be constructed right here. The Almighty gave us everything which is necessary for that purpose. There is no other country of equal product and equal extent which has so many natural advantages as we.

All we have got to do is to harness them and use them and put the great agencies in force which the Almighty has established, and we can be independent of the world. If every other country on the face of the earth should be depopulated and should become a barren waste, this country has all the necessary qualifications to maintain the highest civilization which has ever been maintained. There would be nothing lacking to make men happy and to fulfill the greatest destinies the most ambitious man can ever have for the race.

Why should we let our sympathies extend so far that we are willing to put the American laborer on the plane of the European laborer? How can we for a moment contemplate that?

Mr. President, I will not enter into it. My sympathies will never get beyond my country to such an extent that I would bring disaster and distress upon it. While I shall gladly in every movement that I make keep in mind the interests of the whole race, I shall never do it at the expense of my own people. I shall never do it at the expense of the American citizen, whether he be native born or whether he be one who has come here to participate with us in the benefits of a free government and a rich country.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I do not admit that we are wasting time here, and I make no apology for taking the floor for a few minutes. It is the first time I have known in this debate that we have come into the essence of the question. We are discussing fairly and squarely the doctrines of protection and free trade, and I thank the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] for being the first man who has ever risen to defend the theory of his party fairly and squarely in all this debate.

Several SENATORS. And the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HAWLEY. Oh, yes; I beg pardon. The Senator from Texas, *primus inter pares*, is the champion of free trade. So there are two of them. I agreed in everything—with the very vigorous and sound statement of doctrine made by my friend from Colorado on my left [Mr. TELLER]; I agreed with everything he said except one, that there is something entrancing about the abstract doctrine of free trade.

Mr. GRAY. He said it was perfect.

Mr. HAWLEY. Well, poetically perfect. He meant academically perfect.

Mr. TELLER. Yes, theoretically.

Mr. HAWLEY. But practically good for nothing. That is what he said. To me it has no beauty. I think it is cruel. I think it is the policy of the wild beasts. I can conceive nothing that less deserves the praise of Christians and statesmen than the unadulterated doctrine of free trade. Stated simply and clearly it is this: Every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, the world over.

That is what free trade is. It invites the intelligent American who is earning his \$2 a day as a matter of Christianity and sound policy to open the gates to the man who is obliged to work for 6 or 10 cents a day, who is the victim of generations of oppression, cruelty, and injustice on the part of his rulers or of ignorance on their part, and let them all in to compete with him upon equal terms. "Buy where you can buy the cheapest," no matter if you find in a few years you will have nothing to buy with, is the essence of the free-trade doctrine.

Now, where would that leave us? Every man can imagine for himself. There is no country that exemplifies free trade. There is none worth bringing into the argument.

Mr. GRAY. Not this country?

Mr. HAWLEY. Not this country at all. The Senator was very unhappy in his illustration. Here are 70,000,000 people living under almost precisely the same laws.

Mr. GRAY. And pretty happy, so far.

Mr. HAWLEY. And all enjoying the same benefits of a wise civil government and a free government, with almost every variety of soil and climate. As the Senator from Colorado well said, we can live without the rest of the world. We could erect that famous Chinese wall a hundred miles high all around us and keep it for fifty years, and when it was broken down at the end of that time there would be found within it a happy, rich, educated people, enjoying every luxury in the world. That is what we could do. The Chinese wall is the famous barrier which you talk of sometimes, and I accept it as an illustration. Great Britain is not an exemplar of what free trade is.

Mr. GRAY. I said this country is an exemplar.

Mr. HAWLEY. I know the Senator did, but I was going to say further, there is another country that professes to be free

trade, and is endeavoring to teach everybody else the doctrine. It is not a free-trade country; it is very far from it. The free-trade country is that which levies absolutely nothing upon importation and raises its money by direct taxation. I have under my desk, and I take it every year and have for a series of years, the only free-trade publication I know of in Great Britain, which continually, from year to year, denounces the tariff of Great Britain because it is not a free-trade tariff, and because her system of taxation is unequal and oppresses her people. Great Britain lives as she does because she must live as she does.

If Great Britain could awake some morning and find there had arisen to the southwest of her, subject to the favoring influences of the great Gulf Stream, a continent of half a million square miles, Great Britain would change her theories before night. She would take possession of that land. Let us suppose it had in its hills, as we have, all the metals, precious and common; that it had somewhere in that region soil fitted for the production of every cereal and everything necessary for man's life and man's comfort or man's luxury. She would take possession of it as quickly as she could get there, and she would immediately proclaim the doctrine of protection, because she would say, "That beautiful region that God has given us we must develop."

No, the first business of a nation is not to break down all its bars and let all the wild cattle of the universe run through its gardens. The first duty of a nation is to build itself. How these free traders can fail to see the magnificent beauty of the path that is laid before the United States I can not imagine. We all dwell upon the wonderful resources, the broad extent, the magnificence of the possession that God has given us, the possibilities of everything that a nation can need, and yet do not acknowledge that which to my mind is on the very forefront of all this, a command of the Lord God to develop this country and to set the world an example of what a nation can be, and especially what a free nation can be.

Take the British colonies. All of them tax their mother. They do not let her bring goods in free, neither does she give them a fair chance at her. I was given by an Englishman not long ago a very curious illustration on this subject. The French begin with a tariff prohibiting everybody and everything, and then go around making special bargains. France lives by a series of reciprocity treaties. She excluded all foreign-built vessels. They were prohibited. Great Britain made an arrangement to let wooden vessels or iron or steel vessels also in upon a certain footing, but inasmuch as Canada would have the advantage of her, because she could build wooden ships very cheaply, Canada was not admitted to that special benefit. It is thus that the mother country arranged with its neighbor.

Mulhall, the statistician, who is accepted as one of the highest authorities in the world, states what I have stated heretofore, but I remind the Senator from Delaware of it again, that Great Britain goes outside of her limits for 95 per cent of her raw material, while the United States has within her limits 93 per cent of all she needs. That simple, bare statement, I hold, is enough to settle the argument.

While we have our resources undeveloped, we go 3,000 miles to get something which we might just as well produce ourselves, and very much better for ourselves. No, sir; there is no beauty to me in carrying iron or coal from Pennsylvania or Alabama to England and letting somebody make something for us. There is no beauty to me in sending cotton over there to make cotton cloth more cheaply in England, because it can be made more cheaply there, and bringing it back here to pay for cheap agricultural products. There is no beauty at all in that sort of exchange. It is the most perfectly obvious thing in the world (it is shown time and again in our history until one gets tired of speaking of it), if it be necessary to place some little or some considerable taxation upon foreign articles until the American can once get hold of it, with his ingenuity, with his extraordinary application, with his great power of business combination, that which has made our 170,000 miles of railway, and the ingenuity displayed in the marvelous records of our Patent Office, the American soon makes these articles and surpasses all the rest of the world in making them. Then there are two transactions at home, the creation of the raw material and its transformation, instead of the creation of the raw material here and the transformation abroad, with 6,000 miles of travel.

Do not these things commend themselves to the gentleman's logic? Do they not commend themselves to his love of country? Does he not see in all this the dream of a future such as no nation ever had even for a dream?

Great Britain is not yet through with her task in this matter. Not at all. She is just beginning to find that she is paying her people a little more than other peoples are paying their people. She is paying a little better wages. From a very carefully made up tabulation, not got up to illustrate an argument, I found that where the United States pays a dollar Great Britain pays

fifty-two cents and France we will say forty-seven, and Belgium forty-six, and so forth, those countries ranging just below Great Britain.

Now, Great Britain finds to the exasperation of many of her people that Belgium can send many of her things in there cheaper than she can make them; that Germany has sent many of them cheaper than she can make them herself; that France can export to Great Britain many things at a price lower than that at which Great Britain can make them. Her doctrine compels her to say, "That is all right; we must buy of you; we will buy where we can buy the cheapest." There are many things in her textiles and in her metallic manufactures that are sinking. Her people are losing their own trade.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. HAWLEY. It will be no interruption at all.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to call his attention to the fact that the English statistics of her wages, compared with the nations on the Continent, do not show the length of time that the working-man is out of employment—whether he works four days or five days or six days a week; the statistics only show the wages he gets per day while he is employed. For instance, in Sheffield (I do not know how it is to-day, but when I was at Sheffield years ago) two-thirds of the persons employed in the cutlery factories did not go to work at all on Monday, being employed but five days in the week. It is well settled by those statistics that of the manufacturing laborers in England who reach the age of 60, 50 per cent are paupers, and are supported as paupers after that age.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not care to prolong the discussion now. I have but one more point to make, and that is to say, as a substitute for our system of taxation, Great Britain, the alleged free-trade country, has one very much different, and I commend it to our free traders if they are going through with their schemes, as I understand they are. I beg the attention of the Senator from Delaware just one moment longer. I understand that this bill has now become an unfortunate creature without a father, recognized by nobody, resembling nothing unless it be a mule, being "without pride of ancestry and without hope of posterity." I understand that is the way this bill is regarded. It bears nobody's name. The two distinguished gentlemen who are put forward as official nurses of it remind one of the small girl carrying the big baby in Punch's picture and crying, "Drat the child! It is more trouble than all my money."

The English have a substitute, and our free-trade friends, as a substitute for our system, will by and by adopt the English system. She raises the sum of about \$100,000,000 substantially from four articles, and those are articles of universal consumption. That is to say, it is a per capita tax as nearly as they can make it, and so is their internal revenue taxation. All their direct beer tax and liquor taxes and many more things of that sort have been levied not according to the burden-bearing capacity of the people. The revenue obtained from duties or imports is nearly three dollars per capita.

That is not a fair system for taxation. I figured the other day that about 57 per cent of the whole of the British revenue of nearly \$500,000,000 is raised very much in the same way. The only exception of any consequence is in their income tax; that they have brought down to \$750 a year, and they pursue it with a minuteness that shows that if there was anything to be got out of the blood of the pauper they would get it. That is the system that is to be pressed upon us. After this bill shall have been passed, the next step in the next Presidential campaign will be something like the British free-trade system.

Mr. GRAY. I merely want to say that if the gentlemen on the other side who have been talking so interestingly on the academic phase of the question this afternoon will only agree upon a time to vote we would be very glad on this side to instruct them in the true theory of revenue reform, and I should have even some hope of bringing my friend from Connecticut, who occupies the extreme Chinese wall doctrine of protection, somewhat more into the light; but until then we shall have to suppress ourselves and deny ourselves the great pleasure.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does my eloquent friend claim that this is a revenue tariff before us?

Mr. GRAY. I am not claiming anything.

Mr. HAWLEY. Does my friend claim that it is a free-trade tariff? Does my friend claim that it is a tariff for protection? It is all three; no man owns it, and every man outside of Congress denounces it.

Mr. HOAR. I will agree upon a time to vote, after the Senator from Delaware, or any member of the committee, has explained to us the principle on which this bill proceeds and why one item is ad valorem and another is specific. In one hour after those questions have been answered which we have been putting for the last three months, I will for one agree to vote.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I think that the Senate and the country owe a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who are the recognized free traders upon the other side of the Chamber, for entering into the debate this afternoon. There has been a fashion upon this side of the Chamber when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] had granted some little protection to some American industry which would allow that industry to survive, to express our gratitude to those Senators for their kind consideration for that industry. I think that we are under a greater debt of gratitude to-day to the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Delaware for bringing into the debate of this afternoon the great question of protection as against free trade, and avowing themselves as free traders.

It seems to me that the discussion might well proceed which has been originated by the Senator from Delaware. I do not think the Senator ought to rise and bring on such a debate and then deprecate this discussion or refrain himself from proceeding with its discussion. I know the Senator from Delaware is very heavily burdened just now in the work which he is performing upon the investigating committee, which is to determine whether the sugar trust controls Senators and influences legislation, and yet I believe that the Senator would be entirely able to enter upon a full exposition of his views upon the tariff that would tend very much to the benefit of the Senate and of the country. And if the Senator from Texas, who has also brought on the discussion to-day of the question whether free trade increases American imports into foreign countries, would give a full elucidation of his views upon that subject, I believe the country would be much benefited.

Mr. President, the action of the two Senators who have caused so much discussion this afternoon has, I doubt not, vexed the heart of the Senator from Tennessee, who is so impatient to have this bill pass and become a law. Those Senators have brought up for discussion a question that does lead us to what we have been seeking for the last two or three months, and that is the question of principle that possibly guided the other side in the framing of the bill. To-day we have the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Texas, free traders, upon the scene. To-morrow we shall have the Senator from Arkansas, who is willing any industry shall survive, and occasionally we shall have the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD], who undertook to lay down the principle that governs the Democracy, the principle of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection, while he says he knows what the Republican principle is; that the Republican principle is a tariff for protection with incidental revenue.

It seems to me that with all these Senators participating in the debate, we might, if time would allow (and I do not see why it should not allow), go on and at last reach a principle upon which we could all agree. This bill could then be recommitted to the Committee on Finance, and when it should be reported upon in accordance with this principle it might be acted upon in a very few days.

To proceed briefly, as I intended when I endeavored to get the floor an hour or two ago, before the Senator from Delaware brought on the extremely interesting discussion which we have had, I desire to speak of the argument of the Senator from Texas, his reiteration of his proposition that the reduction of duties, that free trade tends to increase American exports to foreign countries. I must confess that I can not understand that doctrine. I can not understand how the question whether we have duties upon articles which we import into this country has any effect upon the demand by foreign countries for our productions. I think the proposition is absurd, Mr. President.

The other side of the question has been well explained by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. The Senator from Colorado has truly said that nations take the productions which they want provided they can get them cheap enough, and if they can not pay for them in their own products they must pay for them in gold or silver. But I regard it as a patent absurdity to say that the question whether we put a duty upon any imported article has anything to do with the question of any exportation of our products to a foreign country. I can understand how a duty may affect the amount of our importation from another country, because our duty may increase the price, and the price being increased, we may import less, our people may use less; but not how that duty will affect the amount that the other country will take from us.

I can understand how a duty in the other country upon some importation from the United States will affect the amount which that country may take from us, but not at all how a duty in this country will affect the purchases of that other country from us. I can understand how the question whether the other country shall impose a duty upon an article which she takes from us may

affect the question whether we shall impose a duty upon an article from that country which we import into this country; and upon this idea rests the principle of reciprocity.

Take, for instance, the case of Brazil, to put it in the concrete. If we put a duty on coffee it may lessen our consumption of coffee. If Brazil puts a duty on our flour it may lessen our export of flour to Brazil. Therefore it might be wise for us to stipulate that Brazil should not put a duty on flour, and that we should not put a duty on coffee. That would be an application of the principle of reciprocity, but the mere fact that we put a duty on coffee or that we do not put a duty on coffee does not have the slightest relation to the question how much flour Brazil will purchase from us. She will purchase from us just exactly what flour she wants. If Brazil has a duty upon it she may import less; if she has not a duty she may import more; and therefore it may be desirable for us under the operation of the principle of reciprocity to induce Brazil to remove her duty. But the mere question whether we have a duty upon coffee imported into this country does not have the slightest effect upon the amount of flour that we shall send to Brazil.

It seems to me the Senator from Texas is entirely illogical in his argument that the removal of duties from merchandise imported into this country increases American exports of our own products to foreign countries. Whether we have duties high or low, whether we have free trade or not, the amount that another country will take of our merchandise is exactly what she needs for her own consumption. She will take more or less of it according as she needs it, or according as she can get it high or low, and she will not take one single dollar's worth of merchandise the more from us whether we have high tariff or low tariff, whether we have free trade or whether we have protection.

The Senator from Texas, believing that free trade promotes foreign exports, has himself become a free trader. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the speech which he made in 1884 when the bill called the Morrison bill was pending before the House of Representatives. In the House of Representatives, April 15, 1884, the bill "to reduce import duties and war-tariff taxes," having, upon the motion of Mr. Morrison, been taken up for consideration, Mr. MILLS of Texas, closed his speech as follows:

Where now is that naval armament that once disputed with England the sovereignty of the seas? Where now are our commercial fleets that once shared with her the profits of the carrying trade of the world? Our ships are rotting, our seamen are all dead. Ichabod is written on the folds of the once powerful ensign of the Republic, and the eye seeks in vain for its broad stripes and bright stars among the ten thousand masts that crowd the harbors of the world.

The Senator from Texas did not allude to a certain unfortunate circumstance that had driven the American merchant marine from the ocean, and that was the war of the rebellion, during which our whole fleet engaged in the carrying trade had been destroyed. When peace came iron ships had taken the place of wooden ships, and we had not at that time and have not yet been able to recover the position we once occupied upon the ocean. But the Senator from Texas, pursuing his hope that again we should engage in the carrying trade, said:

God grant that the day may soon come when American ships, freighted with American commerce, shall again go to sea under the shield and protection of our own flag. But if that day is to come it must be preceded by a reversal of the policy of commercial restriction. We must remove both by legislation and diplomacy every hindering cause that prevents the free exchange of the products of our labor in all the markets of the world. We must unfetter every arm and let every muscle strike for the highest remuneration for its toil. We must let wealth, the creation of labor, grow up in all the homes of our people. Then every industry will spring forward at a bound, and wealth, prosperity, and power will bless the land that is dedicated to free men, free labor, and free trade.

Mr. President, there was the Senator from Texas in 1884. He has been a free trader ever since that time. I have here now one of his latest expressions upon that subject, taken from the New York Sun of April 21, 1894. It purports to be a speech delivered by him to a Democratic audience at Minneapolis, and the Sun says "his words were like a bugle blast." The Senator from Texas said:

Free trade will kill trusts as dead as a door nail. And yet the American people insist on sending men to Congress that vote for protection. We must have absolute free trade. Levy a tax on incomes and the wealthy men of the country, and you will see prosperity. I believe in free trade, free labor, free speech, and a free press. We would be exporting articles of production to all parts of the world if Grover Cleveland was President of the United States.

There was the prediction of the Senator from Texas, and now here again I confront him (or would confront him if he were within the Chamber) with the promise which he made—one of the many promises which he made—of the great blessings that were to flow to this country if Grover Cleveland was President of the United States. He came to us in New England and promised us free iron ore and free coal. You, Mr. President [Mr. FAULKNER in the chair], know—and no one knows better—how that

promise has been kept to us. In the far West, in Minneapolis, he promised us that if Grover Cleveland could be elected President the trusts should be killed, particularly if we could have free trade. He said:

Free trade will kill trusts as dead as a door nail.

I want to ask the Senator from Texas whether he will not at this stage of the progress of the bill tell us whether he still believes that the election of President Cleveland will give us the foreign exportations which he promised us, whether he believes that this bill will give to New England the prosperity he promised should come to us from free raw material, whether he believes that all his expectations are to be realized which he expressed so freely at the East and at the West, at the North and at the South, when he was advocating, and successfully advocating, the advent to power in the Presidency and in both branches of Congress of the Democratic party.

I hope the Senator from Texas, as well as the Senator from Delaware, before this debate passes on to another schedule of the bill, will enlighten us upon these points. I do not myself undertake to understand fully the whole tariff question which has been brought forward for discussion by the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Texas, and which has been so ably and eloquently participated in this afternoon by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Massachusetts. I have, however, clung to the idea that under free trade the wages of all the countries affected by free trade would be equal. I have believed that it was impossible, without protective duties, to prevent the wages of any one country from going down to the level of the wages in other countries.

Mr. Abram Hewitt stated that the effect of free trade would be to reduce the standard of wages in this country to the standard of foreign wages; and how the Senators upon the other side of the Chamber can afford to tell us that they believe in free trade and not admit that under free trade the wages of this country must be the same as wages in the foreign country having the lowest rate of wages, I can not understand.

Mr. President, the utterances of distinguished foreigners have been quoted this afternoon bearing upon this question. I happen to have in my hand the utterance of a distinguished Englishman, which I will read as bearing upon the question of theoretical free trade and the necessity of protection, if we are to keep up wages in this country. It is an utterance of Cardinal Manning, in the Nineteenth Century, for December, 1890. He said:

There is no doubt that free trade, freedom of contract, buying in the cheapest market, and selling in the dearest, are axioms of commercial prudence. They are hardly worthy of being called a science. Nevertheless, this freedom of trade has immensely multiplied all branches of commerce and developed the energies of all our industrial population. But it has created two things—the irresponsible wealth, which stagnates, and the starvation wages of the labor market. This cheapest market is the market of the lands, penniless and helpless.

And now I ask the Senators from Delaware and Texas whether they seriously advocate the substitution of the English system of free trade for the American system of protection, when according to this high English authority it will inevitably result in this country as well as in Europe in the creation of the irresponsible wealth which stagnates and the starvation wages of the labor market.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this amendment has been the fruitful source of a general debate upon the principles of tariff taxation not only in this, but in every country, I think, upon the globe. Believing, as I do, that the country has been thoroughly enlightened on the subject, and in order that it shall not be further enlightened upon this amendment, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HALE. I see what, of course, the Senator desires. I presume the Senator will consent, if we can have a vote on the amendment itself now, without further debate, that we may take it instead of upon his motion.

Mr. HARRIS. I am afraid the Senator from Maine can give no guarantee that there will not be three hours more debate upon the amendment. I should as soon take the vote upon the amendment itself as upon my motion.

Mr. HALE. Let us try and see if we can not have a vote.

Mr. HARRIS. If there is no further debate I will withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 189 and insert:

Horses and mules, \$30 per head: *Provided*, Horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.  
Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH].

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. FRYE (when Mr. GORMAN's name was called). The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] is detained from the Chamber by illness, and is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES].

Mr. PALMER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I inquire if the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am paired with that Senator, and will not vote. If he were here I should vote "nay."

Mr. CALL. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORELL]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. BRICE (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], but I will transfer my pair to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] and let my vote stand.

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

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague [Mr. MCLAURIN] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. RANSOM (after having voted in the negative). I ask leave to withdraw my vote. I have consented to pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. I can, however, vote if necessary to make a quorum.

Mr. CAREY (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to inquire if the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MITCHELL] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. CAREY. I withdraw my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. RANSOM. The Senator from Wyoming can transfer his pair to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], and he and I can vote.

Mr. CAREY. That is satisfactory. I will let my vote stand.

Mr. RANSOM. I vote "nay."

Mr. GORDON. May I inquire whether my colleague [Mr. WALSH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Georgia has not voted.

Mr. GORDON. Then I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] to my colleague, and vote "nay."

Mr. HOAR (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to inquire if the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. HOAR. I am paired with that Senator, and desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Let the Senator from Massachusetts transfer his pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], then the Senator from Massachusetts and myself can both vote.

Mr. HOAR. I have no objection. Then I will let my vote stand.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 30; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Aldrich,	Dubois,	Lodge,	Platt,
Allison,	Frye,	McMillan,	Power,
Carey,	Gallinger,	Patton,	Shoup,
Chandler,	Hale,	Peffer,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Washburn.
Davis,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	

NAYS—30.

Berry,	Faulkner,	Kyle,	Smith,
Blackburn	Gibson,	Lindsay,	Turpie,
Blanchard,	Gordon,	Martin,	Vest,
Brice,	Gray,	Mills,	Vilas,
Caffery,	Harris,	Murphy,	Voorhees,
Camden,	Hill,	Pasco,	White.
Cockrell,	Hunton,	Ransom,	
Coke,	Jones, Ark.	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—32.

Allen,	George,	McPherson,	Pugh,
Bate,	Gorman,	Manderson,	Quay,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Oregon,	Sherman.
Call,	Higgins,	Mitchell, Wis.	Squire,
Cameron,	Irby,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Daniel,	Jarvis,	Morrill,	Waish,
Dixon,	Jones, Nev.	Palmer,	Wilson,
Dolph,	McLaurin,	Proctor,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Before offering the amendment covering the three classes of live animals I submit the amendment which has just been voted down, but substituting \$20 a head for \$30 per head.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 189 and insert:

Horses and mules, \$20 per head: *Provided*, That horses valued at \$150 and over shall pay a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRIS. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moves to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HOAR. I wish the Senator from Tennessee, who has charge of the bill, would, before we vote on this matter—it will take him but a minute—tell us how he expects to have the ad valorem duty on the horses determined.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the appraisers will find out without any instruction from me.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator if he knows himself, or has any idea himself, how it will be done?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to lay the amendment on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I did not intend to call the yeas and nays on the motion, but as the Senator from Tennessee would not let me have a vote upon the amendment itself, I certainly was tempted to call for the yeas and nays on his motion. I did not, however, conclude to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, I thought that he had yielded the floor and did not desire to say anything. I certainly should not have interfered with any disposition of that Senator to explain his amendment.

Mr. HALE. No; I did not want to do that. I simply wanted to take a *viva voce* vote, without the yeas and nays, and the Senator cut me off by moving at once to lay the amendment on the table. I offered the amendment in perfect good faith, and it was not offered for any purpose of delay.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Maine understands very well my object. I wanted to cut off debate; that was all.

Mr. HALE. There would not have been any debate. I was not myself proposing to say a word.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well; I did not desire that anybody else should say anything, if the Senator himself did not desire it.

Mr. HALE. I move now, as another amendment, to strike out the pending paragraph of the bill and insert the clauses in the present act covering cattle, horses and sheep, which the Secretary will read from a memorandum he has, beginning with cattle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read:

The SECRETARY. Strike out paragraph 189 and insert:

189. Cattle, more than 1 year old, \$10 per head; 1 year old or less, \$3 per head.

Hogs, \$1.50 per head.

Sheep, 1 year old or more, \$1.50 per head; less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head.

All other live animals, not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HALE. Upon that amendment I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. DANIEL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE]. Otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH]. My colleague [Mr. MCLAURIN] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. HOAR (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] is paired I understand with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] by an arrangement with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. I vote "yea."

Mr. PALMER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH].

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called.) I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], but will transfer my pair to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JARVIS] and vote.

I make this announcement for the residue of the day, unless one of those Senators shall return to the Chamber. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] and withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr.

CAMERON], is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], and I promised both those Senators when they left the Senate Chamber that I would announce the pair. I ought to have done so on the last vote, but I announce it now.

Mr. BRICE. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] is paired. If not, I will transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] to him and vote. [A pause.] I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 31; as follows:

## YEAS—22.

Aldrich,	Frye,	McMillan,	Power,
Allison,	Gallinger,	Patton,	Shoup,
Carey,	Hale,	Peffer,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Perkins,	Washburn.
Cullom,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	
Dubois,	Lodge,	Platt,	

## NAYS—31.

Allen,	Coke,	Kyle,	Roach,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Smith,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Martin,	Vest,
Blanchard,	Gray,	Mills,	Vilas,
Brice,	Harris,	Mitchell, Wis.	Voorhees,
Caffery,	Hill,	Murphy,	Walsh,
Camden,	Hunton,	Pasco,	White.
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Ransom,	

## NOT VOTING—32.

Bate,	George,	McLaurin,	Pugh,
Butler,	Gordon,	McPherson,	Quay,
Call,	Gorman,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Oregon	Squire,
Daniel,	Higgins,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Davis,	Irby,	Morrill,	Purple,
Dixon,	Jarvis,	Palmer,	Willson,
Dolph,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	Wolcott.

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary read as follows:

Breadstuffs and farinaceous substances:

190. Buckwheat, corn or maize, cornmeal, oats, oatmeal, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour, 20 per cent ad valorem, but each of the above products shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States.

The Committee on Finance reported an amendment in line 13, after the word "oats," to strike out "oatmeal;" and in line 19, after the words "United States," to insert "oatmeal, 15 per cent ad valorem;" so as to read:

Buckwheat, corn or maize, cornmeal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour, 20 per cent ad valorem, but each of the above products shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States; oatmeal, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PETTIGREW. In line 13, after the words "corn or maize," I move to insert the words "15 cents per bushel."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the agreement of the Senate is that when a paragraph is reached the Senate shall first vote upon the amendments of the committee if there be one submitted. There is a committee amendment to this paragraph. Is there objection to its adoption?

Mr. PLATT. I object to it.

Mr. President, this is perhaps one of the most remarkable provisions in the bill, and with relation to this particular amendment I will state that I see no reason why rye flour and wheat flour should be admitted free from countries which impose no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States, and that oatmeal should be 15 per cent ad valorem; I can not see why, if the provision which is embodied in the bill is to remain, it should not apply to oatmeal as well as to rye flour and wheat flour.

That brings me to a consideration of the entire question of the proviso which is attached to the paragraph, namely, that on all these products, buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour, the duty shall be 20 per cent ad valorem except when imported from those countries which impose no import duty on the like products from the United States.

We have been told that the reciprocity provisions of the McKinley act are unendurable. I am tempted to read what the chairman of the Finance Committee said in relation to it. Speaking of sugar he said:

Nor must the reciprocity features of the McKinley law be overlooked in connection with this issue. The so-called reciprocity contained in this law may much more properly be styled an act for the punishment of our own people by retaliating on them the offenses committed by foreign countries in keeping our goods out of their markets by the imposition of high-tariff duties. That unparalleled and clearly unconstitutional piece of legislation reads as follows:

He cites the section, and then says:

Str, here is a tariff schedule containing five articles of prime necessity to the American people which are to be heavily taxed, and their cost to the

consumer largely increased, at the mere will and pleasure of the President of the United States, whoever he may happen to be, and as often as he pleases.

One of the cardinal objections to the McKinley act has been the reciprocity clause in the act, and so reciprocity has been entirely eliminated from the present bill. The men who constructed the pending bill would have no reciprocity in it; and yet here in this clause there is a recognition of a sort of bastard reciprocity, and the astonishing thing about it is that we are to have reciprocity to make the articles which are produced by agriculturists in this country free of duty.

Mr. CULLOM. So as to let all those articles come in free.

Mr. PLATT. That is the reciprocity which those who have formed the bill desire, a reciprocity which shall make buckwheat, corn, cornmeal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour free of duty in this country.

Democrats have been traveling all over the land telling the farmers that they need no protection upon these articles, and in regard to this instance they can not be charged with inconsistency in not living up to their professions as in some instances in the bill, for they have provided in the bill a clause by which these articles will be free from every country where they can by any possibility come into competition with the American farmer.

Upon the passage of the bill corn and wheat will be admitted free from the Argentine Republic, for the Argentine Republic has no duty upon those articles. Upon the passage of the bill wheat and rye will be admitted free of duty from Russia, because Russia has no duty upon those articles. It does not require any prophetic knowledge to know that Canada will immediately take off the import duty upon all these products and that they will come in free from Canada. Is that a picture which the American farmer will contemplate with complacency? I do not know how it may be with the Western farmer, but I assure Senators that the farmers of Connecticut, who are now in competition with corn and wheat and oats from the Dakotas, do not also want to go into competition with the Argentine Republic and with Russia and with Canada in their raising of those articles.

Mr. President, perhaps the farmers of the country will believe the story which has been told them that the duty upon agricultural products is of no benefit to them. Perhaps they have shut their eyes to the capacities of the Argentine Republic for the production of wheat and corn. It is the only country on earth which can compete with the farmers of the United States in the raising of corn. We have had a practical monopoly of corn-raising in this country. It is the one crop in the production of which we have supposed that by reason of our peculiar adaptation no other portion of the world could compete with us. But it turns out that in that vast country known as the Argentine Republic the soil and the conditions for raising corn are equal to those in the United States, with labor very much cheaper, and with gold at a premium of from 75 to 85 per cent, and with land to be had for a song.

The Argentine Republic has just begun to discover its possibilities as a corn-raising country. It has 1,118,000 square miles, an area, I think, about fifteen times as large as the State of Nebraska, which is one of the great corn-producing States of the United States. With the exception of a few provinces in the northern portion, which are mountainous, it may be said that almost the whole of that vast region is adapted to the raising of corn, and among the mountainous provinces there are valleys and plains most fertile, which grow 45 and 50 bushels of corn to the acre. It is the country in which a straight line of railroad can be built longer than in any other country on the face of the earth.

Have the agriculturists of America forgotten the time when they despised the probability that wheat could be successfully cultivated in India so as to compete with them? Only a few short years ago the Western agriculturists had no fear of the wheat of India. They may well take an example from the wonderful development of the production of wheat in India as to what, with free corn, will occur in the development of corn-growing in the Argentine Republic. Of that vast country not more than 4 per cent to-day is under cultivation, but its capacity for the cultivation of corn is being rapidly developed, until in 1891 the exports of wheat amounted to 448,000 tons and those of corn to 700,000 tons.

I have said, Mr. President, that the agriculturists of the seaboard States do not want to be put into competition with free corn from the Argentine Republic. It can be bought cheaper in the Argentine Republic to-day than it can in any corn-growing State of the United States. It can be brought from the Argentine Republic and landed in New York at less freight than is paid for bringing corn from corn-growing States. I undertake to say that with the pending bill passed a man can take New York funds, which are gold, send them to the Argentine Republic and buy corn at silver prices, and bring the corn to New York,

where it becomes gold, and, if there were enough of it in the Argentine Republic, shut out from the Eastern portion of this country every bushel of Western corn.

Perhaps some of the people of the East would desire that. Perhaps those who do not raise corn would be entirely willing to have the Argentine Republic enter into competition with the corn growers of Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas; but the people of Connecticut believe in protection, and they believe in protecting the corn grower and the wheat grower, although possibly, if those products were free, it might be cheaper to those in the Eastern States who do not raise corn.

I suppose the bill will pass with this paragraph as it is drawn, and if no Western man on the other side of the Chamber is found to protest against it, I wish to be able to tell the corn growers of Iowa and Nebraska, when the Argentine corn shall have shut their corn out of the Eastern markets, that I at least pointed out what was to come.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] asks me how about Canadian wheat and oats. I had already spoken of that matter. The duty on wheat and corn and oats in Canada will be taken off immediately upon the passage of the pending bill as surely as the sun will rise. Then the Western wheat-grower will come in competition with the Canadian wheat-grower; the man who raises oats will come in competition with the Canadian oat grower, and barley will be protected. The man who makes wheat flour and corn meal in Canada will have the opportunity to import it into the United States free, but the man who makes oatmeal in Canada will have to pay a duty of 15 per cent when he exports his oatmeal to this country. Why is not the oatmeal manufacturer in Canada put upon the same footing with the man who makes rye flour, wheat flour, or corn meal there when the Canadian duty is taken off?

I do not wish to consume time about this matter. It is one of the glaring illustrations of the fact that tariff reform as it has been preached means anything or nothing. There is to be no reciprocity, because it is against tariff reform. But reciprocity which puts the American farmer in direct competition with the Argentine Republic, with Russia, and with Canada—

Mr. CULLOM. And everywhere else.

Mr. PLATT. And every other country which does not or will not keep an import duty upon those products, is tariff reform also.

Mr. WASHBURN rose.

Mr. HARRIS. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. WASHBURN. I wish the Senator from Tennessee would withdraw that motion for a moment.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Tennessee moves to lay the committee amendment on the table!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee must laboring under a misapprehension. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS. I thought the Senate was proceeding upon an amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW]. Is the amendment of the committee pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled that under the agreement of the Senate it is proper first to pass upon the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. That is certainly true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] took the floor upon the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. No matter which amendment is pending, if the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] is anxious to be heard, of course I shall yield to him. I do not desire to move to lay on the table the amendment of the committee, if that be the amendment which is now held by the Chair to be before the Senate.

Mr. WASHBURN. I desire to say only a few words on the pending paragraph, but before doing so I will inquire of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], who I notice is in his seat, what is the reason why these articles, buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, etc., are allowed to come in free of duty, while a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem is placed upon barley?

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish an answer now?

Mr. WASHBURN. Yes. What reason guided the committee in putting a duty on barley, while it proposes that the other agricultural products shall come in free?

Mr. VEST. If I understand the Senator, he asks me a question as to the reason why a difference is made in the duty?

Mr. WASHBURN. No. Why should there be a duty in one case, in the case of barley, and not a duty in the case of other agricultural products like wheat and rye?

Mr. VEST. There is a duty in all those cases.

Mr. WASHBURN. No; I understand there will be no duty after the bill becomes a law, because of course the duties which

Canada now places on those articles will be withdrawn, and they will be admitted free. Why should not barley be put in the same category?

Mr. VEST. I do not understand the Senator's question. If he will read the paragraph he will see that on buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour, there is a duty of 20 per cent. Then it is provided:

But each of the above products shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like products when exported from the United States.

Otherwise there is to be a duty put upon buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour, of 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WASHBURN. "Shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States."

Mr. VEST. Exactly.

Mr. WASHBURN. Assuming that Canada imposes no import duties upon those articles, they will come in free.

Mr. VEST. Of course they will come in free if Canada will admit our products free.

Mr. WASHBURN. Of course Canada will admit our products free. Nobody doubts that.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that is already arranged, and that the arrangement was made before the bill passed the other House.

Mr. VEST. I do not know that there is any such arrangement, but I know very strong representation—

Mr. WASHBURN. But even under the assumption that Canada will not withdraw the duty, and of course it will, why should not the same provision apply to barley? I ask that more as a matter of curiosity than anything else.

Mr. VEST. I can only answer the Senator by saying that there were large barley interests in the United States, which appeared before our committee and through their Senators made demands for even higher duties than we give in the bill.

Mr. WASHBURN. And they ought to have had them.

Mr. VEST. They objected very strenuously to having this reciprocal arrangement, as it was termed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], in regard to barley. We went as far as we could in meeting the representations that were made by Senators as to the interests of their constituents. But when it came to barley there was no such demand.

Mr. WASHBURN. There would have been a demand. There is no reason why the wheat growers of Minnesota and the Dakotas should not demand the same terms that are accorded to barley. In our State and in all the Northwestern States the wheat production is of vastly more importance than the barley production, and if the producers of barley are to be protected I can see no earthly reason why the producers of wheat should not have the same protection.

Now, hitherto the question of the duty upon wheat has been of no practical effect, but as matters stand to-day, if wheat is put on the free list, as it will be by the action of the Canadian Government, the wheat growers of Minnesota and the Dakotas are to come into direct and sharp competition with Manitoba and the entire Canadian dominion. Manitoba produces every year and has produced for the last three or four years from twelve to fifteen million bushels of wheat, equal to any wheat raised in this country, if not better in quality. They have all the facilities; they have the soil and climate and every condition suited to the production of wheat. They have cheaper labor than we and can produce wheat at a less price.

With wheat put on the free list the poor farmers of Minnesota and the Dakotas, who were in distress and are almost starving because of the low price of wheat, are to have the additional competition of 15,000,000 bushels from Canada. There is nothing but an artificial or an imaginary line between the two countries. The natural market for the wheat of Manitoba is Minneapolis. Without a duty it will run there as freely and as naturally as water will run through a spout. It is sure to come to that market, and of course it is sure to come into competition with all the wheat raised in that part of our country. I of course feel that I address deaf ears, but I wish to have the Senate understand, I wish to have the country understand, I wish to have the farmers of the Northwest understand what is the purpose and will be the effect of the bill so far as admitting wheat free of duty is concerned.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri may mislead some members of the Senate. This is not a proposition for reciprocal trade with Canada except as to these articles. If Canada takes the duty off buckwheat, corn, corn meal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour, then their products shall come in free and we may send there our products. Everybody knows that we do not propose

to send any wheat or oats or any of those articles to Canada. So it is an absolutely one-sided affair. There is no benefit to come to us, unless it is a benefit to have Canadian flour, Canadian wheat, corn, etc., brought in contact with our own.

I think this is a cruel provision on the American farmers. They are ground down now practically to the very lowest state they can go and survive. Wheat was selling in New York City yesterday for 56½ cents a bushel. It never before was so low in the world; and as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] says, if there is to be no duty upon wheat, and if the Argentine Republic puts no duty on the importation of wheat, and it never will, because it would be like carrying coals to Newcastle, nobody would think of going to the Argentine with wheat—

Mr. PLATT. There is no import duty on wheat in the Argentine.

Mr. TELLER. There is none, but if there were one they would take it off. In an article which appeared in one of the London papers not long since it was demonstrated that they can put wheat into Great Britain at 44 cents a bushel and leave a fair profit. There is not a seaport from Portland to New Orleans in which the Argentine country can not put their wheat cheaper than any Northwestern producing section of our country.

I should like to know what interest demands the proposed action. I should like to know what interest is to be served by it. Nobody in the Eastern seaports that I know of is demanding it. Why should we give Canada the benefit of our market when Canada gives us nothing? It is the veriest bosh to say that when they open their ports to our wheat we will open our ports to theirs, because we can not send any wheat there. Nobody will think of doing it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Does not the Senator from Colorado believe that the opening of the ports to Canadian wheat would at least break the hold of the millers' trust upon the price of wheat in the Northwest?

Mr. TELLER. I do not know anything about a millers' trust.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to make one suggestion. We in the Northwest are not suffering from any competition in wheat. We are, however, threatened with, and seriously feel, the grasp of a gigantic millers' trust, which controls the price in the Northwest to a very great extent, and it would be broken by the admission of wheat free from Canada.

Mr. TELLER. After the vote the Senator gave yesterday on the sugar schedule, he need not be very much alarmed about any trust. I was in hopes I should not hear anything more about trusts from the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALLEN. Let me say to the Senator from Colorado that I voted to take off all there was in the sugar schedule which the sugar trust had in it. Did the Senator from Colorado do the same thing?

Mr. TELLER. I did.

Mr. ALLEN. I did.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator may have done so, but I think he voted upon other propositions which the trust wanted him to vote upon. At least it seemed to me to be in that interest.

The price of wheat in this country is not fixed by a millers' trust. The price of wheat all over the world is lower than ever before. Wheat has sold in London within the last thirty days for 70 cents a bushel. It will sell there in the next six months still lower. If the great mills up in Minnesota have been holding wheat they will simply buy the Canadian wheat a little cheaper, and they will have another opportunity to put their grip upon the farmers of the Northwest.

But, Mr. President, that is not the trouble. Wheat is low because of circumstances which the Senator from Nebraska and I agree upon practically, the financial condition; but recognizing the condition as existing, why should we not preserve to the American farmer at least the American market for his wheat? Manitoba has a section 1,200 miles from our line due north where wheat can be raised in competition with any portion of the United States. If Manitoba wheat growers produce 12,000,000 bushels now, they can produce 50,000,000 bushels when they have a market, and they will produce 50,000,000 bushels, too. The pending bill is not for this year or next year. It is to remain, I suppose, for many years, at least until there is a change of political parties which will enable it to be changed.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

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

Mr. TELLER. I yield.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Colorado is mistaken about the

exports from this country into Canada and the imports from Canada into the United States. He asserted a few minutes ago that there is no possibility of our sending any wheat into Canada. The Treasury reports show that in 1891 Canada exported to this country less than a million bushels of wheat, and we exported to Canada over five and a half million bushels.

Mr. ALDRICH. Our exports into Canada all went through Canada to Europe. We did not send a bushel to Canada to be sold and consumed there.

Mr. TELLER. I was just going to make that statement. We have not sold a bushel to Canada for Canadian consumption.

Mr. VEST. Where is the proof that it was not for Canadian consumption? The Treasury report shows that it went to Canada.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly; it went through Canada to Europe. A large portion of the wheat of certain States goes through Canada to Europe.

Mr. VEST. The Senator might as well say that the wheat that came into the United States from Canada went on through to Mexico.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not by any manner of means.

Mr. VEST. Where is the proof of it? I want something more than the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island. I have had enough of that. The Senator from Rhode Island gets up here without any proof in the world; he is notoriously the most extreme protectionist in the United States; he make a specialty of the business, and he asserts here that none of the wheat exported to Canada is used there.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think everyone in the United States who knows anything about the subject knows that that is true.

Mr. VEST. That is mere assertion—Rhode Island assertion.

Mr. ALDRICH. We do not send any wheat to Canada for consumption.

Mr. VEST. That is mere Rhode Island assertion. I want some proof. I take the Senator's statement for nothing unless we have proof.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Missouri take the statement of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN], who does know something about it?

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Minnesota knows all about the milling business. I do not know whether he knows about the Canadian imports.

Mr. WASHBURN. The Senator from Minnesota knows that there is not a bushel of wheat exported from the United States to Canada for use in Canada. There is a great deal of wheat that goes over the new line from Minneapolis and St. Paul to Montreal. A large amount goes into Canada that way, but the fact that wheat is cheaper in Canada than in the States is conclusive proof that it would not go there for a market. I know from my own observation and experience in milling and handling wheat that it does not go there for domestic consumption.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Colorado pardon me?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. It seems to me one consideration ought to settle this question. The Canadian duty, according to my recollection, is 15 cents a bushel; it may be 20 cents. The Senator from Missouri probably knows. I think it is 15 cents. Everybody knows that there is no selling price in Canada which would enable wheat to be sent in there for Canadian consumption after paying a duty of 15 or 20 cents.

Mr. TELLER. There is one thing which will settle this question. Wheat is cheaper at all times in Canada, as everybody knows, than it is in the United States. There has not been an hour in five years, I will venture to say, when wheat has not been cheaper in Canada than in the United States. It is the height of folly to talk about American wheat going into Canada for Canadian consumption.

Mr. VEST. I hope that the Senator from Colorado will be consistent and will adhere to his statement in regard to prices and to the quantity of imports and exports. The Treasury reports show that we imported into this country \$9,661 of wheat in 1893 and exported \$93,534,970. What is the necessity for the duty on wheat?

Mr. TELLER. We do not want the Canadian wheat to come here.

Mr. VEST. Ah!

Mr. TELLER. We do not want the Argentine wheat to come here. We raise a surplus of wheat ourselves. Of course they may steal our European markets; we can not prevent that, but we can control and hold our own market if we will. They can raise wheat in Canada, I repeat, as the Senator from Minnesota said, cheaper than we can, and they do raise it cheaper. The market quotations will show that it is cheaper there all the time. They ship wheat to Europe. They ship it here occasionally, in spite of the tariff, and they pay the duty. They have to pay it of course.

There is no reason in the world why we should open our ports to Canadian wheat. But we are infinitely more in danger from Argentine wheat than from Canadian wheat. They can raise wheat in the Argentine, according to the best authorities, for 25 cents a bushel. They have a better wheat country than we have. They have great rivers, where they can put it on vessels. They can move it from the Argentine Republic into any Atlantic seaport in the United States at a less rate than the wheat growers of South Dakota can put wheat into Chicago or New York.

It may be that there is something back of this which nobody can see. I can not see any excuse to open our ports now, and to thus directly depress the price of wheat, which is so low now that no farmer can afford to raise it and make a living, seems to me to be a cruelty upon the farmer. It may be that the theory is that you want to put everything to the lowest possible price.

It may be said that we are to do just what Great Britain has been doing, insisting that the price of living shall be put low, because the great bulk of their people are employed in manufactures. This inures, if it inures to the benefit of any living person, to the benefit of the manufacturer. Are we prepared now to make war upon the farmer of this country, who, I repeat, is having as much as he can stand under?

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. Before the Senator from Minnesota proceeds, I should like to state that the Canadian tariff on wheat is 15 cents a bushel.

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. He attributes the low price of wheat to a trust among the millers. I desire to state that there is no trust among the millers. There never has been, and there is no expectation of one. There is no syndicate, there is no combination or anything of the kind whereby the price of flour can be kept up.

Furthermore, I will state that the best flour that was ever made in the world, and no better flour is made anywhere in the world to-day, is made and sold at Minneapolis for \$3.50 a barrel. I will state further that the millers in the Northwest in the last year have not made on an average 10 cents a barrel in the manufacture of flour.

Mr. PALMER. I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that a very considerable portion of that superior flour is sold in Canada.

Mr. WASHBURN. I think not. So far as my observation goes, none of it is sold there; but I would not say positively. There is a great deal sent to Great Britain. I do not think any is sent to Canada. I have never known of any being sent there.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the Senator from Minnesota a question?

Mr. WASHBURN. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the Liverpool market have anything to do with the price of wheat? The reason why I ask the question is because I have been in close contact with agricultural industries all my life, and I know in the part of the United States where I reside the price of wheat is regulated exclusively by the Liverpool quotations.

Mr. WASHBURN. We used to suppose that the price of wheat in this country was made in Liverpool and Mark Lane; but since the Chicago and other produce exchanges have taken charge of our markets and made their prices artificially, I say the price is not made in Liverpool or London.

Mr. WHITE. It is so far as we are concerned.

Mr. WASHBURN. But that has nothing to do with the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska. I will state that the price of flour and wheat varies the same as the mercury of the barometer. If wheat goes up flour goes up. As I said before, there has not been a margin of 10 cents a barrel of profit in the manufacture of flour in the last year. So the Senator from Nebraska attempts to put the millers and those engaged in a legitimate industry and a legitimate business in a false position.

When I say there is no trust, I speak exclusively of the millers in the Northwestern States, or the spring wheat growing region. I know nothing about any arrangement that may be made among the St. Louis millers or the millers in Southern Illinois, but what I said applies to the entire spring wheat growing region.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota, as he is good authority on wheat flour, if any wheat flour comes into this country from the Argentine?

Mr. WASHBURN. I have never known of it.

Mr. VEST. I will ask the Senator if we do not export flour to Brazil, in the vicinity of the Argentine Republic?

Mr. WASHBURN. Since we have had the reciprocity arrangement which the Senator from Missouri proposes to destroy, we have sent some flour to Brazil. We have sent a great deal to Cuba. But we now expect to lose both of those markets.

Mr. VEST. More flour has been sent to Brazil than to Cuba. Mr. WASHBURN. I think not.

Mr. VEST. The Treasury reports show that \$3,647,250 of wheat flour was sent to Brazil in 1893 and to Cuba only \$2,857,000.

Mr. HOAR. What is the date of the establishment of the reciprocity between the two countries?

Mr. VEST. It was early in 1891. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, so as to allay any apprehension about our market, that we imported of wheat flour from all countries in 1893 \$1,362 worth, and we exported \$75,494,347.

Mr. WASHBURN. I did not know that we imported any.

Mr. VEST. Yes; a little over \$1,000 worth.

Mr. WASHBURN. It is a very unnatural condition of things that we should import a barrel of flour when we export as largely as we do.

Mr. VEST. That was imported as a matter of course to go through this country on its way to Mexico.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator from Missouri takes his seat I should like to ask him, merely for information, why oatmeal has been taken out from the effect of the provision in paragraph 190 and put so that it will have a duty of 15 per cent on it in any event? What distinguishes oatmeal from other farinaceous foods?

Mr. VEST. Because under the McKinley act the duty is only 17 per cent, and we did not want to increase the McKinley duty. In the second place, because there was evidence before us of an oatmeal trust, and notwithstanding our solicitude for trusts, we did not propose to do anything in behalf of that trust if we could help it.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Missouri misunderstands me. I did not ask about the amount of the duty on oatmeal. I asked why the provision which applies to buckwheat, corn, corn meal, oats, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour that they shall be admitted free of duty under certain conditions was not made applicable to oatmeal also.

Mr. VEST. For the reason I have stated, because oatmeal is in the control of a trust.

Mr. LODGE. That would be the reason, I should suppose, for making it free, from your point of view.

Mr. VEST. We put a duty of 15 per cent on it absolutely.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the Democratic doctrine.

Mr. VEST. That is less than 20 per cent of the duty which applies to all articles to which the provision applies.

Mr. LODGE. I know it is; but the provision declares that where another country admits free of duty these things enumerated here imported from the United States, we shall admit the like articles free of duty. But you have arranged it so that oatmeal shall not be admitted free of duty in any case. How is that a blow to the trust?

Mr. VEST. Suppose the other countries do not admit oatmeal free of duty, and we have no reason to expect they will, because we were exporting largely even to Great Britain—

Mr. LODGE. Then the bill is simply made up on the theory of what you were expecting.

Mr. VEST. The proviso was put in on the facts before us, which showed that we exported largely of oatmeal prior to the passage of the McKinley act. We exported 27,000,000 pounds in 1884; 36,000,000 pounds in 1885; 29,000,000 pounds in 1886; 16,000,000 pounds in 1887; 4,000,000 pounds in 1888; 10,000,000 pounds in 1889; 25,000,000 pounds in 1890. Then the McKinley duties were put on, increasing the duties of course, and in 1891 our export fell off from 25,000,000 pounds to 7,000,000 pounds. In 1892 they rose again to 20,000,000 pounds; and in 1893 they fell again to 5,000,000 pounds; and last year the largest portion of the exportation went to Great Britain.

Mr. LODGE. But we also export very largely of wheat.

Mr. VEST. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. And this proviso is made applicable to wheat and wheat flour.

Mr. VEST. There is no trust upon wheat that I have ever heard of, and it has been charged that there is a trust upon wheat flour.

Mr. LODGE. That is the point. I do not understand why it is a blow to the trust to put a duty on oatmeal which can not possibly be removed even if these other countries put it on the free list. I should think that is exactly what the trust wants. It is protecting it, according to the Senator's theory.

Mr. VEST. The largest part of the oatmeal which competes with ours is made in Scotland. If they should refuse to take off the duty on American oatmeal, then the duty would be 20 per cent, but we took no chances on that.

Mr. LODGE. How would it be 20 per cent?

Mr. VEST. Because there would be no reciprocity, and the duty would be 20 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. But you have oatmeal as a separate proposition without any reference to action by other countries.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will look at the paragraph he will see that oatmeal is taken out of the reciprocity provision and a duty of 15 per cent absolutely is put upon it.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that. It is put down here at 15 per cent. It is to carry that duty under all circumstances.

Mr. VEST. Exactly.

Mr. LODGE. I understand the Senator to say that oatmeal was taken out from the effect of the provision and the duty upon it made absolute in order to defeat a trust in this country.

Mr. VEST. If it is any accommodation to the Senator or anybody else, we have not the slightest objection to changing it and putting it back where it was when the bill came from the other House.

Mr. LODGE. I do not care.

Mr. VEST. I merely gave the reason for putting it where it is.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to know why oatmeal is excepted.

Mr. VEST. If it is put at 20 per cent there is no contingency that it can be made any less. If it is put in the proviso it might be admitted free of duty.

Mr. LODGE. I can see no reason. When the Senator was asked about barley he said that he arranged it that way because certain Senators insisted upon it, and I want to know why oatmeal was not treated the same way.

Mr. VEST. I have not the slightest objection to withdrawing the amendment and letting it go back.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator's blow to the trust is a love tap.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Massachusetts is very facetious. But if the Senator from Massachusetts objects let it stand as it is. It suits us either way.

Mr. LODGE. It does not make any difference to me.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] as well as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] have made statements regarding the protection of wheat, which is one of the staple products of the Northwest and one of the staple products of the State which I have the honor in part to represent, and of which I think I know something from having resided in the Northwest and in a wheat-growing State for nearly forty years of my life, which I desire to correct.

The Senator from Minnesota says there is no such a thing as the millers' trust in the Northwest. I do not know that I can say that there is a millers' trust except from certain evidences which are in my possession from persons who are members of that trust. I have a number of acquaintances engaged in milling in the Northwestern States, some of them on quite an extensive scale.

A short time ago one of those men in talking with me explained to me how it came that in my own town his flour was not placed on sale. Another one explained to me how the territory in the Northwest was divided for the sale of flour. Possibly the Senator from Minnesota himself knows something about this matter. This gentleman explained to me that the territory that this association controls, I do not now recall its name, possibly it is the Northwestern Millers' Association, is divided among the millers, by which the flour of the different members of the association is parceled out to certain territory and not permitted to come in contact with the product of other mills or other members of the association in that territory.

I say that it has been a notorious fact throughout the Northwest for the last ten years that there is a millers' trust, and that that trust vitally affects the price of buckwheat and all those grains which are ground into flour.

Mr. WASHBURN. The Senator will allow me to ask him if there is such a trust, why is it that the price of wheat is higher in Minneapolis than it is in any market of the United States proportionately; higher than in Chicago or New York, or any of the Eastern markets? If there was a trust whereby they controlled the wheat with a view of depressing its price, why is the market price higher there than anywhere else?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know that that statement is true at all, though it may be.

Mr. WASHBURN. I know it is true to-day, and it is usually true.

Mr. ALLEN. But I do say that the millers' trust in the Northwest affects vitally the price of wheat. There is not a farmer in the State of Nebraska, there is not an intelligent farmer in the State of Minnesota, who does not know that there is a millers' trust, and that it affects the price of wheat; but I do not say that this trust controls the price of wheat altogether, but it affects it to some extent.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. Supposing the suggestion of a trust be true, would it not be to the advantage of any such trust if, at a particular harvesting season, it could throw into the element of

sale and purchase twelve or fifteen million bushels of wheat more than are thrown into the market now—the 15,000,000 bushels of Manitoba wheat?

Mr. TELLER. The Argentine wheat is what troubles them more than anything else.

Mr. ALLISON. I am speaking now of the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska as to the production of wheat in the Northwest. Suppose the Dakotas and Minnesota should produce, say, 60,000,000 bushels of wheat, and Manitoba 20,000,000; this is practically all harvested at the same moment. If the trust desires to depress the price of wheat, I should think they would have nothing more convenient for that purpose than to have added 20,000,000 bushels more to the production in order that they might depress the price.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not accept the statement of the Senator from Iowa without some qualifications. In the first place I do not accept the statement that wheat can be produced cheaper in Canada than it can be in the United States. I think that statement is not capable of proof. It is surprising, however, that no article that has been talked about in this Chamber for sixty days, or since the pending bill has been under discussion, can be found that some Senator has not said that the labor cost of that article is cheaper in some other country than in the United States. That is, if Senators upon that side of the Chamber are to be believed and full force given to what they say, every article made and consumed in the United States costs more in the United States than it costs elsewhere. I do not believe that myself, and I never yet have seen any evidence of its truthfulness. This trust, however, by keeping out the Canada product can more easily control the American product.

I do not accept the statement that wheat can be, or is, produced in Canada cheaper than it is in the United States. There are certain climatic conditions against that conclusion. Wheat can be produced no cheaper there than it can be produced here; for, as the Senator from Iowa knows, we sell wheat or wheat products by the millions of dollars' worth in the open markets of the world in competition with Canadian wheat and in competition with Indian wheat, Argentine wheat, and Russian wheat; and that is what fixes the price to a certain extent with us here.

But, answering the question more fully, I should say that this trust would have a little more difficulty in controlling the entire volume of wheat on this continent, if reciprocal relations existed between Canada and this country, than they would otherwise. I do not pretend to say that the price of wheat is fixed entirely by the millers' trust. I simply say that that trust has an important part in fixing the price of wheat to the farmers of the Northwest. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] says that wheat is higher in his city of Minneapolis than in any other place in the Northwest, if I understand him correctly. What is it selling there for to-day?

Mr. WASHBURN. I have not noticed the price to-day, or for the last three or four days, but for sixty days it has been a cent or two higher than in Chicago.

Mr. ALLEN. How high has it been?

Mr. WASHBURN. It has varied from 60 to 61 and 59½ cents, along there. I do not keep a very close run of it. I know it has been pretty low down.

Mr. ALLEN. There is no doubt of the truthfulness of the statement of the Senator, because he is in a position to know that wheat was 60 cents in Minneapolis. I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota why it is that within 300 miles of the city of Minneapolis wheat can not be sold for a cent more than 85 cents a bushel by the farmer?

Mr. WASHBURN. I suppose it is on account of the cost of transportation between where it is raised and Minneapolis.

Mr. ALLEN. And that, too, in direct railroad communication with the city in which the Senator lives.

Mr. WASHBURN. I am not responsible for railroad transportation, nor is the city in which I live.

Mr. ALLEN. No; but the political party which has been in power in this country for some years may be to some extent.

Mr. WASHBURN. I do not know what they have to do with railroad transportation.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, in the county in which I live in Nebraska, at the time wheat was selling for 60 cents a bushel in Minneapolis, less than 300 miles by rail from where the Senator from Minnesota resides, the same grade of wheat was selling at 35 cents at the railroad station. The farmer was selling at that price. A difference of almost one-half between the price to the farmer in Northeast Nebraska and the price that was being paid in Minneapolis, not to exceed 300 miles from that spot, and with a railroad directly between the two places. It shows conclusively that it is not a question of Canadian competition, or threatened competition, which affects the price of wheat to the American wheat-raiser in the slightest degree. You can not make a farmer in the wheat-producing portions of this country believe

that. The farmers have passed that stage of ignorance, and have emerged into more intelligence and more light.

It is not any competition or threatened competition in consequence of the destruction of the protective tariff; it is the price which comes to the farmer from the Northwestern markets upon Lake Superior and Chicago that fixes the price of his wheat. Not only that, but it is the excessive railroad charges which are imposed upon the farmers of the great West in getting their product to the market. Possibly the Senator from Minnesota may explain why it is that every hundred pounds of Minnesota flour which is sold within a radius of two or three hundred miles of where it is manufactured costs the consumer from 60 to 75 cents profit per hundred pounds, which goes to the manufacturer.

Mr. WASHBURN. I can not explain, unless the groceryman who sells the flour makes an enormous profit.

I will say, so far as the flour which is produced in Minnesota is concerned, that the best flour, as I before stated, is sold at about \$3.50 a barrel, and the profit which has been made by the millers during the past year, on an average, has not exceeded 10 cents a barrel. If somebody out in Nebraska sells it for \$6 a barrel, there is a great profit made somewhere, either by the railroads or by the grocerymen. They must presume upon a very extraordinary condition of sentiment when that thing can be done.

Mr. ALLEN. If we go to our local mills to buy flour, or go to the grocery store to buy flour, we find the price to be the same at every grocery store and at every mill, and all the flour of the local manufacturers sells for identically the same price as the flour manufactured at Minneapolis. The price is the same wherever you go to the consumer of that flour. The same grade of flour manufactured by different mills brings precisely the same price; and I say if the millers whom I know, and with whom I have conversed, are to be believed, the profit upon every hundred pounds of that flour, even in our own country, where we have flour and food products so cheaply, is not less than 60 or 70 cents per hundred, which is taken out of the consumer.

But I want to mention one more matter, notwithstanding it is getting late. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] has taken occasion to say that the wheat-raiser and the corn-raiser of Nebraska and in the other great Western States are to be affected by the passage of this item and by the threatened importation of wheat and corn from other countries. There is not a man in all that country who believes a statement of that kind. The Senator from Connecticut seems to forget the fact that corn and wheat were never lower in this country within the last twenty years than they are to-day. There never has been a time in the last twenty years of the history of this country when wheat and corn brought less to the farmer in the great grain-producing States than they do to-day; and yet we are existing under the McKinley act and we have all the benefits arising from it if there are any.

It is not any threatened importation of corn or wheat from other countries; it is the grasp which the East has upon the wheat-fields and cornfields of the Northwest through watered railroad stock. The great West is being drained to-day; its fields are being drained of their profit to pay interest upon fifty or sixty thousand dollars per mile on watered railroad stock owned in the East. That is what is destroying the Western country.

Five years ago I recall the fact that, in the town where I reside, as fine corn as ever grew sold for less than 12 cents a bushel; the farmer got less than 12 cents for it, and at that precise time corn was selling in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and throughout the East at 40 and 45 cents a bushel. It was not any threatened importation of corn from some other country which produced that difference to the producer of corn in Nebraska; it was the immense profit that we were paying upon watered railroad stocks to pay dividends upon railroads whose stocks were watered for forty, fifty, and sixty thousand dollars a mile. That is the trouble to-day. If we can get reasonable transportation to theseaboard, then the Northwestern country stands ready to compete with the world in these great staples of corn, wheat, and oats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the committee has withdrawn the amendment?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. No, sir; the committee has not withdrawn the amendment, but propose to change the amendment so far as the insertion of the words "fifteen per cent ad valorem" are concerned, and insert in line 15, after the word "ad valorem," what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the words "ad valorem," in line 15, it is proposed to insert:

And oatmeal, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to address some remarks to the Senate upon this particular schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] desires to be heard.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WASHBURN. It is not worth while for me to attempt to reply to the entirely irrelevant questions submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], and to his remarks relative to railroad rates, watered stock, and all that sort of thing; but I wish to reiterate here and now that there is no existing trust among the great millers of the Northwest of any description, and there never has been.

There may be possibly, and I judge there are from what the Senator says, perhaps some little country mills which undertake to control a certain limited territory. That is all. But that there is any great trust, any great organization, which has in view the control, in any way or shape, of the wheat market is not true, and never was true.

In North Dakota there are four or five small mills, I think, which have an arrangement whereby they are incorporated under one management to save expense.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator permit me a question?

Mr. WASHBURN. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. Let me ask if it is not true that you are selling your flour and that you make contracts with your customers by which flour shall not go below a certain price?

Mr. WASHBURN. No, sir; there is nothing of that description. Furthermore, there is no understanding between the different mills in Minneapolis whereby they shall fix a certain rate. There is the sharpest competition between them all the time, each endeavoring to undersell the others.

Mr. ALLEN. How does it happen that four or five different flours, manufactured by four or five different mills, of the same grade and the same brand, sell for precisely the same price, as it does, in different stores in the same town?

Mr. WASHBURN. I do not know what arrangement the grocerymen in New Haven or Hartford or New York or Philadelphia have, but I know that so far as the mills are concerned, there is no such arrangement and never has been; but even if there was a trust, the statement would be absurd.

Suppose there was a trust among the great mills in Minneapolis, how utterly absurd is the idea that they could control or fix the price of wheat in this country, which raises 500,000,000 bushels a year. We consume annually in Minneapolis from thirty to forty or fifty million bushels. The idea that we can fix the price, and that we can control all the wheat grown in this country, when all the markets of this country and of the world are open to wheat, is simply absurd and preposterous.

But even if there was a trust, even if the great mills in the Northwest should combine to put down the price of wheat, they could not do it. It never has been done, and it never will be done. The existing price of wheat is fixed by natural causes, by overproduction. More has been done by the Chicago Board of Trade to break down the price of wheat and keep it down than by any other power that has been in existence. It is not owing to a combination of the millers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to submit some thoughts to the Senate upon this schedule, and I should like to take a little time, say twenty or thirty minutes—I shall not exceed thirty minutes—and I want to do it carefully, because I regard the subject as one of very great importance; but I do not wish to detain the Senate to-night, unless Senators wish to remain. It is now nearly 7 o'clock, but I shall proceed if that be the desire of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. This is the sixty-fourth day that this bill has been under consideration by the Senate, and we are on page 43. Proceeding at the same ratio of progression, I think we shall get this bill out of Committee of the Whole about Christmas come a year.

I desire to oblige the Senator from Kansas and every other Senator, and myself as well; but I had hoped that both sides of the Senate would consent to stay here until, not an unreasonable hour, 7 or 8 o'clock, and try to make some progress to-day.

Mr. HALE. We are now within about 15 minutes of 7, and after a pretty hard day, we have run over three-quarters of an hour beyond the usual time of adjournment.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it is better for us as Senators to subject ourselves to some little personal inconvenience and discomfort than to continue to subject the country to the discomfort of a paralysis, of a suspension of the business of the country, awaiting the final decision of this question. I want to be amiable, and I intend to be so—

Mr. HOAR. When?

Mr. HARRIS. Now, and always hereafter; but it costs me an effort under existing circumstances.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator will get further along with the bill if he yields.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have remained three-quarters of an hour beyond the usual time of adjournment. The day has been spent in a profitable discussion of this bill, and I am sure that greater progress in the future will be made in its consideration by sitting reasonable hours than by any attempts to sit unreasonable hours.

Mr. HARRIS. I had come over here to the Senator's side of the Chamber with the hope of conferring with the Senator from Rhode Island, with the idea of arriving at some conclusion about making progress, while the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] was speaking.

Mr. ALDRICH. Had the Senator called upon me earlier in the day I should perhaps have been willing to have consulted with him.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, it is about the same distance from the Senator's seat to mine that it is from mine to his, and I should have been glad to have received a visit from him. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. I suggest to the Senator that at 7 o'clock he move an adjournment.

Mr. HARRIS. Let us go on until that time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Pending that, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sorry the Senator has taken that course. I do not propose to resort to any arbitrary methods; I want to conform to the wishes of the Senate; but if the Senator from Rhode Island proposes to take charge of the business of the Senate, we shall see whether he will control it or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAY in the chair). Debate is not in order. The Senator from Rhode Island moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am willing to withdraw the motion until 7 o'clock; but at 7 o'clock, unless the Senator from Tennessee makes the motion or moves to adjourn, I shall renew it.

Mr. HARRIS. I consent to do nothing under threat.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I make the motion to go into executive session.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well; let the Senator make the motion if he chooses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

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

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who has left the Chamber; and therefore I withhold my vote.

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

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON]; but I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am paired with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], but I advised that Senator that I should vote whenever my vote was necessary to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

Mr. DANIEL. I am paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. SQUIRE] with the right to vote to make a quorum, and I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. GORDON. I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 36; as follows:

YEAS—4.			
Dubois,	Perkins,	Pettigrew,	Washburn.
NAYS—36.			
Allen,	Daniel,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Berry,	Faulkner,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Blackburn,	George,	Martin,	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Brice,	Gray,	Murphy,	Vest,
Caffery,	Harris,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Camden,	Hunton,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Peffer,	Walsh,
Coke,	Kyle,	Ransom,	White.
NOT VOTING—45.			
Aldrich,	Carey,	Frye,	Hawley,
Allison,	Chandler,	Gallinger,	Higgins,
Bate,	Cullom,	Gordon,	Hill,
Butler,	Davis,	Gorman,	Hoar,
Call,	Dixon,	Hale,	Irby,
Cameron,	Dolph,	Hansbrough,	Jarvis,

Jones, Nev.	Mitchell, Oregon	Proctor,	Teller,
Lodge,	Morgan,	Pugh,	Wilson,
McMillan,	Morrill,	Quay,	Wolcott.
McPherson,	Patton,	Sherman,	
Manderson,	Platt,	Shoup,	
Mills.	Power.	Squire,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum having voted, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich,	Dubois,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Berry,	Gallinger,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Blackburn,	George,	Martin,	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Gibson,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Brice,	Gordon,	Murphy,	Vest,
Caffrey,	Gray,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Camden,	Hale,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Carey,	Harris,	Patton,	Walsh,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Peffer,	Washburn,
Cockrell,	Hunton,	Perkins,	White.
Coke,	Jones, Ark.	Pettigrew,	
Daniel,	Kyle,	Ransom,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Secretary will again call the roll on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER], but under the arrangement I have with him I can vote to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], but under the arrangement made with his colleague [Mr. ALLISON] I am permitted to vote to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

Mr. HOAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH].

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY], but I have reserved the right of voting to make a quorum. I vote "nay."

Mr. BLANCHARD. I wish to state that I voted on this roll call, notwithstanding the fact that I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. I reserved the right in my pair with him to vote to make a quorum.

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 35; as follows:

YEAS—2.			
Dubois,		Pettigrew.	
NAYS—35.			
Berry,	George,	McLaurin,	Smith,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Martin,	Stewart,
Blanchard,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Wis.	Turpie,
Brice,	Gray,	Murphy,	Vest,
Caffery,	Harris,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Camden,	Hunton,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Peffer,	Walsh,
Coke,	Kyle,	Ransom,	White.
Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Roach,	
NOT VOTING—48.			
Aldrich,	Dixon,	Jarvis,	Platt,
Allen,	Dolph,	Jones, Nev.	Power,
Allison,	Frye,	Lodge,	Proctor,
Bate,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Pugh,
Butler,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Quay,
Call,	Hale,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Cameron,	Hansbrough,	Mills,	Shoup,
Carey,	Hawley,	Mitchell, Oregon	Squire,
Chandler,	Higgins,	Morgan,	Teller,
Cullom,	Hill,	Morrill,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Hoar,	Patton,	Wilson,
Davis,	Irby,	Perkins,	Wolcott.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum having voted, the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS. I know it is not in order now to make a remark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can proceed by unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to say that it was not my purpose to get into any wrangle or to undertake to force reluctant Senators to stay here; but I did appreciate my own duty to the extent of desiring that we should remain here until 7 or 8 o'clock to try to make some progress with this bill; and whatever may be the feeling that should exist in relation to the course of the other side, I am not willing to subject that side or this to the inconvenience of remaining here to send for absent Senators. Therefore I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 7, 1894, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 6, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. In the absence of the Chaplain, prayer was offered by Mr. EVERETT, a member from the State of Massachusetts.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION FOR PRINTING AND BINDING.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an additional estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for printing and binding for the current fiscal year, submitted by the Public Printer; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## SITE FOR MINT AT PHILADELPHIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to House resolution dated May 23, information as to what steps have been taken toward securing a site for the mint in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY BRIDGE BILL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (H. R. 6448) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Companies to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey, with amendments of the Senate thereto.

On motion of Mr. DUNPHY, the Senate amendments were concurred in.

Mr. DUNPHY moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were concurred in, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ALDERSON, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence, for this day, on account of sickness.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. GORMAN, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of John Wagner, Fifty-second Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

## COMMODORE OSCAR C. BADGER, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4683) for the relief of Commodore Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Commodore Oscar C. Badger, now on the retired list of the Navy, a rear-admiral on said retired list, to take effect on and after the 12th day of August, A. D. 1885, the time of his retirement, he having been at that date at the head of the list of commodores and first for promotion, but was disbanded therefrom by the law requiring all officers to be retired at the age of 62 years. Upon promotion, as authorized by this act, he shall be allowed the pay of a rear-admiral retired on account of age from the date of the passage of this act.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, before unanimous consent is given for the consideration of that bill, I would like to hear some explanation of it.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. Mr. Speaker, Commodore Badger having served from his youth with gallantry in the Navy, and having been frequently commended for heroic conduct, reached that point in life where the law closed the door to promotion on account of age. He was 62 years of age just two months previous to the time when his promotion would have occurred. He was the only one of his class and rank when that door did close. He has at different times represented the United States in several capacities, and has been obliged to expend large amounts of money, both on account of wounds incurred in the service and also on account of having been obliged, as commander of our squadron at Havre during the French Exposition, to entertain numerous distinguished guests at his own expense—for it is well known that our Government, unlike other nations, makes no allowance to its officers for such purposes.

Mr. SAYERS. The purpose of this bill is to put him on the retired list with the rank of an admiral?

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. To put him exactly where he would have been in two months but for the facts I have stated.

Mr. SAYERS. Well, the same demand will be made from other sources if this is allowed.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. There can be no other similar cases.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. It is the only case.

Mr. SAYERS. But I mean applicants below that rank.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. There can not be any other. This is a solitary case.

Mr. SAYERS. What is he getting now on the retired list?

Mr. GEISSENHAINER. About \$3,000, I think.

Mr. SAYERS. As a commodore?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Let me say to the gentleman that the Senate passed this bill unanimously.

Mr. SAYERS. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must object.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (S. 1424) to amend section 8 of "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Calumet River," approved March 1, 1893; when the Speaker signed the same.

## JOSIAH B. ORBISON.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1279) for the relief of Josiah B. Orbison.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. COOMBS. Reserving the right of objection, I think there should be some explanation of this matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the report had better be read.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the report will be read.

The report was read at length.

Mr. KILGORE. I would like to inquire if this bill has been considered at a Friday night session in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, sir.

Mr. McNAGNY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

## BRIDGE ACROSS MONONGAHELA RIVER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the Senate amendments to 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.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid upon the table.

## OMAHA INDIANS, NEBRASKA.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6814) extending the time of payment to purchasers of lands of the Omaha tribe of Indians in Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to extend the time of payments of the purchase money due for land sold on the Omaha Indian Reservation under the sale made by virtue of "An act to provide for the sale of a part of the reservation of the Omaha tribe of Indians in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1882, as follows:

The time for the first payment is hereby extended until the 1st day of December, 1899, the second payment to become due in one year thereafter, and the third payment to be due and payable in one year from the time fixed for the second payment: *Provided*, That the interest on said payments shall be paid annually at the time said payments of interests are due; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall retain in the Treasury all moneys heretofore and that may hereafter be paid as principal under the act approved August 7, 1882, and shall pay over 5 per cent annually to the Secretary of the Interior to be expended by him annually for the benefit of said Indians, as prescribed in section three of said act, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay all interest that has been paid on land sold under said act to the Secretary of the Interior, to be by him paid over to said tribe, to be distributed to the members thereof pro rata by the agent of said tribe, and all interest thereafter coming into the Treasury shall be paid over and distributed to said tribe annually in like manner: *Provided*, That the said act of August 7, 1882, except as changed or modified by this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

Mr. COOMBS. It seems to me that this bill is of sufficient importance to require its consideration in the regular way. I reserve the right to object until I can hear some explanation of its provisions, or until the report can be read.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. The report is somewhat lengthy, and I can explain in a few words its purport.

Under the act of 1882 a portion of the lands of the Omaha Indian Reservation in Nebraska was sold, and the last payment matured in 1885. In 1885 the time of payment was extended one year. In 1886 there was an extension of time two years on these payments; in 1888 an extension of two years was granted, and in 1890 an extension of four years. This bill provides for an extension of three years, and its conditions are those contained in the act passed by Congress in 1890, save and except the amendments proposed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which are embodied in the bill. I ask consent that the bill as amended be considered by the House at this time.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will put into the RECORD the recommendation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. It is incorporated in the report.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYERS. I would ask if this has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Indian Affairs and is indorsed by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Commissioner says:

The bill under consideration does not require the consent of the Indians to its provisions, and whether its effects, if it should become a law, would be beneficial or harmful to the interests of the Indians, I deem it my duty to note my objection to its passage unless it shall be so amended as to provide that it shall be of no force or effect until the consent of the Indians thereto shall have been first obtained in such manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. HOLMAN. And requires the approval of the Indians before its ratification.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. The measure does not take effect until the consent of the Indians is obtained.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Your committee recommend that the words "ninety-nine," in line 13, be stricken out and the words "ninety-seven" inserted.

Strike out in line 21 the word "thereof" and insert the word "thereon."

Add in line 30, after the word "manner," the following:

"Provided, however, That the interest of the purchaser in lands on which the payment of the purchase money is hereby extended, shall be subject to taxation in the State in which they are situated, but any lien created thereby shall be subject to the lien of the United States for the unpaid purchase money; but this act shall be of no force and effect until the consent thereto of the Omaha Indians shall be obtained in such manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

The amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

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

#### EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I ask the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or of the subcommittee designated to conduct the investigation ordered by the resolution adopted May 22, 1894, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, not exceeding \$1,000; and the chairman of said committee, or of such subcommittee, is authorized to draw for the same on the Clerk of the House, in sums not exceeding \$500 at any one time.

The SPEAKER. This resolution is made necessary by the omission from the original resolution of the clause authorizing the committee to draw the money. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and adopted.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KILGORE, by unanimous consent, obtained indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness in his family.

Mr. GARDNER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence indefinitely on account of sickness.

Mr. COX. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

#### UNITED STATES COURTS AT LAREDO, TEX.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7150) to provide for terms of the circuit and district courts for the western judicial district of the State of Texas to be held at the city of Laredo, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### TRIALS IN THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA.

Mr. POWERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 7293) to amend chapter 167 of the acts of the Fifty-first Congress, approved April 26, 1890; which was referred to the House Calendar and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### REMOVAL OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DUNPHY, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 5294) to regulate the removal of letter-carriers; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### PAY OF LETTER-CARRIERS.

Mr. DUNPHY also, from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6685) to increase the pay of letter-carriers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### MINING CLAIMS.

Mr. WEADOCK, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6558) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to mining claims; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

House bill No. 7123 and House bill No. 7171, relating to the same subject as the bill just reported, were, in accordance with the recommendation of the committee, laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT WATERTOWN, WIS.

Mr. BRETZ, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 2332) for the erection of a public building at Watertown, Wis.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. BARWIG, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 4126) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to discontinue the office of collector of customs at certain ports, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### REPEAL OF THE 10 PER CENT TAX ON STATE BANKS.

The SPEAKER. In pursuance of the order adopted yesterday, the House now proceeds to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3825) to suspend the operation of the laws imposing a tax of 10 per cent on notes issued during the period therein mentioned. The previous question has been ordered on the pending amendments and on the bill, but by unanimous consent debate is permitted this morning; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] being entitled to fifteen minutes, and the gentleman from Maine to one hour and fourteen minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the existing tendencies and policies of this country its money has become concentrated in the hands of a few. When, therefore, the panic of last year occurred it was easily within the power of those few when they became alarmed to withdraw their money from circulation. That state of things actually occurred; and private credit promptly disappeared. Our system of business, having thus lost its lifeblood, lay prostrate and paralyzed. In this exigency the banks of the country made certain paper issues amounting to about \$40,000,000, which served the temporary purpose then needed, and enabled actual necessary transactions to be conducted.

The Committee on Banking and Currency have reported to the House, with their favorable recommendation, a proposition to relieve from the penalty the issues thus made to the country to relieve its wants.

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. COX] has offered an amendment to the proposition of the Committee on Banking and Currency which proposes to abolish that penalty altogether. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if paper issued contrary to law and circulated in the midst of a panic, when there was no other money accessible—if that kind of money is entitled to a remission of the 10 per cent penalty, consistency would require that we should abolish the penalty and relieve such paper from it when issued under ordinary and normal conditions, and when it has to compete with the best money in the world.

In the early part of this century our public men greatly differed about the competency of Congress to charter a national bank. That contention was settled by the Supreme Court in favor of the power. There was also a great difference of opinion between our public men as to the power of the States to charter banks of issue. That contention was also settled by the Supreme Court in favor of the power.

In the case of Maryland and McCulloch, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Congress of the United States could not levy a tax on a branch of the national bank, because, arguing philosophically, as he always did, Chief Justice Marshall insisted that that power could not exist, because it would imply the power to destroy the national bank. And yet, long after Marshall was dead and his great colleagues on the bench had disappeared from the scene, that same high court, although it had decided that the States had the power to charter banks of issue, held nevertheless that Congress had the power to destroy that power by taxation.

The inconsistency is glaring. The amendment of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. COX] proposes to wipe out this discrimination and to restore to the States a function conceded to them by the highest court in the world.

How absurd, on the face of it, to concede that the States reserved the power to charter banks of issue, and never reserved the power to protect them against destruction.

But I have not time to elaborate this argument. Mr. Speaker, by the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act of last year, made necessary by the existing panic, the Government has ceased to add to the currency annually any sums commensurate with our increase of population.

By the terms on which the national banks do business, they will soon reach a state of dissolution on account of the maturity of their bonds; and the millions of currency which those institutions supply will have to be retired. I ask, sir, is it not wise, is it not a proper subject for agreement between all parties, to anticipate that period, and provide for the country an adequate banking system in advance of the emergency?

While I would not strike down these national banks, I would, ere they reach the period of their extinction, provide them with competitors and also prudently provide their successors. We may thus make the transition without shock or convulsion. And the new banks of issue can enter the field before the veterans are mustered out of the service.

Mr. Speaker, it has been stated on this floor that the banks of the States have no adequate foundation for a safe and stable currency; and reference has been made to our past experience in support of the apprehension thus expressed.

My honorable friend [Mr. SPRINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who has reported the pending bill, and stoutly opposes the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX], has paraded here before the House a large volume, in which he said it was necessary for bankers to embody the information indispensable to the transaction of their business in the bank currencies of the States. That volume, when examined, simply consists of the weekly publications which were intended as a sort of directory or guide for all the banks, and when compiled and bound together made the large book which he displayed.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand now a volume which is necessary to the business of the national banks of this country, and which is published semiannually as a guide and directory for these institutions.

It is simply one of the appliances of modern commerce and modern banking, and indispensable to the business of the country.

Why, sir, going back to the period at which these banks were in existence, it is only necessary to remind gentlemen that the banks of issue of that era, with here and there a delinquent corporation, furnished a currency that was as good as any currency which the country had ever seen in its history.

It was a currency which followed the experience of the first half of this century. It was a currency bottomed on the experience that followed the panic of 1837. The banks which had thus given credit to their currency were put upon a basis which commanded the confidence and respect of all the world, and that little discount of 1 or 1½ per cent, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] referred, was simply the rate of exchange existing then on account of the conditions of trade then existing.

Why, sir, at that time the rate of exchange between different sections of this country and between all parts of the world was high, and it was because commercial intercourse was difficult.

At this time transportation is easy everywhere, and the telegraph carries news on its wings wherever civilization exists; and instead of the transactions between sections being conducted now so much as in the old way, on the basis of actual money, the principle of free and unrestricted commerce has enabled one section to pay another in its products, and thus very little money is necessary in the settlement of balances; and it is for that reason that the rate of exchange has gone down, and not because bank securities are any better than they were before the war.

Let me illustrate that by the very example that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] referred to. He says that going back to the old State banking system is like going back to the times when they had both State banks and "prairie schooners." Mr. Speaker, his own State would necessarily have had to pay a high rate of exchange on any bank currency, simply because it had only the "prairie schooner" and did not have railroads and steamboats and canals; but the State of Illinois can now pay its debts in New York by the easy and cheap shipment of its wheat, bacon, corn, and other products. Such is the process by which rates of exchange and interstate discounts have almost disappeared.

But, Mr. Speaker, I need not pause to develop this argument.

It will readily occur to any gentleman familiar with modern methods. Is it possible that people who have made the most wonderful strides in all other departments of life, have unlearned the art of banking? Every commercial country has a system of banking peculiar to itself. France, England, Scotland, and Canada have various and safe systems of banking, under which the commerce of the world is conducted. Are the people of these States incapable of devising banks, and are they unworthy to be trusted?

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROSIOUS] stated the other day that these issues of State banks would be insecure, because, forsooth, they would in the Southern States be predicated upon their bonds, and amongst the rest he instanced the State of Georgia as guilty of repudiation. It was a bitter, unthinking taunt. The gentleman did not know what he was talking about. The State of Georgia to-day is paying bonds issued in a time of anarchy and confusion, under the administration of Governor Bullock, simply because they appeared to have been issued under the forms of law; but on the investigation of the bond issues of that period it was found that many of them were issued in violation of law and in violation of notice issued to all the world by the treasurer of the State, and were delivered not to innocent purchasers, but to those who had joined in the conspiracy to loot the State. These latter bonds, so called, have not been paid.

Let the gentleman call it repudiation or what not; it has been the very means by which these bonds of the State of Georgia, that we are paying to-day, are worth in the markets of Pennsylvania and New York as great a premium as the 4 per cents of those States are anywhere in the world. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Sir, if these people, out of the relics of better days, out of the ashes of their departed prosperity, could reinstate these great Commonwealths and restore their credit and sell their bonds to the world at a premium of 14 or 15 above par, I ask if it is not reasonable to suppose they are capable of conducting banking operations. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman desire to proceed further?

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. I would like a few minutes more.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask that the gentleman from Georgia be permitted to conclude his remarks.

Mr. DINGLEY. Not to interfere with the time yielded to this side?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly not.

Mr. REED. I have no objection to the gentleman's time being extended, provided the same time is given to the other side.

Mr. COX. Why certainly, that is conceded.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, does this require unanimous consent? If this debate is to be prolonged throughout the entire day we would like to know it. We have been waiting for four days to call up the Indian appropriation bill, and we would like to know something about when we are going to have an opportunity to call it up. If the consideration of that measure is not going to be entered on to-day we would like to know. I make no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. I make the request that the gentleman from Georgia be allowed to conclude his remarks, and that an equal time be granted to the other side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia be permitted to conclude his remarks, the other side being given the same extension as that which shall be used by the gentleman from Georgia. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TURNER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly indebted to the House for this unusual privilege, and I shall not abuse it. I shall not occupy but a moment or two more. I desired to repel the intimation that the banks of the States would issue anything but a reliable and sound currency, based on secure foundations, and upon the experience of modern fiscal institutions. I believe that the States will find that no other money than that which is sound and safe will answer the demands of their own business; and in the next place, if this money is floated at all under the charters of State banks, it will be because, like the issues of the banks before the war, it will have to compete with the gold and legal-tender money of the country.

I favor the system, sir, because it enables the people of the various communities and localities to utilize their local credits. I have no desire to make war on the national banks; they are approaching the era of their termination. But in any event I would decentralize the power of these national banks and would disperse it among all the people of all the sections of the country. [Applause.] We have, sir, in all those communities forms of local credit which have been considered the basis of sound banking throughout the world. We have State bonds that are

above par; we have municipal bonds that are above par; and we have personal credit under the liability clause of our banks of issue in the Southern States under which even the issues of antebellum State banks were made good after the assets of the banks had perished in the shock of a great war.

But important as this question is, I believe that the country needs also an opportunity to prosper under other legislation now pending in Congress. We stand on the boundary between two eras. There is the past—let us forget it, with its trials, hardships, and bitterness! There is the future—let us thank God, and go forward! The people are standing upon the verge, awaiting the signal to enter upon new conquests and new glories! And there is a hand which I know is waiting, with ill-concealed impatience, to touch the electric button which shall again set in motion all the industries of this great country. God speed the day! [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that under the arrangement I have control of one hour and twenty-nine minutes?

The SPEAKER. One hour and nineteen minutes. The gentleman from Georgia occupied only five minutes additional.

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MEIKLEJOHN].

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the earnest argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] yesterday, to the effect that there was no danger of returning to the State bank system of a quarter of a century ago. I am not surprised at the earnestness with which gentlemen from Georgia advocate a return to the banking system of the fifties. I have before me the General Session Laws of the State of Georgia, passed in 1893. Instead of standing on theories advanced by those who advocate a return to the State bank system, we have before us actual evidence of what we may expect in the way of State legislation if this bill shall pass.

The act to which I refer is entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of circulating notes to the banks and banking associations of this State, to provide for the protection of the same, and to provide for the protection of depositors of such banks or banking associations, and for other purposes." It was adopted on the 20th day of December, 1893, by the Legislature of the State of Georgia, in anticipation of the fulfillment of the Democratic platform and the passage of this bill.

This act provides that the capital of every bank shall be paid in silver, gold, or currency; that one-half of that capital shall be kept on deposit in the vaults of the bank for the redemption of its circulating medium; that one-fourth of that capital shall be invested in State and national bonds, and that one-fourth of it shall be invested in municipal and county bonds of the State of Georgia; that the amount of the capital invested in national bonds, State bonds, municipal and county bonds of the State of Georgia shall be deposited with the State treasurer, and that upon it he shall issue a circulating medium amounting to three times the amount of the capital held in the vaults of the bank for the redemption of its circulating medium.

To illustrate, if the bank is capitalized for \$1,000,000, \$500,000 would be kept in the vaults for the redemption of the circulating medium; \$250,000 would be invested in national and State bonds; \$250,000 would be invested in municipal and county bonds. Upon those bonds there would be issued to the bank incorporated under this act, passed in anticipation of the passage of this bill by Congress, a sum equal to three times \$500,000, or a bank with a capital of \$1,000,000 would receive a circulating medium of \$1,500,000 of this State money. I wish to ask my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX], who is a director of the National Bank of Franklin, how much of the money of a bank organized under this law of the State of Georgia he would desire to receive at the national bank in Franklin, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate in my remarks five sections of this remarkable act which to-day is upon the statute books of the State of Georgia.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CABANISS. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Nebraska to another provision of the law to which he has referred.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MEIKLEJOHN] has expired.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. In reply to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CABANISS], who desires to call my attention to another provision of this act, I will say that I will print with my remarks the entire enactment.

Mr. CABANISS. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the personal liability clause of that act, which makes each stockholder personally liable to the extent of his stock for the redemption of the bank issues.

Mr. MEIKLEJOHN. To please the gentleman from Georgia, I will extend in my remarks the entire law. The laws of the

States under which wild-cat currency was issued had the same liability clause. The act passed by the Legislature of the State of Georgia is as follows:

No. 344.—Circulation of notes by State banks.

An act to authorize the issuance of circulating notes to the banks and banking associations of this State, to provide for the protection of the same, to provide for the protection of depositors of such bank or banking association, and for other purposes.

SECTION I. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same,* That from and after the passage of this act there shall be issued to the banks and banking associations of this State circulating notes upon the terms and conditions set forth in the following sections of this act:

SEC. II. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the governor, the treasurer, and the comptroller-general of this State be, and they are hereby, constituted a commission authorized and required to cause to be engraved and printed, in the manner best calculated to guard against counterfeiting, such quantity of circulating notes in the similitude of bank notes in blank of denominations not greater than \$1,000 nor less than \$1 as they may from time to time deem necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act, and of such form as they may prescribe. Before such circulating notes, or any part of the same, are delivered to a bank they shall be numbered and registered in proper books to be provided and kept for the purpose in the office of the comptroller-general, and shall be countersigned by him in the presence of one or more of the commissioners, so that each denomination of such circulating notes shall be of the same similitude, and bear the uniform signature of such register.

SEC. III. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That whenever any bank or banking association, now or hereafter chartered by the laws of this State, shall desire to issue circulating notes, such bank or banking association shall make and file with the commissioners aforesaid a written application, verified by the oath of the president and cashier, and of a majority of the directors of such bank or banking association in which application shall be shown: First, the name of such bank or banking association; second, the place where its operation and business shall be carried on; third, the amount of its capital stock and the number of shares into which the same is divided; fourth, a transcript of the record of such bank or banking association showing the names and places of residence of the shareholders, and the number of shares held by each of them; fifth, the amount of capital stock actually paid by each shareholder on his shares of stock; sixth, the compliance of such bank or banking association with all other conditions and requirements of this act necessary to authorize it to become a bank of issue as herein provided; seventh, that such application is made to enable it to avail itself of the provisions of this act.

SEC. IV. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That when such application is filed, it shall be the duty of the commissioners aforesaid to inquire into the truth of the recital of such application, and they may require of each or any of the shareholders of such bank a statement under his oath showing his financial condition, and may require of any officer or director any other or further statement under oath showing the financial condition of the bank or of the shareholders.

SEC. V. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the capital stock of such bank or banking association shall not be less than \$25,000, bona fide subscribed and fully paid in by the stockholders in gold, silver, or lawful currency of the United States.

SEC. VI. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That one-half of the cash paid in on the capital stock shall be set apart and kept on deposit in the vaults of said bank as a fund for the redemption of the bills issued by said bank, and shall be used for no other purpose.

SEC. VII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the remaining half of the capital stock so paid in shall be invested in valid county, municipal, State, or United States bonds, as follows: Not less than one-half of said sum shall be invested in valid State bonds or bonds of the United States, but the balance may be invested in the valid bonds of any county or municipality in this State: *Provided, however,* That none of said bonds are below par of their face value: *And provided further,* That the commissioners aforesaid shall approve such bonds.

SEC. VIII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That said bonds when so purchased by said banks or banking associations shall be deposited with the treasurer of the State of Georgia and by him safely kept until the same are released as hereinafter provided.

SEC. IX. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That when such bank shall have complied with the provisions aforesaid, it shall be the duty of the said commissioners to issue to said bank such an amount of circulating notes provided under section 2 of this act as will be equal to three times the amount of United States legal-tender coins or currency deposited in said bank under the provisions of section VI of this act; the circulating notes thus issued shall be of different denominations as the bank may prefer, numbered, registered, and countersigned as aforesaid, and shall constitute a first and prior lien on all the assets of the bank.

SEC. X. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the circulating notes thus issued and put in circulation by such banks shall be promptly redeemed and paid in legal-tender United States coin or currency when presented and payment demanded by the holder at the office of such bank, and failure or refusal by such bank to so promptly redeem and pay its said notes on demand, as aforesaid, shall subject it to all the penalties and liabilities now provided by the laws of this State.

SEC. XI. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the bonds deposited with the treasurer of this State and also the United States legal-tender coin or currency set apart and kept on deposit in the vaults of said bank as provided in section VI of this act, and all other assets of the bank shall each and both be and remain security in pledge for the redemption and payment of the circulating notes aforesaid, and as additional security for such purpose the shareholders of said bank or banking association shall be, and they are, hereby made liable to the extent of the amount of their stock therein at the par value thereof, in addition to the amount invested in such shares, which liability shall be and remain an additional security for the redemption of such circulating notes, and whenever any impairment or reduction of the funds in the vaults of the bank devoted to the redemption of the bank's circulating notes shall occur, so that such fund amounts to less than one-third of the amount of outstanding circulating notes, such redemption fund shall be immediately increased to an amount equal to one-third of the outstanding circulating notes of the bank.

SEC. XII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the personal liability of shareholders to the amount of their stock, as provided in section 2 of this act, shall not cease for the period of sixty days from date of any transfer of such shares of stock by them.

SEC. XIII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That such banks shall at all times have and keep as a reserve fund, in cash, an amount equal to at least 25 per cent of the aggregate amount of its deposits in such bank. The shareholder shall be personally liable in an amount which together with

the amount of their liability for the security of the circulating notes aforesaid, shall equal the amount of their stock in such bank at the par value thereof: *Provided, however,* That such personal liability is hereby pledged, first, for the security of the circulating notes aforesaid, and subject thereto for the security of depositors.

SEC. XIV. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That whenever it shall appear to the commissioners aforesaid that any such bank has permitted the reserve fund for security of depositors, as aforesaid to fall below the amount prescribed in section 13 of this act, the commissioners shall at once notify such bank to make good such reserve; and if such bank shall fail for thirty days thereafter to make good such reserve, the governor shall direct the attorney-general to institute legal proceedings in the superior court where such bank is located for the appointment of a receiver, and for the winding up and settlement of the affairs of such bank.

SEC. XV. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That if at any time any of the bonds deposited by said bank, as hereinbefore required, shall become valueless or depreciated in value, the commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to require the banks to which the same belong to replace said bonds with good and valid bonds, so that the value of said bonds deposited shall always remain equal to the amount of the deposit required by the provisions of this act.

SEC. XVI. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the commissioners shall make and deliver to every bank which may deposit bonds with the treasurer of this State in the terms of this act a power of attorney to receive the interest due on said bonds at any time; but they shall revoke such power of attorney whenever in their judgment the safety of the bill holders requires it, and all interest received on such bonds by the commissioners shall be held in trust on account of such bank.

SEC. XVII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the bonds so deposited with the treasurer shall not be withdrawn until said bank shall have redeemed all of its circulating notes and paid all of its depositors unless necessary to sell or have sold for the purpose of liquidation: *Provided,* That any such bank or banking association shall have the privilege at any time of paying to said commissioners to be turned into the State treasury an amount of lawful money of the United States, equivalent to its outstanding circulating notes, and shall thereupon be entitled to withdraw its bonds there deposited with said commissioners, and the holders of said circulating notes shall thereafter present the same to the State treasurer for redemption or payment, and the said State treasurer shall pay the same out of the said lawful money of the United States so paid by such bank or banking association.

SEC. XVIII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That every such bank shall make four quarterly reports during each year to said commissioners, according to the form prescribed by the latter, which report shall be verified by the oath of the president or cashier of such bank and attested by the signatures of at least three of the directors. Each such report shall exhibit in detail and under appropriate heads the resources and liabilities of said bank at the close of business on any past day by said commissioners specified. Such report shall be by said bank transmitted to said commissioners within five days after the receipt of a request or requisition therefor from the commissioners, and the same shall be published in the newspaper in which sheriff's sales are published for the county wherein said bank is located, at the expense of said bank; and proof of such publication shall be furnished by said bank to said commissioners, as required by them. Said commissioners shall also have power to call for special reports from any particular bank whenever in the judgment of said commissioners the same is necessary in order to a full and complete knowledge of the condition of each bank.

SEC. XIX. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be the duty of the bank inspector, now provided for by the laws of this State, to visit every such bank as often as directed by said commissioners, and make thorough examination of the affairs of such bank, with full power to examine any of the officers or agents of such bank on oath; and shall make a full and complete report of the condition of such bank or banks to said commissioners.

SEC. XX. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be unlawful for any such bank to loan in the aggregate more than 25 per cent of the amount of its capital stock to the officers and directors thereof, or to loan more than 10 per cent thereof to any one of such officers or directors.

SEC. XXI. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That it shall be unlawful for such bank to loan any of its funds to any person or persons on the indorsement of any of its officers or directors.

SEC. XXII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That any officer, agent, or director of such bank, violating the provisions of section 8, 20 and 21 of this act, or either of them, shall be guilty of a felony, and shall be punished by imprisonment in the penitentiary for a term not less than one year nor more than twenty years.

SEC. XXIII. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That no dividend shall be declared by any such bank until after the net earnings shall reach an amount equal to 5 per cent of the capital stock, which 5 per cent shall constitute a surplus, to which shall be added annually thereafter 5 per cent of the net earnings of the bank, and no dividend shall be declared at any time except from the net earnings after deducting therefrom 5 per cent of the same, to be added to the surplus as above provided.

SEC. XXIV. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That the cashier of the bank availing itself of the privilege of doing business under the provisions of this act, shall be required to furnish the governor of the State a good and sufficient bond in an amount equal to the redemption fund held in the vault of such banks, and that this bond shall be conditioned on the good and faithful stewardship of said redemption fund, as provided by law, and which, in all instances, shall equal one-half of the paid-in capital of the bank, said bond to be deposited with the State treasurer and made payable to said treasurer.

SEC. XXV. *Be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid,* That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act be, and the same are hereby repealed. Approved December 20, 1893.

I will also incorporate in my remarks a compilation showing the number of banks from 1852 to 1863, with a brief synopsis of the laws under which they were incorporated, including capital, circulation, and specie. The figures used are those which were compiled by the Secretary of the Treasury, save and except for such years as no statistics were reported by him.

For those years I have compiled the data from Homan's Merchants and Bankers' Directory.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in speaking of the data on State banks compiled by him, says:

One source of difficulty in determining for any specified date the condition of the banks of the country under the old system lies in the fact that the dates for which reports were required were not uniform in the several States.

Each State determined for itself the time for making these reports, and as a consequence the dates of the returns, which are given in the tables mentioned, differ in certain years and for certain States by a period of six and even nine months. Nor is it even certain that the returns of a given State include, in any instance, all the banks of that State, unless it be those of New England or of the State of New York.

The several statements which have thus far been given in this report, together with those printed in the appendix, are the only ones known to be in existence which aim to show the condition in former years of all the State banks of the country, and the information they contain, though only approximately correct, is still valuable and much sought for by writers upon finance and political economy.

MASSACHUSETTS.

The first banking law, in 1829, provided that no bank should commence business until one-half of its capital stock was paid up in gold and silver, deposited in the vault of the bank and examined by three commissioners appointed by the governor. The act of 1851 required that no bank should organize with a less capital than \$100,000 or more than \$1,000,000, and that one-half of the capital should be paid in—not in gold and silver—and that the balance be paid in within one year after the bank opened.

When the bank transferred to the auditor the bonds of any city or town in the Commonwealth, or the bonds of the New England States, New York, or of the United States, in an amount of not less than \$50,000 and not exceeding 25 per cent of the capital of the bank, notes and bills were issued to the bank in an amount equal to the current market value of the bonds. The banking laws were amended in 1852 by an act in which it was specially provided that the conditions of the law relative to the examination of gold and silver in the vaults of the bank by the commissioners, and that banks should not issue bills to an amount exceeding 25 per cent of their capital, should not apply to any bank after the passage of the act.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	137	\$21,172,360	\$3,563,782	\$43,270,500
1853	143	25,620,472	3,731,765	49,050,175
1854	153	24,803,758	3,828,463	54,492,069
1855	169	23,116,025	4,409,402	58,632,350
1856	172	25,544,315	4,555,571	58,598,800
1857	173	18,104,897	3,611,097	60,319,730
1858	174	20,839,438	11,112,716	61,819,825
1859	176	22,086,921	7,532,647	64,519,200
1860	178	25,012,745	6,567,888	66,482,050
1861	183	19,517,306	8,777,193	67,344,200
1862	183	28,957,639	9,595,530	67,544,200
1863	183	29,124,000	9,554,000	67,544,200

MAINE.

1852	39	\$3,254,882	\$632,301	\$3,923,000
1853	60	5,217,750	1,132,610	5,913,570
1854	60	4,623,906	1,163,522	6,393,369
1855	70	5,057,237	877,166	7,326,302
1856	75	5,077,248	753,085	7,890,794
1857	73	4,641,646	703,143	8,135,735
1858	70	2,964,327	615,441	7,614,200
1859	68	3,886,539	663,734	7,408,945
1860	68	4,148,718	670,080	7,506,890
1861	71	4,313,005	658,334	7,656,259
1862	71	4,047,780	710,392	7,970,650
1863	69	6,488,478	747,145	7,983,000

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

1852	31	\$2,625,707	\$175,157	\$3,078,000
1853	35	3,021,579	150,239	3,378,000
1854	36	3,079,548	176,434	3,626,000
1855	46	3,589,482	236,411	4,449,300
1856	49	3,677,689	236,013	4,831,000
1857	47	2,289,939	275,933	5,041,000
1858	53	3,115,643	294,423	5,041,000
1859	52	3,271,183	355,273	5,016,000
1860	51	3,332,010	243,719	4,961,000
1861	52	2,994,408	318,106	5,031,000
1863	52	4,192,034	350,000	4,675,700

VERMONT.

1852	32	\$3,779,131	\$175,379	\$2,721,168
1853	33	4,704,439	188,173	2,914,040
1854	40	3,985,709	190,680	3,275,656
1855	42	3,704,841	201,548	3,603,400
1856	41	3,970,720	208,558	3,555,945
1857	41	4,275,517	158,588	4,022,740
1858	41	3,024,141	178,556	4,082,416
1859	46	2,832,883	193,400	4,029,240
1860	44	3,784,673	185,870	3,872,642
1861	40	2,522,087	173,332	3,016,000
1862	40	5,021,851	190,313	3,911,000
1863	41	5,022,000	190,000	3,911,000

RHODE ISLAND.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	71	\$3,322,314	\$414,970	\$14,037,441
1853	77	4,895,529	359,659	15,917,439
1854	87	5,035,073	312,606	17,511,162
1855	92	5,404,104	385,767	18,682,802
1856	98	5,521,909	545,345	20,275,899
1857	93	3,192,651	570,850	20,334,777
1858	83	2,644,195	732,622	20,070,741
1859	99	3,318,681	608,833	20,321,069
1860	91	3,558,295	450,929	20,865,599
1861	90	3,772,241	471,581	21,070,619
1862	90	3,303,530	606,977	21,234,529
1863	88	6,413,404	505,270	20,890,129

CONNECTICUT.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	51	\$7,118,625	\$825,379	\$12,509,807
1853	53	10,224,441	1,145,857	13,164,594
1854	63	11,219,556	1,207,381	15,597,891
1855	68	6,871,102	810,161	17,147,385
1856	71	9,197,762	1,006,493	18,913,372
1857	74	10,590,421	1,129,708	19,923,553
1858	76	5,380,247	915,844	20,917,168
1859	74	7,561,519	989,290	21,512,176
1860	74	7,702,436	950,723	21,606,997
1862	75	6,918,018	1,529,855	21,794,937
1863	75	13,842,758	1,423,009	21,812,943

NEW YORK.

The aggregate capital of a bank could not be less than \$100,000, and the bank was not to commence business until there was deposited with the Comptroller securities to the amount of \$100,000. The bonds required to be deposited by the act of 1840 were bonds issued by the State, and in 1844 the Comptroller was authorized to receive bonds of the United States.

The act of 1849 provided that one-half of the security deposited with the Comptroller for the circulation should be State bonds and the balance bonds of the United States. The Comptroller was authorized by an act of 1848 to receive mortgages on real estate in lieu of these bonds to the amount equal to one-half of the circulation of the bank, such mortgages not to exceed two-fifths of the value of the land, and no one mortgage should be in excess of \$5,000. The law required that no bank should for a space of more than twenty days have on hand at their place of business less than 12½ per cent in specie of the amount of the bills and notes of the bank in circulation.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	232	\$27,311,954	\$10,730,634	\$59,026,740
1853	257	29,934,657	9,993,815	62,207,216
1854	312	32,573,189	14,169,905	79,018,980
1855	329	31,507,780	13,661,565	83,773,288
1856	338	31,340,003	10,910,330	85,589,590
1857	311	34,019,633	12,898,771	96,381,301
1858	294	23,899,964	29,313,421	107,449,143
1859	300	28,507,990	28,335,984	110,258,480
1860	303	29,959,506	20,621,545	111,441,320
1861	306	28,239,950	26,427,334	111,821,967
1862	302	30,353,020	29,169,715	109,403,379
1863	308	39,182,819	37,803,047	108,668,297

PENNSYLVANIA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	54	\$11,993,456	\$6,085,729	\$18,895,187
1854	61	17,420,348	4,331,655	19,768,864
1855	64	16,739,069	3,944,602	19,864,825
1856	71	16,883,199	6,738,650	22,026,596
1857	71	17,368,095	5,973,138	23,609,344
1858	76	11,610,458	4,580,528	25,691,439
1859	87	11,980,480	11,345,530	24,565,805
1860	90	13,132,892	8,378,474	25,565,582
1861	89	15,830,033	7,818,769	25,808,553
1862	111	16,384,643	11,464,600	26,135,630
1863	94	27,689,504	9,467,294	25,917,650

NEW JERSEY.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	29	\$3,126,083	\$877,507	\$4,325,115
1854	38	4,917,412	805,533	5,147,741
1855	32	3,552,585	826,452	5,314,885
1856	35	4,285,079	782,659	5,682,262
1857	46	4,759,855	849,926	6,582,770
1858	47	3,365,936	1,308,851	7,494,912
1859	46	4,054,770	952,231	7,359,122
1860	49	4,811,832	940,700	7,844,412
1861	50	4,164,799	1,049,090	8,246,044
1862	51	3,927,535	1,493,103	8,258,912
1863	52	8,172,398	1,180,884	8,187,162

DELAWARE.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	4	\$770,440	\$205,555	\$610,000
1854	6	1,286,933	133,367	1,343,185
1855	10	1,380,991	90,149	1,393,175
1856	11	1,192,204	189,051	1,493,185
1857	11	1,394,094	146,367	1,428,185
1858	11	1,240,370	203,228	1,355,010
1859	12	960,846	217,342	1,638,185
1860	12	1,135,772	208,924	1,640,775
1861	8	675,278	126,614	1,088,175
1862	6	445,619	196,725	409,865
1863	5	678,340	66,179	385,000

MARYLAND.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	19	\$4,254,412	\$2,838,071	\$8,064,930
1854	25	4,918,381	3,405,000	9,558,409
1855	29	4,118,197	2,987,225	10,411,874
1856	31	5,297,933	3,398,101	11,202,606
1857	31	5,155,096	3,523,561	12,297,276
1858	31	4,041,021	2,614,728	12,451,545
1859	32	3,977,971	3,120,011	12,560,635
1860	31	4,106,869	2,779,418	12,568,062
1861	31	3,558,247	2,267,158	12,567,121
1862	28	3,794,295	3,682,471	12,155,979
1863	32	6,649,030	2,750,183	12,112,309

GEORGIA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	6	\$4,201,604	\$1,443,714	\$3,810,400
1854	18	9,518,777	1,576,813	12,957,600
1855	21	6,698,869	1,451,880	13,413,100
1856	24	10,092,809	1,955,965	11,508,717
1857	23	9,147,011	1,702,108	15,428,650
1858	30	5,518,425	1,417,545	16,015,256
1859	28	11,687,582	3,751,988	12,479,111
1860	29	8,798,100	3,211,974	16,689,589
1861	18	6,040,775	1,681,997	10,337,200
1862	33	5,000,000	2,000,000	10,689,400
1863	33	5,000,000	2,000,000	10,689,400

MISSOURI.

The minimum capital of a bank was \$1,000,000, and the bank was not allowed to commence business until one-tenth of the chartered capital stock was paid in gold and silver.

The circulation was limited the first year to \$2 for \$1 of capital stock paid in, in gold and silver. After the first year and within two years from the time of commencing business the amount could be increased to \$2.50 for each \$1 of stock thus paid in; and after two years the amount could be increased to \$3 for each \$1 of capital paid in, in gold or silver.

The amount of gold and silver on hand should not at any time be reduced to less than one-third of the amount of the notes and bills of the bank in circulation.

Each parent bank of one million of capital was authorized to have not less than two branches, each with a capital of not less than \$100,000, and the aggregate of the same not to exceed two-fifths of the capital of the parent bank.

Each parent bank with a capital of more than \$1,000,000 to have not less than three branches, each with a capital of not less than \$100,000, nor in the aggregate to exceed two-fifths of the capital of the parent bank.

When \$25,000 of the capital of the branch bank was paid in, the parent bank was to furnish the branch bank with a like amount in coin and the circulation for the branch bank would then issue on the coin in the same ratio as the circulation of the parent bank.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	6	\$2,427,720	\$1,253,311	\$1,210,622
1854	6	2,457,580	937,835	1,215,405
1855	6	1,460,650	975,491	1,215,398
1856	6	2,805,600	4,355,050	1,215,405
1857	6	2,780,380	1,245,184	1,215,405
1858	10	1,718,750	1,424,004	2,620,615
1859	29	6,069,120	3,621,789	5,796,781
1860	28	7,884,888	4,160,912	9,062,651
1861	42	8,204,845	3,820,530	11,133,890
1862	42	6,511,851	2,967,108	11,243,681
1863	42	4,037,277	3,666,017	11,247,681

LOUISIANA.

In this State alone was there a law providing for a suitable reserve with which to redeem the circulation. The minimum capital of a bank was \$100,000.

The circulation was based upon bonds of the United States, the State of Louisiana, or the consolidated debt of the city of New Orleans deposited with the auditor of state, and the bank received note or bills in an amount equal to the securities so deposited.

The bank was required to have on hand at all times in specie an amount equal to one-third of all their liabilities, and the two-thirds of their capital invested in specie funds and bills of exchange maturing in ninety days which could not be renewed.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	29	\$3,514,274	\$4,355,381	\$12,201,870
1853	29	4,409,271	5,946,990	10,934,130
1854	19	6,969,807	7,468,460	18,359,291
1855	19	6,586,601	6,570,588	20,179,107
1856	19	7,222,614	8,191,625	19,027,728
1857	19	9,194,139	6,811,182	21,730,400
1858	15	4,336,624	10,370,701	22,800,830
1859	12	9,094,009	16,218,027	24,215,689
1860	13	11,579,313	12,115,431	24,496,866
1861	13	6,181,374	13,656,088	24,634,844
1863	6	8,876,519	8,806,080	17,888,166

VIRGINIA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	35	\$12,020,378	\$3,238,874	\$10,583,700
1854	55	14,298,792	3,271,042	12,796,466
1855	58	10,834,963	2,728,482	14,033,838
1856	57	13,014,926	3,151,109	13,600,188
1857	57	12,685,627	3,092,741	13,863,000
1858	62	10,347,874	2,710,777	14,651,600
1859	63	10,340,342	3,077,687	14,685,370
1860	65	9,812,197	2,943,652	16,005,156
1861	66	19,817,148	3,017,359	16,486,210
1862	70	12,000,000	3,000,000	18,824,250
1863	70	12,000,000	3,000,000	18,824,250

NORTH CAROLINA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	20	\$4,249,883	\$1,645,029	\$3,789,250
1853	4	4,276,978	1,388,515	3,605,000
1854	25	7,320,667	1,857,048	4,818,565
1855	26	6,667,782	1,291,436	5,205,073
1856	28	5,750,092	1,360,995	6,031,945
1857	28	6,301,262	1,156,993	6,425,250
1858	28	5,699,427	1,035,869	6,525,100
1859	28	6,202,626	1,248,525	6,522,200
1860	30	5,594,057	1,617,687	6,626,478
1861	31	5,218,598	1,059,715	7,863,466
1862	32	4,500,000	1,500,000	7,985,000
1863	32	4,500,000	1,500,000	7,985,000

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	9	\$7,050,573	\$1,669,550	\$9,825,685
1854	18	9,715,783	1,621,973	16,073,580
1855	19	6,739,623	1,283,284	16,003,253
1856	20	6,504,679	1,228,221	17,516,600
1857	20	10,654,652	1,197,774	14,837,642
1858	20	6,185,825	1,104,128	14,885,631
1859	20	9,170,333	5,601,414	14,888,451
1860	20	11,475,634	2,324,121	14,962,082
1861	20	6,089,036	1,628,336	14,952,486
1862	20	7,300,000	1,500,000	14,916,676
1863	20	7,300,000	1,500,000	14,916,676

FLORIDA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1860	2	\$183,640	\$32,876	\$300,000
1861	2	116,250	55,071	425,000
1862	3	300,000	75,000	525,000
1863	3	300,000	75,000	525,000

ALABAMA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	2	\$2,763,015	\$1,175,107	\$2,000,000
1854	3	3,171,487	1,125,954	2,100,000
1855	4	2,382,176	1,125,400	2,296,400
1856	4	3,467,242	1,274,944	2,297,800
1857	4	3,177,234	1,139,312	2,297,800
1858	6	2,581,791	1,302,312	3,235,650
1859	6	6,651,117	3,371,956	3,663,490
1860	8	7,477,976	2,747,174	4,901,000
1861	8	5,055,222	2,715,119	4,976,000
1862	8	4,000,000	2,000,000	4,900,000
1863	8	4,000,000	2,000,000	4,900,000

MISSISSIPPI.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1851	1	\$161,930	-----	\$118,400
1853	1	49,925	\$19,211	132,726
1854	1	234,745	5,669	240,165
1855	1	221,760	8,063	240,165
1856	1	324,080	7,744	240,165
1857	1	556,345	7,912	336,000
1858	2	169,400	591	1,110,000
1859	4	1,000,000	50,000	836,000
1860	4	300,000	50,000	800,000
1861	4	300,000	50,000	800,000
1862	4	300,000	50,000	800,000
1863	4	300,000	50,000	400,000

KENTUCKY.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	4	\$8,823,124	\$3,634,043	\$7,658,700
1854	35	13,573,510	4,596,249	10,869,665
1855	34	8,628,946	4,152,988	10,369,717
1856	33	12,634,533	4,611,760	10,454,572
1857	35	13,682,215	4,406,108	10,596,305
1858	37	8,884,225	4,027,825	10,782,588
1859	37	14,345,696	4,984,141	12,216,725
1860	45	10,520,207	4,502,250	12,835,670
1861	43	10,873,630	4,460,966	13,723,725
1862	44	7,405,015	5,991,015	13,453,303
1863	44	9,035,724	6,322,510	13,798,030

TENNESSEE.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	3	\$4,879,196	\$972,034	\$3,460,114
1854	28	6,821,836	1,983,790	6,599,872
1855	32	5,850,562	1,473,040	6,717,848
1856	45	8,518,545	2,231,418	8,593,603
1857	40	8,401,948	2,094,632	8,454,423
1858	39	6,472,822	2,863,018	8,361,357
1859	34	5,538,378	2,267,710	8,067,037
1860	33	3,844,796	1,284,115	7,985,143
1861	33	3,844,796	1,284,115	7,985,143
1863	14	4,540,906	55,266	3,561,700

MICHIGAN.

The minimum capital of any bank was \$500,000. The bank notes or bills were issued upon United States bonds, the bonds of the State of Michigan or of New York, either of the New England States or Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, or Kentucky, to an amount equal to the value of the securities deposited with the State treasurer, which valuation was not to exceed 95 per cent of their par value or 95 per cent of the market value in the city of New York for the four weeks preceding the deposit of the bonds.

No bank was to commence business until securities to the amount of \$25,000 were deposited with the treasurer.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	5	\$920,951	\$161,483	\$961,228
1853	5	896,140	197,294	665,803
1854	7	1,270,989	357,672	1,084,718
1855	6	500,942	143,123	980,416
1856	4	573,840	152,080	730,438
1857	4	670,549	92,762	841,489
1858	4	364,676	23,776	851,804
1859	3	331,978	42,018	745,304
1860	4	222,197	24,175	755,465
1861	2	47,510	28,389	250,000
1862	4	120,124	37,996	413,030
1863	4	131,087	30,339	416,590

INDIANA.

By the act of 1855, a bank was required to have at least a capital of \$50,000. When bonds of the United States or of any State to the amount of \$50,000 were deposited with the State treasurer, the bank received in notes and bills \$100 on each \$110 of the bonds so deposited. The entire circulation of the State was limited to \$6,000,000 and the circulation of any bank to \$200,000.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	14	3,772,193	1,245,407	2,083,007
1853	14	3,860,524	1,308,933	2,083,007
1854	44	7,116,827	1,820,760	5,554,562
1855	59	8,165,856	1,894,357	7,281,934
1856	46	4,516,422	1,599,014	4,045,325
1857	46	4,731,705	1,420,076	4,123,089
1858	40	3,363,976	1,261,720	3,585,932
1859	37	5,379,936	1,869,000	3,617,629
1860	37	5,390,246	1,583,540	4,343,210
1861	39	5,755,201	2,296,648	4,744,570
1862	37	6,844,700	4,577,259	4,579,985
1863	37	6,782,800	3,455,731	5,492,835

WISCONSIN.

The aggregate capital stock of a bank was not to be less than \$25,000 nor more than \$500,000.

When the bank deposited bonds of the United States or of any of the States with the treasurer of the State the stock was to be valued on the basis of quotations in the city of New York for the six months immediately preceding the deposit, and notes and bills were issued to the bank in an amount equal to the valuation of such bonds.

The bank was allowed at any time to withdraw the bonds of the United States and of any State held for the security and redemption of the bank circulation, and substitute in lieu

thereof the bonds of any railroad company incorporated within the State, such substitution not to exceed one-half of the bills or notes issued to the bank. The bank could commence business whenever securities herein described, to the amount of \$25,000, were deposited with the treasurer, irrespective of the amount of capital paid up.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1854	10	\$485,121	\$182,482	\$600,000
1855	23	740,764	334,393	1,400,000
1856	32	1,060,165	531,713	1,870,000
1857	49	1,702,570	542,938	2,955,000
1858	66	2,013,071	576,543	5,515,000
1859	98	4,695,170	705,009	7,995,000
1860	108	4,429,855	419,947	7,620,000
1861	110	4,310,175	372,518	6,782,000
1862	60	1,419,423	304,478	3,807,000
1863	67	1,600,000	265,000	3,473,000

MINNESOTA.

The law provided that no bank could be organized with a capital of less than \$25,000.

When the bank deposited with the State auditor bonds of the United States or of any of the States, notes were issued to the bank in a sum equal to the value of the bonds so deposited, based on the quotation of the bonds in the city of New York for the six months preceding their deposit. The issue of the circulation was unlimited, and a bank could commence operation as soon as a deposit of bonds was made and the bank bills issued, irrespective of the amount of capital stock paid up.

Years.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1859	2	\$48,643	\$15,272	\$50,000
1861	3	8,702	2,228	155,000
1862	4	81,236	—	156,000
1863	7	198,494	25,658	318,000

IOWA.

The required capital stock of a bank was not less than \$50,000 which was to be paid up in cash, and bonds of the United States or of any State to the amount of \$50,000 were deposited with the auditor, on which was issued notes and bills to the amount of 90 per cent of the valuation of such bonds, to be determined by quotations in the city of New York for thirty days next preceding the date of their deposit.

The bank was to keep on hand at all times an amount of specie sufficient to redeem all bills or notes "as may be presented at the place of payment." They were required to keep a further and additional reserve on hand at all times in specie equal to 25

per cent of all deposits made in specie, and for other deposits a reserve of 25 per cent in notes and bills of the bank.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1860	12	\$563,806	\$255,545	\$460,450
1861	13	689,600	378,030	589,130
1862	14	1,281,453	725,443	720,390
1863	14	1,310,000	600,000	827,220

OHIO.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1852	70	\$11,545,105	\$2,806,902	\$7,818,761
1853	68	11,373,210	2,631,319	7,115,111
1854	68	9,839,008	2,319,064	8,013,154
1855	66	8,074,132	1,690,105	7,166,581
1856	65	9,080,589	2,096,809	6,491,421
1857	61	9,153,629	2,016,814	6,742,421
1858	49	6,201,286	1,734,995	6,560,770
1859	53	8,040,304	1,845,441	6,707,151
1860	52	7,983,889	1,828,640	6,890,839
1861	55	8,143,611	2,377,466	7,151,039
1862	55	9,217,520	3,655,944	5,695,950
1863	55	9,057,837	3,023,285	5,674,000

ILLINOIS.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1853	23	\$1,351,788	\$419,531	\$1,702,456
1854	29	2,283,526	565,152	2,513,790
1855	36	3,420,985	759,474	3,840,946
1857	42	5,534,945	635,810	5,872,144
1858	45	5,238,930	233,239	4,679,825
1859	48	5,707,048	269,585	4,000,334
1860	74	8,981,723	223,812	5,251,225
1861	94	11,010,837	302,906	6,750,743
1862	19	1,415,076	—	—
1863	25	619,286	104,018	894,845

NEBRASKA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1857	4	\$353,796	\$136,325	\$205,000
1858	6	41,641	5,083	15,000
1859	2	23,346	6,629	56,000
1860	6	600,000	100,000	400,000
1861	6	600,000	100,000	400,000
1862	1	16,000	5,627	594,000
1863	1	16,000	5,627	52,000

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Year.	Number.	Circulation.	Specie.	Capital.
1857	5	\$350,000	\$300,000	\$1,282,300
1858	5	350,000	300,000	1,282,300
1859	5	350,000	300,000	1,282,300
1860	5	350,000	300,000	1,282,300
1861	5	350,000	300,000	1,282,300
1862	5	350,000	200,000	1,282,300
1863	5	350,000	200,000	1,282,300

Table showing the aggregate number of the State banks and their principal resources and liabilities from 1834 to 1863.

Years.	No. of banks.	Principal resources.						Principal liabilities.						
		Loans and discounts.	Stocks.	Due from banks.	Real estate.	Notes of other banks.	Specie funds.	Specie.	Other resources.	Capital stock.	Circulation.	Deposits.	Due to banks.	Other liabilities.
1834	506	\$324,119,499	\$6,113,195	\$27,329,645	\$10,850,090	\$22,154,919	\$26,641,753	—	\$1,723,547	\$200,005,944	\$94,839,570	\$75,666,986	\$26,602,293	—
1835	704	365,163,834	9,210,879	40,084,038	11,140,167	21,066,301	3,061,819	\$43,397,625	4,642,124	231,250,337	103,692,495	83,081,305	33,972,578	\$19,320,475
1836	713	457,505,080	11,709,319	51,876,955	14,194,375	32,115,138	4,800,070	40,019,594	9,975,226	251,575,292	140,801,038	115,104,440	50,402,369	25,599,234
1837	788	525,115,702	12,407,112	59,063,910	19,064,451	36,533,527	5,366,500	37,915,340	10,423,630	290,772,091	149,185,890	127,397,185	62,421,118	35,560,289
1838	829	485,631,637	36,308,604	58,195,153	19,075,731	24,804,257	904,006	25,184,112	24,194,117	317,636,778	116,138,810	84,691,184	61,015,092	59,595,679
1839	840	492,278,015	36,128,454	52,898,357	16,607,832	27,372,766	3,612,567	45,132,073	28,352,248	327,132,512	135,170,995	90,240,140	53,135,508	62,946,248
1840	901	462,696,523	42,411,750	41,140,164	23,181,919	20,797,892	3,623,674	33,105,155	24,592,580	358,442,692	106,968,572	75,696,857	44,159,615	43,275,183
1841	784	395,487,632	44,811,135	47,877,045	33,524,444	25,643,447	3,168,708	34,813,958	11,816,603	313,608,959	107,230,214	64,890,101	42,861,889	42,806,226
1842	692	323,957,569	24,585,540	30,732,496	33,341,988	19,432,744	3,115,827	28,440,423	8,186,317	260,171,797	83,734,011	62,408,870	25,863,857	12,775,106
1843	691	254,544,937	23,280,050	20,663,264	22,826,807	13,306,677	6,578,375	33,515,806	13,343,599	228,861,948	58,563,608	56,168,628	21,456,524	7,337,033
1844	596	264,905,814	22,858,670	35,890,930	22,520,803	11,672,473	6,729,980	49,898,209	12,153,639	210,872,056	75,167,640	84,550,795	51,998,040	5,842,010
1845	707	312,117,131	20,356,070	31,689,946	19,039,000	12,040,760	6,785,025	44,241,242	10,073,466	206,045,968	89,608,711	88,020,646	23,337,440	5,853,902
1846	715	310,282,045	20,158,251	31,788,641	21,219,865	13,112,467	8,386,478	49,012,065	7,913,591	196,894,309	105,552,427	66,913,070	28,218,568	5,331,572
1847	715	310,282,045	20,158,251	31,788,641	21,219,865	13,112,467	8,386,478	49,012,065	7,913,591	196,894,309	105,552,427	66,913,070	28,218,568	5,331,572
1848	715	310,282,045	20,158,251	31,788,641	21,219,865	13,112,467	8,386,478	49,012,065	7,913,591	196,894,309	105,552,427	66,913,070	28,218,568	5,331,572
1849	782	338,338,195	23,871,875	32,238,407	20,580,955	16,427,716	13,789,780	35,132,516	12,206,112	203,070,622	108,519,760	61,792,533	28,539,888	4,706,077
1850	824	364,204,078	20,604,759	41,631,555	17,491,809	12,708,016	10,489,822	46,309,765	8,229,632	204,838,175	128,506,091	103,226,177	39,414,371	5,501,401
1851	879	418,756,799	22,388,389	50,718,015	20,582,166	16,303,289	8,680,483	43,019,308	7,965,463	207,309,361	114,743,415	109,556,595	36,717,451	6,335,309
1852	824	364,204,078	20,604,759	41,631,555	17,491,809	12,708,016	10,489,822	46,309,765	8,229,632	204,838,175	128,506,091	103,226,177	39,414,371	5,501,401
1853	750	403,943,758	22,244,692	48,920,258	20,219,724	17,196,083	15,341,196	48,671,048	8,935,972	227,807,553	155,165,251	128,957,712	46,410,828	6,438,827
1854	1208	557,397,779	24,350,330	55,516,085	22,360,472	22,059,066	25,579,253	59,410,253	7,589,890	301,376,071	204,689,207	188,188,744	49,625,262	13,439,376
1855	1307	676,144,758	52,727,082	55,738,735	24,073,901	23,420,518	21,935,738	53,944,546	8,734,540	332,177,288	185,662,223	190,400,342	55,156,667	15,560,623
1856	1398	634,183,280	49,485,215	62,639,725	20,865,807	24,779,049	19,937,710	59,314,033	8,862,516	343,574,272	195,747,950	212,705,662	52,719,956	12,227,867
1857	1416	684,456,887	50,272,329	65,849,205	24,124,522	28,124,049	25,081,641	58,349,638	5,920,336	370,834,686	214,778,820	230,351,352	57,674,333	19,816,580
1858	1422	683,165,242	60,308,230	68,052,802	28,755,894	23,447,436	15,890,441	74,512,832	6,075,906	394,622,799	155,206,344	155,932,047	61,169,875	14,166,713
1859	1476	657,183,799	63,502,449	78,244,967	25,976,497	25,858,289	26,806,822	104,837,816	8,323,041	401,976,242	193,306,818	259,568,278	68,215,651	15,046,427
1860	1562	691,945,680	70,344,343	87,235,457	30,782,131	25,502,567	19,331,521	83,594,537	11,123,171	421,890,095	207,102,477	253,802,129	55,632,918	14,631,815
1861	1601	696,778,421	74,934,879	85,793,900	30,748,927	21,903,602	29,297,878	87,674,507	16,657,511	429,592,713	202,005,767	257,239,562	61,275,256	23,238,004
1862	1492	645,677,780	90,010,987	95,256,586	32,326,649	25,253,589	27,827,971	102,146,215	13,648,006	418,139,741	183,792,079	296,322,408	61,144,052	21,638,093
1863	1468	648,901,863	180,508,260	96,934,452	31,880,495	58,104,328	46,171,518	101,227,369	22,003,443	405,045,829	238,677,218	393,686,226	100,526,527	53,814,145

Mr. DINGLEY. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

[Mr. BINGHAM withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

[Mr. HALL of Missouri withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBINSON].

[Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN].

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances I would deem it my duty to support the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX], to repeal the tax of 10 per cent imposed upon notes issued by State banking associations. I can not support it at this time, because, while I believe that to supply a paper currency is essentially the task or province of banking associations, and that the Government should be divorced from any power of supplying paper money in the form of its own debts, yet while the Government's circulation is in actual existence, filling the channels of commerce to their utmost capacity and often to overflowing, I do not believe there is room in our commercial system for a new form of currency.

If the greenbacks and Treasury notes were withdrawn from circulation it would be the duty of this House to immediately adopt some such measure as that proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee to the pending bill, and thus throw back upon commerce through the banking institutions created by commerce the business of supplying the circulating medium, which is the lifeblood of commerce. Money should bear to commodities that relationship which commerce finds necessary for the circulation of industrial products; and the only method by which the proper volume of currency can be determined is the demand for money which always makes itself felt in the banking institutions of the country.

Commerce always demands the money which it needs to accomplish the circulation of commodities, and the amount which is unnecessary to that purpose it can always draw from the capital of the country, swelling the volume to meet the necessities of trade and reducing the volume when the demands of trade are diminished. The operations of trade make manifest the amount of circulating medium that may be necessary to the transaction of business, and the business of banking is to ascertain the requirements of commerce in this respect and to supply them.

But when the Government has choked the channels of circulation by the issues of paper money, in the form of its own promises to pay, there is no channel open to a currency based upon private capital, and, Mr. Speaker, it is only because I believe conditions do not now exist in which the form of currency contemplated by the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee can find room for circulation in this country, that I oppose the amendment which he has offered. If the way were clear for the adoption of such a form of currency it would, in my judgment, furnish ample means by which these great necessities of commerce could be properly supplied.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. COCKRAN. If I can have an extension of time.

Mr. OATES. It is a simple one. I desire to ask you if this repeal would not be a step in the direction of accomplishing directly what you suggest?

Mr. COCKRAN. I believe it would be a step in the opposite direction; and it is for that reason I oppose the adoption of the amendment. If the gentleman will give me his attention I will state to him precisely what I mean by that. You have now in existence a paper currency furnished by the Government which carries with it a legal-tender quality.

Its amount does not depend upon commercial exigencies. It remains the same whether the volume of commodities in circulation be \$100,000,000 or \$500,000,000. It is made a fixed amount, by operation of law, by an enactment passed at a certain time. It has no reference to existing conditions, and as conditions change every day it is impossible to establish by a rule of law the amount of currency that may be necessary to supply the varying exigencies of trade.

Now it is proposed by this amendment to simply repeal a method of taxation which had for its object the reservation to the banks chartered by the National Government of the power to issue paper money.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COCKRAN. While the conditions under which the Government assumed the function of supplying paper money have passed away, the power to supply it is still maintained. I believe that the national-bank notes are utterly inadequate to the necessities of the country. The system is utterly indefensible. You can not reconcile it with any principle of sound finance or economic laws. It was established as a war measure, a device to take the gold from the banks for the use of the Government, the Government indorsing the paper of the banks in return for the amount of gold or coin which it had obtained from them.

That system ought not to have existed one hour after the safety of the Government had been restored. The interference of Government with the supply of currency is a monstrous wrong. It is a fountain of evil, a peril that hangs like a cloud over the commercial system of this country. But it exists; and my objection to the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee is that you leave the cloud undispelled; that you leave the peril hanging over our commercial system; that you leave the fountain of evil undisturbed, and yet proceed to further complicate our financial system by establishing a new form of currency which is irreconcilable with the existing monetary system, vicious and indefensible though that system may be. Such a course could result only in confusion and disaster.

Mr. TERRY. What about the platform?

Mr. COCKRAN. The platform demanded the repeal of this tax, and I believe in the platform, but I do not believe in repealing the tax haphazard. I believe in removing every trace of the conditions under which that tax was imposed. I will go with the gentleman hand in hand to do that. Follow me, and we will withdraw and cancel all these Treasury notes; we will establish a currency based upon the wealth and the commerce of the country, promoting and facilitating the exchange of commodities, giving to trade the circulation that is necessary to enterprise and prosperity.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great country love their national money. The national money has endeared itself to the hearts of the people by reason of its solidity and its permanency, and because they know it is founded upon stability and stands as firm as the foundations of the Government itself.

It is founded upon our national debt, and so long as notes are issued upon that debt which is pledged to be redeemed by the faith of this Government, so long will the national currency be regarded by the common people of the country as being the best money that we have ever had, preferable even to gold or silver.

The measure under consideration, to relieve the certificates of the New York Clearing House and like institutions from the burden of the payment of the 10 per cent tax intended to be laid on State bank notes, is a proper measure, and one that must commend itself to the fair-minded of all parties.

It is in no sense a political question; and the circumstances that called for the issuing of the certificates it is now proposed to relieve were of an extraordinary character, and when considered justify and commend the measure to us as a proper one, as such taxation was not the intention of the law. The proposed amendment to the bill is quite another matter; intended as it is to remove the 10 per cent tax imposed upon the notes of State banks, it is a direct thrust at the present monetary system, and especially the national-bank system of the country; and anyone who believes in and is favorable to a national currency can not view the amendment with any degree of favor.

"Sufficient unto the day, is the evil thereof" is an old maxim that is supposed to meet the ordinary requirements of everyday life, yet such a maxim will not apply to the necessary detail and arrangement of a financial system or policy of a great country, such as ours now is and as we expect it to be. The national-bank system or law is far from being perfect; indeed, in some of its provisions it is justly complained of, but so far as it is national, and issues notes under the direction, supervision, and authority of the National Government, it is to be commended, and with proper amendments removing the objectionable features it can be made the best of any system that can be devised. In so far as the national-bank notes are concerned, unfortunately for the country the day is not far distant when the bonds on which the notes are based will be paid off, and we will be compelled to look for other securities than those of the National Government, on which the present issue of notes is based.

There is no question but that our national banking system is certainly the best we have ever had in the history of the nation, and can be made the best of any system in the world; and surely no sane man or sound financier can advance or contend with any

degree of belief in his own theories that the substitution for a national currency of forty-four different kinds of currency, or as many kinds as we have States in the Union, regulated by forty-four State Legislatures, each with its own theories of currency and the uses of money and financial management, would better the financial condition of the country or give a better medium of exchange for our commodities than our present system, and such a substitution will be so replete with danger and inconvenience and so subject to the whims and fancies of theorists and speculators that men who have the best interests of the country at heart can not contemplate the proposition for such a change with any but the most serious forebodings of financial disaster.

The old State bank system was so bad and unsatisfactory in its day that the recollection of it is painful to contemplate, and it must be remembered that our country then contained but one-half the population, and did not transact more than one-third the business that is now transacted, and in that day the one-half almost of the time of a busy merchant was taken up in the examination of Bank Note Reporters and Detectives, and keeping himself posted as to the various State banks, their capital, resources, and value of their paper. It would be impossible now, in our present manner of doing business, to conduct the ordinary daily business of this country with a medium of exchange similar to that of our old State banks.

The enactment of an interstate-commerce law to regulate commerce between the States proves the rapidity with which we are advancing, and in a business point of view State lines are—as they should be—almost entirely obliterated, and if the necessities of commerce between the States for the purpose of transporting merchandise requires an interstate law enacted by Congress, how much more necessary it is that the monetary system of the country, in which all the people (not merchants and bankers alone) are interested, should be national in its character and regulated by Congress, and as a bushel of wheat is a bushel of wheat in New Orleans, San Francisco, Chicago, and New York, so should a paper dollar be, and the identification of the one in its quality and worth should be as easy and as visible to the sense as the identification of the other.

When the national debt is paid, there will be no good reason for not continuing a national banking system, and continuing a national currency, but where, Mr. Speaker, is the necessity of paying off the national debt? Why not continue it as one of the permanent things of the country, for the express purpose of basing a national currency upon? We can certainly secure no better basis for an issue of currency than our national debt, and if it is not large enough, who can offer any good reason why it should not be increased, and when could there be a better time for increasing the national debt than the present?

It is a fact well known that the entire country is now suffering from such a stagnation and cessation of business enterprises as has never before been known in our history, and from all sources we hear complaints from thousands of anxious and willing workers with no work to do. Indeed all sources of industry seem to be paralyzed. Then why not the Government commence a system of internal improvement; erect public buildings in cities where they are needed for the proper transaction of our postal and other public business; enlarge and improve our Navy; aid in the maintenance of a public-road system in the country; widen, deepen, and improve our harbors; make navigable our great rivers; strengthen our seacoast defenses; connect the Ohio and the Mississippi and the Great Lakes by a canal, and also the port of New York with the lakes by a canal; largely improve and make safe the levees of the Mississippi, and protect the people of the low lands of the country bordering on its banks—as they should be—at public expense; quit the cheese-paring and niggardly economy that is now being practiced and adhered to, and the large army of the unemployed of the country could at once be put to work and prosperity would again be our guest. The country is in need of internal improvements, especially good roads and improved facilities for cheap transportation. Why not commence the work at once and thus set the pace for returning prosperity?

I hardly expect, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic party to be equal to this emergency; they have brought the country, by their threats of free trade and bad management of our business affairs and dalliance with important public measures, to its present unfortunate condition; and as an additional menace it is now proposed to further unsettle the business of the country by destroying our banking system and by flooding us with currency whose owner and sponsor would in many cases be hard to discover; and the attacks that have been made upon the national banking system by gentlemen upon the floor of this House proves that the heresy of "States rights" still has a lodgment in the hearts and minds of the Bourbon Democracy; and it is again proven that experience fails to be a teacher to some men. We can

hardly expect prosperity and progress to again become our permanent guest until the Government is directed by the grand old party, who believe in a nation superior to the State and not a nation subservient to the State.

The present law could be amended so as to permit State and municipal bonds to be substituted for national bonds, and these could be accepted by the Comptroller as a substitute for the national bonds that are now used as the basis for the national currency, and in addition to these, we have the wealth of the mountains of Nevada, California, and Colorado, with their inexhaustible silver mines, the product of which can be placed in the vaults of the Government's bullion, and by deducting a reasonable per cent of its market value as security against depreciation, the Government could issue its notes on this bullion, and thus aid the silver producers of the country by making it also, as it always has been, a basis for our national currency.

This question, Mr. Speaker, is one of importance to all the people, and if the good sense and fertile genius of our people remain, we firmly believe that State bank notes will never again be substituted for notes issued by national authority, and sufficient ways and means will be found upon which to base a national currency and to continue a system that makes our money as national as our flag, and one that meets the requirements of every business interest of the entire country and satisfies and protects all the people.

The proposed bill is a just and correct one, and should receive the approval of this House; the amendment is vicious, a direct thrust at the prerogative of Congress, a step backwards, a resurrection and rehabilitation of the pernicious doctrine and fallacy of "State rights" that we fondly believed, and still believe, was forever settled at Appomattox. Our currency must continue to be as national as our flag, and he who undertakes to make it different or otherwise commits a crime against our best interests; and against the common people of this great nation, who as much deserve protection as the holder of the bonds or the manipulators of the stock markets of the world. With a well-regulated national currency in the hands of the people it is forever beyond the control of speculators, Shylocks, and plutocrats.

Mr. Speaker, with the destruction of our industries, the repeal of the laws insuring honest and fair elections, and now by an attack upon our monetary system, this Congress and the Democratic party is making a record that only awaits the opportunity for the people to register their condemnation of it; and they will again relegate to the rear a party that has proven itself to be so utterly incompetent and unable to direct and control the affairs of the people of this the proudest and greatest of all nations. [Applause.]

[Mr. MAGUIRE addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. DINGLEY. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUIGG].

Mr. QUIGG. Mr. Speaker, behind this proposition to repeal the 10 per cent tax on the issues of State banks there is another idea than that of affecting values and of adding to a man's wealth by processes that have their parallel only in the tales of the Arabian Nights, and that is the idea of State rights. It must be evident to everybody who has followed the course of this debate that as many votes will be cast here in behalf of the pending amendment to vindicate Calhounism as to placate Coxeyism, though both of these motives will be curiously mixed in the same minds.

To argue to the average Southern Democrat the follies of Calhounism is, I know, as idle as to protest to the raven that its plumage is too dark. The answer in each case will be, "I can not help it; I was made that way." But allowing for the devotion which every Southern Democrat must feel in behalf of the principle for which he has sacrificed so much and got so little, it is still fair to ask him to give occasional consideration to the interests of the country as a whole, and to the fact that in our traffic with one another we know nothing of State lines or of any limiting condition, political or physical.

And this brings me to remark, Mr. Speaker, that it is a constant allegation in the course of these financial debates that New York does not understand the South and West; that it does not know how big the country is, how vast are its resources, how immense its opportunities, how numerous its needs, and how diverse the interests of its people. But that is a great mistake, and you have only to reflect a little to see that it is a mistake. In fact you have only to ask yourselves this single question: Have you any need that you do not promptly communicate to New York? Is there any interest of yours for which you do not seek the capital of Wall street? Is there any State west of the Alleghenies or south of the Potomac the rivers of whose prosperity are not fed by the springs of New York?

The partisanship and sectionalism, whether they come with an apology or a defiance, that have been so often heard in these

financial debates, are a grave menace to the true interests of the country.

When the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], for instance, asked his party associates to vote on a question affecting the currency of the people, not as the representatives of an enlightened public sentiment, but as the blind slaves of a party caucus, he made a demand which their intelligence should have scorned and their patriotism should have spurned! When the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN], who I hope is going to vote right on this proposition, asked you to vote on the seigniorage bill, not as Americans, but as Western men, he appealed to a sentiment and sought to revive here a feeling which, God knows, has done this nation injury enough. When partisanship and sectionalism are the grounds on which gentlemen claim support, they furnish the best reasons in the world why they and their schemes and their leadership should be repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, this country of ours is suffering just now from a bad case of mental myosis. It is epidemic. It seems not merely to shorten the vision, but to intoxicate the brain and to produce a general disquietude and a disposition to quarrel with everybody and anybody who seems to be the least bit prosperous. It was this spirit, gentlemen, that gave office to the Democratic party in 1892. It is this spirit to which those gentlemen over there are indebted for the seats they occupy—for their 100 majority on the floor of this House. It is this spirit against which the people of the country are now protesting when they say to you that if you do not want to lose your jobs any more than they want to lose theirs, you will have a care what kind of values you reduce.

The Democratic party, Mr. Speaker, went to the country in 1892 as the organ of unrest. They were willing to mean anything that anybody wanted they should mean; and if he did not know what he wanted, they were willing to mean that, too. And the scale was turned in their favor by that weird combination of restless characters who never know when they are well off—who do not like the sunshine because it is too warm, nor the shadow because it is too dark, nor the storm because it is too violent, nor the zephyr because it is too gentle—who have neither memory to tell them of the past, nor foresight to warn them of the future, and who go upon the theory that whatever is wrong!

The spirit of socialism gave office to the Democratic party and holds them now to their bargain. They must make war on vested rights. They must make it expensive to be frugal. They must bridle sagacity and curb enterprise. By some means or another they must contrive to render sloth as profitable as industry and to guarantee to extravagance all the rewards of thrift. They are under bond to do the wild and reckless things which the spirit of socialism, called by various names, imagines to tend in these leveling directions. You don't dare to do them [addressing the Democratic side]. You don't dare not to do them. You advance and you retreat. You circle this way and you circle that, a plague to those you menace and an exasperation to those that cry you on!

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the conservative instincts of the House against this legislation. There is no need for it. The Democratic party can not afford it. Do you gentlemen who compose the majority imagine that you can afford to earn a larger measure of public distrust and apprehension than you have already excited? During the few brief months of your existence as a government you have laid a paralysis upon the productive forces of the people.

At that very second of time when it appeared that the Democratic party was in a position to pass a law—when it was plain that it had secured not only the Presidency and the House, but the Senate as well—when from the legislative entanglements of the Western States there issued enough Democratic Senators to make a sure and sufficient Democratic majority in the Senate—at that very second of time the fires were drawn from under the furnaces, the mill wheels slowed down, capital went into retirement, and the working people of the country began to receive envelopes that contained, not a pay check, but a notice to quit.

It was your constant allegation when the Republican party was in control of public affairs, that its policy fostered "strikes."

Well, if it is any comfort to you, you are entitled to the admission that labor is not "striking" much now. There are few sounds of labor controversies now; and the few we hear are sounds, not of manly contention, but of abject despair. The workingman, with an American President and an American Congress hewing and slashing at the foundations of American industry, is not erect upon his feet demanding his views of his rights.

Instead he stands in pitiful destitution, calling out for work, work for any length of time and at any price for his labor. Do you gentlemen think that this is the time to send the country into another financial crisis? Do you think that this is a time

to rush the country forward to the point where the creditor classes will be demanding gold contracts and the debtor classes will be compelled to pay with gold and sell for whatever they can get? If you do, go ahead with your schemes to inflate the currency, but know the forfeit. There is just one thing that can happen to the Democratic party worse than what is going to happen anyhow. It must be defeated. It may be annihilated! [Applause.]

I return the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be entire agreement between gentlemen who support the pending amendment looking to the restoration of State banks of issue and gentlemen who favor a national system, that banks of issue are indispensable in any currency system adapted to modern business.

This is an important recognition of the fact universally recognized by all practical financiers, that modern business can not be successfully carried on with coin alone. Coin is indispensable as a measure and basis, but it is too cumbersome and too expensive for the gigantic exchanges of the civilized countries of to-day. Not only that, but its volume can not readily respond to the fluctuating demand for a circulating medium.

#### BANKS IN MODERN BUSINESS.

For that great volume of circulating medium needed to represent consumable wealth in the process of distribution and adaptation to meet the wants of men—a circulating medium which is practically redeemed in the equivalent of coin, when such consumable wealth reaches the consumer—there is no currency comparable with that issued by banking institutions. It is responsive to the demands of business as no other circulating medium can be, provided the banking system is so adjusted that it is for the benefit of the bank to increase its circulating notes when business desires to have them, and for its interest to redeem them when business does not want them. Such circulating notes are the most economical circulating medium known to man—far more economical and convenient than gold or silver; and in proportion as they are used a smaller amount of coin is required.

Credit notes issued by Government are more expensive than, and not so well adapted for use as a circulating medium as the circulating notes of banks. They can not be elastic, for the reason that they can not be issued in response to the demands of business, but according to the necessities of the Treasury. They represent debt—wealth consumed, not wealth existing. Their value depends upon coin redemption by the Government, and experience shows that such redemption too frequently fails at the critical time. They become the football of a class of politicians, who care little and know less about the principles of sound finance. While for the present we shall retain in our volume of circulating medium our Treasury notes, which are practically a forced loan, yet their presence compels the Government to do a banking business at great expense and much peril to our finances; for the reason that a government whose notes represent wealth consumed requires a much larger gold reserve than does a bank whose notes represent wealth in process of distribution.

In addition to these objections to the issue of Government credit notes in time of peace, there is the further objection that the nation saves nothing, even temporarily, by so doing. For on every dollar which it issues it must bear the expense of the interest on the necessary coin redemption fund, which is 1 per cent (one dollar gold redemption fund for every three dollars of notes issued being the minimum of safety for further issues), and must lose the 1 per cent tax on bank circulation, as well as the 1½ per cent municipal or State tax on bank shares which represent Government bonds that are non-taxable except when invested in the capital stock of national banks, making a total cost of 3½ per cent in addition to the cost of issue and maintenance, when the Government can borrow all the money it needs for less than 3 per cent.

Some idea of the extent to which banking facilities furnish substitutes for money in promoting exchanges, thus rendering less and less coin necessary in business, and of the magnitude of the saving to the people thereby, may be obtained when I mention the fact that, according to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ending October 1, 1892, the national banks of this country received \$120,000,000,000, four hundred millions per day, and disbursed the same, and that only 10 per cent of the amount, forty millions per day, was in money of all kinds, and only 1½ per cent, or \$3,000,000 per day, in coin.

In the same year these banks issued thirteen thousand millions in bills of exchange for the purpose of effecting exchanges between distant points, with the use of very little money.

It must be borne in mind that the chief part of the loanable funds even of banks of issue is not their circulating notes, or even their capital, but their deposits drawn from every class of

society, and consisting mainly of money that would have been idle if banks had not inspired confidence and drawn it from private hoards. Thus of the twenty-eight hundred millions of loanable funds of national banks, eighteen hundred millions are commercial deposits, and only two hundred millions circulating notes. Savings banks in 1892 received seventeen hundred and fifty-eight millions of deposits, and private and State banks ten hundred and sixty millions; making a total of forty-six hundred millions of deposits in all kinds of banks, available in large part as productive capital, and practically performing monetary services.

#### OBJECTION TO BANKS OF ISSUE.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is objected that banks ought not to be trusted with the control of any part of the volume of the currency.

Who is it that ought to determine what the volume of currency is that any people desire? Can I determine? Can you? Can a majority of this House determine beforehand the volume of money that is required at any stage of business? We can not. No body of men was ever wise enough to determine it. What does determine then, in any sound currency, the volume of currency required for business?

Who, in free coinage of gold or silver, determines what the volume is that shall be coined? It is the demand of business which determines it. When there is a demand for more coin the private owners of the coin take their bullion to the mints, where it is coined. Does the Government determine it? Not at all. The private holders of bullion determine it; and they are moved by demand.

All that Government has to do with coinage in such cases is to place upon private bullion a stamp certifying it has the weight and fineness required by law, which makes its value accord with the denomination indicated by the stamp.

So, under a paper currency, whether representative or credit, the demands of business should determine the amount which shall be issued; and when you have a system of banks of issue that responds to the demands of business (and it will do so whenever there is a profit in it), when there is more money needed, then more will be issued by the banks, because each bank can tell what the business demands are on it. They can make a profit upon it; and when business does not demand it, it will be returned to the banks and redeemed, because the holders do not need it. That is a sound currency system, elastic, flexible, and responsive to the demands of business.

All that Government has to do with it is to regulate and control its issue and so guard its redemption and convertibility as to inspire confidence that it is the equivalent of value of the standard coins which it professes to represent; and that control of Government is as indispensable as the control of coinage.

Hence I say that no Congress, and no body of men, however wise, can determine the volume of currency that may be needed at any time. The demands of business determine that, and it is only through banks of issue that you can have the demands of business determining the volume of currency, outside of coin. And the demands of business also determine the amount of coin that should be in circulation at any time.

It all resolves itself into that, and gentlemen who declaim about national bankers, or any bankers, controlling the volume of currency, forget that in issuing circulating notes by banks, as well as in coining money, it is the demands of business pressing upon the issuer of money, whether for coining, or upon the banks that may issue, that determine whether they will issue more. And if they can make a profit—in other words, if business demands it—they will issue it, and if business does not demand it they will draw it in, because all the time that it remains out and is not being loaned and in use it subjects the bank to expense.

I repeat, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that it is to me an encouraging indication that so large a proportion of the membership of this House seem to accept the view not only that capital invested in banking institutions is subserving an important public interest, but also that banks of issue are indispensable for the issue of that portion of the volume of our currency that gives elasticity to the circulating medium.

#### WHO SHALL CONTROL BANKS OF ISSUE.

The point at issue is whether banks of issue shall constitute one uniform system under national control, or, in whole or in part, forty-four different systems under the control of forty-four different States.

#### THE NATIONAL SYSTEM REQUIRES MODIFICATION.

Mr. Speaker, those who favor one uniform national system do not by any means desire to be understood as intimating that the present national system does not require important modifica-

tions in order to adapt it to existing conditions. For the conditions existing at the time of its establishment, it proved remarkably well adapted, especially after it was made a free system. Those who opposed it when it was established came afterwards to recognize its wonderful strength. Senator, now Minister Bayard, of Delaware, voiced the judgment of the ablest statesmen when he said in 1882 that it was the best banking system ever established.

In the progress of time, with the scarcity and high price of United States bonds, which have rendered the issue of circulating notes profitless, it has inevitably become inelastic, and requires not an abandonment of the national system, but such changes as will make it responsive to the business requirements. Gentlemen who complain that in certain parts of this country the unnecessarily large security required under the present requirements for the issue of circulating notes renders the system unadapted to their situation should unite in supporting such changes in our national system as will remove these difficulties, instead of proposing to discard that system and flee to forty-four State systems, which, from the nature of the case, can not furnish a safe, convertible, economical, and uniform currency.

I confess that I can not understand why gentlemen who complain that the unnecessarily large security required by the national system renders it impracticable to use it in many parts of the South should so generally be found opposing amendments reducing this security; and especially why those gentlemen are ready for a State system like that of Georgia, which allows an issue of circulating notes to the extent of three times the capital of a State bank, yet oppose allowing a national bank to issue notes to the extent of more than 90 per cent of the capital.

One thing is certain, and that is that it requires less security to make circulating notes safe and convertible under a national than under a State system, because in the national system every bank must receive the notes of every other national bank at par, while this would be impossible under forty-four different State systems.

#### CIRCULATING MEDIUM SHOULD BE NATIONAL.

Mr. Speaker, the control of the circulating medium, whether coin or paper, should rest in the nation. That the framers of the Constitution so intended has been amply demonstrated. That our experience with State banks of issue before the war and our experience with the present national system have demonstrated the superiority of the latter can not be successfully controverted.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] yesterday asked why the nation should regulate circulating notes of banks any more than the character of tallow dips. I was astonished at the parallel, for the gentleman is too well versed in finance not to appreciate the fact that the regulation of the circulating medium is a very different thing from the regulation of any article of merchandise. It is a very different thing even from the regulation of checks or bills of exchange, for they do not possess the circulating quality.

Whatever possesses the circulating quality, *i. e.*, is accepted at par by all persons within our nation in exchange for their products and passes from person to person by simple delivery—and it needs not the legal-tender quality to thus circulate—is an instrument of inter-state commerce which the nation alone can properly control; indeed, to all intents and purposes, is money.

A circulating medium confined to a State, if that were possible, would be a curse and not a blessing. It would be far worse than the restriction of the navigation of vessels to the waters of the State of origin or the stoppage of through trains at the State border and the transfer of freight and passengers to cars running only in a single State. You can not have a local interstate commerce nor a good currency that shall be simply local. Gentlemen who have invoked a State currency that can not cross the border, ignore the fact that trade is interstate, and a currency which is subjected to discount whenever it leaves the point of issue subjects the people of the State which uses such a currency to pay just as much more for everything they buy as their currency has depreciated.

Convenience and economy demand that currency shall be uniform, and be subject to the same regulations and have the same value in Maine as in Georgia, in Texas as in New York; and it is utterly impossible to have circulating notes issued by forty-four different States uniform in value all over the Union, as the national-bank currency is.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] asked yesterday if the people of a State are not as well qualified to regulate banks of issue as the General Government is to regulate it for them? That is not the question at all. The people act through the General Government just the same as they do through the States. It is a question of in what direction the people shall act. In the

matter of currency, just as in the matter of interstate commerce, it is the duty of the people to act through the nation, and not as in local matters to act through the State.

The people of Georgia are just as ably and faithfully represented upon this floor as they are in the Legislature of Georgia; only they are dealing here with national matters, and in the Legislature they are dealing with local matters. Currency is a matter of national concern—not simply local; and no State Legislatures have any more to do with a circulating medium than they do with the maintenance of an army, or the establishment of a navy, or the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce.

SAFETY AND CONVERTIBILITY.

Mr. Speaker, no bank notes, no paper money, is good which is not believed by the people to be both safe and convertible—sure to be paid finally, and certainly exchangeable for coin, and in all markets in all parts of the country for products at an equivalent of coin. And nothing can give that assurance but actual provision by the issuing bank or other authority for such redemption and conversion.

We have tried the national-bank notes for thirty years; have issued fifteen hundred and twenty-one millions of them; they have everywhere been received at par, and no holder has lost a dollar by them. We tried the State system for more than thirty years previously to the inauguration of the national system, and millions upon millions were lost to the people through their issues of notes.

There was not a year that the notes of nearly every State bank were not at a discount of from  $\frac{1}{4}$  to 20 per cent in the commercial centers outside of the State where issued. The losses by discounts and brokerages, as well as by failures, were enormous.

Business was seriously interfered with by the fact that the circulating medium outside of coin was so poor.

The expense of the unsatisfactory State system was enormous. In bills of exchange alone it is stated that under the national system the saving is one hundred and twenty millions per annum, arising from the fact that the banks now are under one uniform system, in close correspondence, and under the supervision of one head. Counterfeiting was encouraged under the State system by multiplicity of issues.

But it is said that the States will be wiser now, after their sad experience in the past. Does the State banking law enacted by the last Georgia Legislature, the provisions of which have just been stated, justify this assumption? The difficulty, however, is not in want of wisdom; it lies inherently in a policy which proposes heterogeneous and diverse legislation by Legislatures that have not had the opportunity to practically investigate the subject, or that find their judgment overborne by the clamor of communities who look upon themselves as debtors and other States as creditors.

It is certain that Congress, acting for the whole nation, with the eyes of the business men of the whole country on them, will frame one banking law more wisely than some of the Legislatures of the forty-four States.

THE CENTRALIZATION CHARGE.

It is charged that the national banking system is the cause of the tendency of capital and currency to center in great commercial centers; and to substantiate this charge, a table of loanable funds in the national banks, savings banks, etc., on the 30th of June, 1893, from the last report of the Comptroller of the Currency, has been frequently referred to:

Table showing, by States and Territories, the population of each on June 1, 1893, and the aggregate capital, surplus, undivided profits, and individual deposits of national and State banks, loan and trust companies, savings and private banks in the United States on or about June 30, 1893; the average of these per capita of population, and the per capita averages of such resources in each class of banks and in all banks.

States and Territories.	Population June 1, 1893.	All banks.		National banks.	State banks.	Loan and trust companies.	Savings banks.	Private banks.
		Capital, etc.	Average per capita.	Average per capita.	Average per capita.	Average per capita.	Average per capita.	Average per capita.
Maine.....	664,000	\$89,707,745	\$135.10	\$43.14	.....	\$6.48	\$85.48	.....
New Hampshire.....	385,000	102,646,545	266.60	43.32	.....	14.26	209.02	.....
Vermont.....	333,000	47,883,258	143.79	55.08	.....	.....	88.71	.....
Massachusetts.....	2,462,000	803,901,450	326.52	122.40	.....	35.31	168.81	.....
Rhode Island.....	367,000	142,298,067	387.73	127.29	.....	59.85	201.11	.....
Connecticut.....	791,000	218,071,003	275.69	82.57	86.48	9.91	175.17	.....
New York.....	6,311,000	1,839,969,879	291.55	83.82	41.15	52.13	113.79	.....
New Jersey.....	1,557,000	136,829,792	87.88	43.05	6.56	7.80	25.47	\$0.66
Pennsylvania.....	5,000,000	635,096,309	113.40	61.06	10.57	25.05	13.36	1.88
Delaware.....	175,000	15,630,358	88.31	44.17	12.53	8.31	24.30	.....
Maryland.....	1,099,000	110,897,805	103.27	53.18	3.34	2.09	44.22	.44
District of Columbia.....	269,000	22,374,276	83.14	51.66	.....	30.95	.53	.....
Virginia.....	1,695,000	44,329,571	26.13	12.76	13.32	.....	.30	.05
West Virginia.....	800,000	22,621,943	28.28	12.30	15.40	.28	.30	.....
North Carolina.....	1,668,000	18,157,178	7.89	4.25	2.84	.....	.22	.58
South Carolina.....	1,184,000	19,010,017	16.08	6.99	1.79	.....	7.28	.....
Georgia.....	1,917,000	38,014,463	19.83	5.45	12.41	.....	1.65	.32
Florida.....	437,000	8,634,906	19.74	15.11	2.89	.....	1.44	.30
Alabama.....	1,582,000	14,144,814	8.94	6.66	1.04	.....	.62	.62
Mississippi.....	1,332,000	12,162,893	9.13	2.36	6.77	.....	.....	.....
Louisiana.....	1,100,000	38,032,893	32.78	20.09	10.73	.....	1.96	.....
Texas.....	2,395,000	73,245,281	30.70	27.27	.51	.....	.37	2.55
Arkansas.....	1,222,000	8,357,230	6.83	2.73	3.76	.....	.34	.....
Kentucky.....	1,905,000	78,873,841	41.40	18.79	22.61	.....	.....	.....
Tennessee.....	1,820,000	37,523,635	20.62	13.91	5.17	.....	1.54	.....
Missouri.....	2,845,000	176,600,771	62.07	22.29	36.06	1.18	.....	2.54
Ohio.....	3,804,000	246,557,236	64.51	40.35	10.50	.....	10.23	3.73
Indiana.....	2,250,000	78,954,829	35.09	23.25	5.95	.....	2.00	3.89
Illinois.....	4,119,000	285,184,145	69.23	41.82	6.89	3.90	12.83	3.79
Michigan.....	2,237,000	130,848,877	58.50	24.90	31.95	.....	.10	1.65
Wisconsin.....	1,825,000	97,715,823	53.51	23.24	26.00	.....	.....	4.17
Iowa.....	1,982,000	125,873,045	62.49	23.54	12.88	1.77	17.25	7.04
Minnesota.....	1,488,000	110,295,433	73.62	35.92	23.55	4.62	7.57	1.96
Kansas.....	1,516,000	52,497,761	34.63	22.31	12.32	.....	.....	.....
Nebraska.....	1,305,000	81,135,798	62.17	30.58	31.59	.....	.....	.....
Nevada.....	45,000	1,074,641	23.86	19.89	.....	.....	.....	3.47
Oregon.....	373,000	17,962,442	48.15	37.93	2.77	.....	6.81	.64
Colorado.....	495,000	89,445,851	79.69	61.72	10.32	.....	5.84	1.51
Utah.....	230,000	14,040,602	61.04	28.93	5.82	.....	26.08	.21
Idaho.....	108,000	3,248,828	31.01	26.04	2.70	.....	.....	2.27
Montana.....	179,000	23,577,740	131.72	119.37	5.25	.....	4.87	3.23
Wyoming.....	77,000	4,698,619	59.72	44.71	3.38	.....	.....	11.63
New Mexico.....	165,000	3,386,024	20.52	15.57	2.63	.....	1.70	.63
North Dakota.....	253,000	10,885,193	43.02	39.27	12.75	.....	.....	.....
South Dakota.....	430,000	13,499,311	31.59	17.43	13.96	.....	.....	.....
Washington.....	485,000	30,715,357	63.33	38.12	24.43	.....	.....	.78
Arizona.....	64,000	1,514,601	23.55	16.59	11.76	.....	.....	.....
California.....	1,317,000	289,584,673	219.58	16.73	85.49	.....	115.37	2.29
Oklahoma Territory.....	130,000	1,523,792	11.72	7.67	4.05	.....	.....	.....
Indian Territory.....	195,000	891,822	4.57	4.57	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total United States.....	67,021,000	6,412,939,954	95.68	38.64	15.83	9.73	29.93	1.55

Gentlemen from the South have called attention to the fact that the loanable funds of national banks in Southern States are less per capita than in the North, and have argued that this

proves that the national system is antagonistic to their interests, and that a State system would remedy the trouble. The answer to this assumption is to be found in the fact that

this table shows as much discrepancy between loanable funds in savings banks as in national banks. In other words, the discrepancy is not caused by the national system, but it is due to other causes. The causes are not difficult to find when it is borne in mind that thirty years ago the war of the rebellion freed their slaves, whom they had scheduled before the war as property, and swept away their wealth; and when it is remembered that slavery had led the South to resolutely refuse to diversify her industries. But in the decade between 1880 and 1890 manufactures have been introduced, and no part of our Union has made greater progress in wealth.

It appears by the census bulletin of wealth that while New England and the Middle States, which receive so much animadversion in certain quarters, increased 21 per cent in wealth between 1880 and 1890, the South Atlantic States increased 40 per cent. This result does not bear out the criticism of some of our Southern friends that there is something in our financial policy that favors New England. Undoubtedly the fact is that notwithstanding the South is increasing its wealth so rapidly, it finds more profitable employment in other investments than in banking—which is due partly to her immense undeveloped resources which lay dormant in slavery, and partly to the fact that the habits of the people do not favor the making of deposits in banks, upon which depends whether a banking institution will pay. The large amount of loanable funds reported in such Western agricultural States as Minnesota, California, Montana, and Washington disprove the allegation that national banks are unsuited to such States and favor the East.

Capital always goes where there is a demand for it and it can be profitably used. Money always goes where there is merchandise that is wanted to exchange for it, or where it can be loaned with satisfactory security. However much money may be issued, whether by Government or banks, no one can obtain it without paying an equivalent.

REAL ESTATE LOANS.

This reminds me, Mr. Speaker, that one complaint against the national-bank system is that the law discourages loans on real estate security. The law, however, only recognizes a principle of sound banking, as applicable to State as national banks. It must be borne in mind that commercial banks receive mainly commercial deposits, i. e., the balances deposited by business men.

These deposits average only four and a half days. It is on these deposits that banks of discount make the great part of their loans. By making loans of from thirty days to four months only, it has been found that 75 per cent of the deposits—85 per cent, outside of the reserve cities—can be safely loaned, provided the loans are promptly paid. It has been found, also, that in order to secure prompt payment of loans it is necessary to confine them to commercial paper with convertible security. Now, everybody knows that real-estate loans are not readily convertible, and are usually for a longer time than commercial banks can safely discount paper. For this reason real estate loans properly belong to savings banks, where the deposits are more permanent and in the nature of investments. What the South needs is not State banks of issue, but savings banks, and a greater diversification of her industries.

"HOME" INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. Speaker, among the objections which have been made to a national system of banks of issue, none is more puerile than that which ascribes to them special friendliness to great commercial centres and indifference to remote communities—especially in the South.

I know of no reason why five, ten, or fifty gentlemen residing at any point in the South should be any different men when organized into a national banking association than into a State bank. The stockholders and managers in national banks reside in the locality where the bank is established. They are not strangers. And the national bank is as much a "home institution" as a State bank, and as devoted to home interests in one case as the other.

The charge that the national banks precipitated the panic of last year by hoarding money to increase the rate of interest is so absurd, that it hardly seems possible to suppose that anyone can believe it. It is disproved by the bank returns, which show that the bank reserves during the panic were millions upon millions less than before the panic. It is disproved by the fact that the chief dependence of a bank for profits is its deposits; and it is absurd to suppose that any bank would knowingly do anything to produce distrust when this would result in a withdrawal of the deposits on which its profits depend. As a matter of fact the panic would have been much more serious and prolonged if it had not been for the strength of our national banking system.

THE MONOPOLY OBJECTION.

Objection has been made to the national banking system that it is a monopoly. I was surprised at that objection. I should

like to know what constitutes it a monopoly. Any five citizens of the United States having the necessary capital—for capital is required to build a mill, or to run a farm, or to do any kind of business—any five citizens of the United States having the necessary capital may associate themselves together as a national banking association, may go into banking and issue circulating notes under the provisions of the law. How do you find any monopoly in that?

Where is the monopoly? Why, it is one of the freest institutions in this land. Mention any other institution of so prominent a character which is as free as the national banking system. And what about the State banking system? Do you propose to have a free State banking system? Not at all. In order to obtain authority to establish a State bank, even if this tax should be repealed, you must do what under existing State laws? You must go to a State Legislature to accomplish your purpose and lobby your bill through, and yet that is called the system "of the people." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine has one minute remaining.

Mr. DINGLEY. There are many other points that I desire to present, but I have not the time. I yield the remaining minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I telegraphed to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to ascertain the amount of tax which had been imposed on the temporary issues of institutions other than national banks during the crisis of 1893, and I received this answer by telegraph:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, June 5, 1894.

To Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER,

House of Representatives:

No tax imposed; no effort made to collect any.

JAS. S. MILLER, Commissioner.

So it seems that since this bill was reported the Department has decided not to impose any tax upon the issues of 1893, to which the pending bill applies. There is, therefore, no necessity for the passage of the bill. It only remains for the House to dispose of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX].

The SPEAKER. The time for debate is exhausted. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That all acts and parts of acts imposing a tax on notes of State banks or State banking associations, either when used for circulation and paid out, or when used for circulation or paid out, shall be, and the same are hereby, repealed, as to all notes of such State banks or State banking associations as shall be authorized to issue notes by the laws of the State in which they are respectively situated.

The SPEAKER. The question will first be taken on the amendment just read, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COX] as an amendment to the amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. Mr. COX and Mr. SPRINGER were appointed to act as tellers during the call of yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 102, nays 172, not voting 79; as follows:

YEAS—102.

- |                   |                  |                   |                 |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Abbott,           | Cummings,        | Livingston,       | Russell, Ga.    |
| Alexander,        | Davey,           | Maddox,           | Sayers,         |
| Arnold,           | De Armond,       | Maguire,          | Shell,          |
| Bailey,           | Denson,          | Mallory,          | Snodgrass,      |
| Bankhead,         | Dinsmore,        | Marshall,         | Stallings,      |
| Bell, Tex.        | Edmunds,         | McCulloch,        | Stockdale,      |
| Black, Ga.        | Ellis, Ky.       | McDearmon,        | Stone, Ky.      |
| Bland,            | English, Cal.    | McLaurin,         | Strait,         |
| Boatner,          | Enloe,           | McMillin,         | Swanson,        |
| Bower N. C.       | Epes,            | McRae,            | Talbert, S. C.  |
| Branch,           | Fithian,         | Meredith,         | Tate,           |
| Breckinridge, Ky. | Fyan,            | Money,            | Terry,          |
| Bunn,             | Geary,           | Montgomery,       | Tracey,         |
| Cabaniss,         | Gorman,          | Morgan,           | Tucker,         |
| Campbell,         | Grady,           | Moses,            | Turner, Ga.     |
| Catchings,        | Hall, Mo.        | Neill,            | Turner, Va.     |
| Clark, Mo.        | Harter,          | Oates,            | Turpin,         |
| Cobb, Ala.        | Heard,           | Ogden,            | Washington,     |
| Cockrell,         | Henderson, N. C. | O'Neill, Mo.      | Wheeler, Ala.   |
| Cooper, Fla.      | Hutcheson,       | Paschal,          | Williams, Miss. |
| Cooper, Ind.      | Izlar,           | Patterson,        | Wilson, W. Va.  |
| Cooper, Tex.      | Jones,           | Paynter,          | Wise,           |
| Cox,              | Kyle,            | Pendleton, Tex.   | Woodard,        |
| Crain,            | Latimer,         | Price,            | The Speaker.    |
| Crawford,         | Lawson,          | Richardson, Tenn. |                 |
| Culberson,        | Lester,          | Robbins,          |                 |

NAYS—172.

- |              |              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Adams, Pa.   | Bingham,     | Cadmus,      | Coombs,       |
| Aldrich,     | Blair,       | Cannon, Cal. | Cooper, Wis.  |
| Apsley,      | Bowers, Cal. | Cannon, Ill. | Cornish,      |
| Babcock,     | Bretz,       | Capehart,    | Cousins,      |
| Baker, Kans. | Brickner,    | Causey,      | Cover,        |
| Baker, N. H. | Broderick,   | Chickering,  | Curtis, Kans. |
| Baldwin,     | Brookshire,  | Clancy,      | Dalzell,      |
| Bartholdt,   | Brosius,     | Cobb, Mo.    | Daniels,      |
| Barwig,      | Brown,       | Cockran,     | Davis,        |
| Belden,      | Bryan,       | Coffeen,     | Dingley,      |
| Bell, Colo.  | Bynum,       | Conn,        | Dolliver,     |

Doolittle,	Hitt,	McKaig,	Sibley,
Draper,	Holman,	McKeighan,	Sickles,
Dunn,	Hooker, N. Y.	McNagy,	Sipe,
Dunphy,	Hopkins, Pa.	Meklejohn,	Smith,
Durborow,	Houk,	Mercer,	Sorg,
Ellis, Oregon	Hudson,	Murray,	Sperry,
Erdman,	Hulick,	Northway,	Springer,
Everett,	Hull,	O'Neil, Mass.	Stephenson,
Fielder,	Hunter,	Payne,	Stevens,
Forman,	Ikirt,	Pearson,	Stone, C. W.
Funston,	Johnson, Ind.	Pence,	Stone, W. A.
Geissenhainer,	Johnson, N. Dak.	Pendleton, W. Va.	Sweet,
Gillet, N. Y.	Kem,	Perkins,	Talbot, Md.
Goldzier,	Kiefer,	Phillips,	Tarsney,
Griffin,	Lacey,	Pickler,	Tawney,
Grout,	Lane,	Piggott,	Taylor, Ind.
Grow,	Lapham,	Post,	Taylor, Tenn.
Hager,	Layton,	Powers,	Thomas,
Hainer,	Linton,	Quigg,	Updegraff,
Haines,	Loudenslager,	Ray,	Van Voorhis, Ohio
Hall, Minn.	Lucas,	Rayner,	Walker,
Hammond,	Lynch,	Reed,	Wanger,
Hare,	Magner,	Reilly,	Warner,
Harmer,	Mahon,	Reyburn,	Waugh,
Harris,	Marsh,	Richards, Ohio	Weadock,
Hartman,	Martin, Ind.	Richardson, Mich	Wheeler, Ill.
Haugen,	Marvin, N. Y.	Ritche,	Williams, Ill.
Hayes,	McCall,	Robinson, Pa.	Wilson, Ohio
Hendrix,	McCleary, Minn.	Rusk,	Wilson, Wash.
Hepburn,	McDannold,	Ryan,	Wolverton,
Hermann,	McEtrick,	Settle,	Woomer,
Hicks,	McGann,	Shaw,	Wright, Mass.

## NOT VOTING—79.

Adams, Ky.	Cogswell,	Hooker, Miss.	Randall,
Aitken,	Curtis, N. Y.	Hopkins, Ill.	Robertson, La.
Alderson,	De Forest,	Johnson, Ohio	Russell, Conn.
Allen,	Dockery,	Kilgore,	Schermerhorn,
Avery,	Donovan,	Kribbs,	Scranton,
Barnes,	English, N. J.	Lefever,	Sherman,
Bartlett,	Fletcher,	Lisle,	Simpson,
Beltzhoover,	Funk,	Lockwood,	Somers,
Berry,	Gardner,	Loud,	Storer,
Black, Ill.	Gear,	McAleer,	Straus,
Boen,	Gillet, Mass.	McCreary, Ky.	Strong,
Bontelle,	Goodnight,	McDowell,	Tyler,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Graham,	Meyer,	Van Voorhis, N. Y.
Bundy,	Graham,	Milliken,	Wadsworth,
Burnes,	Grosvenor,	Moon,	Wells,
Burrows,	Hatch,	Morse,	Wever,
Caminetti,	Heiner,	Mutchler,	White,
Caruth,	Henderson, Ill.	Newlands,	Whiting,
Childs,	Henderson, Iowa	Outhwaite,	Wright, Pa.
Clarke, Ala.	Hines,	Page,	

So the amendment was rejected.

The roll call having been concluded, the Speaker directed his name to be called, and voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CLANCY. My colleague, Mr. GRAHAM, is absent on account of sickness, and I ask that he be excused. If here, he would vote in the negative.

Mr. GEAR. I have voted on this question for the purpose of making a quorum, but I withdraw my vote, being paired with the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. ALLEN. If he were here, I should vote "no."

Mr. LYNCH. My colleagues from Wisconsin, Mr. WELLS, Mr. BARNES, and Mr. SOMERS, are all absent and paired. If present, they would all vote "no" on this question.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BOEN] is absent on account of sickness. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas. I have voted in the affirmative on this question. Finding, however, that I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Alabama. I am paired on this question with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HENDERSON]. But for that fact I should vote in the affirmative.

Mr. BARWIG. My colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WELLS] is paired. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. My colleague, Mr. GARDNER, is absent on account of sickness; and I ask that he be excused. If here, he would vote "no."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. My colleague, Mr. ALLEN, is at home with his wife, who is very ill. He is paired with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. My colleague, if present, would vote "aye."

Mr. MONTGOMERY. My colleague, Mr. GOODNIGHT, who is absent on account of sickness, is paired with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HENDERSON. My colleague, if present, would vote in the affirmative.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BELTZHOOVER with Mr. WEVER.  
 Mr. MUTCHLER with Mr. WADSWORTH.  
 Mr. LOCKWOOD with Mr. AITKEN.  
 Mr. SCHERMERHORN with Mr. MILLIKEN.  
 Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas with Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois.  
 Mr. CARUTH with Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut.

Mr. HATCH with Mr. CURTIS of New York.  
 Mr. CAMINETTI with Mr. SHERMAN.  
 Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.  
 Mr. GRESHAM with Mr. VAN VOORHIS of New York.  
 Mr. WHITING with Mr. CHILDS.  
 Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. FLETCHER.  
 Mr. CLARKE of Alabama with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.  
 Mr. PAGE with Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. SOMERS with Mr. STRONG.  
 Mr. BURNES with Mr. BOUTELLE.  
 Mr. MCALEER with Mr. WHITE.  
 Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. RANDALL.

For this day:

Mr. BLACK of Illinois with Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. ENGLISH of New Jersey with Mr. BUNDY.  
 Mr. DOCKERY with Mr. MORSE.  
 Mr. BERRY with Mr. AVERY.

On this question:

Mr. KRIBBS with Mr. WELLS.  
 Mr. TYLER with Mr. BARNES.  
 Mr. ALDERSON with Mr. DONOVAN.  
 Mr. LISLE with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. GEAR. Mr. ALLEN if present would vote for the Cox amendment, Mr. GEAR against it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana with Mr. LOUD. Mr. ROBERTSON if present would vote for the Cox amendment, Mr. LOUD against it.

Mr. MEYER with Mr. STORER. Mr. MEYER would vote for the Cox amendment, Mr. STORER against it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio with Mr. KILGORE on both propositions on repeal of the tax on banks.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi with Mr. COGSWELL. Mr. HOOKER if present would vote for the Cox amendment and against the Springer bill; Mr. COGSWELL would vote against the Cox amendment and for the bill.

Mr. BURROWS with Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. BURROWS would vote against the amendments and the bill, and Mr. MCCREARY would vote in favor of repealing the tax of 10 per cent on the issue of State banks.

The result of the vote was announced, as above stated.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment reported by the committee, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the operations of sections 3412 and 3413 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and sections 19, 20, and 21 of the act to amend existing customs and internal revenue laws, and for other purposes, approved February 8, 1875, and all other sections of said Revised Statutes, and all acts and parts of acts imposing a tax of 10 per cent on the amount of certain notes when used for circulation and paid out, be, and are hereby, suspended as to any such notes which were originally issued between August 1, 1893, and October 15, 1893; and no such tax shall be collected on the amount of any such notes: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall suspend the operation of such notes as to the tax on the amount of any such notes paid out and used for circulation after January 1, 1894."

The SPEAKER. This is the amendment reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. COX. I move to recommit the bill—

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order now. It is only in order when we have reached the stage of the passage of the bill. The pending question is on the amendment.

Mr. REED. I would like to have unanimous consent to find out what all of this is about. It is about the only thing we have not discussed.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is merely a change in the phraseology of the original bill, and makes it more explicit. It does not differ materially from the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just read.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the engrossment and third reading of the original bill.

The question was taken; and the House refused to order the engrossment and third reading of the bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The bill is lost.

## INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to, Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the first bill on the Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6913) making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is quite voluminous, and I ask unanimous consent that the first formal reading be dispensed with.

Mr. RAY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I demand that there be order on the floor; and I want to serve notice now that since the reading of this bill has been demanded we will have order continuously until it is finished.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentlemen who called for the reading of this bill (as I understand they want some time to debate it, and as it will take all this afternoon, probably until 5 o'clock, to read the bill), why not waive the reading and take until to-morrow morning to examine it and let the House adjourn now?

Mr. RAY. With that understanding I will withdraw my objection to dispensing with the reading of the bill. I want time to examine it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope there will be no objection to pursuing that course.

Mr. PICKLER. What is it?

Mr. HOLMAN. That the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the House now adjourn.

Mr. RAY. I will withdraw the demand for the reading on that condition. There are several gentlemen who would like to look through the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman withdraws the demand for the first reading of the bill, and I ask now unanimous consent that the first reading be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6913, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that for a moment. I understand that the object in dispensing with the reading of the bill was to allow general debate to go on. Why not allow it this afternoon?

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, if any gentleman is prepared to speak this afternoon I shall not object.

Mr. GROW. I would like to say to my friend from Indiana that I think I am perhaps the only member of this House who has not had an opportunity to express his views on the tariff. As that is a new question, and as it will not interfere with the Indians, I would just as soon take this afternoon as any other time. My friend will remember that when Thaddeus Stevens was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, he had an appropriation bill that he was anxious to pass—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist upon the motion?

Mr. HOLMAN. I withdraw the motion, so that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can make his remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not been recognized to make any remarks.

Mr. HOLMAN. I withdraw the motion for the present, and ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be permitted to make his speech this afternoon.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I must object to that unless we consider the appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 82, noes 52.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. COOPER of Indiana as tellers at the desk.

Mr. MADDOX. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDOX. Suppose the House fails to adjourn now, under the objection of the gentleman from New York, will not the Indian appropriation bill have to be read in full?

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. No, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I will state to the gentleman that if the House does not adjourn, the reading will be called for.

The SPEAKER. The bill can be read in half an hour. There is no trouble about that. As many as favor the motion that the House do now adjourn, will when their names are called, say "aye;" those opposed, "no;" and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 98, answered "present" 0, not voting 150; as follows:

YEAS—104.

- |                   |                  |                   |                   |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Abbott,           | Everett,         | Lane,             | Ryan,             |
| Adams, Pa.        | Forman,          | Linton,           | Shell,            |
| Aldrich,          | Fyan,            | Loudenslager,     | Sipe,             |
| Alexander,        | Geary,           | Lucas,            | Snodgrass,        |
| Apsley,           | Gillet, N. Y.    | Maddox,           | Sorg,             |
| Babcock,          | Gorman,          | Mahon,            | Sperry,           |
| Baker, N. H.      | Grow,            | Marvin, N. Y.     | Stephenson,       |
| Baldwin,          | Hager,           | McCall,           | Stockdale,        |
| Bartholdt,        | Hainer,          | McDannold,        | Straus,           |
| Bingham,          | Hall, Minn.      | McDearmon,        | Tawney,           |
| Boatner,          | Harmer,          | McGann,           | Taylor, Tenn.     |
| Bowers, Cal.      | Hartman,         | McLaurin,         | Thomas,           |
| Breckinridge, Ky. | Haugen,          | McMillin,         | Turner, Ga.       |
| Brosius,          | Hepburn,         | Morgan,           | Updegraff,        |
| Campbell,         | Hermann,         | Murray,           | Van Voorhis, Ohio |
| Cannon, Cal.      | Hicks,           | Northway,         | Walker,           |
| Cobb, Ala.        | Holman,          | Payne,            | Wanger,           |
| Coffeen,          | Hooker, N. Y.    | Paynter,          | Washington,       |
| Cooper, Tex.      | Hopkins, Pa.     | Pendleton, W. Va. | Weadock,          |
| Cooper, Wis.      | Hulick,          | Perkins,          | Wheeler, Ill.     |
| Covert,           | Hull,            | Pickler,          | Williams, Miss.   |
| Curtis, Kans.     | Hunter,          | Post,             | Wilson, Ohio      |
| Daniels,          | Izlar,           | Ray,              | Wilson, Wash.     |
| Doollittle,       | Johnson, N. Dak. | Reilly,           | Wilson, W. Va.    |
| Draper,           | Kiefer,          | Richardson, Tenn. | Wise,             |
| Ellis, Oregon     | Lacey,           | Robinson, Pa.     | Woomer.           |

NAYS—98.

- |              |                  |                 |                |
|--------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Arnold,      | Crain,           | Kyle,           | Richards, Ohio |
| Bailey,      | Crawford,        | Lawson,         | Sayers,        |
| Baker, Kans. | Culbertson,      | Lester,         | Sibley,        |
| Bankhead,    | Davis,           | Livingston,     | Smith,         |
| Barwig,      | De Armond,       | Lynch,          | Springer,      |
| Bel, Tex.    | Denson,          | Magner,         | Stevens,       |
| Black, Ga.   | Donovan,         | Maguire,        | Stone, C. W.   |
| Bower, N. C. | Dunn,            | Marshall,       | Stone, W. A.   |
| Bretz,       | Edmunds,         | Martin, Ind.    | Stone, Ky.     |
| Brickner,    | Ellis, Ky.       | McCulloch,      | Traut,         |
| Brookshire,  | English, Cal.    | McEtrick,       | Talbert, S. C. |
| Bunn,        | Epes,            | McKalg,         | Talbot, Md.    |
| Bynum,       | Erdman,          | McNagny,        | Tarsney,       |
| Cabaniss,    | Fielder,         | McRae,          | Tate,          |
| Capehart,    | Fithian,         | Montgomery,     | Taylor, Ind.   |
| Catchings,   | Goldzier,        | Moses,          | Terry,         |
| Chickering,  | Haines,          | Neill,          | Tucker,        |
| Clancy,      | Hall, Mo.        | Oates,          | Turner, Va.    |
| Clark, Mo.   | Heard,           | O'Neil, Mass.   | Warner,        |
| Cobb, Mo.    | Henderson, N. C. | O'Neill, Mo.    | Wheeler, Ala.  |
| Cockrell,    | Hudson,          | Paschal,        | Williams, Ill. |
| Cooper, Fla. | Hutcheson,       | Patterson,      | Woodard,       |
| Cooper, Ind. | Ikirt,           | Pearson,        | Wright, Mass.  |
| Cousins,     | Jones,           | Pendleton, Tex. |                |
| Cox,         | Kem,             | Reyburn,        |                |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—0.

NOT VOTING—150.

- |                    |                 |                 |                    |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Adams, Ky.         | Dalzell,        | Hopkins, Ill.   | Quigg,             |
| Aitken,            | Davey,          | Houk,           | Randall,           |
| Alderson,          | De Forest,      | Johnson, Ind.   | Rayner,            |
| Allen,             | Dingley,        | Johnson, Ohio   | Reed,              |
| Avery,             | Dinsmore,       | Kilgore,        | Richardson, Mich.  |
| Barnes,            | Dockery,        | Kribbs,         | Ritchie,           |
| Bartlett,          | Dolliver,       | Lapham,         | Robbins,           |
| Belden,            | Dunphy,         | Latimer,        | Robertson, La.     |
| Bell, Colo.        | Durborow,       | Layton,         | Rusk,              |
| Beitzhoever,       | English, N. J.  | Lefever,        | Russell, Conn.     |
| Berry,             | Enloe,          | Lisle,          | Russell, Ga.       |
| Black, Ill.        | Fletcher,       | Lockwood,       | Schermerhorn,      |
| Blair,             | Funk,           | Loud,           | Scranton,          |
| Bland,             | Funston,        | Mallory,        | Settle,            |
| Boen,              | Gardner,        | Marsh,          | Shaw,              |
| Boutelle,          | Gear,           | McAleer,        | Sherman,           |
| Branch,            | Geissenhainer,  | McCleary, Minn. | Sickles,           |
| Breckinridge, Ark. | Gillett, Mass.  | McCreary, Ky.   | Simpson,           |
| Broderick,         | Goodnight,      | McDowell,       | Somers,            |
| Brown,             | Grady,          | McKeighan,      | Stallings,         |
| Bryan,             | Graham,         | Melkjohn,       | Storer,            |
| Bundy,             | Gresham,        | Mercer,         | Strong,            |
| Burnes,            | Griffin,        | Meredith,       | Swanson,           |
| Burrows,           | Grosvenor,      | Meyer,          | Sweet,             |
| Cadmus,            | Grout,          | Milliken,       | Tracey,            |
| Caminetti,         | Hammond,        | Money,          | Turpin,            |
| Cannon, Ill.       | Hare,           | Moon,           | Tyler,             |
| Caruth,            | Harris,         | Morse,          | Van Voorhis, N. Y. |
| Causey,            | Harter,         | Mutchler,       | Wadsworth,         |
| Childs,            | Hatch,          | Newlands,       | Waugh,             |
| Clarke, Ala.       | Hayes,          | Ogden,          | Wells,             |
| Cockran,           | Heiner,         | Outhwaite,      | Wever,             |
| Cogswell,          | Henderson, Ill. | Page,           | White,             |
| Conn,              | Henderson, Iowa | Pence,          | Whiting,           |
| Coombs,            | Hendrix,        | Phillips,       | Wolverton,         |
| Cornish,           | Hines,          | Pigott,         | Wright, Pa.        |
| Cummings,          | Hitt,           | Powers,         |                    |
| Curtis, N. Y.      | Hooker, Miss.   | Price,          |                    |

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:  
Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky with Mr. SCRANTON, for the rest of this day.

The SPEAKER. Before announcing the result, the Chair will submit a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 82) to authorize the Missouri River Power

Company, of Montana, to construct a dam across the Missouri River; when the Speaker signed the same.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. MCCREARY of Kentucky, for four days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. WRIGHT of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BOUTELLE, an extension of his leave of absence for ten days.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1635) for the relief of George T. Larkin, and the same was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a resolution of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7360) to prevent the product of convict labor from being furnished to or for the use of any Department of the Government, and to prevent the product of convict labor from being used upon public buildings or other public work—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DEARMOND: A bill (H. R. 7361) to provide for the assessment, by jury, of the punishment of persons found guilty of felony in courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOATNER: A bill (H. R. 7362) to prohibit courts of the United States from enforcing the specific performance of contracts for personal service, by writs of injunction or other legal process—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7363) to limit the power of judges of the courts of the United States to punish for contempts of court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPERRY: A resolution relating to the accounts of the Sergeant-at-Arms—to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. CAPEHART: A bill (H. R. 7364) granting a pension to Cynthia Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITHIAN: A bill (H. R. 7365) to remove the charge of desertion against Perry Ambercrombie and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 7366) to perfect the military record of Henry R. Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7367) making Carrabelle, Fla., a support of entry and delivery—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PASCHAL: A bill (H. R. 7368) for the relief of William Davenport, William A. Wallace, Theobald Monier, W. J. Locke, and the legal representatives of James R. Sweet, J. B. Lecoste, and John Green, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7369) to pension Edward H. Timony, of Texas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7370) to pension Elise Marsteller, of Texas—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 7371) for the relief of the estate of Hugh L. Gallaher, deceased, late of Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 7372) for the relief of John Rick, of Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petition of citizens of Lancaster, Pa., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of citizens of Cherokee County, N. C., in behalf of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, asking for the passage of resolution 154, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold certain funds claimed by the Cherokee Nation, and distribute the same pro rata between the two tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of 41 citizens of East Mauch Chunk, 84 citizens of Gracedale, and 94 of Hazleton, all of Pennsylvania; of 94 citizens of St. Albans, Vt.: 23 of West Superior, Wis.; 39 of Decatur, Ill., and 14 of Woodstock, N. H., praying for the passage of House bill 5804, an act to promote the safety of railroad employes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVERETT: Petition of citizens of Malden, Mass., in favor of exempting fraternal beneficiary orders from the income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Palladium Council, No. 287, of the Royal Arcanum, of Everett, Mass., for the exemption of fraternal beneficiary societies from a tax on income—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITHIAN: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Perry Abrecombe, of Company B, Ninety-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGER: Petition of citizens of Bellevue, Iowa, for a bridge over Crooker Hough—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, protest of St. John's Lutheran Church, of Lyons, Iowa, against God in the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of W. H. Peckerell, Frank Weighard, George A. Shaffer, and 110 other citizens of Vinco and Summerhill, and other parts of Cambria County, Pa., for passage of House bill 5246, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOUK: Petition of certain citizens of Harriman, Tenn., against the income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDSON: Papers to accompany House bill 7354—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition to accompany House bill 7353—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7355—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IKIRT (by request): Resolution from Crystal Spring, Ohio, against interest-bearing bonds—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts: Petition of George Prewett and others, in favor of the passage of the bills for the relief of American seamen—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Charles A. Walker and others, in favor of the passage of the bills for the relief of the seamen of the United States—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Petition of A. N. Fisher, administrator of Isaac N. Fuller, deceased, of Cannon County, Tenn., to the Congress of the United States, asking reference of claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIPE: Petition of 115 citizens of Allegheny City, Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the passage by Congress of Senate bill 1136, to establish a Government telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 36 citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., praying Congress to pass Senate bill 1136, to establish a Government telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: Petition of David Bandy, of Hamilton County, Tenn., for removal of charge of desertion, to accompany House bill 7253—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: Memorial of citizens of Princeton, Caldwell County, Ky., praying exemption of fraternal associations from operations of proposed income-tax law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of 32 citizens of McKean County, Pa., in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill, providing for admission to the mails of publications of fraternal associations and college journals as second-class matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 18 citizens of Oil City, Pa., in favor of exempting fraternal beneficiary associations from Federal taxation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Fordham Council, No. 1412, Royal Arcanum Immediate Relief Fund Association, by John R. Ross, secretary, for the exemption of fraternal associations from the operation of the income tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCKER: Papers in claim of Hugh L. Gallaher, of Waynesboro, Augusta County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition from the citizens of Montgomery County, State of Tennessee, asking for the exemption of mutual life insurance companies and associations from taxation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.