

Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question if he were present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SQUIRE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], and I withhold my vote, unless it be necessary to make a quorum.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PATTON. I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. MILLS. I am paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. If he were present I should vote "yea," and he would vote "nay."

Mr. BATE. I am paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. BERRY. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. SQUIRE. In order to make a quorum, I vote "nay."

Mr. CULLOM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], but as this is a private bill, I think I am at liberty to vote, notwithstanding the pair, and I vote "nay."

Mr. BATE. In order to make a quorum I shall vote. I desire to say that if the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] were here, I believe he would vote "yea." I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH. I am paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], but in order to make a quorum I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 36; as follows:

YEAS—10.

Call,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Washburn.
Cameron,	Hunton,	Shoup,	
Dolph,	McMillan,	Smith,	

NAYS—36.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Manderson,	Proctor,
Allison,	Faulkner,	Martin,	Roach,
Bate,	Frye,	Mitchell, Wis.	Sherman,
Blackburn,	George,	Murphy,	Squire,
Blanchard,	Hansbrough,	Pasco,	Stewart,
Camden,	Hawley,	Peffer,	Turpie,
Carey,	Jarvis,	Perkins,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Pettigrew,	Vilas,
Cullom,	Lindsay,	Platt,	White.

NOT VOTING—32.

Allen,	Gibson,	Jones, Nev.	Power,
Berry,	Gordon,	Kyle,	Pugh,
Brice,	Gorman,	Lodge,	Quay,
Butler,	Gray,	McLaurin,	Ransom,
Caffery,	Hale,	McPherson,	Teller,
Chandler,	Harris,	Mills,	Voorhees,
Coke,	Higgins,	Morgan,	Walsh,
Daniel,	Hill,	Morrill,	Wilson,
Dixon,	Hoar,	Palmer,	Wolcott.
Dubois,	Irby,	Patton,	

So the bill was rejected.

EXTENSION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the House joint resolution in regard to the extension of appropriations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution (H. Res. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the joint resolution may be read the second time by its title.

Mr. ALDRICH. After the second reading I shall object to the third reading of the joint resolution to-day.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the joint resolution be read the second time.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government was read the second time by its title.

Mr. ALDRICH. I object to the third reading of the joint resolution to-day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the joint resolution will go over.

BAYOU DES GLAISES AND ATCHAFALAYA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7668) to authorize the St. Louis, Avoyelles and Southwestern Railway Company to bridge Bayou Des Glaises and Atchafalaya River in the State of Louisiana.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 1, line 7, after the word "Avoyelles," to insert "State of Louisiana;" and in line 9, after the words "Red River," to insert "in said State;" so as to read:

That the St. Louis, Avoyelles and Southwestern Railway Company, its successors or assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a railway bridge and approaches thereto over and across Bayou Des Glaises, in the parish of Avoyelles, State of Louisiana, and also a railway bridge and approaches thereto over and across the Atchafalaya River, be-

twen Melville and the mouth of Red River, in said State, at such point as may be selected by said railway company for crossing said bayou and river with its railroad line, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BOUNTY LAND WARRANTS—REMOVAL OF BAR OF DISLOYALTY.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3130) to repeal in part and to limit section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CULLOM in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bate,	Gallinger,	Mitchell, Oregon	Shoup,
Berry,	George,	Murphy,	Smith,
Blanchard,	Gray,	Pasco,	Squire,
Camden,	Harris,	Patton,	Turpie,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Peffer,	Vest,
Carey,	Higgins,	Perkins,	Vilas,
Chandler,	Hill,	Platt,	Walsh,
Coke,	Hunton,	Proctor,	Washburn,
Cullom,	Jarvis,	Pugh,	White.
Dolph,	Kyle,	Quay,	
Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Roach,	
Frye,	Martin,	Sherman.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for the present consideration of the bill indicated by him?

Mr. PLATT. I object.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, notwithstanding the objection.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, August 15, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, August 15, 1894.

Prayer by Rev. J. H. M'CARTY, D. D., of the city of Washington.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following resolution, August 13, 1894:

Resolved, That the order heretofore made requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 4864, "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," be rescinded; that the conferees heretofore appointed on the part of the House be discharged from further duty in that behalf, and that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments to said bill and agree to the same.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MITCHELL of Wisconsin, presented sundry memorials of citizens of Manitowoc, Montfort, and Milwaukee, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the support of the Government in maintaining the present system of sectarian Indian education, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and Merchants' Exchange, of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying that an appropriation of \$250,000 be made for the construction of a lock and dam in the Cumberland River below the mouth of the Harpeth River, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BUTLER presented the petition of Mrs. Jane Dickson Vardell, of Newbern, N. C., establishing her claim for property destroyed by the Federal troops during the civil war and praying to be reimbursed therefor; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the support of the Government in maintaining the present system of sectarian Indian education, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for the passage of the anti-optional bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5363) for the relief of Henry W. Lee, reported it without amendment.

B. D. GREENE.

Mr. PASCO: I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 859) for the relief of B. D. Greene, to report it favorably, without amendment, and submit a report thereon.

Mr. HALE: I should like to have the bill taken up and put on its passage.

Mr. COCKRELL: Let it be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to B. D. Greene, bondsman of George E. Ward, who shall file the proper vouchers for money advanced or labor and materials furnished in and about the work of improvement on the Rappahannock River during the year 1888, the sum of \$1,916.97, being the amount due George E. Ward by the Government, which said sum shall be paid to the said B. D. Greene.

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

Mr. HARRIS: I shall not object to the consideration of this bill, but I give notice now that until the routine business of the morning hour is concluded I shall object to the consideration of any other measure.

Mr. GEORGE: I hope the Senator from Tennessee will allow me to get in one bill that I have been trying for a week to have passed.

Mr. HARRIS: As soon as the routine business is over I think every Senator will have an opportunity to call up bills for consideration.

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

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

Mr. PASCO: I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2231) for the relief of B. D. Greene, the bill having the same purpose in view as the bill just passed, to report it adversely. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1066) to authorize the Third Auditor of the Treasury to audit certain quartermaster's vouchers belonging to John Finn, of St. Louis, Mo., to report it favorably with amendments.

The bill is intended to correct a technical mistake in a bill passed in the last Congress, and I ask unanimous consent to place it on its passage.

Mr. HARRIS: What is the request?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon: The bill is intended to correct an error in an act passed in the last Congress, and I hope I may be allowed to have it considered at the present time.

Mr. HARRIS: I have given notice that until the routine morning business is disposed of I shall object to the consideration of any bill.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon: By unanimous consent I will withdraw the report for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: The report will be withdrawn, if there be no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Peter Grant Stewart, of Oregon, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 898) granting a pension to Jesse Davenport, of Company A, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, in Oregon Indian wars of 1855 and 1856, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GORMAN, from the Committee on Printing, reported a bill (S. 2312) to authorize the preparation and publication of a descriptive catalogue and index of Government publications; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Immigration, reported a bill (S. 2314) to provide for the exclusion and deportation of alien anarchists.

INVESTIGATION BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be, and is hereby authorized and instructed to inquire and report to the Senate whether the Southern Steamship and Railway Association has violated the interstate commerce law in the fixing of its passenger and freight rates differentials for the shipment of freight from the interior to or through its various port points, or otherwise, and whether said rates are not in derogation of the law of competition, intended to be preserved by said interstate-commerce law.

Second. And, if it should find said rates in violation of the interstate-commerce law, said committee is hereby further instructed to report in what respect said rates violate said law, and suggest a remedy for a correction of the same.

That said committee have leave to sit during the recess of the Senate at such points as may be most convenient for a full and complete investigation of the matters embraced in the foregoing, and shall have authority to send for persons and papers; administer oaths, and examine witnesses and employ a stenographer; and the necessary expenses incurred by said committee in the conduct of the investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution submitted by Mr. CALL on the 10th instant, reported adversely thereon:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents have authority to sit during the recess of Congress and continue their session during said recess for the investigation of the proposed change of the patent laws, to send for persons and papers and take such evidence as they may think proper and necessary, and visit such places as they may think advantageous for gathering information upon the subject and report the same to Congress at the next session, and also authority to employ a stenographer and the necessary clerical assistance, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. CALL: Mr. President, I intend to ask leave of absence from the Senate for a few days, and in regard to the resolution which has just been reported adversely, I ask the Senate to take it up for consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been reported.

Mr. HARRIS: When routine morning business has been concluded I shall certainly interpose no objection to such request; now I do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Objection being made, the resolution can not now be considered.

INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. RANSOM on the 10th instant, reported adversely thereon:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and they are hereby authorized and directed to sit during the recess of Congress, and to visit and examine the Pacific coast between Points Duma and Capistrano, with a view to determining the best location for the construction of a deep-water harbor. Said committee is also hereby authorized to visit and examine such other works of river and harbor improvement on the Pacific coast, existing or proposed, as in their judgment the interests of commerce may demand, and shall have power to subpoena witnesses, to administer oaths and take testimony, to employ a stenographer, and to appoint a sergeant-at-arms from the messengers of the Senate; and that the actual necessary expenses of said committee, properly incurred, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate in the usual manner.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2313) for the relief of William J. Maddox, administrator of Laura E. Maddox, deceased, sole executrix of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. QUAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7971) to exempt from duty sugar, molasses, etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7969) to place upon the free list all ores of iron; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7970) to place upon the free list barbed fencing wire and wire rods for the manufacture of the same; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7968) to place upon the free list bituminous coal, shale, slack, and coke; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2297) to provide for the restatement, readjustment, settlement, and payment of dues to army officers

in certain cases; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. GORMAN. By the permission and at the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], I ask that he may be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Claims.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] will be excused from further service upon the committee named.

Mr. BRICE was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask that the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JARVIS] be appointed a member of the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Select Committee on National Banks, and the Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States; that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] be appointed a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MARTIN] be appointed a member of the Committee on Pensions.

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

Mr. MANDERSON. We were unable to hear the request on this side. We have no idea what it is. I ask that it be read at the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the request of the Senator from Maryland.

The Secretary read as follows:

That Senator JARVIS be appointed on the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Select Committee on National Banks, and Select Committee to Establish the University of the United States.

That Senator DANIEL be appointed upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

That Senator MARTIN be appointed upon the Committee on Pensions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he is ready to report an appointment to fill the vacancy upon the Committee on Finance?

Mr. GORMAN. I have not made such a request. The request is confined to the committees named.

CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING STATUARY.

Mr. TURPIE. I offer, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. VOORHEES], who is a member of the Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, a resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress be instructed to inquire what expenditures, if any, are authorized by existing law for works of statuary in connection with the new Library Building, and whether any contracts or expenditures have been made for such works, and that said committee have leave to report at any time on said subject to the Senate.

Mr. TURPIE. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.

The motion was agreed to.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS IN SENATE WING OF CAPITOL.

Mr. KYLE. I offer a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That during the recess of Congress no intoxicating liquors shall be sold or used in the Senate wing of the Capitol building; and the Capitol Police Board is hereby authorized and directed to enforce this resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Under the rule the resolution should go to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution under the rules will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. KYLE. I thought the resolution in regular form would lie on the table until to-morrow. I requested in the first place its immediate consideration.

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

Mr. GORMAN. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the present consideration of the resolution, and it will go over under the rules.

RECENT ELECTION IN ALABAMA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] coming over from a previous day, in relation to the recent election in Alabama.

Mr. CHANDLER. The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] has not yet reached the city. I therefore ask that the resolution may go over, as it did yesterday, for another day.

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

PRINTING OF THE REVENUE BILL.

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

The Secretary read the order yesterday submitted by Mr. HALE, as follows:

Ordered, That 5,000 copies of bill H. R. 4864 as passed, and to be known as the sugar-trust tariff bill, be printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Let the resolution go to the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

FREE COAL, ETC.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask that the revenue bills which came from the House of Representatives on yesterday and had their first reading have their second reading at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the bills.

The bills were respectively read the second time by their titles, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7968) to place upon the free list bituminous coal, shale, slack, and coke;

A bill (H. R. 7969) to place upon the free list all ores of iron;

A bill (H. R. 7970) to place upon the free list barbed fencing wire, and wire rods for the manufacture of the same; and

A bill (H. R. 7971) to exempt from duty sugar, molasses, etc.

Mr. HARRIS. I deem it my duty to submit to the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, received this morning. I send it to the Secretary's desk, in order that it may be read to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, D. C., August 15, 1894.

DEAR SIR: Your letter advising me that the House of Representatives had passed and sent to the Senate bills putting sugar, coal, iron ore, and barbed wire on the free list, and requesting "an official statement from you (me) as to the effect that the passage of these bills, or either of them, would have upon the revenues of the Government," is received, and in response I have the honor to say that, according to the most careful estimates that can be made, if no change is made in the proposed revenue legislation which has recently passed through Congress, the total receipts into the Treasury during the current fiscal year will be as follows:

Estimated revenues for fiscal year ending June 30, 1895.

From duties on imports:		
Senate bill, including \$43,000,000 on sugar		\$173,000,000
From internal taxes:		
Whisky	\$95,000,000	
Tobacco	33,000,000	
Fermented liquors	33,000,000	
Income	15,000,000	
Oleomargarine	1,800,000	
Playing cards	1,000,000	
Miscellaneous	200,000	
		179,000,000
From sales of lands and other miscellaneous sources		20,000,000
Total estimated revenue		378,000,000

The estimated receipts for the present year from the proposed tax on incomes and playing cards, and the proposed additional tax of 20 cents per gallon on distilled spirits, are, it will be observed, much less than is stated in the various tabulated statements which have heretofore been used in the discussion of these subjects, but I am satisfied the amounts here given are approximately correct.

The proposed income tax will not become payable, by the terms of the bill recently passed, until "on or before" July 1, 1895, which is the close of the fiscal year; and it is estimated by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that by reason of the large stock on hand the receipts from the tax on playing cards will not amount to more than \$1,000,000 during this year.

The estimated increase of receipts on account of the additional tax on distilled spirits during the present year has already been prevented to a great extent by the withdrawal of large quantities of goods from the bonded warehouses and the payment of the tax thereon at 90 cents per gallon, and this process is still going on.

The total expenditures during the current fiscal year will be as follows:

Civil and miscellaneous, including deficiency in postal revenues	\$90,000,000
War, including rivers and harbors	55,000,000
Navy, including new vessels and armament	33,000,000
Indians	10,000,000
Pensions	143,500,000
Interest	30,500,000

Total estimated expenditures \$363,000,000
Estimated surplus for year 15,000,000

The duty on sugar proposed in the recent bill will, according to importations of that article during the fiscal year 1893, yield an annual revenue of \$43,478,958, and the duties on the other articles mentioned in your communication would yield, under that bill, about \$1,000,000; that is to say, iron ore, \$270,920; coal, \$426,149; and barbed wire, fencing wire, and wire rods, of iron or steel, when imported for the manufacture of barbed-wire fencing, about \$300,000.

It will be seen, therefore, that if sugar alone is placed upon the free list, the expenditures during the present fiscal year will exceed the receipts to the amount of \$28,478,058, and if the duties are removed from all the articles

specified in your letter the deficit will be \$29,478,058, not including any expenditure on account of the sinking fund, or the payment of \$2,333,000 of Pacific Railroad bonds which will mature during this fiscal year.

In view of the existing and prospective requirements of the public service, I am of the opinion that it would not be safe to place all the articles enumerated in your letter, or even sugar alone, upon the free list, without imposing taxation upon other articles or subjects sufficient to raise an annual revenue of about \$30,000,000.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, *Secretary.*

Hon. ISHAM G. HARRIS,
Acting Chairman Senate Finance Committee.

NOTE.—The bonds of the Pacific Railroad guaranteed by the Government, to the amount of \$2,362,000, mature during the present fiscal year; and this amount is not included in the above estimate of expenditures.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion, if it is in order, to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7971) to exempt from duty sugar, molasses, etc. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill, and I hope it will be disposed of one way or another at this time.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to say a word, and move to refer these bills to the Committee on Finance, if the Senator from Missouri will allow me. I shall be very brief.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course I yield to the Senator from Tennessee. I presume his motion will permit debate.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; the motion which I shall make is debatable.

Mr. VEST. Then I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, while I am heartily in favor of free sugar, raw and refined, and certainly have no objection to putting the other articles dealt with by the other bills which are now on the table upon the free list, in view of the communication just received from the Secretary of the Treasury, and the strong probability, if not the absolute certainty, that if these bills shall become laws we shall during the current fiscal year have a deficiency in the Treasury of twenty-nine or thirty million dollars, I feel it my duty to move the reference of each of those bills to the Committee on Finance, in order that that committee may, in dealing with those bills, so deal with them that we may provide against that probable or inevitable deficiency which must occur during the current fiscal year according to the statement submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury. I do not think that Congress can afford to adjourn without such provision as will effectually guard against such deficiency. For that reason, and that reason only, I move that the bills be referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. HUNTON. I desire to know from the Senator whether an abolition of the differential duty on refined sugar would create any deficiency in the Treasury for the next fiscal year? I, for one, am in favor of a duty on sugar, and I am opposed to the differential duty of one-eighth of 1 cent. If it is in the power of the Senator from Tennessee to say that an abrogation of that duty of one-eighth of 1 cent will not create a deficiency, then I desire to separate the two points in that bill, and concur in the House provision as to the differential duty of one-eighth of 1 cent and nonconcur in the bill so far as raw sugar is concerned.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I do not hesitate to express the opinion that a duty of 40 per cent straight on raw and refined sugars, which would eliminate the one-eighth of 1 cent to which the Senator from Virginia refers, would produce more than \$30,000,000, which deficiency the Secretary of the Treasury thinks the Treasury is threatened with by these bills. I am quite as much opposed to the differential duty as is the Senator from Virginia, but my opinion is that the Finance Committee ought to deal with the bills, and so deal with them that we may effectually guard against that dreaded deficiency. More than that, Mr. President, I do not care to say.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. This matter has been so thoroughly discussed during several months past and is so thoroughly understood by every Senator on this floor as to what his own views are, that I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee why we can not proceed now, without sending the bills to the committee? Let us consider the Secretary's letter, and everything connected with the subject, and determine whether we will agree with the bill as it passed the other House, or whether we will let the tax remain on raw sugar and knock off the tax on refined sugar.

Let the Senate determine the matter and not bury it in a committee. The free-sugar bill was passed by the House of Representatives with only 13 dissenting votes. An overwhelming majority of the people of the entire United States are in favor of free sugar, and I believe it is the duty of the Senate to take up the bill now and vote on it and let each Senator record him-

self, so that the country will know how the Senate of the United States stands on this question.

We have been handicapped here for months; the Senate has been charged with being in favor of the sugar trust; we have been charged with being opposed to free sugar, and my object in moving to consider the bill now is to let the country know how each Senator stands on the bill. Let him record his vote for free sugar or against it. I for one believe that the Senate ought to pass the bill precisely as it came from the other House without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t"—

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BERRY. And that a provision for free sugar ought to become the law of the land.

Mr. MANDERSON. Will the Senator from Arkansas submit to a question? I am led to ask it because the Senator's statement as to his views shows very conclusively to some of us that the matter has not been debated sufficiently, and the Senator certainly needs more light.

Mr. BERRY. I decline to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MANDERSON. The question I desire to ask is whether—

Mr. BERRY. I have stated that I decline to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MANDERSON. Will the Senator from Arkansas state how he voted on the differential of one-eighth when the tariff bill was before the Senate?

Mr. BERRY. I decline to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MANDERSON. All right, if the Senator from Arkansas does not desire to answer any question I propound to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is entitled to the floor, and declines to yield.

Mr. BERRY. What I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee is whether, in case the bill is referred to the Committee on Finance, there will be a report made in time to enable the Senate during the present session to vote upon these questions? I do not want to have the bill buried in the committee. I take it for granted that the Senators on the other side of the Chamber will desire to vote for free sugar, as many of them have done already. I certainly wish to vote for the bill as it came from the other House. It seems to me it is the duty of the Senate to dispose of this question now and not bury it in the Finance Committee, which I understand is equally divided between the two political parties, as it stands at present, or leave it there until we have no quorum or until the next session of Congress. All I desire is that the question shall be determined now in one way or the other, so that each Senator can say whether he is in favor of free sugar or is opposed to it.

Mr. HARRIS. In answer to the question of the Senator from Arkansas I can say, for myself only, that if this bill or these bills are referred to the Finance Committee I shall ask the committee to meet for the purpose of considering them immediately; and, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall insist upon the earliest report consistent with a fair consideration of the bill. If it could be done in three hours, I should gladly have them report the bill back within that time, but I think in dealing with a probable deficiency probably involved in these four bills, the measures ought to be considered by the appropriate committee and the deficiency provided against before the Senate takes definite action on any one of them, and certainly before the Senate takes definite action upon all of them.

As to the committee being equally divided, if, as the committee is to-day constituted, the majority party is not permitted to exercise its will in respect to the time and manner of report, I will promise the Senator from Arkansas that one hour shall not pass until I ask the Chair to fill the vacancy on the Finance Committee, when we will have the power to control the action of the committee.

Mr. VILAS, Mr. BLANCHARD, and Mr. COCKRELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair had recognized the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], who yielded to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. That is true.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277 to the bill (H. R. 5575) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions:

A bill (S. 253) granting a pension to Maria Hall, widow of Joseph E. Doak, deceased;

A bill (S. 1772) extending the time for the completion of a railroad bridge over the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, in the State of Washington;

A bill (S. 1885) to extend the privileges of the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement to the city of Ocala, in the State of Florida;

A bill (S. 2269) providing for reconveyance by District Commissioners of certain lands to Andrew J. Curtis and Mary E. Curtis;

A bill (S. 2303) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Contentnea Creek, at Grifton, Lenoir County, N. C., and to establish it as a post-road;

A joint resolution (S. R. 68) for the relief of W. D. Mack, a clerk in the Record and Pension Division of the War Department; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 96) to extend the charter of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 2107) granting to the Northern Mississippi Railway Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in Minnesota; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit a conference report on the general deficiency bill. I ask that the report be concurred in, and that the Senate insist upon its amendments numbered 127 and 128, upon which no agreement has been reached by the conference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7477) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 23, 28, 29, 46, 51, 67, 123, 139, 168, 169, 171, and 172.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 122, 124, 125, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 173, 174, and 175, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to examine the accounts of A. G. Studer, late consul at Singapore, and allow him credit for unofficial fees received by him for notarial and unofficial services performed by him during the period of his said consulship at Singapore, from the beginning of same to March 31, 1888, and by mistake paid by him into the Treasury, and to pay the balance, if any, which may be found due thereon."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "Including expenditures for counsel employed, with the approval of the Attorney-General;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out in lines 4 and 5 of said amendment the words "eight hundred dollars," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$300, in addition to the sum of \$500 heretofore appropriated;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "Territory of Arizona: The Attorney-General shall pay out of the appropriation for support of United States prisoners for the fiscal year 1895 such sums as may be found equitably due upon examination to the Territory of Arizona for maintenance of Indian convicts in Territorial prisons heretofore convicted under the provisions of section 9 of the Indian appropriation act, approved March 3, 1885: *Provided*, That hereafter no payment shall be made to any State or Territory for maintenance and keeping in prison of Indian convicts convicted in any State or Territorial court for violation of the provisions of said section 9 of the said act approved March 3, 1885."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment, insert as a separate paragraph, the following:

"For fees and expenses of marshals, United States courts, \$250,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, after the word "attorney," insert the words "in full satisfaction;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the

Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$400;" and add at the end of said amendment the following: "and hereafter the preparation of memorial addresses on deceased Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be done under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing without extra expense therefor;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"To pay J. E. Johnson for services as stenographer on special hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, \$37.50."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 51 of the bill, after line 9, insert as a separate paragraph the following:

"To pay the guardian of the only child of M. C. Lisle, late a Representative in Congress from the State of Kentucky, \$3,508.00; and on page 52 of the bill, in lines 7 and 8, strike out the following: "In all, \$24,777.50," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"To E. H. Funston, \$2,000;

"To H. L. Moore, \$2,000; in all \$28,777.50."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 5 and 6 of said amendment, strike out the words "discharge the expenses justly" and insert in lieu thereof the words "pay the expenses, and for legal services justly or equitably;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$175,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That any and all judgments included in said documents which the present Attorney-General has already examined and is willing to certify under the provisions of this act, and any and all judgments rendered during his term of office which he shall be willing to certify under the provisions of this act may be certified notwithstanding the order of payment herein specified;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out lines 27, 28, and 29 of said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For horses and other property lost in the military service, except the claims of the Globe Mutual Insurance Company, of St. Louis, Mo., Gilbert Elliott, receiver, and the claim of the Security Insurance Company, of the city of New York, \$14,462.14;" and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 127 and 128.

F. M. COCKRELL,
CALVIN S. BRICE,
EUGENE HALE.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
J. G. CANNON.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COCKRELL. The only point in dispute is the proposed appropriation of \$1,809,539.70 to pay a judgment in favor of the Southern Pacific Company. The House has refused to agree to that amendment of the Senate. I move that the report be concurred in, and that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 127 and 128.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to know what has become of the amendment increasing the appropriation for the payment of Indian depredation claims?

Mr. COCKRELL. The amendments that were made by the Senate were substantially agreed to, and the amount as the Senate proposed was reduced somewhat. The appropriation is left substantially as it was.

Mr. DOLPH. Is the appropriation left substantially as the House put it, or as the Senate put it?

Mr. COCKRELL. As the Senate put it, except that there is some reduction. The House conferees would not agree to the full amount that the Senate put in.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senate increased the appropriation from \$100,000 to \$250,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not remember the exact amount of the reduction which has been made, but there is some reduction.

Mr. SHERMAN. I call for a separate vote on the amendment providing for the payment of the judgment in favor of the Southern Pacific Company. I desire to vote against the amendment. Let the vote be taken upon the general agreement which has been made, and a separate vote on the two amendments which have not been agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the report.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, the question is in respect to the amendment to pay the judgment in favor of the Southern Pacific Company.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 127. I have not had time during the present session to consider the very important question involved in the finding of the Court of Claims. I wish time to examine it. It not only involves the one or two million dollars proposed to be appropriated here, but it will involve also, arising out of this judgment, many other millions. I therefore hope that the Sen-

ate will recede from the amendment with a view to its consideration next session.

Mr. COCKRELL. Before the Senator from Ohio makes that motion, will he allow me to state that this is a judgment already rendered by the court. Subsequent liabilities have been paid, and every month the Government is paying this very company because of such claims. This is a back amount which was suspended.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President—

Mr. COCKRELL. Payment was refused; the matter was taken into court; the court rendered a judgment, and there the judgment stands, drawing 5 per cent interest now, I believe, under the law.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. That is what I wished to inquire about. It is 4 per cent, is it not?

Mr. COCKRELL. It is 4 per cent. The judgment draws that rate of interest under the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. As we are borrowing money now, and as our receipts do not equal our expenditures, I think the Senate had better recede from the amendment. We are paying interest, anyway. I think a little more careful consideration should be given to this subject, which involves so much money. It will be only a short time until the next session of Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Ohio must also remember that this is a nonbond-aided railroad.

Mr. SHERMAN. The fact that the House of Representatives has declined to agree to the amendment is a sufficient justification in itself why we should not press it, at least until a fuller examination is made. If the objection of the House of Representatives is final, if they insist upon it, we might as well recede now as at a later date.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio, that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 127 and 128.

Mr. DOLPH. On that I ask for the yeas and nays. ["No," "No."]

Mr. GEORGE. Let the amendments be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a second?

Mr. DOLPH. I withdraw the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the amendments be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments will be read.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

To Southern Pacific Company, \$1,809,539.70; in all, \$3,083,785.85.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio, that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 127 and 128.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think I must ask for the yeas and nays. The amendments must be receded from if the other House insists upon its disagreement.

Mr. COCKRELL. The matter will be considered in conference fully in connection with what the Senator from Ohio has said. The vote of the Senate is equivalent to insisting upon the amendments.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well; I have no objection to letting the matter go back to conference with the statement I have made.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the amendments numbered 127 and 128.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. COCKRELL, Mr. BRICE, and Mr. HALE were appointed.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5575) "making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 119, 127, 128, 133, 134, 270, and 279.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That a joint commission, consisting of the select committee of five Senators appointed by the President of the Senate to investigate the Ford Theater disaster, and five members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall investigate the Ford Theater disaster and report to the Senate and House whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate the sufferers of that disaster for the injuries sustained by them; and if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the commission will investigate each individual case and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case. The commission may employ a clerk who is a stenographer, and who shall do the stenographic work of the commission as clerk; and

that the commission shall have power to send for persons and papers, and the chairman of the commission or of any subcommittee may administer oaths. The expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and House of Representatives on vouchers approved by the chairman, and the commission may report by bill or otherwise;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Add at the end of said amendment the following: "to be paid out of the appropriation for surveys of public lands made by this act;" and on page 87, in line 14 of the bill, strike out the words "two thousand five hundred dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the words "four thousand dollars;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 238, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$45,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$5,000;" and add at the end of said amendment the following: "The Bureau of American Republics shall be placed under the control and direction of the Secretary of State, who shall report to Congress at its next regular session the propriety of continuing said Bureau, or if any obligation exists upon the part of the United States requiring the continuance thereof;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277, from which amendment numbered 277 the Senate had receded.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 278, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"COTTON STATES AND INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT ATLANTA, GA.

"SEC. 3. For an exhibit by the Government of the United States of such articles and materials as illustrate the function and administrative faculty of the Government, to be made at the Cotton States and International Exposition to be held at Atlanta, Ga., in the year 1895, and for the employment of proper persons as officers and assistants by the board of management hereinafter created, and for the maintenance of the building hereinafter provided for, and for other contingent expenses incidental to the Government exhibit, to be approved by the chairman of the board of management and by the Secretary of the Treasury upon itemized accounts and vouchers, \$150,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be disbursed by the board of management, of which not exceeding \$10,000 shall be expended for clerical services. And to secure a complete and harmonious arrangement of said Government exhibit a board of management shall be created, to be charged with the selection, purchase, preparation, transportation, arrangement, safe-keeping, exhibition, and return of such articles and materials as the heads of the Executive Departments, the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, and the United States Fish Commission may, respectively, decide shall be embraced in said Government exhibit. The President may also designate additional articles for exhibition. Such board shall be composed of one member to be detailed by the head of each Executive Department, one by the head of the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, and one by the head of the United States Fish Commission, and the President shall name one of said members as chairman.

"But the United States shall not in any manner nor under any circumstances be liable for any of the acts, doings, proceedings, or representations of the said Cotton States and International Exposition, organized under the laws of the State of Georgia, its officers, agents, servants, or employees, or any of them, or for the service, salaries, labor, or wages of said officers, agents, servants, or employees, or any of them, or for any subscriptions to the capital stock, or for any certificates of stock, bonds, mortgages, or obligations of any kind issued by said corporation, or for any debts, liabilities, or expenses incidental to the exposition: *Provided, however*, That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at said exposition, upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulation as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exhibition to sell for delivery at the close of the exposition any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition in the exposition building or on its grounds, subject to such regulation for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such article by the revenue laws in force at the date of importation, and all penalties prescribed by law shall be applied and enforced against such articles and against the persons who may be guilty of any illegal sale or withdrawal: *And provided further*, That medals with appropriate devices, emblems, and inscriptions commemorative of said Cotton States and International Exposition, and of the awards to be made to exhibitors thereof, be prepared at some mint of the United States for the board of directors thereof, subject to the provisions of the fifty-second section of the coinage act of 1873, upon the payment of a sum not less than the cost thereof; and all the provisions, whether penal or otherwise, of said coinage act against the counterfeiting or imitating of coins of the United States shall apply to the medals struck and issued under this section.

"For taking down the Government main building erected for the Government exhibit at the World's Columbian Exposition, and its transportation, or so much of the material thereof as may be available, and its reerection upon the site selected for the said Cotton States and International Exposition, including the purchase of such new materials as may be found necessary, \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That if it be found impracticable to take down, transport, and reerect said building for the sum herein appropriated, then the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause a new building to be erected upon said site of the Cotton States and International Exposition for the Government exhibit, at a cost not to exceed \$50,000, for which purpose the amount herein appropriated is hereby made available: *Provided always*, That the United States shall in no manner and under no circumstances be liable for any bond, debt, contract, expenditure, expense, or liability of any kind whatever of the said Cotton States and International Exposition, its officers, agents, servants, or employees or incident to or growing out of said exposition, nor for any amount whatever in excess of the \$150,000 and of the \$50,000 herein authorized; and the heads of Executive Departments, the Smithsonian Institution and National Museum, and the United States Fish Commission, and the board of management herein authorized, their officers, agents, servants, or employees, shall in no manner and under no circumstances expend or create any liability of any kind for any sum in excess of the appropriations herein made, or create any deficiency."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amend-

ment as follows: In line 15 of said House amendment strike out the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "occupied, and not less than 20 acres of each 160-acre tract;" and the Senate agree to the same.

F. M. COCKRELL,
A. P. GORMAN,
W. B. ALLISON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
JOS. H. O'NEIL,
WM. COGSWELL,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. MANDERSON. Is this a final report?

Mr. COCKRELL. It is a final report.

Mr. MANDERSON. It completes the agreement between the two Houses?

Mr. COCKRELL. It does.

Mr. MANDERSON. I should like to have read again that feature of the report that has reference to the names of those who were killed in the Ford's Theater disaster.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is amendment numbered 110, on page 59.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The part of the report indicated by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "That a joint commission, consisting of the select committee of five Senators appointed by the President of the Senate to investigate the Ford Theater disaster, and five members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall investigate the Ford Theater disaster and report to the Senate and House whether in equity and justice the Government should compensate the sufferers of that disaster for the injuries sustained by them, and, if it shall be decided that they should be compensated, then the commission will investigate each individual case and report the amount of compensation that should be allowed in each case. The commission may employ a clerk who is a stenographer, and who shall do the stenographic work of the commission as clerk, and that the commission shall have power to send for persons and papers, and that the chairman of the commission or of any subcommittee may administer oaths. The expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate and House of Representatives on vouchers approved by the chairman, and the commission may report by bill or otherwise;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I think that this is a most unfortunate if not a very cruel result. The Ford's Theater disaster occurred, as I recall the date, early in June, 1893. The whole country was shocked by that result, attributable clearly to negligence somewhere, for which the Government of the United States was responsible. Twenty men were killed and over one hundred men were injured; and all of them were employes of the Government, working in the capacity of clerks in the ramshackle building that tumbled about their ears. When the Senate met at the extra session it appointed a special committee, men some of whom were certainly well qualified by experience for the investigation of this matter. That committee had as its efficient chairman the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], who, with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], and the senior Senator from Nebraska were charged with the duty of the investigation.

The committee was composed of four lawyers, men of large practice in their profession, and a business man who has achieved, as is well known, great success in that capacity. They set themselves to this work. They held numerous meetings. There was prepared with great care a blank application or petition that should form the basis of each claim. No step has been taken by that committee which has not been akin in thoroughness of exploration to that which would have been had had those men gone into court for the purpose of a settlement of their claims. There was no question in the mind of any member of that committee, and there can be no question in the mind of any member of either House of Congress, but that the Government is liable in damages to the people who were thus injured and to the heirs of those who were killed. There is no question of the moral or equitable liability. There can be none in the mind of any man. In the mind of no lawyer can there be any question of the legal liability if a private individual and not the Government of the United States were substituted for the party to blame.

The blanks having been thus prepared they were carefully filled by those who applied. There devolved upon me as one member of the committee the exploration of the claims of those who were instantly killed or those who died immediately after the occurrence. I made very thorough exploration in every line not only as to the character of the injury, the result where death did not immediately follow, and the examination of physicians and those who had examined the body after death, but we also investigated the facts concerning the survivors. I wish it were possible for me to go through that list of names and that list of survivors to show the deplorable condition of the families of the

people thus killed—widows in some cases with six or eight children, with no income, dependent upon the charity of the public or such aid as they can get from individual relatives, perhaps of relatives unable to give them the sustenance that they demand.

Even during this long session of Congress, with its daily sittings from 10 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the evening, the committee was unable to give that thorough examination that was needed as to the claims of those who were not killed, but great progress has been made in that direction. My impression is that the Senator from California and the Senator from Michigan have, as to all of the claims submitted to them, some twenty-two to each, made the exploration, and they have been ready to report. The Senator from Tennessee has not been able to make that exploration on account of the duties devolving upon him as a member of the Committee on Finance, but in the partial report made from the special committee it was shown that there had been such investigation that during the coming recess undoubtedly we would be able to report as to all the cases, that the aid they absolutely need may be given to them.

Partial report was made that \$5,000 should be appropriated to the families of those who were killed, making a total appropriation of \$105,000. This has apparently been abandoned by the Senate conferees. I regret it exceedingly, for I see that these people are to have that sickness of heart which comes from hope deferred. This new proposition is that there shall be raised a joint committee of ten, five from each House, and that they shall again explore and investigate, and so time will creep along with petty pace, day will succeed day, week will succeed week, and month will succeed month, and there will be no relief to these people who are in such great suffering and distress.

When can the proposed committee of ten of the two Houses of Congress meet for the purpose of this exploration. With this long continued session running close up to the fall elections it is not presumed that that committee will get to work during the recess. Then will come the short session of Congress with its numerous demands, requiring of every man the expenditure of all the forces in him, taking up great time. Certainly it will not be until after the close of the present Congress that any committee will have the opportunity to make that exploration; and then what will come? There then will be no organization of the House of Representatives that will permit a joint committee to be established; and I can foresee that for years to come these poor people will be clamoring at the door of Congress for that relief which common decency, common honesty should require that we should give at once.

Mr. President, for this reason alone I shall vote against this conference report. I appeal to the Senator from Missouri, in view of the circumstances which have been stated and that were stated a day or two since when unfortunately I was not in the Chamber, that an effort be made again to pay these people the money that is fairly due them.

Another item has been abandoned in the report. It is perhaps too late to make comment upon it, but here we are to be left with another adjournment of Congress without any steps being taken towards the erection of a new Government Printing Office. That item is, I understand, entirely stricken out of the bill by some sort of parliamentary juggling that for one I certainly can not understand. But I appeal to the Senator from Missouri and I appeal to my colleagues upon the special committee to see if we can not obtain for these people, by some process, that which is fairly and decently their due.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to offer a suggestion in connection with the amendment relating to the Ford's Theater disaster. The Senator from Nebraska as well as the Senator from Tennessee have gone over the matter thoroughly before the Senate and I fully agree with them as to everything they have said. We have done, of course, a great deal of work individually upon that committee. We have examined a number of cases, and with great care. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if it would not be possible to insist upon this provision to pay the relatives of those who are dead, at the same time stating that we shall certainly be willing and glad to meet a joint committee on the part of the other House with reference to the cases concerning which there has been no formal conclusion reached.

I have no doubt the Senator from Nebraska will agree with me that it would be practicable to have a joint committee in the future with reference to the claims not yet reported to the Senate. If the House were willing to take that view of it, the payment could be made in those cases where there can be really no question. There is no doubt of the death. No one claims that there is any pretense here that a person applying for relief does not represent the family of the decedent, nor is there any doubt to anyone who has taken a most casual look at the transaction that if the property were owned and controlled by an individual that individual would be liable for gross neglect in

placing his employes in a building which was inherently unsafe and the unsafeness of which was patent. Under these conditions a private individual would undoubtedly be liable.

Of course if we can not agree, we can not agree, but it seems to me that it is worth an additional effort to see whether or not these people can not be to the limited extent proposed in the bill compensated at the present session. The chairman of the committee, of course, understands the situation better than I can understand it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to embarrass the committee of conference in charge of this bill. Believing as I did that the Government ought to make a measure of compensation to the heirs of the deceased and to the seriously injured parties in the employment of the Government who suffered by reason of the disaster, I introduced the resolution that raised the committee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, to investigate and report whether compensation should be made at all, and, if at all, to what extent. That committee was unanimously of opinion that compensation ought to be made, as I am. I regret that the other House did not raise a similar committee at the same time. I would have been glad to have had a joint committee; but in the light of such investigation as we have been able to make, there is no member of that committee who has a doubt as to the fact that compensation ought to be made.

I stated the other day when the conference report was before the Senate that we had merely asked for appropriations in this bill to compensate the widows and orphans of those who were killed outright in the disaster, the injured parties requiring more scrutiny of investigation as to the extent, the character, and probable duration of their injuries, and as to the measure of compensation they ought to receive.

In view of the fact that the widows and orphans of those persons who were killed outright by that disaster are in the main penniless and suffering, I had hoped—and if there be a ground on which to base a hope, I still shall indulge it—that the conferees on the part of the Senate may induce the House of Representatives to appropriate by this bill the money necessary to relieve the sufferings of those widows and orphans.

So far from objecting, I am exceedingly glad to have the House of Representatives appoint a similar committee, or a joint commission, if it may be so called, and let both Houses investigate to their entire satisfaction all the circumstances leading to that disaster and its fatal results, and determine the question as to compensation; but being perfectly satisfied myself that compensation is demanded by every consideration of justice, of equity, and propriety, I have indulged the hope, and indulge it still, if possible, that the widows and orphans of those deceased persons may be provided for by the passage of this bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I must say frankly and candidly to the Senate that the House conferees will not agree to the amendment proposed by the Senate. They say that they have had no opportunity of investigating the matter, and know nothing about it; that it does not belong to an appropriation bill, and ought not to have been sent to them in that form, when they had no opportunity of investigating it and determining it, and that it involves questions of law as well as questions of fact. When they made the suggestion to us that they did not understand the case, we then as a last resort agreed to the substitute directing the select committee already appointed by the Senate in connection with a similar committee to be appointed by the House of Representatives, to investigate and report upon the subject. In my judgment, I say frankly it is either this provision, or none at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The question is on concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

The report was concurred in.

EXTENSION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the House joint resolution continuing the appropriations for the executive branches of the Government provided for in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and I ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. Res. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. COCKRELL. The sundry civil appropriation bill has now passed the Senate and will doubtless pass the House of Representatives, where the conference report will be agreed to today, but it can not possibly be enrolled and signed by the Presiding Officers of the two Houses and prepared for the signature of the President of the United States before to-morrow evening,

probably, if then. The clerks have already worked so hard that they are not able to work any longer until they have a few hours' rest. Therefore the passage of this joint resolution for some time is absolutely necessary. Let the joint resolution be read, and we can modify the time.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the provisions of joint resolutions approved June 29 and July 31, 1894, providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government, be, and the same are hereby, extended and continued in full force and effect to and including the 24th day of August, 1894.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to amend the joint resolution by changing the time it is to take effect by striking out "twenty-fourth" and inserting "twentieth;" so as to read "20th day of August."

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to the joint resolution in the form now suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

FREE SUGARS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has the floor on the motion to refer the bill (H. R. 7971) to exempt from duty sugars, molasses, etc., to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, it is with very great reluctance I find myself compelled to differ with the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, of which committee I am a member. I have not the slightest doubt if this motion to refer the bills which have come to us from the House of Representatives prevails it will be the end of the consideration of those measures.

The fact has already been alluded to that the Committee on Finance as now composed consists of five Republican members and five Democrats. Even if the Senator from Tennessee should fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of our late lamented colleague, Senator Vance, of North Carolina, it is well known to every intelligent man that at this stage of the session, with the probability of the absence of a quorum in one or both Houses within a very few days, it will be impossible to bring those bills back here and secure their consideration.

Mr. President, in addition to the reasons which have been so forcibly urged why there is no necessity for a reference of these bills to the Committee on Finance, I desire most earnestly and explicitly to urge another. It is due to the Senate as a body, it is due to individual Senators, and particularly to those of us who have been called upon to discharge the difficult task imposed on members of the Finance Committee in the majority and members of the conference committee. I repeat what I said the other day, that the calcium light should be turned into this Chamber and every Senator should assume the responsibility before the American people of taking his position upon the questions which have been fruitful of gross and miserable scandals against the personal character of many of us.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] asked the present occupant of the chair [Mr. BERRY] if he could now support free sugar after having voted for the one-eighth differential on refined sugar in the pending bill? Let me answer that question. I voted for that one-eighth differential. I am willing to stand by that vote and by the bill as it is to-day, rather than have the party to which I belong convicted before the American people of incompetency and incapacity and of utter obliquity as to the pledges which it made to the people in the canvass of 1892.

I was called upon as a member of the Finance Committee and as a member of the conference committee to make a choice between evils. I was called upon to stand before the people of this country and say we could pass no bill at all, that our party was utterly incompetent, or to take a bill infinitely better than the McKinley act, and go before the Democrats of the United States and say to them, "I have brought you the best that circumstances permitted, and I have done my duty honestly and faithfully as I saw it."

There is no inconsistency in the position of those who voted for the pending bill and who now favor free sugar or a duty upon sugar which will produce the revenue which the Secretary of the Treasury says is necessary to carry on the Government.

Mr. President, I am most unfortunate in that I am compelled again to say something in the nature of criticism as against the present Administration. It has not been many days since the President of the United States, the head of our party, under whose flag to-day and now I am ready to fight to the death for tariff reform and Democratic policy, declared in a letter to the

chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that the Senate bill, now accepted, constituted perfidy to the Democratic party and dishonor to Democratic principles.

The Wilson bill came to us with no duty at all upon sugar, raw or refined. Every word in the letter the Secretary of the Treasury sent to us to-day, and which was read from that desk, is an arraignment of that bill, because it shows that if passed there would have been a deficiency of more than \$30,000,000, and it would have been necessary to again issue interest-bearing bonds in order to carry on the operations of the Government. It must be remembered that we have increased duties by the amendments adopted by the Senate to the House bill, and it must be remembered that we have produced more revenue—

Mr. COCKRELL. We had to do it.

Mr. VEST. And were compelled to do it; but if what the Secretary of the Treasury now says be true—and I do not gain-say it—what would have been the condition of this country with the Wilson bill enacted? A deficiency of from forty to fifty million dollars staring us immediately in the face.

Sir, the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury is a vindication of the bill as passed by the Senate. Much has been said against that bill. I propose before I close to show that the self-constituted critics of the newspaper press and the miserable demagogues who want to pull down men in high places in order that they may climb there themselves, have perverted the truth and have assailed the bill as passed by the Senate in such fashion as convicts them before the American people of gross slander or willful ignorance.

Mr. President, the Hebrew superstition which turned a goat into the wilderness in order that it might carry away the sins of the people still exists. In times of great popular depression and calamity a scapegoat must still be found even amongst civilized nations, and the Senate of the United States is now filling that position with the American people. Much of this we have brought upon ourselves. We have brought it upon us because we have no rules for the transaction of business. For some years after becoming a member of this body, attracted by the idea of its great dignity and conservative character, I favored the absence from our rules of the previous question, as it is termed.

Sir, after my experience in the last five months, I have not an enemy in this world whom I would place in the position that I have occupied as a member of the Finance Committee under the rules of the Senate. I would put no man where I have been, to be blackmailed and driven in order to pass a bill that I believe is necessary to the welfare of the country, by Senators who desired to force amendments upon me against my better judgment and compel me to decide the question whether I would take no bill at all or a bill which had been distorted by their views and objects. Sir, the Senate "lags superfluous on the stage" to-day with the American people, because in an age of progress, advance, and aggressive reform we sit here week after week while copies of the census reports, almanacs, and even novels are read to us, and under our rules there is no help for the majority except to listen or leave the Chamber.

Is it to be wondered at that in an age like this the people should at last turn upon a body which seems to be made for obstruction and not progress? I do not wonder that the Senate has become a byword and reproach with the loose tongues and pens, bought and acting for every sort of mercenary interest throughout the land.

Sir, let us look for a minute at the history of the sugar schedule, which has been the rock in all this debate around whose base the cross currents and eddies of discussion have boiled and seethed. In one end of the Union, in that beautiful State of Louisiana, were the cane-growers, on 74 per cent of whose product as refined sugar, is all the protection that is given to the product of the trust, and who demanded protection because they represented an American interest. For myself, let me say, that allied to them geographically and by the ties of blood and commerce, I had rather give to them protection than to any other class within our broad domain. At the other end of the Union was a giant monopoly, stretching its Briarean arms into every family and to every breakfast table throughout the land, with watered stock amounting to \$75,000,000, upon one-half of which they were paying 7 per cent, and upon the other 12 per cent quarterly, with a surplus of \$18,000,000 ready for distribution amongst their stockholders—aggressive, defiant, almost dominant in the legislation of the country. Between these two was the minor interest of the beet-sugar producers, so small, however, as hardly to enter into the discussion as to the duties to be imposed.

Mr. President, under the McKinley act the duty upon refined sugar, the product of the trust, amounts to 60 cents on the hundred pounds—50 cents upon the face of the act and one-tenth differential as to all countries that impose an export duty; and

as Germany is the only country that imposes this discriminating duty, and the only country that sends to us the refined sugar that competes with our product, the duty upon refined sugar under the McKinley act amounts practically and really to 60 cents on the hundred pounds. Under the Wilson bill, about which we have heard so much, and which is so often placed anti-thetically against the bill as it passed the Senate in regard to tariff reform, and especially in regard to the duty upon sugar—under the bill as originally reported by Mr. WILSON from the Committee on Ways and Means to the House of Representatives, and which was endorsed in the President's message of December last, the duty upon refined sugar, the product of the trust, was 25 cents on the 100 pounds, with the raw material free, as it was in the McKinley act, and a bounty for eight years upon the raw sugar of the South. The House of Representatives struck out the duty and sent to us a bill with free sugar, raw and refined. That bill was sent to the Finance Committee and taken charge of by a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], who had taken the place of our late lamented colleague, Mr. Vance, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], and myself.

Sir, it has been said that we are the creatures of the sugar trust. The liars and slanderers and libelers, the miserable creatures who live upon the garbage and filth of public life, and whose bread has been breathed upon by infected lungs, dare to make this statement about men who have gone through these five months of labor and anxiety and humiliation in order to do their duty.

Here is the bill we proposed [exhibiting], printed and brought to the full Committee on Finance. Here is the sugar schedule as we made and agreed upon it. It imposed eighty hundredths of a cent on sugar not above 80 degrees under the polariscopic test, and one-hundredth of a cent for each additional degree up to 100 degrees, without any differential at all in favor of the sugar trust. It imposed a revenue duty upon the sugars of Louisiana, but gave nothing to this trust, which is said now to dominate the Senate.

This bill, upon the morning that we proposed it to the Finance Committee, was taken out of our hands and put before a caucus of Democratic Senators, without our knowledge or consent, and for three days we wrangled and disputed in regard to the terms of the tariff measure to be proposed to Congress.

The end of that discussion was—and if any Senator here denies it let him rise in his seat and say so—that this bill as we had made it was rejected, although a better bill than the Wilson bill in the way of tariff reform, lowering duties upon woolen goods and in the metal and other schedules.

Mr. MILLS. Reducing duties \$15,000,000.

Mr. VEST. Reducing duties \$15,000,000, as my friend from Texas says.

Mr. GRAY. And with more ad valorem and fewer specifics.

Mr. VEST. And with more ad valorem and fewer specifics. It came nearer to my idea of what a tariff-reform bill should be than any that had been enacted since the Walker tariff of 1846. At the end of these three days of miserable wrangling and re-creation we were turned out of that caucus with the intelligent and definite instruction to make a bill that would secure 43 Democratic votes, and which could be passed by the Senate! To that task we addressed ourselves. The result is seen in the bill which has been passed.

Mr. President, I shall speak of that bill in a few moments; but I desire to say now in passing that much of it, a very large portion of it, was agreed to by me simply in order to escape the humiliation of going back to the Democrats of the United States with no bill at all. It is as well known as that we are assembled in the Senate of the United States that in this Chamber are some six or seven Democrats as honest as I, whose motives I do not impugn, with whom I differ radically and essentially in regard to the tariff.

It has been said that we have made a fight here for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] against the President. Mr. President, in 1892 I wrote the first letter that came from a member of this body in favor of Mr. Cleveland's nomination for the Presidency. It was written to the Greystone Club, of Denver, Colo., and in it I said that, whilst my personal relations with the Senator from Maryland were as pleasant as they could possibly be, I would not support him for the nomination because he did not represent my views in regard to tariff reform; that, whilst I differed with Mr. Cleveland in regard to the silver question, I was prepared to support him for the nomination, and, of course, for election, because he stood the foremost representative of what I believed right in regard to the tariff question.

Sir, I have fought for no man, and never shall. I belong to no faction. I am neither of the house of Montague nor Capulet, of York nor Lancaster. I shall fight under any flag which leads to the principles I believe to be right, no matter in whose hands the staff of that banner may be placed. I am ready now to follow

the President. I shall not follow him when I know that he is committing an injustice upon members of his party and doing violence to the results that ought to be achieved by the Democratic party in the coming canvass.

Mr. President, pursuing what I was saying in regard to the sugar duty, the result of our labors in regard to it is seen in the provisions of the tariff bill which has been accepted by the House of Representatives. The bill passed the Senate, but under circumstances which convinced many of us that the margin was so slight and the danger so great that it would be almost rashness to bring it back to the Senate with any great difference in its composition.

It has been said repeatedly—and I shall come to that more explicitly directly—that there never has been a time, and this has formed the staple of the editorials of the metropolitan press—that a bill like the Wilson bill in its provisions substantially and generally could not be passed in this Senate.

It has been asserted that nothing but pure cowardice or sinister motives kept us from reporting a bill similar to the Wilson bill which would have been passed, and which would have forced certain Senators "into the open," as the expression was, and who then would not have dared to vote against it. If there is a Senator here to-day upon either side of this Chamber who believes that the Wilson bill, or anything equivalent to it, could have been passed in the Senate at any time I ask him as a personal favor to rise in his seat and say so. [A pause.] I have been in this contest from the beginning, giving time and labor at the risk of life and health to the work before me, and I assert there never was a time when anything like the Wilson bill could have been enacted into law.

Sensors from the great manufacturing States of the Northeast looked upon that bill as murderous to the interests of their constituents, and would have fought it to the death. The complications growing out of the sugar interest assisted them in their opposition, and with no rules in the Senate and a majority of one, possibly of two, we were at the mercy of the minority, and it was as impossible to have passed that bill as for me to-day to carry this mass of marble upon one hand.

I come now to another phase of this measure, and I shall

nothing extenuate,
Nor set down aught in malice.

When we came into conference with our brethren in the other House after the first disagreement—and it is unnecessary to go behind that—I stated myself (and I make that remark in order to assume the full responsibility), when the conference first assembled, that it was useless to go any further with the bill or with the disagreement between the two Houses until we had disposed of this Medusa head of the sugar tariff continually confronting us. It was agreed unanimously that we should take up the sugar schedule to the exclusion of every other subject, and come to a determination upon it.

We did take it up, and finally agreed, without a dissenting vote in the conference, upon a sugar schedule. That schedule was 40 per cent upon the saccharine matter in the sugar imported, together with a differential of one-fifth of 1 cent in favor of the refiners, constituting 20 cents upon the 100 pounds. The one-tenth differential as to countries which impose a discriminating duty was left out and the bounty upon sugar until the first of January was left out. The schedule as I have stated it was unanimously agreed upon in the conference, and was set aside.

The argument in favor of this schedule was that it removed the nebulous and scandalous accusation that in the 40 per cent upon raw and refined sugar in the bill there was some hidden profit to the trust, to which they clung closely, and which was not known to the public. As the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the other House suggested, when the 40 per cent was placed upon the saccharine matter alone, it stripped the bill of this objection and let the whole world know that the trust received 20 cents upon the 100 pounds instead of 25 cents under the Wilson bill as originally framed, and 60 cents under the McKinley act.

Mr. President, for five long months the waves and winds had roared around Congress in regard to sugar. Cartoons, editorials, lying correspondents, demagogues on the hustings had accused the Senate of having been sold out to the sugar trust. Everywhere and anywhere, by night and day, the question was in regard to the sale of the Senate to the sugar trust. When we had agreed with our associates of the other House, and the sugar schedule had been disposed of, we fondly supposed that the great obstacle to agreement had been removed, and that we should then and there meet and embrace like brethren and stand as one before the American people. Imagine our surprise when we found that the insuperable obstacle was not in the sugar duty, but that it came from the duty upon coal and iron ore.

From the 20th day of March, when the tariff bill was published to the world, to the 2d day of July, when the President

wrote his letter to Mr. Wilson, no intimation had been made to the members of the Finance Committee that a bill with a duty upon coal or iron ore, or both, constituted perfidy to Democratic principles and dishonor to the Democratic party.

Sir, recurring again to an unpleasant subject, I hope for the last time, I have no quarrel with the President of the United States. I made no attack upon the President of the United States. The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] did me injustice when he put me in the classic rôle of the envious Casca, who stabbed Cæsar at the foot of Pompey's statue. I simply defended the motives of myself and my colleagues upon the Finance Committee against the imputation in the President's letter.

If it were necessary, in order to remain in public life, that I should retract one word of what I said in the Senate, I would not utter it. No man, no matter how high his position, has a right to perpetrate an injustice upon another. After the President of the United States had told my colleagues—for I had not been to the White House—that although he preferred free coal and free iron, still the bill as we were preparing it would receive his support; and after we had given our labor, our energy, almost our lives, to the preparation of the bill, for the President to come before the American people and denounce a measure which he had failed to denounce before, although he knew its provisions, was an act of gross injustice to those of us who had suffered far more than he.

The result has been and will be under existing circumstances that the best campaign document furnished the Republican party, of which we will not hear the last until the approaching canvass is ended, will be the letter of the President denouncing the Senate without exception for having framed a bill, the provisions of which are now necessary, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, to prevent the issue of interest-bearing bonds to carry on the Government.

After two days or more of attempt at amicable adjustment—and I beg to say here and now that for each of the conferees on the part of the other House I entertain the most sincere personal regard and have no complaint to make of their action in any way whatever—we offered to the conferees on the part of the House to allow the sugar schedule to stand as we had made it, and to which we all agreed, and that they should take either free coal or free iron ore, as they pleased.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Missouri means as the conferees had made the sugar schedule.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course as we, the conferees, had made and agreed upon it. We offered them the privilege of taking either free coal or free iron ore, stating to them that it seemed to us fair to adjust the differences between the two bodies by their taking one-half and leaving the other half as the Senate had voted it.

Let it be understood that all this time the Senate conferees personally agreed with the House of Representatives, but we were there as conferees, representing the Senate, standing by the votes of the Senate, instructed to maintain the position of the Senate. While I did not consider myself bound to the extremity of standing by all the amendments of the Senate without exception and without further amendment, but was prepared to give up many of those amendments in order to save the bill, yet, at the same time, as a conferee on the part of the Senate, I considered myself honorably bound to defend and advocate, as far as possible, the instruction which had been given to me.

When this proposition was made to the House conferees that they should take either free coal or iron ore, they expressed great gratification, and said the spirit which we had manifested would be met by them in the same conciliatory and friendly manner. They went out for consultation, and after some two hours came back and suggested that it would probably be best to take free iron ore instead of free coal. We told them that was a matter to be determined by them, and that we were willing to make the change.

We then adjourned, with a sort of parliamentary love feast for the second time, concluding that the matter had been fully adjusted and that we could make a report. We stated to them at the same time, I should have said, that with our knowledge of the Senate and the close vote that must occur here upon any disputed question, it was not safe to go through all of the schedules and out down duties, and that it would be dangerous to come back to the Senate with reductions in the m tal schedule, the woolen schedule, the cotton schedule, the glass schedule, and the other great schedules in the bill. The next morning we met again in conference, and our friends from the House then informed us that they had concluded it was best to have free coal instead of free iron ore. We said "Gentlemen, take your choice. We can be

Happy * * * with either,
Were t'other dear charmer away."

[Laughter.]

After we had concluded upon free coal and had settled the sugar question, the chairman of the conferees on the part of the House stated that he considered it his duty and that of his co-conferees to demand that we take up the whole bill and go through all of the schedules and agree to such adjustment as would not endanger the fate of the bill in the Senate.

Speaking for myself, I can state that while I personally was willing to agree to any report that they might see proper to make in order to get the bill through the Senate—I stated frankly that to commence such a general reduction, or even any material reduction, of the duties in the bill would endanger its passage through the Senate, and that this was the great peril to be avoided above all others.

We also offered them free sugar instead of free coal, or 40 cents a ton for five years on coal and iron ore, with a reciprocal provision imposing the same duties on coal and iron ore from other countries as might be placed by such countries on coal and iron ore from the United States.

The House conferees insisted upon those reductions, and from the beginning to the end of the whole conference the trouble was, and I say it most respectfully and kindly, that our friends in the other House could never be made to understand that we knew more about the condition of affairs in the Senate than they did. Their idea seemed to be that for some sinister or occult purpose we were avoiding an open vote. They continually demanded of us, "Take the bill back to the Senate with such amendments as you yourselves concede with us ought to be made, and let the Senate, in the broad, open light of day, vote upon it."

We, upon the other hand, with one view under heaven, so far as I am concerned, that of avoiding the absolute destruction of all tariff legislation during this Congress, assured them, and every day confirmed us in our opinion, that if the bill came back here with material amendments it would be defeated and the country would be told that the Democratic party was incompetent to make any bill at all.

While the House conferees were insisting upon taking up all of the schedules and we were warning them against the inevitable result, the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] introduced his resolution which brought about the tie vote, in which the Chair gave the deciding vote, so well known to the Senate and to the public. After that there was no conference, because that vote demonstrated beyond all sort of question that what we had said to them in regard to the conditions in the Senate was absolutely and inevitably correct.

Mr. President, what are the salient points in the Senate bill, which has been so much derided and abused? What has the Democratic party of the country given to the American people in the shape of tariff reform as compared with the McKinley act? A false issue has been made before the people, and it has been made deliberately and intentionally for sinister purposes. It has been telegraphed, written, and spoken everywhere that the question was between the Senate bill and the Wilson bill.

That never was the question. It is as false as the assertion so often made that this is a Democratic Senate. This is not a Democratic Senate on the question of tariff reform. It never was, and it never will be, as at present constituted. But it has been said everywhere that the question was between the Wilson bill and the Senate bill. The question all the time has been between the Senate bill and the McKinley law. That was the choice to be made, and every man who understood the situation knew it.

Now, what have we done; and I shall dispose of that question in a very few words? The bill which the House has accepted, and which in a few hours will go to the President of the United States, puts wool, lumber, salt, copper, burlaps, bags and cotton bagging, flax and hemp, all agricultural implements, cotton ties, and binding twine absolutely on the free list, in antagonism to the provisions of the McKinley law. On coal and iron ore the duty has been decreased from 75 cents to 40 cents a ton. On lead ore the duty has been decreased one-half. On zinc sheets it has been decreased one-half. On woolen goods, the citadel of protection, the great fortress of monopoly and outrage in the McKinley law, the duties have been reduced 50 per cent. They have been reduced 38 per cent in the metal schedule, 22 per cent on cotton goods, 31 per cent in the glass schedule, 22 per cent on chemicals, where the House bill reduced the duties only 20 per cent.

If Senators and the opponents of the Democratic party, before they criticise the bill further, will take the trouble to examine the "Comparison of the Tariff and Administrative Acts of 1890 and the Bill H. R. 4864," being report No. 559, Fifty-third Congress, and turn to the comparative statement from the Treasury Department, they will find a summary, the substance of which I will state. Under the present law the average ad valorem is 49.58 per cent; under the House bill it is 35.51, and under the

Senate bill it is 33.68 per cent. In other words, between the McKinley act and the House bill there is a decrease of 14 per cent; between the McKinley act and the Senate bill there is a decrease of over 11 per cent, being a differential between the House and Senate bills of 3 per cent. We have sugar included in our bill, while the House bill came to us with no duty on raw and refined sugar.

Mr. HARRIS. Under the McKinley act, of course, sugar was free.

Mr. VEST. It was free with a bounty of 2 cents a pound. If Senators will turn to page 394 they will find another summary. The average ad valorem rate based on the value of importations of the fiscal year 1887, in the act of 1883, was 47.10 per cent; average ad valorem rate of the Mills bill, based on the value of importations of the fiscal year 1887, 42.38 per cent, or a difference of 5 per cent; average ad valorem rate in the McKinley act, based on the value of the importations of the fiscal year 1893, 49.58 per cent; average ad valorem rate, based on the value of the importations of the fiscal year 1893, in the House bill, 35.51 per cent; average ad valorem rate, based on the value of the importations of the fiscal year 1893 in the Senate bill, 38.68 per cent.

So it appears, Mr. President, that all this scandal, vituperation, and criticism arise upon a difference of 3 per cent between the two bills. When we have made the immense step in advance on the path of tariff reform of putting wool upon the free list, and have reduced the duty upon woolen goods 50 per cent, when we have put lumber and salt upon the free list, and have reduced the duties upon lead and zinc, we are still told that in framing the Senate bill we have been guilty of perfidy to Democratic principles and dishonor to the Democratic party.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Senate bill retains the Income Tax, shorn of many objectionable provisions, which establishes, I trust, for all time the democratic principle that taxation should be in proportion to Governmental protection, and that the citizen should pay upon his income above a fixed sum, and not upon consumption.

Mr. President, I am glad now to be able to speak as an American Senator and not as a conferee. My friend from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] suggests to me that I should say something in regard to the deficiency. The Secretary of the Treasury has informed us that if the duty is taken from sugar there will be a deficiency of \$30,000,000. I make no issue with the Secretary of the Treasury. I regret that this fact was not made known to us before, but since it has come to us now I shall not avoid the issue. If it be true that a deficiency of \$30,000,000 will be created and that bonds are to be issued, why should we send the bill to the Finance Committee, never to be heard of again?

Why should we not grapple with the proposition now? What are committees for except to give information to the Senate as to details? Who does not know all about the sugar duty? Who is not prepared to act upon it? If to make sugar free will create a deficiency of \$30,000,000, then why not put 40 per cent on sugar, raw and refined, and leave it there and take the responsibility each one for himself before the American people, with no protective duty to the refiners at all? Take Mr. Theodore Havemeyer, president of the trust, at his own proposition, when, in 1888, he said that the refiners of the United States could hold their own with those of any other country in the world.

Why should we continue this scandal? Why should we now send the bill into a tomb and put the seal of the everlasting upon it, and then have the American people say, "Oh, yes; they did their work for the trust, and then they were afraid to face what the representatives of the people had sent them in the shape of a free sugar bill?" Why can not we settle it now? Why shall we put it off? Where stands the majority of the Senate upon the sugar question? Why force a few of us to be the scapegoats of popular indignation, scandal, and defamation everywhere? Why not let every man stand out and answer to his name and say what he thinks should be done, and go back to his people with the result?

Sir, I am tired of evasion, suspicion, and lies. I want the truth to be known, and let each man assume the responsibility for himself. Another word and I shall have concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. Before the Senator from Missouri, my colleague on the Committee on Finance, concludes, I should be glad to have him state, as he opposes the reference of the bill to the committee, what remedy he suggests for the threatened evil of a deficiency of \$30,000,000 in the Treasury.

Mr. VEST. I have just stated it.

Mr. HARRIS. I have not understood the Senator. I was unfortunate in that respect.

Mr. VEST. I endeavored to make it as clear as possible. I would impose a revenue duty upon raw and refined sugar. I understand my friend from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] has prepared such an amendment. He showed it to me this morning. It meets all doubt about a deficiency, answers the Secretary of the Treas-

ury completely, and relieves us of all this nebulosity of defamation which has been so rank in the country for the last five months. I have, for myself, always advocated free sugar, but I am willing, in order to meet the demands of the Treasury Department, to vote for the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas has prepared and will offer. I will make another remark, and then I am done with the subject, I hope forever.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant ever to indulge in personal-ity, but my attention has been called recently to an infamous statement, coming from a generally reputable source, made in the public press, to the effect that my action in reference to the letter of the President to Mr. WILSON, and in regard to the bill had been dictated by a feeling of revenge against his Excellency because he had ignored me as to the patronage of my State. The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] was kind enough in his concluding remarks, when he played the role of Marc Antony, and when some people suspected that he would like to have played Marc Antony in earnest, and "come to bury Cæsar, not to praise him," to say as to those who formed the classic group that had attacked our modern Cæsar:

What private griefs they have, alas, I know not.

Mr. President, I have no private griefs; but I wish to acknowledge in the most public manner my gratitude to the President for having relieved me from all responsibility in regard to appointments in Missouri. Sir, if there is anything in my public life which has afforded me any pleasure, real and substantial, it has been the fact that the President in the exercise of his constitutional right, of which I do not complain, informed me that he no longer desired my advice or assistance in regard to Missouri patronage.

Not again during this Administration will I stand in a crowded anteroom looking into the anxious and haggard faces of expectant officeholders. Not again when admitted to his august presence, will I watch the shadows, possibly produced by indignation, that float across the Executive brow and feel hope sink "to rise no more." Not again will I be damned at country post-offices and upon street corners as an ingrate who has given no offices to his friends. Sir, were it not for this tariff I could now indulge in the ecstasy of that well-known hymn:

There shall I bathe my wearied soul
In seas of endless rest,
And not a wave of trouble roll
Across my peaceful breast.

[Laughter.]

I have no complaint against the President as to patronage. I am ready to follow him now as the old Scotch followed the banner of the Bruce, when he fought for country and honor. I fight for no man; I fight for my principles, my party, and my country. Men pass away like clouds from the evening sky, but principles live forever. Sir, when any man accuses me of personal motives in what I have done in connection with the bill, my connection with which is now ended, I simply answer him as Marmion to Douglas:

Lord Angus, thou hast lied.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury which has been read to the Senate, I offer an amendment to the pending bill.

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

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not understand that the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the amendment be read for information.

Mr. MANDERSON. That can be done. Let it be read for information and ordered printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Arkansas that the amendment can be read for information. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask that the amendment may be considered as pending, and that it be printed with the bill and go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. It can not be considered as pending, but the Senator may offer it and have it printed.

Mr. HARRIS. Let the amendment be read and printed, and if the bill is referred, let it be referred with the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That from and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all sugars and on all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, or of beet juice, melada or concentrated melada, concrete or concentrated molasses, a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem.

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid on molasses testing above 40° and not above 56° polariscope, a duty of 2 cents per gallon; if testing above 56° polariscope, a duty of 4 cents per gallon.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I have not risen either to attack

or defend the bill which has recently passed Congress and is now awaiting the signature of the President. I think perhaps the least that we can say about that measure the better it will be. It is the most remarkable measure that has ever found itself upon the pages of the statute books of any country. It is a phenomenon in political science; and especially is it so when we consider that this is a popular Government and that legislation in a popular government is the crystallization of the public will. I make bold to say here to-day that that bill does not reflect the sentiment of one thousand people of the United States.

I do not think I will be far from the truth when I say there is not a Republican in the United States who favors it. I do not think I will be far amiss when I say there is not a Populist in the United States who favors it, judging by the votes of their representatives in this Chamber. I do not believe I will be far from the truth when I say that the great masses of the Democratic people of the United States condemn it. It is the product, as we all know, of five or six, or at best seven, members on this floor.

As my friend from Missouri said, and well said, a while ago, there is no Democratic majority on this floor on tariff reform, and there has not been at any time since I have been a member of this body. There are four distinct parties upon this floor. There is a Republican party, a Democratic party, a Populist party, and a Conservative party. The Conservatives hold the balance of power, and we all know what the balance of power means. It is one of the most potent instruments wielded either in legislation or in the executive departments of government. It is the balance of power that has adjusted the territorial boundaries of the dominions of Europe for more than a century. It is the balance of power that has kept crowns upon heads in Europe, and the balance of power here, five or six members expressing by their votes their will and not the will of the people of the United States, or any considerable number of them, have made the bill what it is, and it will be a law in a short time. In a government of freemen the ballot box is the source of all power and the expression of all power. It is the crystallized public will, so to speak, of the people of the United States. Yet, as I said, I do not believe if the entire body of the people of the United States were polled 1,000 voters would say that it is a bill that meets their approval.

We all voted for it over here. We passed it. As the Senator from Missouri well said, the issue was between that bill and the McKinley law; and as I said, perhaps not in such fine language as my friend would use, and perhaps not exactly in parliamentary language, especially when used in the Senate of the United States, we all found ourselves "between the devil and the deep sea," and we went to the sea rather than see the country go to the devil. [Laughter.]

We have no apologies to make for it. The bill is better than the McKinley law. It was the best we could do under the circumstances.

I regret, Mr. President, that my friend and other distinguished gentlemen will continue to attack the President of our party because we differ. The President may have been wrong or he may have been right. I believe that he is an honest man. I believe that he sincerely wants the redemption of the pledges made to the six million Democrats at the ballot box when they voted to change the control of the Government. The issue is not between the President and this body on the sugar question. The President's letter showed that he is in favor of a tax on sugar. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury is no condemnation of the President's letter to Mr. WILSON.

The nervous language that he used in the letter to Mr. WILSON that to abandon the cause and the principles of the Democratic party and its professions would be party perfidy and party dishonor was not made about sugar. It was made because we were departing from the pledges that we had made for free materials of manufacture and the reduction of the cost of the production of American manufactures, giving employment to our people, manufacturing more, and sending our manufactures out to the world and selling them in competition, driving all rivals and competitors before us and taking the world's market. The President of the United States wanted to give employment to the idle people of the United States. We had promised them not only free coal and free ore, but our platform pledge was that tariff reform should take the direction of free materials for manufacture. The bill we had passed was not doing it.

Now, my friend from Missouri was not hit by those words. He need not lose any sleep. They were not aimed at men who have his principles and his record in public life. I know what his political convictions and his principles and his record have been. His record has been the same as that of the great majority of our party. It has been for tariff reform, for reduction of taxes, for exempting from taxation the materials of manufacture. It was not at him that those words were aimed. I myself lose no

sleep on account of those words. "Let the galled jade wince; my withers are unwrung."

I will state some of the things at which the President was aiming. If you will look on pages 324 and 325 of this document, here are nearly two pages of materials that were taken from the free list in the Wilson bill and transferred to the dutiable list in the Senate bill. I will not take time to read them. We were going backward when we had promised to go forward and exempt materials of manufacturers from taxation. It was at these and at this line of policy that the criticism of the Executive was leveled, and not at such a man as my friend from Missouri [Mr. VEST], or my friend from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], or my friend from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

I have no criticism to make on the committee of conference. They have done all that they could do. We were within a power we could not resist, and we either had to take the terms dictated to us or to take the McKinley law. That is all there is about it.

My friend quoted in defence of the bill the per cents in the tables. Nothing is more deceptive than per cents. Suppose we had \$400,000,000 worth of dutiable goods coming into the United States, and that is in round numbers the amount in 1893. Suppose the duties paid on those goods amounted to \$400,000,000 this year, that would be 100 per cent, would it not? Suppose, in revising the tariff, we put \$200,000,000 worth of these same imports on the free list and receive \$200,000,000 of duty on the other \$200,000,000 of imports, the duty would still be 100 per cent and show that we had not reduced taxation.

Suppose we put \$300,000,000 worth on the free list and \$100,000,000 worth on the dutiable list, and tax them \$100,000,000, it would still show that we have done nothing, for it is still 100 per cent. Suppose you put everything on the free list but a pound of candy worth a dollar and charge a dollar and a half duty upon it, you are arrayed before the country for increasing taxation 50 per cent, notwithstanding you have exempted \$400,000,000 worth of imports from taxation, and removed that great burden from the shoulders of the people.

In looking at a question of this sort, you must take into consideration the goods that you exempt entirely from taxation and add to the free list. That was the peculiar value of the bill of 1887. In that bill we put about \$20,000,000 worth of imports on the free list. This bill only puts about \$11,000,000 worth on the free list. We are going backward instead of forward. I say for myself (and I know I speak for my friend from Missouri, and my friend from Tennessee, and my friend from Arkansas, and all the rest of them), we do not at all accept this as a final settlement of the question of tariff reform. We have carried the outposts that defended the citadel of the enemy, and we intend to push the contest until we carry the gates of the city and sweep the streets of the enemy and take everything from him.

We intend to restore to the people of this country the God-given right to work for life and to sell the products of their work in whatever markets they can sell them. The right to work is worthless if you can not sell the products of your work, for we are all working for other people. If we entirely forbade commerce and trade and exchange, civilization would perish in one generation from off the face of the earth. The greatest possible calamity that could befall the human family would be to carry the doctrine of protection to its logical analysis and forbid everybody from trading. The greatest possible benefit that could occur to the human family would be to remove all barriers and permit them to enjoy free trade all over the world.

Mr. President, I shall say nothing more about the bill. It is a step in the right direction. It is a substantial step in the right direction, with the exception of the policy of taking from the free list any articles that enter into free manufacture. It will be a substantial benefit to the country. It will reduce the cost of woolen goods to the people of the United States from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000, to say nothing of other schedules.

But, Mr. President, I rose to say something about the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. I rose to say that there is no cause whatever to apprehend a deficit. I say that you may take all the tax off sugar and you will have more money than you can spend legitimately. All the estimates that have been made by the Finance Committee, which have been adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury, are based upon the imports of 1893 under the McKinley law.

What has been the fact with reference to every tariff act in the history of the Government that reduced duties when they were above the protected point? Importations increased, and with increased importations came increased revenue. It was so in the Walker tariff of 1846. We had no surplus revenue under the protective tariff of 1842. In 1846, though the duties were decreased down to a revenue standard, the revenue increased \$8,000,000 the very next year. I want to read good standard authority on this question. I read from the report of the Finance

Committee of this body made by my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] in 1888. At that time, as we all know, we had about \$100,000,000 in the Treasury that we had no use for, and one of the main arguments for the bill of the House of Representatives was that it would empty the Treasury and reduce the revenue.

What do our friends say? I read from the report of the majority of the Committee on Finance on the Mills bill in 1888. Listen to it. Here is the truth enunciated and a principle to which all of us agree, both Republicans and Democrats, that when you have protective duties above the revenue point and reduce them you increase importations and increase the revenue. We contend that that is right. Our friends on the other side contend that it is wrong; but the fact we both admit.

Mr. GRAY. Both admit it as true.

Mr. MILLS. The fact we both admit, that when the duties are above the revenue point and a reduction of duties is made, the logical and inexorable consequences are increased importations and increased revenue. I read from the report made by my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] in 1888:

Your committee, after a thorough examination of the provisions of the bill (H. R. 9051) referred to them by the Senate, have become convinced of its inadequacy as a remedial measure in view of the condition which confronts us.

1. Its adoption would probably result in an increase, instead of a reduction, of the revenue from customs.

It is claimed by the friends of the bill that the reduction of revenue from this source would amount to \$49,486,240.75, but we are confident that the large reduction in rates proposed would result in greatly increased importations. When American producers supply a considerable portion of our market with articles in general use and the rates on these are reduced below the protective point, both importations and revenue must increase.

By the acts of July 14, 1870, May 1 and June 6, 1872, important reductions in tariff rates were made and the free list greatly enlarged. It was officially estimated at the time of the passage of the various acts that these changes would result in a reduction of the revenue from customs of \$57,227,510. The revenue from this source in 1869 was \$176,114,904, and in 1873 it was \$184,929,542, or an increase of \$8,814,138, instead of a reduction of \$57,227,510. This increase took place notwithstanding the fact that free importations increased in value \$157,707,264 between 1869 and 1873. Similar results may be reasonably expected should the House bill become a law.

Now, listen to this:

If foreign manufacturers should, through the changes made in the cotton and woolen schedules, secure a quarter of the market now held by our cotton and woolen manufacturers—and this is certainly a very conservative estimate—the additional amount of duty collected from increased importations would amount to at least \$60,000,000 annually. The expansion of imports which would surely follow the reduction of rates on china, porcelain, common window glass, manufactures of iron and steel, flax, jute, hemp, and a large number of minor manufactures, would greatly augment the revenue.

The importations in 1888 were about what they were in 1893. The reduction proposed is in the same neighborhood, only this approaches more closely to the revenue point and therefore will bring greater importation and greater revenue.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator for information—which bill approaches nearer the revenue point?

Mr. MILLS. The Senate bill.

Mr. GRAY. Nearer than the so-called Mills bill?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir; the duties are lower. Now, with these facts before us, and they are mathematical and can not be contradicted, there is to be a very large increase of importations under the bill. My friend from Rhode Island nods his head in assent to it. A large increase of importations means a large increase of revenue. It was estimated at \$60,000,000 in 1888 on cotton and woolen goods alone, to say nothing of the other articles in the schedules.

There is no necessity for putting a dollar of taxation on sugar, and yet I consented to it with my friend from Missouri and my friend from Arkansas when we were arranging these schedules. I will be frank enough to say that I proposed it, and that my friend from Missouri and my friend from Arkansas opposed it for a time. I proposed it and urged it, for two reasons. One was that we could not pass the bill without it, which is just the same reason that I gave for voting for the bill. The other was that a number of our friends, as some of them appear to-day on the floor, felt that it would not be safe; that the bill upon its face looked like it would bring a deficit. They had not looked at the question of the increased importations that would follow. I consented that a tax on raw sugar might be placed in the bill. That would bring \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000.

That tax was placed in the bill, as my friend has read. It was changed, however, but the amount of revenue produced under the changed specifications in the bill will be about the same. The only fact that reconciles me to the duty on sugar is that if we receive forty, fifty, sixty, or seventy-five million dollars more money than we want, we are in debt and can purchase our interest-bearing bonds and extinguish them.

But I prefer to put sugar on the free list, and to do it now. There is no necessity for sending this bill to the Finance Committee. We are in possession of all the facts. A number of us have been dragooned from day to day and week to week and

month to month as voting the way we did not believe we ought to vote in accordance with our own private convictions, and because we deferred to others in voting to get a bill that was better than the McKinley law. Now, I ask for a vote on this question in order that we may all show what our convictions were as to this item.

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

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Does the Senator take issue with the Secretary of the Treasury in the statement made by him this morning, and does the Senator hold that there is no necessity for the revenue to be derived from sugar?

Mr. MILLS. I do, most unequivocally.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I understand the Senator to say that he would vote to put sugar on the free list?

Mr. MILLS. I will.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will he do so in the face of the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MILLS. I tell you the Secretary of the Treasury copies the estimates made by the Finance Committee and they are made on the imports of 1893 and on the duties of the McKinley law. As I have shown, in every instance where we have reformed the tariff and brought the rates of duty down the imports have increased and the revenues have increased.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If I correctly understood the Senator's contention since he began his remarks, it was simply that while we had placed many things on the free list, notably wool, salt, lumber, and other articles, still the bill had been maintained nearly up to the McKinley rates. If that be the case, how is it possible for him to claim a large importation of goods over and above the imports of 1893?

Mr. MILLS. The Senator has got things mixed up. If he will notice the estimates he will find that, taking the importation of 1893 with the rate of taxation existing in 1893, \$400,000,000 worth of goods were imported. Now, take the goods which are made dutiable under the bill according to the amount imported in 1893 and we get \$179,000,000, when under the McKinley law the amount was \$198,000,000. Of course, some of the dutiable articles in the McKinley law are put on the free list, but take these same goods and you will find that the imports will be increased perhaps \$100,000,000 or \$150,000,000 in value, and then at our rate, say 38 per cent, they will bring over \$30,000,000 more than the amount indicated by the Secretary of the Treasury. If you go to the Secretary of the Treasury and ask him he will tell you that he made his estimate on the importations of 1893.

Mr. MCPHERSON. He could make it upon nothing else.

Mr. MILLS. He could make it upon nothing else. He had nothing else to make it on.

Mr. HARRIS. He so states.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, I have made these remarks to present the facts to the Senate that we may act intelligently on the question. There is no earthly necessity for any consideration of the bill by a committee. We now have all the facts. These questions were discussed over and over again in this body during the long continued debate on the tariff bill, and I hope my friend from Tennessee will withdraw his motion to refer and let us vote upon this measure.

Mr. HARRIS. With great respect, as I have, for the opinions of the Senator from Texas upon this question, the actual conditions of the Treasury of the United States, the demands upon it and the revenue necessities, I trust, as I know he will pardon me for saying, I shall be governed by the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury as to these necessities and as to the probable revenues derivable from the bill just passed rather than upon his opinions.

Now, I move the reference of these four bills. My motion, to be strictly in order, should refer to each of them separately, and inasmuch as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has made a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill for free sugar, as it may be called, I apply my motion to that bill. I can not withdraw it; believing, as I do, that the proper committee of this body should carefully consider and report the proper method, whatever that may be, of guarding against this apprehended and, as I believe, absolutely certain deficiency if that bill shall pass in the form it comes to us from the other House.

I am in full sympathy with the Senator from Texas. If I felt at liberty to exercise my own judgment and inclinations, independent of revenue necessities, I should go with him; but, as a member of the Finance Committee and as a member of the American Senate, I shall never consent for this Congress to adjourn until we have made such provision as will avoid the bankruptcy of the Treasury and a deficiency of twenty-nine or thirty million dollars. It is the highest of our duties to provide against such deficiency. If the amendment of the Senator from

Arkansas [Mr. JONES] will cover that contingency, as I believe it will, and the Senate chooses not to refer to the committee, upon the idea that the Senate knows quite as much as it can be informed by any committee, I shall have no regrets.

I would myself prefer absolutely free sugar, raw and refined, but in view of the present revenue necessities, and in view of the fact that the duties upon coal, the duties upon iron ore, the duties upon barbed wire, and rods to make it, are infinitesimal and cut no figure which is appreciable in respect to this deficiency, we have to deal with sugar in respect of this deficiency. Whether the Senate may choose to deal with it without a reference to the Committee on Finance or not I am not so particular, but in respect to questions such as these I have always deemed it safest for the appropriate committee to consider, and carefully consider, and report to this body the exact method best calculated to accomplish a given and a necessary result.

Let the Senate decide the question as it may as to whether the bill shall be referred or not, but if it is not referred, free-sugar man as I am, in reference to this inevitable deficiency I shall vote to put such a duty on sugar, raw and refined—and I want it to be a straight duty upon both, equal and alike—as will give absolute assurance of furnishing the revenues necessary to meet the demands of the Government. No more than this do I desire to say.

Mr. MILLS. Before taking my seat I wish to state, as I have stated repeatedly here before, in the other House, and in the country, that I am in favor of a tax on sugar, on coffee, on tea, on tropical fruits, and on every article that does not come in competition with anything that is produced in this country, except the materials of manufacture. That I understand to be a tariff for revenue. I have taken that position everywhere.

The only reason why I would favor the repeal of the sugar tax now is that it would be going backward, and, as I said awhile ago, I do not want to go backward. It has been placed on the free list, and I do not want to go back and vote it on the dutiable list, nor do I advocate putting coffee and tea and those other things upon the dutiable list now; but if there was a majority of this body and of the other body in perfect harmony with my views, then I would construct a tariff, and in constructing that tariff I would put a tax on coffee and on tea, and I would put everything that is to be remanufactured on the free list, in order that we might produce our products at the lowest possible cost and drive all rivals before us in all the markets of the world.

Mr. President, for the same reason I would put a tax on sugar, because nine dollars out of every ten would go into the Treasury and only one dollar out of every ten would go into the private pocket of a protected producer; but when you put sugar on the free list, which was done in carrying out the Republican policy, that revenue shall be the incident and protection the principle, and they put a heavy tax on woolen goods in order that nine dollars might go into the pocket of the private producer where one dollar goes into the Treasury.

For these reasons I would put a duty on sugar. But we are not now constructing a Democratic tariff, a tariff for revenue, and such a tariff as the industrial interests of these people require. The time will come when we shall be engaged in that work here in this body, for, if I am not mistaken in the public judgment and public common sense of this country, they are growing stronger in the faith that the best possible condition of the human family is that in which the God of nature placed them, every man to be free, and every man following his own pursuits of happiness in his own way, choosing his own occupation, and government existing alone for the purpose of securing him in the full enjoyment of those rights.

Mr. GRAY. And of keeping the peace.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, before this matter is disposed of, I wish to make one suggestion in respect to the course which may be, and I think ought to be, taken with this bill. But before doing so I will call a moment's attention to the observations of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], with a view to correct one or two points to which he alluded, and of supplementing what he said with some further facts in relation to the passage of the revenue bill. Whenever we hear the charming eloquence of the Senator from Missouri we are captivated and enthralled for the time, and it is almost with difficulty that one is able to direct his attention to facts which are not presented, or reasons which have influenced the actions of others.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri truly said that a caucus of Democratic Senators was called, and that as the end of it the Finance Committee was required to report a bill which should command the assent of 43 Democratic Senators; and at least at that time it was hoped it would command the assent of 44.

Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that the caucus which charged the Finance Committee with that duty as-

sembled long before the report of the Finance Committee was made to the Senate. The Finance Committee undertook to execute that behest. They did execute it so far as it was in their power to do so. If we can understand the action they took, the fact that they reported a bill implied attempt to discharge the duty imposed upon them.

The bill had come to the Senate on the 2d of February. It was not until the 20th of March, after weeks of labor, that the Finance Committee reported their bill. That bill was then entitled to have had the support of a Democratic majority in the Senate. That bill was, as the Senator from Missouri said, a justifiable bill in its general features, while criticism might be passed upon some points in respect to it. We have been speaking of caucus action, and it is only fair to Democrats, of whose caucus so much has been told, to add that they voted in that caucus for free iron ore, and the bill reported to the Senate did not execute that vote. But upon the general behest to prepare a bill which should command a majority of the Senate, the committee reported the bill with a duty upon iron ore as well as upon coal.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon, but he is entirely mistaken about the facts. There never was but one bill, except the bill which the House has accepted, prepared by the majority of the Finance Committee. That was a bill which I had a moment ago upon my table here, which proposed a duty upon coal, but not a duty upon iron ore. It provided a duty of 50 cents upon coal and made iron ore free. I helped to make that bill and I know every word in it. That bill was carried to the Democratic caucus on the morning we prepared it. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], had called the Finance Committee together, and notice was served upon us of a caucus.

That was the only bill that ever was presented to a caucus of Democratic Senators. I said nothing in my remarks about the last one. The amendments had all been made and were submitted. I spoke of the caucus at which we presented that bill with a duty of 50 cents on coal and with iron ore free. The bill is in print and the Senator from California [Mr. WHITE] has it.

Mr. VILAS. Let me understand the Senator from Missouri. Does he say that he spoke of a caucus after the Finance Committee had reported the bill to the Senate?

Mr. VEST. Oh, no; before the bill was reported to the Senate. There were two caucuses. The bill which I had upon my desk, and which was printed and put in the hands of each member of that caucus, had 50 cents duty on coal, and iron ore free, together with a specific duty on sugar, to which I referred this morning, commencing at 80° by the polariscopic test and going up one-fourth of a cent on the hundred. That was the only bill we presented until the bill which was accepted by the House of Representatives was reported from the committee. The Senator has his dates and facts all wrong.

The second caucus called was in regard to the Jones amendments to the bill as to which we took a vote in the caucus—I will say since the matter has been mentioned—upon iron ore, and the vote stood 18 to 18, if I remember.

Mr. VILAS. I remember it as 19 to 17.

Mr. VEST. I know the vote was very close. Then we were dismissed with the advice to make a bill which could be passed.

Mr. VILAS. Has the Senator from Missouri the bill which was reported by the Finance Committee?

Mr. VEST. I had it a few moments ago, and will procure it for the Senator.

Mr. VILAS. I may be in error in respect to the report of the Finance Committee. It may be easily corrected if I am. Upon that point there ought to be no difference of statement although there is liable to be always a difference of remembrance in respect to a particular fact, which it will be easy enough to correct if I am wrong.

Mr. VEST. I now have the bill and will hand it to the Senator.

Mr. VILAS (examining). This is not the bill as it was reported by the Finance Committee.

Mr. VEST. It is the bill reported by the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance; it is the caucus bill.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri and I are not at difference. He is speaking of a bill which was printed as a mere tentative report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance before the time when the caucus was held. I was speaking of the bill which the Finance Committee reported a long time—I shall not say how many days, for I do not remember the date of the caucus—but a long time after the caucus, and the bill of the Finance Committee as reported first to the Senate, the only report the Finance Committee ever made. I am very sure contained a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore and a like duty on coal, although the caucus had previously

voted for free iron ore, and Senators about me confirm my remembrance.

Mr. VEST. That is a very different statement.

Mr. VILAS. That is the identical statement which I made, and it was with reference to that bill that I was about to remark that if the Finance Committee discharged the duty imposed upon them—and I think they did at that time faithfully and laboriously, and after great labor to do so—the duty then fell upon the Senate to support them; it fell upon the Democrats here to accept the best solution which the Finance Committee had been able to make, at least, and pass the bill in the Senate.

But, sir, all that faded away. Nothing came of it. Why? Because the action of the Finance Committee in the execution of the direction of the Democratic caucus was not accepted by all professing Democrats. From the 20th of March to the 7th of May, a period of forty-eight days, the bill was unfinished business in the Senate, talked about, filibustered against, debated after a fashion which our rules permit under the name of debate, but not a step of advance was made. Why? Because the Finance Committee had not made a Democratic bill? No; it was for the reason given this morning both by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Texas, that there is no Democratic majority here so far as tariff reform is concerned, which would accept and follow the principles of the party as expressed by its constituted authorities in caucus and in the Finance Committee.

Then came the second caucus, as a result of which a long list of amendments were proposed. I do not wish to review what I said the other day upon that subject nor to repeat; but I desire to ask this of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, as an independent fact which is necessary to my justification and to the justification of the Democratic members on this side of the Senate. I ask him if it was his understanding that the result of that caucus in a request to support those amendments in the Senate was obligatory, or regarded as obligatory, upon members on this side of the Chamber after the time when that bill should pass the Senate and go into conference?

Mr. VEST. Do you want an answer now?

Mr. VILAS. I will thank the Senator to answer.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, my understanding is—I speak for myself alone—that as members of the Democratic party and the caucus we were to support those amendments. I never understood that after we went into conference, and I was a member of that conference committee, that I could agree to nothing except those amendments. In other words, I considered it my duty to carry out the wishes of the Senate as expressed by their votes so far as possible consistent with securing a tariff bill, but no farther. If I had found that any of those amendments by being modified could have secured the passage of any sort of a tariff reform bill, I should have been willing to modify them, and so expressed myself in conference.

Mr. VILAS. I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Missouri did not quite answer the question which I have put to him, but I have no doubt he will. I was not speaking of what might be his opinion of his duty as a member of the conference committee, but whether or not he understood that any obligation upon those who attended that caucus extended beyond the passage of the bill in the Senate?

Mr. VEST. I thought I answered that question. If I did not, I shall do so. I did not think so.

Mr. VILAS. The Senator answers precisely as I thought he would.

I wish to observe another fact and ask the Senator another question, for I know, or I believe I know, he agrees with me upon that subject. After the amendments, known as the Jones amendments, were reported and the bill was thereupon further debated in Committee of the Whole, there was a great number of amendments proposed, and more than 60 distinct and important increases of duty were placed upon that bill in Committee of the Whole; eleven different subjects that had been left upon the free list after all previous action were placed upon the dutiable list in Committee of the Whole. Now, I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri if it was not a common expression which he and other Senators of the Finance Committee made use of, which passed continually among Democratic Senators on this side of the Chamber, that this bill was to be made in conference and that none of those amendments were to be regarded as obligatory or binding upon us, but would be corrected in conference?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I will state frankly that my idea in regard to those amendments was that they were to be changed in conference if it were possible. There were a great many amendments put upon the bill, which I supposed we could afterwards get rid of in conference, and some of them were put on with the distinct understanding that they could be changed in conference. I never understood that when we adopted those

amendments they were to remain there without regard to the consequences upon the measure. The result in conference, as a matter of course, was governed by circumstances, about which I knew nothing and could have known nothing at that time.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin, if I understand him, that there were amendments which were put on that we hoped to get rid of. I could name a great many of them that we hoped to get rid of in conference, but it so eventuated that we could not do it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think the Senator from Missouri ought to add in connection with his statement that about that class of amendments there would have been no difficulty in correcting them in conference if other things could have been agreed to.

Mr. VEST. That is true.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, one other thing ought to be understood here if we are having a plain talk about the facts, and that is that most of those amendments, if not all of them—no, perhaps not all, but nearly all—were made at the instance of Senators upon the other side of the Chamber, and were made with the expectation that they were not to be defended and fought for in conference, at least to some extent. I do not know as to what number of them that would be true, but it was true as to a considerable number.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Senator passes from that statement, I want to say that I had no such understanding as he now states.

Mr. VILAS. I do not remember whether the Senator from Iowa had any amendments made or not.

Mr. ALLISON. I had one made, but I had no understanding that it was to be surrendered at any time or under any circumstances.

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, I have had no understandings of the sort, but I am only speaking of reports and conversations current on this side of the Chamber.

Now, I wish to draw attention to the facts, or to the inference which is properly to be drawn from these facts. And, first, let me observe that it is the explanation of the votes that were given on this side of the Chamber by Senators who were ready to trust the Finance Committee in their leadership of this bill, but who, except for their confidence in a justification by the final result, would have been unwilling to have gone on assenting to those amendments, I think all of them, or nearly all of any great significance.

Take the amendments that were put on in reference to wool. I wish I had at hand the documents by which I could show the effect of those amendments. The Senate would never have accepted them.

I do not care to attack the bill which has passed; I do not care to carry forward for a moment any controversy among ourselves; "Let the dead Past bury its dead;" but, sir, I can not permit the statements which have been made to go without calling attention to these very important and significant facts upon which turns the justification of Democratic Senators on this side, men who have been sincere and honest in their belief that this system of taxation, which has failed so far of redress, is an iniquity and an injustice upon the people of the United States.

I wish right here to make another remark, for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], I am sorry to say, felt it permissible to cast some animadversions upon the President. Just these facts here disclosed, and the others stated by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] some days ago, completely exonerate the President from any obligation to the Senate bill, and that ought to be told as it has been now plainly told. He constantly expressed his wish and hope that the bill when made in conference, as it was to be made, as it was expected to be made, by Democratic conferees in fidelity to Democratic principles, would carry to the extent claimed the principle of free raw materials.

The Senator from Missouri began by saying the President accused the Senate of party perfidy. The letter does not bear that interpretation.

The President spoke only to a conferee on the part of the House, in a private letter, a conferee who had been foremost in championship of the cause of free raw materials, when he said that in that particular conjuncture of affairs to abandon that cause would be party perfidy and party dishonor. He did not put it to him in personal terms, but simply said that the abandonment of the cause would be such perfidy and dishonor. There was no accusation of the Senator from Missouri, and I am astonished and regret that he should assume to believe that he could be accused of party perfidy or party dishonor by reason of any effort which he made here to pass the bill through the Senate, or that any other man, who has been so honestly and zealously laboring to bring about that result, could be so accused.

Mr. HARRIS. In view of the most kindly relations which

exist between the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, I regret to interrupt him; but he stated a few minutes since that the Democratic Senators had trusted the Finance Committee, and I beg to know whether he meant to be understood as saying that the committee had in any sense, to any extent, or in any way, betrayed the trust which the Democratic Senators reposed in them?

Mr. VILAS. I will presently speak to the point to which the Senator from Tennessee calls attention.

Mr. HARRIS. I will wait patiently until it suits the convenience of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. VILAS. I was not speaking with the view of accusing members of the Finance Committee—

Mr. HARRIS. I did not quite understand the Senator's reference to the trust which the Democratic Senators had reposed in the committee, and then I thought he somewhat complained of their action.

Mr. VILAS. No; I did not. What I was saying was that the members of the party on this side of the Chamber did place their trust in the Finance Committee and its leadership, and therefore they voted, as they did in special and particular cases, against the principles they would have supported or what the principles they supported would have required of them.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Wisconsin will allow me, I will state that the Democratic members of the Finance Committee did the same thing under the absolute necessities which confronted them.

Mr. VILAS. Yes, sir; precisely. I made that statement with a view of explaining the basis of our action.

I am going to make a remark in respect to the way in which the bill was passed. The Senator from Missouri asked if anyone in the Senate believed that the Wilson bill would have passed the Senate. I am perfectly sincere in saying that I do not. I have not believed it. If I had believed it I should not have consented to a single amendment increasing a duty above that reported by the Wilson bill, and I should have been glad to have had many duties lower than the Wilson bill provided.

To the point to which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] called my attention I will make this observation. Those Senators assigned to conference failed to agree with the House conferees. I do not know, except as I have heard shadowy reports outside, and some statements by conferees, what took place or why they failed to agree. I do not know upon what basis our expectations for a better bill were disappointed, except that the Senator from Missouri has said that it was because the conferees believed they could pass nothing else through the Senate.

I have but one criticism upon that, and that criticism I desire to make openly and plainly, since the Senator from Tennessee has called my attention to the matter. I by no means impute to him or to any of these honorable gentlemen any motive different from that which ought to govern a man of honor, but I do not believe they ought to have subjected all of us to the consequences of that fear without giving it a trial in the Senate. There is the point which I make.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me for a moment? My answer to the suggestion of the Senator is this. When I was informed by individuals who had the power to defeat the passage of the bill as originally reported by the Senate committee or as it came from the other House, and I was informed that it could pass and could only pass by certain concessions, and in good faith we agreed to make those concessions in order to harmonize and unify the elements necessary to its passage and thereby acquired power to pass the bill, which is a vast improvement upon the existing law, though not what the Democratic members of the Finance Committee would have desired, and not what the majority of the Democrats on this side of the Chamber would have desired, does the Senator from Wisconsin assume that having entered upon such an agreement and it having been carried out in good faith by the other side, we were at liberty to throw it off, ignore and abandon it because it was not exactly consistent with our views? If he does, he and I entertain very different opinions as to the obligations of an honorable agreement.

Mr. VILAS. I do not believe—

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to make a statement?

Mr. VILAS. I should like to make one observation.

Mr. VEST. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I should like to make a statement.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to make an answer to the Senator from Tennessee first, and then I will give way.

I desire very particularly to state, and I may refer here to the friendly and pleasant personal relations between the Senator from Tennessee and myself, which I am sure will not be broken by any difference between us in respect to what our duty requires of us in the Senate—

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly hope not.

Mr. VILAS. That from my intimate knowledge of his character I could conceive of no such thing as his abandoning or breaking an agreement; and I do not believe that the Senator from Tennessee imagines that I would either do it myself or would suspect it of him.

Mr. VEST. Now, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I thought I had stated clearly this morning, but perhaps it was obscurely stated, that the difficulty all the time between the House conferees and the Senate conferees consisted in the fact that the House conferees seemed to think, like the Senator from Wisconsin, that we exaggerated the obstacles in the way of passing in the Senate any bill that might be reported from the conference. Finally, all the Senate conferees agreed in the offer to the House conferees that we would come back and submit to our respective Houses the disagreement between us and allow the respective bodies to vote upon those disagreements.

We repeatedly stated to the House conferees, "If you doubt our judgment in regard to this matter, all of us being anxious to pass a tariff bill, let us go back to the Senate and report the action we have taken, and the fact that we are unable to agree, and let the Senate instruct us;" and they refused to allow us to do it. Finally, speaking for myself alone, I said to the House conferees, "Write out your report; I will not even read it. I will sign it and go back to the Senate and take the result, and you gentlemen can then be satisfied whether we are fighting a shadow or whether we understand the real condition of affairs among our colleagues."

There never was a more unjust statement than that made by the Senator from Wisconsin. We exhausted every proposition in order to get the bill back into the Senate, to report a disagreement, to report a general disagreement, to report what we had done, and then report specifically what we had disagreed about. They said, "No; we have the power to prevent any such report, and it can not be made."

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from Missouri will add that the conferees on the part of the Senate offered to the House conferees to make any report which they thought they would be willing to intrust to the chances of passing and that the conferees on the part of the Senate would agree to such a report being made, certainly there can be no criticism in respect to it. But I do not understand from the statement which the Senator has made that that was offered on the part of the Senate conferees, but that it was only an expression of personal willingness on his part.

Mr. VEST. I stated distinctly that the Senate conferees offered to report a disagreement, a general disagreement or a report of the progress we had made in agreeing, and then the points on which we disagreed, and let the Senate vote upon it. We of course did not say to the conferees as a body "Make out your report and we will accept it and go to the Senate." That would have been absurd, although for myself I was willing to come here with any report at all, in order to show the world that the House did not understand the situation and that we did.

Mr. VILAS. I have no desire to enter into any criticism upon the action of the Senate conferees. I desire only to state the justification for our action during the progress of the bill on this side of the Chamber. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] invited me, impliedly, to state what I thought about it, and I felt bound to do it. I can only say this, in further justification of the remark, that I myself am not happy under the idea that there is or was some specter, undefinable, intangible, unnamable, that should have frightened the Senate and the House of Representatives into the acceptance of a bill with all those sixty amendments put on here as in Committee of the Whole, in super-addition to those which were reported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], and which we undertook to pass into conference with hope of improvement there.

Mr. President, I do not propose to prolong any discussion of the methods by which the bill was passed. I know, and do not question, the personal honor of the men who were especially engaged in trying to pass the bill. Criticism can be made, explanation of the position which the rest of us were placed in can be made, without any imputation of that kind upon any of them. We are not talking here of personal action. We are talking of party duty and the maintenance of party principles; and I am sure the Senator from Missouri will not claim, whatever may be the gain of the bill that has passed over the McKinley law, that it comes near to being the fulfillment of the pledges of the Democratic party to the people, which we hope yet to meet in time.

I am unwilling to let it go, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] stated in his speech, that we are settling the tariff measure for twenty years by the passage of this bill. I am not willing to let it go that this meets my sense of obligation as a Democrat, my sense of obligation as the servant of Democrats, who has often appealed to the people to support these measures

of tariff reform. It is true something has been gained. I do most profoundly hope that it is more than I have supposed it to be from the examination I have made.

I wish it had been vastly more than it is; and while I agree that the Wilson bill could not have been passed, I can not yet discharge myself from the belief that something better could have been done than what we have done. Yet in that I am perhaps unsupported by the opinions of others; it may be merely an erroneous individual belief. At all events the Senate in its majority and the House of Representatives have acknowledged the justification of fear, and the bill has been therefore passed.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question?

Mr. VILAS. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. Is the Senator from Wisconsin of the opinion that the Wilson bill, so called, as it passed the House, was a bill which presented to the country a measure of full tariff reform as he and I understand tariff reform?

Mr. VILAS. No, sir; I wish it had. I myself would have been far better pleased to have seen the bill come from the House of Representatives constructed on the principle on which the Walker tariff of 1846 stood. I would have been far better pleased to have seen a bill brought here which was everything that a Democrat could wish for. I believe it would have had a better chance of passage. Oh, no, Mr. President, let us have no misunderstanding on that matter. The Democratic party has lost such an opportunity, it seems to me, as in the providence of God is offered to man or parties but seldom in the history of the world.

While I lament it, while I feel, and do not attempt to conceal my regret, that we have not done more, I by no means undertake thereby to say that we have not done much. The Democratic party in the nation understand by this time, I believe, the situation in which we stood. I hope they understand the paralysis which the rules of the Senate give it in the power of any minority to inflict upon its action. I hope they understand by this time with what constancy of effort, with what humiliation, almost, we have bowed our necks in faithful desire to pass a bill that will give them as much relief as it was possible for us to obtain from those who were preventing so far as they could the passage of any bill. Upon that belief, upon that hope, I stand alone for justification before my countrymen for having contributed to a union of effort by support of some duties that I never could have justified except because thus, and thus only, could we gain anything from the enemy entrenched in power and possession.

I have been led into extending the observations that I desired to make, preliminarily to what I wish specially to urge, much beyond what I originally intended. It seems to me that now is the opportunity for us. The Senate, if we can judge by the expression elicited when the first conference report was under discussion, is not, on either side of it, ready to defend a special and particular duty in favor of the sugar trust. We are now given the opportunity to deal with it, and no longer does the safety of the tariff bill, with all its various features of beneficence, stand involved in the attempt to correct the iniquitous advantages given to that great trust. Let us, therefore, take up the pending bill, and if we can not remove the duty upon sugar, let us amend the measure and place the duty upon sugar where it ought to be.

Mr. GRAY. A revenue duty.

Mr. VILAS. A revenue duty upon sugar, without one single particle of gift to a great monopoly, and above all things without winning the hand of corporate greed with any of the great powers of government to levy taxes upon every home and every family in this land.

It is easy to deal with this subject. We need no reference of the bill to the Finance Committee. The Senator from Missouri, himself a member of the Finance Committee, has well expressed that. We need no further incubation out of the Senate.

Right here, under the light of day and the witness of all who may assemble to observe our action, let us take the bill, and leaving the duty on sugar as a revenue duty or fixing it where you will, let us eliminate from it, by suitable amendment, all these advantages given to the sugar-trust monopoly, and send it back to the House of Representatives. And I aver my belief that when that action shall be taken there will be a cry of rejoicing from the people of this country from one end to the other, not Democrats alone, but Republicans as well, that at last their great Government, their Congress with its two Houses, is not the servile dependent of a sugar trust or any other monopoly in the land.

Mr. President, was a motion made for the present consideration of this bill, or was it withdrawn?

Mr. BERRY. I made the motion, and I did not withdraw it. I made the motion that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. VILAS. Then that motion was made before the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will answer the inquiry of the Senator from Wisconsin, if he desires.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from Arkansas has not answered it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hear the remark of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. I stated to the Senator from Wisconsin that I made a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill now on the table, calling it by number. Thereupon the Senator from Tennessee moved to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that under the rules the motion of the Senator from Tennessee takes precedence. The rule can be read if there is any question about it.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Mr. President—

Mr. VILAS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether, in the event the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance should fail, he favors the passage of the bill as it came from the other House, or whether he proposes to put some kind of a duty upon sugar?

Mr. VILAS. Mr. President, I have no concealment of my opinions on this subject. Sugar is a fair subject for a revenue duty, and when that duty shall be laid in fair and moderate measure so that none but the Treasury of the United States shall derive the gain which comes from it except so far as it is impossible to withhold incidental protection to the fields of agriculture, I have no doubt the people of the United States will willingly and cheerfully pay it. They will gladly pay it rather than be bestridden by this Man of the Sea.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. If the Senator will allow me, I will say, with all deference, that is hardly an answer to my question. I am in favor of the passage of the bill as it came from the other House. I am not in favor of the passage of a bill putting any kind of a duty on sugar, and my vote on the motion to refer might be influenced somewhat if I were fully advised as to the intention of parties on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. VILAS. I do not know what may be the opinion of others on the subject. For my own part I think a revenue duty on sugar is proper. I would, however, rather than have the trust profit to the extent of millions, abandon sugar as a subject of revenue duty. But I do not think it is necessary to take that course in order to relieve ourselves. We may obliterate from the law the differential duties in favor of this gigantic monopoly and leave a revenue duty that shall give no protection but that which will go to a class of people who, as a whole, pay the tariff duties and do not enjoy them—the agricultural class of the country.

Therefore I was about to make a remark, but the President of the Senate anticipated me. I thought that a motion to take up a bill for consideration was not debatable, and therefore when it was made, except debate proceeded by unanimous consent, it was necessary that a vote should be immediately taken upon it.

Mr. FAULKNER. If the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I will state that a motion could not be made to take up the bill until it has reached the Calendar, but before it reached the Calendar the Senator from Tennessee intervened with a motion to refer, which takes precedence in that way, and the motion to refer is debatable.

Mr. VILAS. Can a debatable motion be made upon the top of a nondebatable motion, and thus debate be opened?

Mr. FAULKNER. The order of precedence of motions is laid down in the rule.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that the motion to refer takes precedence of the other motion, and is the first motion in order.

Mr. VILAS. I do not conceive that it makes any difference in what order we vote, so that there is an intelligent understanding of what we mean to do. If we vote to refer the bill (and I mean no imputation at all upon the Finance Committee when I say it) I think we vote to do what the distinguished member of that committee who sits near me [Mr. VEST] said we thereby should to bury it or hide it, or put it beyond possibility of immediate action at the present session of Congress. Therefore, those who are willing to make this effort to take off the tentacles of this gigantic sugar trust from the Senate and the people of the country will vote against a reference and in favor of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FAULKNER. Before the Senator from Wisconsin sits down, as my mind is leaning in the direction of voting in favor of the motion of the Senator from Tennessee, and yet I stand very much on the line he has been discussing, I should like him to state to the Senate in a way to satisfy me that a vote to refer means the killing of this bill. By what authority, after the declaration of the Senator from Tennessee, does the Senator make that statement to the country? I understood the Senator

from Tennessee to say that he would call the committee together at once, and if there was any question about the matter, the political division being equal in the committee, if it divided on party lines, within one hour after that division he would see that the Democrats had a majority of the committee. Now, after that statement, upon what authority does the Senator from Wisconsin state that there will be no action by the committee?

Mr. VILAS. I do not make that statement upon authority, though if I sought to obtain it the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is sufficient authority to justify the opinion. But upon a very few circumstances or reasons, which can be readily presented, I base that idea. If it is necessary for the bill to go to the Finance Committee at all, after the months of instruction which we have had here by our mutual debate, it is necessary that it should go there for some time; it is necessary that it should go there for reflection and study, perhaps again to struggle with the idea whether the bill can be passed or not, or what amendment is necessary to pass it. That will take time. The moment we fail to act on this measure, that moment we shall see our quorum disappear and our power to dispose of it at all at the present session will go with it. Now, while we have the Senate present, a Senate instructed in this business, able to cope with it to-day as well as to-morrow, without as well as after a Finance Committee's report, let us proceed to deal with this subject and discharge our obligation to the country.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, if no other gentleman on the other side of the aisle desires to unfold the secrets of that great charnel house known as the Democratic party, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. DOLPH. I hope the Senator will allow an executive session and withdraw his motion.

Mr. MANDERSON. Very well.

Mr. CALL. I hope neither motion will be insisted upon.

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 second report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5575) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. Res. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 2303 to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Contentnea Creek, at Grifton, Lenoir County, N. C., and establish it as a post-road;

A joint resolution (S. R. 96) to extend the charter of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government.

OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of July 24, 1894, information as to the percentage of the enlisted men, noncommissioned and commissioned officers of the regular Army of the United States who are aliens, and what percentage are citizens of the United States by birth or naturalization; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DOLPH. With the consent of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON], I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Oregon to withdraw that motion while I ask the consideration by the Senate of a resolution which was reported adversely by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

Mr. DOLPH. Very well.

Mr. BERRY. I shall have to object to the consideration of the resolution the Senator from Florida desires to call up. I want to have the question determined whether we are going to settle this free-sugar proposition before any other thing is interjected into it. I am compelled, therefore, to object to the consideration of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to the resolution called up by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MANDERSON. I renew my motion.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from Nebraska yielded to me a moment ago that I might move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have no objection to that. I yield for an executive session.

Mr. GRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, upon which the yeas and nays are demanded.

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

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay," and I suppose he would vote "yea."

Mr. GORDON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY], and vote "nay."

Mr. McPHERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. PUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PLATT. My colleague [Mr. HAWLEY] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], I believe.

Mr. FAULKNER (after having voted in the negative). I did not know that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] had left the Chamber. He said he would leave some time to-day.

Mr. PLATT. He has gone.

Mr. FAULKNER. Under those circumstances, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I am paired with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. Having ascertained that if he were present he would vote "yea," I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the negative). I voted "nay," but I am paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who I see is not present and has not voted. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES].

Mr. PASCO. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. POWER].

Mr. HARRIS. Then I suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], who is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], that we transfer our respective pairs.

Mr. QUAY. I have no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY. I vote "yea."

Mr. CALL. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], but with the privilege of voting on this question. I therefore vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN. I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WASHBURN].

The result was announced—yeas 18; nays 34; as follows:

YEAS—18.			
Aldrich,	Davis,	Manderson,	Quay,
Allison,	Dolph,	Mitchell, Oregon,	Shoup,
Blanchard,	Gallinger,	Patton,	Smith.
Caffery,	Higgins,	Perkins,	
Chandler,	Kyle,	Plate,	
NAYS—34.			
Bate,	Dubeis,	Jones, Ark.	Ransom,
Berry,	George,	Lindsay,	Roach,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	McLaurin,	Stewart,
Brice,	Gray,	Mills,	Turpie,
Call,	Hansbrough,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vest,
Camden,	Harris,	Palmer,	Vilas,
Carey,	Hill,	Pasco,	White.
Cockrell,	Hunton,	Peffer,	
Coke,	Jarvis,	Pettigrew,	
NOT VOTING—32.			
Allen,	Gorman,	Martin,	Teller,
Butler,	Hale,	Morgan,	Voorhees,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Morrill,	Walsh,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Murphy,	Washburn,
Daniel,	Irby,	Power,	Wilson,
Dixon,	Jones, Nev.	Proctor,	Wolcott.
Faulkner,	Lodge,	Pugn,	
Frye,	McMillan,	Sherman,	
Gordon,	McPherson,	Squire,	

So the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. I simply desire to say that the motion I made has no reference whatever to the pending measure. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] was about to move an adjournment. There was some executive business that I thought should be transacted, and obtaining his consent, I moved an executive session. If it is the desire of the Senate to discuss the pending measure I shall certainly be very glad to have it done, and if I get a chance to vote upon the House bill relating to sugar, I shall vote for the bill as it came from the other House.

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5645, which is a bridge bill.

Mr. BERRY. I object to any bill called up by anyone until the sugar matter is disposed of. Let us have a vote on the pending motion.

FREE SUGARS, ETC.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] to refer to the Committee on Finance the bill (H. R. 7971) to exempt from duty sugars, molasses, etc.

Mr. PALMER. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] declines to allow the consideration of the bill I wished to call up, I will for a few moments turn my attention to the consideration of what might be fairly called the pending measure.

The tariff bill now in the hands of the President received the vote of every Democratic Senator except the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL]. It is a Democratic measure. I voted for that bill and for most of the amendments, and I accept the distinct responsibility of having done so. I have no apologies to make here for any vote I gave. Whatever apologies or explanations I may hereafter undertake to make, I will make to those to whom I am responsible. I voted as in Committee of the Whole for nearly all the amendments. I voted for the bill on its final passage in this body. I am, I repeat, responsible for my votes, and I am surprised that Senators decline that proper responsibility.

Mr. President, I am not a party leader, and I am glad that I am not. I have been a soldier in a very small way, and I have read something of military history. Napier, in the marvelous account he gives of the Peninsula campaign, says that the cry of save yourself was never heard in the English army, but he says that in the French army the French expression equivalent to it was often heard. I have never on any occasion used the cry, "save yourself," or "save myself." I voted for the measure with my Democratic friends, and whatever responsibilities may result from it I accept without the slightest hesitation.

I do not regard the bill as perfect. It is obnoxious to some of the objections which have been urged by Democratic Senators: but I shall expect to hear those objections sufficiently urged within a short time by those who are opposed to the bill. I am not disposed to furnish them any material myself, if I could do so. Even though my humble share might be beneficial to them, I am not disposed to vouch it now. All that can be said for the bill is that it is a very great improvement over the law which it is to supersede, and that is glory enough.

We talk about the pledges of the Democratic party during the last campaign. What were those pledges? So far as I am concerned, the pledge I made to the people was to exert myself to secure the best possible tariff bill, based upon the principle of a tariff for revenue only. That the bill which has been passed falls short of the perfect realization of that purpose may be admitted, but we have done what we could in that direction.

Neither do I agree with gentlemen who say that there is not a Democratic majority in the Senate. There is. I know of no authority to impose any cast-iron rule upon Democratic Senators or Democrats in either public or private life.

Gentlemen here have presented their opinions, they have urged them, and they have stood by them. The majority members of the Committee on Finance exerted themselves with a fidelity to principle, with a devotion to the opinions of the majority of the Senate to an extent that is worthy of all praise. They accomplished the very best possible results, and what more can be expected? They have simply expressed the views of the Democrats in this body. It is true our private opinions were expressed to them. It was their task to have a bill passed which would be the best possible approximation to a perfect bill in the conception of those who claim to be masters of the science. They had done that.

It is true my eloquent friend from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS] says an offering has been made to the sugar trust. Mr. President, this is not the first time it has been done. Let the act that will be superseded by the bill just passed be examined and it will be found that there are large concessions in it to special interests. In the canvasses that have occurred since 1890 we have charged it, and we have demonstrated it. That the bill recently passed should have a particular blemish is not surprising. Special interests have great power.

I return again to the original proposition. We have done the

very best that could be done. Think of the condition in which we were placed. I repeat that it is a Democratic measure. The Democratic party is entitled to all the credit that can possibly be derived from it. The Democratic party must accept all the blame.

Mr. President, I have made it the rule of my life never to complain, publicly at least. Whatever little private swearing I may have done on my own account, I have never complained of that which I intended to submit to. I must confess that my party leaders with their needless confessions, I think, with their gratuitous confessions of imperfections in the bill are going far beyond the wisdom that should characterize party leaders.

Mr. President, I think this is about what I wish to say in this connection. I have no disposition, I may remark by the way, to go into the history of party controversies over this question. I doubt the wisdom of these disclosures; I doubt the propriety of these discussions of what took place before the conference committee. I am sure so far they have done no good, and I am sure that neither of the gentlemen who represented the Democratic side of the Senate have any reason to suppose a defense of their conduct is in any possible sense necessary. They need no defense; and whatever they have said in defending themselves or any explanation they have made I think is the result of extreme sensibility, because I think that we know and the country knows how faithfully and earnestly they have exerted themselves to secure the best possible result. The conference committee knew very well what the difficulties were; the conference committee recognized them, and it dealt fairly with us and dealt fairly with the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives. The result has been realized so far as our votes go.

I say all these measures are to be tested not by any absolute rule. I wish I could get some cast-iron mode, some cast-iron form of a tariff bill. I should like to see the production even in mere delineation. These measures are good or bad as they are compared with what precedes or what may follow. The Senator from Missouri to-day enumerated the great results which have been accomplished when we have struck at the foundation of the whole doctrine of protection.

Mr. President, the abolition of the tariff on wool is of itself a triumph. I hope my friends will allow me to say that it used to be said in Illinois before the war and during the war that if a man had an interest in a negro, however small, it necessarily made him sympathize with the Southern Confederacy; and wool has been the very type, the shibboleth of protection. We have step after step stricken it down; we have destroyed that method by which the protectionists have captured the farmers of the West.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would it interrupt the Senator if I were to call his attention to a little matter in that connection?

Mr. PALMER. Not in the slightest. Nothing ever disturbs me.

Mr. GALLINGER. Here is a dispatch from Ottawa, Ontario, dated August 14, which says:

At last we Canada wool men will have an opportunity of selling our goods in the United States. For the past eighteen months we have had to grin and bear it; now we have a chance of getting even.

Does the Senator think that removing the tariff on wool and permitting the woolgrowers of Ontario to take possession of our markets will help the farmers of the United States?

Mr. PALMER. I have an answer to the Senator from New Hampshire that does not cost me an effort. If the Canadians will bring their wools into Illinois and sell them cheaper than the manufacturers of New England, in God's name let them come.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is in reference to raw wool.

Mr. PALMER. Let them bring in the raw wool.

Mr. GALLINGER. And blot out the sheep industry of Illinois?

Mr. PALMER. Never. That is one of the humbugs of this whole controversy. It has been argued again and again that sheep can not be raised without some protection, some help. The sheep industry would be benefited by cheap wool.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will allow me—I do not wish to trespass upon his time—if wool is raised in Canada and brought into Illinois, and if woolen goods are manufactured in Canada and brought into Illinois and displace both wool and the woolen manufactures in Illinois, how are the people of Illinois to be benefited by that? Will they not be damaged?

Mr. PALMER. The Senator says "if." If the Senator will affirm that those things will certainly follow, then I shall contradict him as emphatically as politeness will allow.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what this telegram from Ontario says. Will the Senator also permit me to read a statement from one of our consuls in Scotland covering substantially the same matter?

Mr. PALMER. I shall consider it as having been read, as I understand it covers the same matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well; I shall read it in my own time when I get the opportunity.

Mr. PALMER. It will afford me the greatest satisfaction to hear it.

Mr. President, the age of humbug is rapidly passing away, and the day has passed in this country when people can be deceived by this humbug protection. It is claimed that wool can not be raised without protection, and the same claim has been made for every other product. One of the successes of the tariff bill recently passed is in the destruction of that miserable delusion which has kept the sheep-growers of the West attached to the protectionist party.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PALMER. With the greatest satisfaction in the world.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator now approving, defending, or opposing the bill which has surreptitiously passed recently in regard to the tariff?

Mr. PALMER. Am I approving it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; or is the Senator opposing it? I do not understand exactly what the Senator's position is?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Or apologizing for it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Or is the Senator apologizing for it?

Mr. PALMER. I shall answer that question so fully that the Senator, even though he is from Rhode Island, in my opinion can not err. I approve the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Which one?

Mr. PALMER. I mean the bill in the hands of the President.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not know whether the Senator meant the bill which is now pending or the one which has been passed.

Mr. PALMER. I think the Senator is not quite so ignorant as he professes to be.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is a bill on the table for putting barbed wire on the free list.

Mr. PALMER. I approve that, because it also provides for the free admission of the material of which barbed wire is made.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The Senator from Illinois, then, approves both bills. One puts barbed wire on the free list and the other puts a duty upon it; and yet the Senator approves both.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I do approve both as stated. [Laughter.] I approve them upon the principle that I had rather take a cup of coffee than a dose of salts.

Mr. ALDRICH. Which is the cup of coffee and which is the dose of salts?

Mr. PALMER. The McKinley law is the dose of salts. The Senator ought to know that without being told.

I have said already that the value of such measures is to be determined by comparison. I have said that I approve the bill now before the President. I regard it as one not perfect, but one which admits of improvement. I should regard the bill proposing to abrogate the duty upon sugar as a great improvement.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the Senator ever know of a tariff bill which could not be improved? I have never seen one which could not.

Mr. PALMER. I have just asked for a cast-iron form of a tariff bill, or the picture of it. I should regard the barbed-wire bill as an improvement; I should regard the bill proposing to remove the duty upon iron as an improvement; I should regard the bill removing the duty upon coal as an improvement, but, with all that, I regard the bill as it is as an infinite improvement over the law which it proposes to repeal. By its provisions we get rid of the infamy of a bounty on sugar.

There is nothing in the history of legislation so indicative of corruption, and never was an attempt made by any party in the world to corrupt a whole section such as was the imposition of the sugar bounty of 1890. Look at it; think of the effect of it. I speak not now of the Louisiana Senators; I speak of the Populists. The Populists, as I understand them, are free traders, are in sympathy with us, and yet the bounty upon sugar has embarrassed those gentleman to an extent which is pitiable. Although there were improvements, changes in the tariff much to their advantage, yet they were—I shall not say bribed, I shall not say corrupted, but yet they cling to this miserable bounty, and their known opposition to this bill has been one of the embarrassments which stood in the way of its final passage.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me just one word?

Mr. PALMER. With great pleasure.

Mr. KYLE. I wish to say for the Populist Senators in this Chamber that they are in favor of fulfilling every moral contract made by the United States Government with the humblest of its citizens. That is their position.

Mr. PALMER. Does my friend from South Dakota put that upon the ground of contract alone?

Mr. KYLE. Upon the ground of contract alone. *Ab initio* I am not in favor of the bounty system.

Mr. PALMER. The question of ethics involved in this is one which I shall not now discuss; but I think my friends the Populists are a good deal like other people; they insist upon the absolute and perfect fulfillment of every bargain where they have the long end of it. [Laughter.] But I doubt, with great respect to my friend, whether they would have been so conscientious about a bargain which operated in favor of other people.

It can be said with equal confidence that manufacturing establishments have been constructed in New England, in New York, in New Jersey, in Pennsylvania, in Illinois, in which large investments have been made upon the faith of the McKinley law; and if the judgment of those persons were to control Congress it would be but a little while until all the powers of Congress over revenue questions would be held to be irrevocably abandoned on the score of some moral contract.

Mr. KYLE. I presume the Senator from Illinois, then, is in about the same category as the Populists.

Mr. PALMER. I should be willing to be like them in many respects.

Mr. KYLE. I understand the Senator is a free trader upon general principles, but when it comes to barbed wire he is not a free trader, but wishes to protect the barbed-wire interests in Illinois.

Mr. PALMER. I confess I am somewhat like a citizen of Maine who said he was in favor of the Maine liquor law, but against its enforcement. [Laughter.] I have explained myself fully on that point, I trust. When I have expressed my satisfaction with the bill which has passed the House that ought to acquit me, at least so far as I need an acquittal, but I need to be acquitted of nothing. About half my lifetime was spent in proving my consistency, and I regard that portion of my life as having been substantially thrown away. [Laughter.] From this time forth no Senator, no friend of mine, can stop my mouth by any testimony that I have given by my past acts. I am trying to do the best I can now. If I erred in the past, I have repented thoroughly.

But that has been the effect of the bounty, and although my friends the Populists had in the bill which has passed provisions which were largely in the interest of their people, although the whole country will feel the benefit of them at no distant day, still the bounty was not there, and because the bounty was not there our friends would not even accept the very great advantages which were offered them by the bill.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to have one word just there.

Mr. PALMER. With pleasure.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to ask whether the Senator from Illinois does not recognize the justice of paying the bounty to the sugar growers for the present year?

Mr. PALMER. I do.

Mr. KYLE. That is all the Populists contend for.

Mr. PALMER. But, Mr. President, I do not put it upon the ground of a debt. I felt, and I feel yet, that the retention of that bounty was too much to pay, or rather we could not sacrifice all which that bill contained for the sake of the bounty.

Mr. KYLE. But we could sacrifice the honor of the American people to the sugar trust.

Mr. PALMER. I do not quite understand what my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, means by the sugar trust and sacrificing the honor of the American people to the sugar trust. May I ask the Senator what he means by that?

Mr. KYLE. I mean the granting of the differential of one-eighth of 1 cent per pound on sugar.

Mr. GEORGE. They have a half cent now.

Mr. PALMER. I understand that under the present law they get more.

Mr. HARRIS. It gives them 60 cents on the hundred pounds.

Mr. PALMER. So I am told; and the difference is altogether in favor of the consumer, as I understand. I was told by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that even the sugar producer derived a very considerable benefit from that same one-eighth differential.

But, Mr. President, I said sometime ago, and I repeat it, that I expected to pay a large price to get rid of the bounty. It did not make much difference to me into whose pocket the money went. We had to buy the exemption from the bounty on sugar, and had to pay for it. The bounty, as I said before, had demoralized South Dakota, it had demoralized Nebraska, and we had to buy out the representatives from those States where they raised cane and beets. Somebody has said they had us by the throat. They said, "Give us bounty," not "your life or your bounty," but "You can have no bill that will reform the tariff unless you pay for it by a bounty."

Mr. KYLE. Then, according to that statement, the Senator finally concluded that it was cheaper to buy the sugar trust than to buy the Populist Senators?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, I did do that, too. The price is much less, I confess. [Laughter.] I have said in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] in another connection, when my people have to buy, I want them to buy where the thing is to be bought the cheapest. But the great point was to buy out of this bounty, and we had to pay that price for it, unless we can get rid of it by the passage of the bill now before us.

Mr. President, I have been betrayed into criticisms upon the bill that I did not intend to indulge in. There is nothing in this matter for recrimination among Democrats. We have differed in opinion about the provisions of the tariff bill. Gentlemen whose Democracy will never be questioned have entertained one view of the question—I need not name them—and another gentleman, who need not be named, and whose boast it is "I am a Democrat," has voted against this bill. [Laughter.] We have found him not opposing it on all grounds, but at all points. So it is not fair to say that gentlemen who differ about these things are not Democrats.

I propose to go home and tell the people of Illinois—for they are very sensible people—"The House passed a bill which was confessedly imperfect"—perhaps I ought not to say "confessedly"—"and the Senate received that bill. There were a number, whom I need not name, who favored a different bill from that which has passed; some Democrats felt that they could not in conscience vote for the bill under any aspect of the case; that was the situation; and we have presented you a bill"—that is, if the President shall think proper to sign it [laughter], and that is a matter about which I do not, of course, know anything—"at all events the House and the Senate have passed a bill, and I take for myself the full and absolute responsibility for every provision of that bill. You may think that I erred; no doubt I did; but I will give you the reasons why I did it."

Mr. President, I want to say, in conclusion, that aside from the people of the State of Illinois, whose confidence I had once, and I hope to retain it, although I expect it will cost me some explanations [laughter], I am responsible to no earthly being. I am simply doing the very best I can, and I am willing to take the consequences. If any Senator here thinks that he needs explanation, in God's name let him make it. I need none. I have done the best I could; I have done my duty; I will take the responsibility, and I have no complaints to make of any Senator on either side.

The gentlemen on the other side have fought us steadily. They must be answerable for that. We have been somewhat divided, but do not let us aggravate the trouble by any controversies here. If we are going to have any fight, let us retire to a private room. Indeed, I understand we had a caucus, but I think the divisions there have been so far exposed that it might as well have been had out of doors.

Mr. CAREY. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PALMER. With great pleasure.

Mr. CAREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he is in favor of the repeal of the bill as passed by the Senate in whole or in part before the President signs it.

Mr. PALMER. Neither. I want to answer that so distinctly that the Senator can not misunderstand it. I am in favor of neither. I am in favor of improving the bill, whether the President signs it or not.

Mr. CAREY. Then, the agreement on the part of forty-three Senators on the other side did not go any further than simply getting the bill through; that is, you propose to fool some people on your side of the Chamber.

Mr. GRAY. Oh, no.

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator means by that question to ask me whether I mean to fool anybody or not, I hope he will pardon me for not answering. If the Senator means to use an appellation, I hope he will still pardon me for declining to answer.

Mr. CAREY. Reference has been made to forty-three Senators who agreed to pass the Senate bill. Does the agreement last up to the time the President approves the act, or is that off now?

Mr. PALMER. I am not prepared to answer the question. I would advise the Senator, if he desires information on that point, to consult gentlemen who know better than I do. That is the best source of information from which he can get it. I think I have stated my own views and opinions, and the Senator will pardon me for not answering his question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to present certain statements obtained from authentic sources with reference to the operations of the tariff bill as passed by the Senate when it becomes a law.

I regret exceedingly that Democrats should decry and denounce a measure for which the Democratic party is in honor bound to accept the entire responsibility. This bill is at best a compromise measure, for the passage of which no Democrat is called upon to apologize.

We all know the situation which surrounded us in the Senate;

we all know the formidable opposition which confronted this measure on the other side of the Chamber; and we must admit that this bill is in a measure a compromise to the strength of the formidable opposition arrayed against it on the other side of the Chamber, because under the rules of the Senate, or rather in the absence of a rule, it is impossible to bring any question to a vote until the utmost limit of debate has been exhausted.

So, instead of Democrats, after the passage of the bill, indulging in crimination and recrimination about it, we should make up our minds to assume the full responsibility and go before the country and say that we have done the best we could under the circumstances. I do not consider that this is the end of this great question. It will continue to be a live question before the American people until the issue of tariff reform is finally and ultimately accomplished.

Mr. President, I did not rise to make any extended remarks, but merely to submit for publication in the RECORD certain authentic statements which will show how beneficial the bill as it passed the Senate will be to the taxpayers of the country in removing onerous tariff rates and in opening up the way for freer trade among the nations. I shall not trouble the Senate or consume its time by reading these tables, etc., but shall ask permission to have them published in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). If there be no objection, the statements referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should be glad to have the statements made by the Senator from Georgia read, and I should also be glad if he would state the authority upon which they are based.

Mr. WALSH. I have here an official statement showing the schedules of importations under the McKinley law, the estimated duties under the bill as it came from the House, and the duties under the bill as it passed the Senate. I have a statement here by Mr. Durfee, thesecretary of the Finance Committee, and I have

certain other statements of importance prepared by Mr. Schoenhof, one of the tariff experts connected with the Finance Committee. I give them now upon my own responsibility, of course.

Mr. ALDRICH. If they are to be published in the RECORD as coming from any authority, I desire to have them read.

Mr. WALSH. I will have them read. It will take some time to read them, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island object to the publication in the RECORD of the statements mentioned?

Mr. HARRIS. I imagine the Senator from Rhode Island does not desire to have these tabulations and statements read.

Mr. WALSH. It would be very interesting to him.

Mr. ALDRICH. As the statements are to be published in the RECORD with more or less authority, I should be glad, as I may not have time to read them, to hear them read.

Mr. HARRIS. Would it not answer the Senator's purpose to read them in the RECORD in the morning?

Mr. ALDRICH. My time is taken up with the sessions of the Senate, and I have very little time to read the RECORD. I should be glad to have the statements read.

Mr. HARRIS. It is now 5 o'clock, and I was about to ask the Senate to devote its attention to some other business or quit.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Tennessee desires to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, or adjourn, I am willing to quit.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Georgia must be permitted to print the papers in the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it be done, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the statements will be published in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The statements referred to are as follows:

Imports, rates of duty and revenues under McKinley law and estimated revenues under House and Senate bills.

Schedules.	Imports of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893—		Estimated duties by bill (H. R. 4864), as passed by the—		Senate increases over House bill.	Average ad valorem under—			Per cent of reduction by Senate bill over present law.
	Values.	Duty received.	House.	Senate (July 3).		Present law.	House bill.	Senate bill.	
A. Chemicals, oils, and paints.....	\$21,066,224.25	\$6,234,555.13	\$5,096,316.00	\$4,860,370.05	+\$235,945.95	31.61	25.09	24.44	22.68
B. Earths, earthenware, and glassware.....	23,666,698.85	12,118,239.41	8,060,370.31	8,333,132.65	272,762.34	51.20	34.13	35.21	31.23
C. Metals, and manufactures of.....	48,206,500.64	20,954,071.84	15,608,146.08	16,878,956.08	1,270,810.00	58.33	34.99	36.53	37.37
D. Wood, and manufactures of.....	2,247,205.40	714,518.62	488,098.30	484,931.17	*3,167.45	31.79	21.96	23.62	25.70
E. Sugar.....	109,817,948.14	193,294.48	16,832.14	43,478,957.57	43,462,125.43	14.55	23.43	39.59	112.10
F. Tobacco, and manufactures.....	12,688,407.12	14,831,989.99	11,528,783.11	13,337,977.28	1,809,194.17	117.82	91.58	105.95	10.07
G. Agricultural products and provisions.....	41,526,276.40	12,421,205.69	7,993,441.78	9,594,553.51	1,611,141.73	33.21	21.59	23.10	30.44
H. Spirits, wines, and other beverages.....	13,874,921.06	9,698,336.91	8,421,347.54	8,455,386.86	44,039.32	69.90	60.69	61.01	12.75
I. Cotton manufactures.....	20,510,438.98	11,333,605.23	7,835,585.28	8,922,286.92	1,043,701.64	55.25	38.45	43.54	21.19
J. Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of.....	41,706,792.44	18,767,353.37	12,724,279.49	13,848,060.04	1,123,780.55	45	30.51	41.05	8.76
K. Wool, and manufactures of.....	36,913,737.16	36,404,797.81	14,714,879.23	18,019,778.37	3,304,899.14	98.62	39.78	48.82	50.50
L. Silk, and silk goods.....	37,919,949.92	29,310,258.74	17,113,647.62	17,589,653.77	476,006.15	53.56	45.13	46.39	13.33
M. Pulp, papers, and books.....	8,680,319.32	2,070,124.10	1,658,398.97	1,781,922.00	123,523.03	23.85	19.10	20.53	13.92
N. Sundries.....	54,975,796.63	14,573,886.16	13,100,352.45	13,444,152.56	343,800.11	26.80	26.33	24.45	8.02
Sec. 4. Unenumerated.....	1,364,193.47	258,951.01	258,951.01	200,973.23	*54,977.68	18.98	18.98	18.73	1.31
Articles transferred to free list by both House and Senate.....	41,368,000.71	11,438,264.48				27.63			
	514,463,408.49	198,373,452.97	124,657,429.32	179,251,142.16	54,593,712.84	40.58	35.51	38.08	21.98

* Schedules A, D, and section 4 are decreases.

† Increase.

‡ Net increase over House.

NOTE.—The computations of the average ad valorem rates of duty are calculated upon the dutiable value only. The value of the articles that are free of duty by either the present law, House or Senate bills, are excluded.

	Dutiable value.	Duty.	Advalorem rate.	Decrease of duty.
Under present law.....	\$400,069,658.48	\$198,373,452.97	49.58	
Under House bill.....	351,041,963.12	124,657,429.32	35.51	\$73,716,023.65
Under Senate bill.....	463,447,163.11	179,251,142.16	38.68	19,122,310.81
			Per cent.	

The increase in duties under the Senate bill as compared with the House bill is due almost entirely to the duty placed on sugar by the Senate.

ESTIMATES OF REVENUES UNDER HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS.

The estimated revenue by Senate bill:

From customs.....	\$179,251,142.16
Internal revenue, additional from—	
Income.....	\$30,000,000
Spirits.....	20,000,000
Playing cards.....	3,000,000
	53,000,000.00
	232,251,142.16

Estimate of revenues by Secretary of Treasury for fiscal year 1895.

Customs.....	\$190,000,000.00
Internal revenue.....	160,000,000.00
Miscellaneous items.....	20,000,000.00
Postal service.....	84,427,748.00
	454,427,748.00

Estimate of revenues under House bill 4864 as it passed the House.

Customs.....	\$124,657,429.32
Internal revenue (under present law).....	160,000,000.00
Internal revenue, additional (under bill 4864).....	53,000,000.00
Miscellaneous items (under present law).....	20,000,000.00
Postal service (under present law).....	84,427,748.00
	442,085,177.32

Estimate of revenues under House bill as amended and passed by the Senate, July 2, 1894.

Customs.....	\$179,251,142.16
Internal revenue (as above stated).....	213,000,000.00
Miscellaneous items (as above stated).....	20,000,000.00
Postal service (as above stated).....	84,427,748.00
	496,678,890.16

COMPARISON OF THE M'KINLEY SUGAR BOUNTY AND THE SENATE DUTY.

The following in reference to the sugar schedules of 1883, 1890, and the Senate bill was prepared by Mr. Benjamin Durfee, statistician of the Finance Committee of the Senate:

Imports of sugar (dutiable only).

1883.	
Amount of imports.....pounds..	1,884,267,751
Value of imports.....	\$84,356,545
Duty collected.....	\$46,711,795
Average ad valorem of duty.....per cent..	55.37
Average value of imports, per pound.....cents..	4.47
Average duty per pound.....do.....	2.47

1890.	
Amount of imports.....pounds..	2,709,554,540
Value of imports.....	\$82,743,777
Duty collected.....	\$59,985,873
Average ad valorem of duty.....per cent..	65.24
Average value of imports per pound.....cents..	3.05
Average duty per pound.....do.....	1.99

Imports of free sugar, 1893.

Amount of imports.....pounds..	3,728,783,783
Value of imports.....	\$114,796,397
Under tariff act of 1894, at 40 per cent duty, would be.....	\$45,917,558
Average value of imports per pound.....cents..	3.78
Average duty per pound under tariff act of 1894.....do.....	1.51

Under the operations of such a law as the Senate bill there would have been payments of \$45,917,558 into the United States Treasury as duties on the imports of sugar in the fiscal year 1892-'93, instead of payments of \$9,375,130 out of the Treasury as bounty to American producers of sugar.

The payments of bounty to sugar producers are increasing at the rate of 20 per cent annum. For the past three fiscal years the amounts paid have been as follows:

Year ending June 30--	Amount of bounty.
1892.....	\$7,342,077
1893.....	9,375,130
1894.....	12,099,399

At the same rate of increase the payments for the next ten years would be as follows:

Year ending June 30--	Amount of bounty.
1895.....	\$15,608,224
1896.....	20,134,608
1897.....	25,973,644
1898.....	33,506,000
1899.....	43,232,740
1900.....	55,780,234
1901.....	71,956,501
1902.....	92,823,686
1903.....	119,742,812
1904.....	154,568,227
Total for ten years.....	633,326,876

Such a rate of increase in the domestic production of sugar would be necessary to enable the industry to supply the entire amount consumed in this country by the time fixed for the expiration of the bounty provisions of the tariff act of 1890, namely, July 1, 1895. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1884, the consumption of raw sugars in the United States was approximately 2,933,017,920 pounds, this amount representing the sum of the imports and domestic production for that period. On a similar basis, the consumption for the year ended June 30, 1894, was 4,931,711,251 pounds, an increase of 68 per cent in the ten years. A continuance of this ratio of increase in the consumption of sugar for the next ten years would reach 8,275,274,901 pounds in 1904, in which year the domestic production would have reached a slightly smaller figure at the present rate of increase, or about 7,728,411,350 pounds.

The import value of sugars has decreased from an average of 4.47 cents in 1883 to 3.78 cents in 1893. Assuming a similar decrease in the next ten years, the price would be about 3.20 cents per pound in 1904, making the value of the amount necessary to supply this country in that year \$264,808,796. If all the demands of the country at that time were to be supplied by domestic producers, under a continuance of the present bounty, it would necessitate the payment of \$165,505,498 out of the National Treasury. If the wants of the people were to be met by imports of sugar, there would be paid into the Treasury the sum of \$105,923,518 in duties under the rates fixed by the Senate bill and upon a price for sugar assumed to be as much below the present value in 1904 as the present price is below that of ten years ago. There would be a difference of \$2,142,915 between the operations of the McKinley bounty and the Senate bill duties on sugar ten years hence.

The average yearly bounty under the McKinley bill if continued to termination would be \$63,332,887, while the duty under the Senate bill based on imports for 1893 would be only \$45,917,558.

The advantages of the sugar schedule of the Senate bill, as compared with the bounty provision of the McKinley law, are still further emphasized by contrasting the operation of the two measures in the matter of refined sugars. The McKinley law gives the refiners a protection of five-tenths of a cent per pound, and an additional tenth of a cent upon refined sugars imported from countries that pay an export bounty, making a total of six-tenths of a cent per pound, or 60 cents per 100 pounds.

The Senate bill gives refiners a protection of one-eighth of a cent per pound over and above the duty on the raw sugar. An additional tenth of a cent is provided for sugars imported from countries that pay an export bounty, but importers can be relieved from this additional duty upon proof that any particular

invoice of sugar has not received any such export bounty, either direct or indirect. Based upon the differential the protection to refiners under the Senate bill is, therefore, virtually one-eighth of a cent per pound, or 12½ cents per 100 pounds. The benefit to consumers of refined sugar by reason of the Senate bill can be stated thus:

Duty per 100 pounds of refined sugar.

McKinley law.....	\$0.600
Senate bill.....	.125
Saving by Senate bill.....	.475

The approximate consumption of raw sugars in the United States during the fiscal year 1892-'93 amounted to 4,210,908,864 (imports 3,728,783,783 pounds, domestic production 482,125,081 pounds). Upon the usual allowance of 112 pounds of raw sugar for 100 pounds of refined this would equal a consumption of 3,759,740,067 pounds of refined sugar. The saving to consumers on this quantity by the difference between the McKinley act and the Senate bill, at the rate of 47.5 cents per 100 pounds, would amount to \$17,858,765. The cost of the McKinley bounty to producers of raw sugar and protection to refiners may be stated as follows:

Cost of McKinley sugar bounty and duty to consumers, 1892-'93.

Protection to refiners.....	\$17,858,765
Bounty paid to producers.....	9,375,130
Total.....	27,233,895

Not a penny of this amount went into the United States Treasury; the people paid direct to the refiners the amount of the protection given to this industry, while the amount of the bounty was paid out of the Treasury receipts from customs and other taxes. As the total duties paid during the fiscal year 1892-'93 on sugars above No. 16 Dutch standard amounted to only \$160,500, the tariff on refined sugars was not paid by importers, in accordance with the protectionist theory. A tariff rate of 40 per cent, like that provided in the Senate bill, applied to the imports of 1892-'93, would have yielded \$45,917,558 in revenues, instead of costing the consumers and the United States Treasury \$27,233,895 on the above basis. The duty imposed by the Senate bill saves the payment of over \$9,000,000 per year out of the Treasury to sugar producers, and also saves the payment of nearly \$18,000,000 by the people, as consumers, into the coffers of the sugar trust.

SAVING TO CONSUMERS OF WOOLEN GOODS BY THE SENATE DUTIES.

English cloth made in Leeds, imported into the port of New York, wool and cotton warp, 60 inches wide, weighing 11½ ounces per yard: Cost per yard 1s. 3d. less 5 and 5 per cent discount, 27 cents net per yard:

McKinley duty (38½ cents per pound + 40 per cent per yard).....	Cents. 39.80
Senate duty (40 per cent per yard).....	10.80
Saved to consumer.....	29.00

The samples No. 1 to No. 6 attached to the respective statements represent actual importations made in the current year. The prices are the actual invoice prices, as passed by the appraiser's department in New York.

J. SCHOENHOF,

Deputy Appraiser of the Port of New York.

English cloth, wool and cotton warp, imported into the port of New York, 54 inches wide, weight 13 ounces per yard: Cost per yard 1s. 2½d., less 7 per cent, 27 cents net per yard:

McKinley duty (38½ cents per pound + 40 per cent per yard).....	Cents. 42.00
Senate duty (40 per cent per yard).....	10.40
Saved to consumer.....	31.60

English overcoatings, wool and cotton warp, imported into the port of New York, 50 inches wide, weight 20 ounces per yard: Price 1s. 9d. net per yard, 42 cents net per yard:

McKinley duty (33 cents per pound + 40 per cent per yard).....	Cents. 70.45
Senate duty (40 per cent per yard).....	15.80
Saved to consumer.....	53.65

Worsted coating, Bradford, England, imported into the port of New York, 57 inches wide, weight 20 ounces: Cost 2s. 9d. per yard, less 7 per cent, 62½ cents per yard:

McKinley duty (44 cents per pound + 50 per cent), per yard.....	Cents. 80½
Senate duty (50 per cent), per yard.....	31½
Saved to consumer.....	55

French cashmere, imported into the port of New York, 45 inches wide: Cost 0.95 francs per meter net, 18 cents per yard:

McKinley duty (12 cents per square yard + 50 per cent), per yard.....	Cents. 24
Senate duty (50 per cent), per yard.....	1
Saved to consumer.....	11

French dress goods, challies, all wool, imported into the port of New York, 30 inches wide, weight 2½ ounces per yard: Cost per yard, 30½ cents net:

McKinley duty (12 cents per square yard + 50 per cent), per yard.....	Cents. 20
Senate duty (50 per cent), per yard.....	10
Saved to consumer.....	10

Balance sheet, showing the amount saved to the consumer by the adoption of the Senate bill in place of the McKinley act.

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL AND WOOLENS.

1892-'93. Imports of manufactures of wool.....	\$36,993,000
Duties	36,448,000
Import value, duty paid	73,441,000
1889-'90. Census year, domestic manufactures:	
Woolen goods.....	\$183,577,000
Worsted goods.....	79,194,000
Hosiery and knit goods.....	\$67,241,000
Deduct cotton hosiery.....	17,000,000
Carpets.....	50,241,000
	47,770,000
	310,782,000
Value of domestic manufactures.....	384,223,000
Add 33½ per cent to cover wholesale and retail profits.....	128,074,000
Cost of wool manufactures to consumers.....	512,297,000
Cost of wool manufactures under Senate bill on same amounts:	
Importations.....	\$36,993,000
Duty, 45 per cent.....	16,665,000
	53,658,000
1889-'90. Value of domestic manufactures, \$310,000,000, reduced from an average of 100 per cent duty to 45 per cent rate as a result of free wool.....	\$224,525,000
	278,183,000
Add 33½ per cent as profits.....	92,728,000
	\$370,911,000
Amount saved to consumers under Senate bill.....	141,386,000

Articles transferred from the dutiable list of the House bill to the free list of the Senate bill.

	Present.	House.	Senate.
Opium, crude or unmanufactured.	Free	\$1 per lb.	Free.
Boards, plank, deal, and other sawed lumber:			
Orhemlock, whitewood, sycamore, white pine, and basswood—			
Planned or finished on one side.	\$1.50 per M feet.....	50c. per M feet.	Do.
Planned or finished on two sides.	\$2 per M feet.....	\$1 per M feet.	Do.
Planned on one side and tongued and grooved.	do.....	do.	Do.
Planned on two sides and tongued and grooved.	\$2.50 per M feet.....	\$1.50 per M feet.	Do.
All sawed lumber not specially provided for.			
Planned or finished on one side.	\$3 per M feet.....	\$1 per M feet.	Do.
Planned or finished on two sides.	do.....	do.	Do.
Planned on one side and tongued and grooved.	\$2.50 per M feet.....	50 c. per M feet.	Do.
Planned on two sides and tongued and grooved.	\$3.50 per M feet.....	\$1.50 per M feet.	Do.
Burlaps, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value (except such as may be suitable for bagging for cotton)—			
Not exceeding 60 inches in width.	1½ cents per pound.....	15 pr. ct.....	Do.
Exceeding 60 inches in width.	40 per cent.....	30 pr. ct.....	Do.
Bags for grain made of burlaps.	2 cents per pound.....	20 pr. ct.....	Do.
Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar material for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, flax, jute, or jute butts—			
Valued at 6 cents or less per square yard.	1.6 cents per square yard.....	15 pr. ct.....	Do.
Valued at more than 6 cents per square yard.	1.8 cents per square yard.....	do.....	Do.
Enfeurage grease.....	20 per cent.....	20 pr. ct.....	Do.

Saving in duties by transfers from dutiable to free list by House and Senate bills.

Schedules.	Imports, 1893.	Duties, 1893.
A. Chemicals, oils, and paints.....	\$712,180.57	\$114,967.29
B. Earth, earthen and glass ware.....	636.00	95.40
C. Metals, and manufactures of.....	1,131,240.45	128,657.23
D. Wood, and manufactures of.....	10,198,391.11	1,143,204.34
E. Agricultural products, etc.....	1,512,574.31	494,365.84
F. Spirits, wines, etc.....	31,490.00	5,896.53
G. Flax, hemp, jute, etc.....	1,730,231.60	207,485.99
H. Wool, and manufactures of.....	18,498,553.92	8,203,323.14
I. Sundries.....	3,195,695.85	432,657.93
Articles under section 4, act of October 1, 1890.....	4,389,007.00	717,530.79
Total.....	41,398,000.71	11,438,264.48

AVERAGE AD VALOREM RATES OF MILLS BILL, M'KINLEY LAW, AND SENATE BILL, WITH PER CENT OF REDUCTION BY SENATE BILL.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, August 1, 1894.]

TARIFF STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY HON. PATRICK WALSH.

Mr. WALSH. I present a petition of the Commercial Club of Savannah, Ga., praying for the early settlement of the tariff question. I ask that the petition lie on the table, and be printed in the RECORD.

The petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SAVANNAH, GA., July 20, 1894.

"The Commercial Club of Savannah, at a meeting duly held and regularly called for that purpose, distinctly and emphatically records its earnest protest against the dilatory action which now marks the progress of the tariff bill pending before the Congress of the United States. This club embraces within its membership men who represent the leading commercial and industrial pursuits of this community. Its interests are not circumscribed within the limits of this city, nor within the great State of Georgia, but the objective purpose of its formation was to advance alike the material prosperity of the entire nation. It believes that it voices the sentiment of the people of the United States when it says that the uncertainty attendant upon the adjustment of that measure has caused untold financial embarrassment, restricted the use of capital, limited investment, and has had a general and most depressing effect upon all lines of material activity.

"The delicate and complicated machinery of business at this time is not unlike the condition of a sick patient who has long been deprived of the sustaining forces of life; and the great financial convulsion which has recently swept over this country has left its business interests in such a condition that the immediate application of restorative remedies is imperatively required.

"Any concession which would tend to effectuate the immediate passage of this bill would be infinitely preferable to delay at this crisis. It is therefore resolved by the Commercial Club of Savannah, That immediate action upon the tariff bill is necessary to end the existing financial depression and embarrassment and to stimulate trade to its normal condition. It is further resolved, That the Representatives and Senators of the State of Georgia in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to use every effort to bring about some speedy and definite action upon this bill. It is further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Representatives and Senators from the State of Georgia."

TARIFF STATEMENT.

Mr. WALSH. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the average ad valorem rates of duty of the Mills bill, the McKinley law, and the Senate bill, with per cent of reduction by Senate bill on the articles contained herein. It is a matter of information in which I think the country generally is interested.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Statement of average ad valorem rates of duty of the Mills bill, McKinley law, and Senate bill, with per cent of reduction by Senate bill on the undermentioned articles.

Articles.	Mills bill (1888).	McKinley bill.	Senate bill.	Per cent of reduction by Senate bill over McKinley bill.
Camphor, refined.....	15.25	12.20	10	18.63
Sumac, extract of.....	20	23.24	10	54.97
Epsom salts.....	63.90	38.34	25.51	33.46
Castor oil.....	50.17	100.35	43.87	56.23
Cod-liver oil.....	25	28.65	20	30.19
Opium, prepared for smoking.....	141.58	169.65	84.82	50
Chromium colors.....	25	30.84	20.56	33.33
Ocher.....	19.64	19.64	16.37	16.66
Sienna.....	21.14	21.14	17.62	16.66
Umber.....	25.80	25.80	21.50	16.66
Spirit varnishes.....	74.56	69.56	59.56	14.38
All other varnishes.....	40	35	25	28.57
Whiting:				
Dry.....	142.48	143.48	71.24	50
Ground in oil (putty).....	189.50	189.50	94.75	50
White lead.....	39.47	59.21	29.60	50
Nitrate of potash.....	21.32	21.32	10.66	50
Bicarbonate of soda.....	45.35	60.47	30.24	50
Bichromate of soda.....	45.59	20	25	45.16
Strychnine, or strychnine.....	117.24	63.79	70.34	25
Sulphur, sublimed.....	34.39	28.66	20	20.22
Sumac, ground.....	14.86	19.81	10	49.52
China:				
Painted, etc.....	50	60	35	41.67
Plain.....	40	55	30	45.45
Bottles:				
Empty.....	70.17	70.17	52.63	25
Filled.....	71.48	71.48	53.61	25
Demi-johns, empty.....	37.91	37.91	28.43	25
Manufactures of glass.....	40	60	35	41.67
Cylinder glass, polished, unsilvered.....	17-64	20-64	13-48	25-38
Plate glass, fluted, etc.....	49-64	49-64	37-43	25-33
Plate glass, unsilvered, cast, etc.....	98-174	98-174	88-122	10-30
Plate glass, cast, silvered, above 24 by 60.....	37.04	49.39	31.28	36.67
Cylinder and crown glass, silvered.....	32.91	43.88	27.79	36.67
Spectacle lenses.....	40	60	35	41.67
Stained or painted window glass.....	40	45	35	22.22
Roofing slate.....	25	25	20	20
Iron ore.....	23-37	23-41	15-21	40-47
Iron in pigs, etc.....	42.70	42.70	22.77	46.67
Scrap iron.....	42.70	47.83	28.47	40.48
Scrap steel.....	38.39	43	25.59	40.49
Bar iron.....	27-53	25-53	16-32	25-40
Bars of rolled iron.....	56.18	61.77	44.93	27.25

Statement of average ad valorem rates of duty of the Mills bill, McKinley law, and Senate bill, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Mills bill (1888).	McKinley bill.	Senate bill.	Per cent of reduction by Senate bill over McKinley bill.
Boiler or other plate iron or steel.....	95	54	25	53.70
Rails of steel.....	60.67	58.24	33.99	24.47
Sheets of iron or steel, common or black.....	62-25	25-70	20-55	21-30
Tin plate.....	Free	78.44	42.32	46.05
Tin, manufactures of.....	40	55	35	36.36
Steel ingots, etc.....	22-45	29-50	20-40	20-35
Wire rods.....	34	34	22.67	33.33
Cast-iron vessels, etc.....	28.31	26.97	17.98	33.33
Malleable iron castings.....	36.37	31.83	16.37	45.57
Hollow ware.....	29.43	35.33	23.55	33.34
Chains.....	39.41	47.28	30	36.55
Firearms.....	35	41-80	30	27-62
Nails.....	23-39	23-46	23-30	4-46
Railway fish plates.....	57.54	72.18	25	65.36
Hand, back, and other saws.....	30	40	25	37.50
Screws.....	53-133	47-111	33-67	28-40
Wheels.....	66.98	83.72	41.86	50
Plates, rolled, brazier's copper.....	30	35	20	42.86
Gold leaf.....	33.65	44.87	30	33.14
Silver leaf.....	77.78	77.78	30	61.43
Lead sheets.....	32.98	36.65	18.33	50
Nickel.....	36.95	23.77	14.26	40
Gold pens.....	30	30	25	16.67
Penholders and parts of.....	30	30	25	16.67
Pins.....	23.35	29.19	14.50	50
Zinc in sheets.....	40	45	20	22.22
Manufactures of metal.....	30	30	20	33.33
Shooks and boxes.....	30	30	20	33.33
Casks and barrels.....	30	35	25	28.57
Clocks, of wood.....	111.85	111.85	83.89	25
Rice, cleaned.....	64.19	64.19	41.08	20
Rice, uncleaned.....	44.83	44.83	22.42	49.99
Honey.....	15-33	12-31	12-32	14.29
Oranges, lemons, and limes.....	35	35	30	40.01
Comfits, sweetmeats, etc.....	51.34	51.34	30.80	33.33
Nuts, not shelled (almonds).....	42.42	42.42	28.28	33.35
Nuts, shelled (almonds).....	52.90	52.90	35.32	72.85
Filberts, not shelled.....	54.64	72.86	20	15
Peanuts, unshelled.....	30	17.95	15	28
Extract of meat.....	73-294	91-367	65-264	37.39
Spirits, distilled.....	40	35.17	25.05	26.53
Cotton cloth:				30.54
Not over 100 threads:				25.15
Not bleached.....	40	35.17	25.05	23.59
Bleached.....	40	38.60	26.53	18.88
Dyed, colored, etc.....	40	40.80	30.54	11-40
Exceeding 100 threads:				40-17
Not bleached.....	40	42.39	32.39	100
Bleached.....	40	43.27	35	89.23
Dyed, etc.....	40	43.84	38.84	76.71
Cables, cordage, and twine.....	16-25	16-31	10-20	74.27
Bagging for cotton.....	15.24	32.52	Free	66-71
Woolen yarns.....	40	278.66	30	72.00
Shawls, woolen, not above 40 cents per pound.....	40	150.30	35	66-94
Knit fabrics, not above 40 cents per pound.....	40	136	35	45
Blankets.....	40	80-104	35	10
Hats of wool.....	40	86-106	35	10
Flannels, not over 50 cents per pound.....	40	85-104	25-35	10
Silk, partially manufactured.....	60.50	60.50	20	10
Silk, webbings, gorings, etc.....	50	50	45	10
Silk buttons.....	50	50	45	10
Silk dress goods.....	50	50	45	10
Silk ribbons.....	50	50	45	10
All other silk.....	50	50	45	10
Writing, drawing, and other paper, n. s. p.....	25	25	20	20
Dolls and other toys.....	30	35	25	28.57
Emery.....	25.19	25.19	20.15	20
Firecrackers.....	100	147.32	50	66.06
Coal, bituminous.....	22.72	22.72	12.12	46.65
Slack or culm of coal.....	28.68	28.68	14.34	50
Coke.....	20	20	15	25
Matches.....	35	33.93	20	41.06
Haircloth, known as crinoline cloth.....	30	27.99	20.99	25
Haircloth, known as hair seating.....	23.22	23.22	15.48	33.33
Leather, bend or belting, and sole.....	15	10	10	33.33
Calfskins, japanned.....	30	30	20	33.33
All not specially provided for.....	15	10	10	20
Boots and shoes.....	35	25	20	14.29
Manufactures of India rubber.....	30	30	25	18.18
Umbrellas covered with silk or alpaca.....	50	55	45	100
Burrstone, manufactured.....	20	15	Free	100
Composition metal, copper.....	35	6.49	Free	100
Plates of copper, not rolled, etc.....	18.88	11.80	Free	100
Cider.....	20	18.52	Free	100
Binding-twine.....	15	6.47	Free	100
Paintings in oil or water colors.....	30	15	Free	100
Statuary.....	30	15	Free	100
Hatters' plush.....	15	10	Free	100

PRINCIPAL ITEMS OF REDUCTION BY SENATE BILL.

The most prominent reductions of duty proposed by the Senate bill are set forth below:

Articles.	Percent of reduction.
Borax, refined.....	60.00
Castor oil.....	56.28
Peppermint.....	46.89
Baryta, manufactured.....	55.36
Whiting, dry.....	50.00
Paints, ground in oil.....	50.00
Zinc paint.....	42.80
Lead, red.....	49.99
Lead, white.....	56.00
All other not specially provided for.....	50.00
Soda (saleratus).....	50.00
Soda, caustic.....	50.00
Sal. or soda crystals.....	50.00
Sponges.....	50.00
Cement.....	50.00
Lime.....	16.67
Clocks, china.....	58.33
Iron ores.....	46.67
Fuel, bars, blooms, etc.....	45.46
All other and slabs, blooms, or loops.....	76.31
Sheets or plates (iron or steel).....	45.73
Tin plates.....	46.05
Wire rope made of steel wire not smaller than No. 5 wire gauge.....	58.40
Sheets.....	60.00
Chains.....	61.50
Penknives and pocketknives.....	42.50
Knives and forks.....	52.00
Firearms, pistols.....	53.15
Shotguns.....	55.88
Nails, wire.....	46.16
Spikes.....	76.67
Bronze metal.....	60.88
Silver leaf.....	61.00
Lead.....	50.00
Zinc.....	50.00
Sugar candy.....	71.00
Mules.....	79.00
Cattle.....	68.00
Beans.....	51.00
Castor beans or seeds.....	50.00
Raisins.....	40.00
Peanuts.....	73.00
Apples.....	53.00
Lard.....	50.00
Mustard.....	47.00
Cotton cloth.....	50.00
Cotton plushes.....	50.00
Flax.....	50.00
Cables, hemp, untarred.....	55.00
Cables, tarred.....	68.00
Gill netting.....	72.00
Shoddy.....	71.00
Woolen yarns.....	89.00
Woolen shawls.....	77.00
Knit fabrics.....	74.00
Blankets.....	72.00
Hats of wool.....	72.00
Flannels for underwear.....	71.00
Woolen dress goods.....	54.00
Woolen plushes.....	52.00
Carpets.....	64.00
Silk.....	67.00
Silk velvets.....	69.00
India rubber wearing apparel.....	39.00
Paper sheathing.....	50.00
Playing cards.....	63.00
Brooms.....	50.00
Buttons.....	41.00
Shoe buttons.....	62.00
Firecrackers.....	66.00
Coal, bituminous.....	47.00
Matches.....	41.00
Gun wads.....	71.00
Gloves.....	50.00
Cocoa matting and mats.....	72.00
Clay pipes.....	80.00

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution proposing an investigation by the Committee on Patents, reported adversely by the Committee on Contingent Expenses, may be considered by the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. When was it reported?

Mr. HARRIS. This morning.

Mr. COCKRELL. I object. I do not think the Senate is in condition to take up a resolution that comes from a standing committee of the Senate adversely reported, and undertake to pass it over the adverse report.

Mr. CALL. All right. I shall not press the request at this time.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is a resolution providing for a peripatetic traveling committee to go over the country. I am opposed to such propositions on general principle.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent to address an inquiry to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS]. The whole day has been wasted with useless debate, and I wish to know whether the Senator is not prepared to fix an hour to-morrow when we may vote upon the pending question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRIS. It is always with profound attention, and generally with admiration, that I hear a suggestion from the Senator from New Hampshire, and I always regret, as I regret now, when I am unable to give him a perfectly frank, full, and satisfactory answer.

Mr. CHANDLER. A suffering country, I say to the Senator from Tennessee, waits upon his answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRIS. I admit that there is a suffering country, and it has suffered for many months because of the conduct of the Senator from New Hampshire. [Laughter.] But not to prolong this exceedingly interesting and important discussion between the Senator from New Hampshire and myself, unless he hankers to make a reply to my remarks—

Mr. CHANDLER. I simply wish to ask the Senator to fix a time when the country may be relieved from suffering because of either of us by an adjournment.

Mr. HARRIS. Whenever the Senator from New Hampshire will consent to be absolutely silent, that result will be brought about. [Laughter.] I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, August 16, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, August 15, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Rev. W. E. PARSON, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday was read and approved.

CORRECTIONS.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I desire to correct the daily RECORD. On page 9956, on the vote on the bill for free sugar, I am recorded as paired with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I was not paired with anybody. Mr. CULBERSON, I see, voted "yes," and if present I should have voted the same way. I would have voted to continue the bounty provided for the producers of sugar in this country under the act of 1890, believing that the Government in good faith was pledged to that.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I desire to correct the daily RECORD. On page 9950 I am recorded as voting in the affirmative on the question of free iron ore. I did not vote on that question at all; but was paired with my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. I want the RECORD so corrected.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker (after making a correction as to how he would have voted on the motion to discharge the House conferees on the tariff bill had he not been paired, said: "I desire to be recognized for the purpose of presenting a resolution.")

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I desire to be recognized for the purpose of presenting a resolution.

The SPEAKER. We have not reached that period yet.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 4864) to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am requested to ask indefinite leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. ADAMS, on account of sickness in his family.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by my colleague, Mr. COCKRAN of New York, to ask indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness in his family.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 6080) to amend section 4833 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 6038) to repeal House resolution numbered 104, first session Fifty-first Congress, granting to Secretary of War a permit to license to use a pier at the mouth of Chicago River; and

A bill (H. R. 387) to authorize the construction of a life-saving station at or near Rock Point or East Marion, Long Island, New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4605) granting chief justices of United States courts in Territories power to appoint commissioners to take proof in land cases, etc., asked a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. PUGH, Mr. HILL, and Mr. PLATT as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. R. 99) to compile the public laws relating to street-railway franchises in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1007) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a deputy coroner, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2303) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Contentnea Creek at Grifton, Lenoir County, N. C., and to establish it a post-road.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That Mr. HOAR be excused as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 6284) to prevent interference in the collection of State, county, and municipal taxes assessed against corporations and corporate property, and for other purposes; and Mr. PLATT be appointed in his place.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277, and had receded from the amendment of the Senate numbered 277 to the bill (H. R. 5575) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION OF HON. CLIFTON R. BRECKINRIDGE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, D. C., August 14, 1894.

DEAR SIR: I have to-day resigned my commission as member of Congress for the Second district of Arkansas.

Very truly, yours,

CLIFTON R. BRECKINRIDGE.

HON. CHARLES F. CRISP,

Speaker House of Representatives.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5575) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 277.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment indicated by the gentleman from Texas, so that the House can see what it is.

Mr. SAYERS. I will state to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment of the House is simply the amendment for the purchase of ground upon which to erect a public building near the present Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's motion?

Mr. SAYERS. To insist upon the House amendment to the Senate amendment 277.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House further insist upon its amendment to the Senate amendment indicated.

The motion was agreed to.

SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MICHIGAN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of Congress, information as to the probable cost of completing the improvement of Saugatuck Harbor, Michigan; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

JOSHUA BECK, DECEASED, VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a copy of the finding of the Court of Claims in the case of Joshua Beck, deceased, against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CHARLESTON HARBOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, showing the necessity for additional aids to navigation in Charleston Harbor, South Carolina; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A. D. BABCOCK.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (S. 744) for

the relief of Avery D. Babcock and wife, of Oregon; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

MARIA HALL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House an act (S. 253) granting a pension to Maria Hall, widow of Joseph D. Doak, deceased.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill.

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 place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Maria Hall, widow of Joseph E. Doak, deceased, late a private in Capt. Renshaw's company of Tennessee militia from December 6, 1812, to April 20, 1813, and from September 23, 1813, to December 19, 1813.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I think we have passed that bill two or three times already in this House.

Mr. DE ARMOND. No, sir. It has never been presented before.

Mr. KILGORE. Let the report be read, Mr. Speaker.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 253) granting a pension to Maria Hall, widow of Joseph Doak, deceased, have examined the same and report:

The following facts are established in this case: Soldier performed military service as recited in the bill. Soldier's widow remarried, and for this reason pension was denied her in the Pension Bureau.

Claimant is now a widow, aged 90 years, and entirely supported by charity. The bill is a meritorious one, and your committee recommend its prompt passage.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DE ARMOND, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MARYLAND AND WASHINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a joint resolution (S. R. 96) to extend the charter of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company.

Mr. HEARD. Mr. Speaker, in the temporary absence of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RUSK]; I ask unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution be taken up and passed, as the House committee has reported a like measure unanimously.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the time for building and completing the railroad provided for in an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Maryland and Washington Railway Company," approved August 1, 1892, be, and the same is hereby, extended six months from and after the 1st day of August, 1894.

Mr. HEARD. I only want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a road chartered in the State of Maryland to run to the District line, and by Congress to come from that point to the boundary of this city, and this joint resolution extends for six months the time for its construction. I think there can be no objection to it on the part of anybody.

Mr. DINGLEY. Has the work been commenced?

Mr. HEARD. I understand that they have commenced work on the road in Maryland, and they ask only six months to complete it to the boundary of this city.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEARD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUCAS, for two weeks, on account of sickness.

To Mr. McCALL, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. ROBBINS, indefinitely.

To Mr. GORMAN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. COOKRAN, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CONN, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. WELLS, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. HOPKINS of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. ENLOE, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, for one week, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HULICK, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to with-

draw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers (a petition for a pension) in the case of Joseph Shayler, Seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

TURNER MERRITT.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of the estate of Turner Merritt, late of the parish of East Baton Rouge, La.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate and find whether or not Turner Merritt, late of the parish of East Baton Rouge, La., was loyal to the United States throughout the late war; and if said finding should be that he was so loyal, then and in that event, said court is further authorized and directed to investigate, find, and report to Congress how much cotton, if any, was taken from him and used by the Federal Army in the defenses of Port Hudson, and what its value then was, and whether any payment has been made therefor; also how much of said cotton was thereafter sold by the Government and for how much. And if it should appear from the testimony to be given in said court that any witnesses have died whose affidavits are now on file in the case, such affidavits shall be received as evidence and shall be allowed such weight as said court may deem proper.

An amendment recommended by the Committee on War Claims was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the claim of Turner Merritt, late of the parish of East Baton Rouge, La., for cotton alleged to have been taken from claimant during the war of the rebellion by the United States forces, and used by them in the defenses of Port Hudson, be referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of what is commonly known as the Bowman act and section 14 of the Tucker act, and said court is authorized to take jurisdiction in the premises and report to the House of Representatives as authorized and required by said statutory provisions, reserving to said House of Representatives the right to finally pass upon said claim upon the receipt of said report."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. The gentleman, I am sure, will withdraw his objection when he understands that this merely refers the case to the Court of Claims, without binding Congress in any way, shape, or manner to make an appropriation in case the court should pass favorably upon the claim.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is this for cotton seized?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. No, sir; it is for cotton used for breastworks in the defense of Port Hudson.

Mr. BARTLETT. By whom?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. By Gen. Grant.

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

STEAMER MARGARITA.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6986) to provide for the American registry of the steamer Margarita.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steamer Margarita, of Philadelphia, purchased and owned by an American citizen and repaired by him in the United States, to be registered as a vessel of the United States.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to authorize and direct the inspection of said steam vessel, steam boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances of said boilers, and cause to be granted the proper and usual certificate issued to steam vessels of the merchant marine, without reference to the fact that the said steam boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances were not constructed pursuant to the laws of the United States and were not constructed of iron stamped pursuant to said law; and the test to be applied to the inspection of said boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances will be the same in all respects as to strength and safety as are required in the inspection of boilers constructed in the United States for marine purposes, save the fact that said boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances not being constructed pursuant to the requirements of the laws of the United States and are of unstamped iron, shall not be an obstacle to the granting of the usual certificate if said boilers, steam pipes, and appurtenances are found to be of sufficient strength and safety.

Mr. FITHIAN. Is there a report in this case?

The SPEAKER. There is.

Mr. PIGOTT (to Mr. FITHIAN). The bill is all right.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the report be read.

The report (by Mr. PIGOTT) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6986) to provide for the American registry of the steamer Margarita, having considered the same, respectfully report as follows:

This steamer was purchased in England by A. J. Drexel, an American citizen, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., for the sum of \$90,000. The owner has expended in repairs upon the said steamer in an American shipyard the sum of \$15,000 and has made and approved plans for further expenditure of \$30,000, including the following alterations: Replumbing, refurnishing, electric light, painting, calking decks, new boats, and entirely overhauling the machinery.

During the Fiftieth, Fifty-first, and Fifty-second Congresses a large number of vessels were authorized by similar acts to be registered as vessels of the United States, in volume 25 of the United States Statutes at Large, pages 134, 475 and 668; volume 26, pages 145, 312, 414, 491, 495, 561, and 630.

Your committee, having carefully considered all the facts in the case, respectfully recommend that the bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. PAYNE. I have no objection to the gentleman making an explanation of the bill.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not interpose any objection in the way of the patriotism of an American gentleman who wishes to sail under his country's flag, and who has made every effort to do so. Mr. Drexel last summer had an American yacht, which he owned and sailed in. Owing to the ill health of his wife, he was ordered to take a trip abroad.

He endeavored to have built in an American shipyard a yacht large enough for this purpose, but was informed that a year and a half would be the shortest time in which it could be completed, and he was unable in any shipyard in the country to succeed in getting a promise of its construction in less time than that. There was no yacht of sufficient tonnage of American build that could be found for sale; and so under all of the circumstances, being unable to purchase here or have the yacht built, he purchased one abroad, paying for it \$90,000.

But true to his American instincts, which he had inherited from his father, he brought the ship into our ports, and expended \$45,000 additional in an American shipyard to put it in proper condition for the purpose contemplated. He discharged the English captain and the English crew, and in these hard times keeps in constant employment a crew of forty men and a Yankee skipper; and with that natural pride which belongs to an American citizen he comes here now asking Congress, having used every honorable and patriotic effort to get this ship of American build, to be allowed to sail the ship under our own flag and with an American register.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, when these circumstances are known that this courtesy will be extended to him. I trust, in view of the patriotic instincts exhibited by one of our citizens, under such circumstances, who desires to sail under his own flag, as a loyal American citizen, and obey in every way the laws of his country, that this privilege will be granted to him that the bill contemplates. I trust when these facts are known that there will be no member of this House who will make an objection to the request for unanimous consent to consider the bill. Does any member of this House suppose that I, being the representative in part of one of the great cities of this country, in which are the largest shipping interests in the United States; that I, coming from the city of Philadelphia, full of shipyards, and now building the great American Navy, would dare to rise in my place and introduce a bill or ask consent to have one considered that would hurt in any way American shipbuilding interests?

I hope, therefore, in view of the peculiar circumstances of the case, and the large amount expended in an American shipyard on the remodeling of this yacht, that the strict letter of the law will not be allowed to stand in the way of doing a simple act of justice to an American citizen who desires the privilege of sailing with an American register and under the American flag.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

OCALA, FLA., PORT OF DELIVERY.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1885) to extend the privileges of the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement to the city of Ocala, in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement be, and the same are hereby, extended to the city of Ocala, in the State of Florida. And the said city of Ocala is hereby constituted a port of delivery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOCKERY. Before consent is given to the consideration of this bill, I think there should be some explanation of it. Is this recommended by the Department?

Mr. COOPER of Florida. It is recommended by the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOCKERY. As I caught the reading of the bill it creates some additional officers.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. No. Let me say to the gentleman that this is recommended by the Treasury Department for the reason that Ocala has become a very large cigar-manufacturing point, and they are proposing now to transfer several large cigar factories from Havana to Ocala, if it can be made a port of entry. For that reason, in view of the largely increasing business of the place in this direction, the Department recommends the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. What number of additional officers does it create?

Mr. COOPER of Florida. It does not create any that I know of.

Mr. WISE. None whatever.

Mr. DOCKERY. No additional charge on the Treasury?

Mr. COOPER of Florida. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. COOPER of Florida, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER.

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1772) extending the time for the completion of a railroad bridge over the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, in the State of Washington.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the completion of the bridge across the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, in the State of Washington, under the act of Congress approved August 29, 1890, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Oregon Railway Extension Company," be, and the same is hereby, extended until the 15th day of April, 1898.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. COOMBS. I would like some explanation first, Mr. Speaker. Has this bill passed the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. It has. It is the unanimous report of that committee. The report is very short, if the gentleman desires to have it read. I will state, however, that this is simply the ordinary extension of a franchise which was granted about four years ago.

Mr. COOMBS. It extends the franchise to 1897; quite a long time.

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. Under the circumstances it is not a long time. The river is very broad, and the company got into some financial difficulties, and is now in the hands of a receiver. Prior to that time the work was partly done. The piers are already built; but it will take some time to complete the superstructure. It is a gigantic enterprise.

Mr. COOMBS. Have there been any protests against it?

Mr. ELLIS of Oregon. None whatever.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. ELLIS of Oregon, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS CONTENTNEA CREEK, NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. BUNN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2303) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Contentnea Creek, Grifton, Lenoir County, N. C., and to establish it as a post-road.

The bill was read.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BUNN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

W. D. MACK.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 68) for the relief of W. D. Mack, a clerk in the Record and Pension Division of the War Department.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That William D. Mack, a clerk in the Record and Pension Office, and a veteran of the late war, who lost both feet in a railroad accident while returning from the anniversary ceremonies of the battle of Gettysburg, on July 4 last, is hereby exempted from the operation of so much of the act approved March 3, 1863, making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, as limits the amount of sick leave with pay that be granted by heads of Departments, and that the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to said William D. Mack such portion of his salary as has been withheld from September 11 to October 14 (thirty-four days) on account of injuries received in the said railroad accident.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS NEWARK BAY.

Mr. DUNN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7839) to bridge Newark Bay.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the boards of chosen freeholders of the counties of Hudson and Union, in the State of New Jersey, or the legally constituted authorities of the city of Bayonne and the city of Elizabeth, as may be determined by the authorities of the State of New Jersey, now or hereafter to be granted, shall be, and they or either of them are hereby, authorized to locate, build, maintain, equip, and operate a bridge across Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey, between the city of Elizabeth, in the county of

Union, and the city of Bayonne, in the county of Hudson, at a point not less than 500 feet above the present bridge structure known as the Central Railroad bridge: *Provided*, That the bridge herein authorized shall be built as a drawbridge, with a draw giving a clear width of opening of not less than 100 feet, and said bridge shall be located and built in such manner and under such regulations for the security of navigation as the Secretary of War may prescribe; and to secure that object the parties proposing to build said bridge shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawing of the bridge and a map of the location, and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be commenced or built; and should any change be made in the plans of said bridge during the progress of its construction, such changes shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War: *Provided also*, That the draw of said bridge shall be promptly opened, upon reasonable signal, for the passage of vessels and boats; and the owners of said bridge shall maintain thereon, from sunset to sunrise, such lights and other signals as the Light-House Board shall prescribe.

Sec. 2. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the approval of this act.

Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and personally I have no objection to its passage. But it is proper to state that one of the Representatives from New Jersey [Mr. ENGLISH] now absent is bitterly opposed to it; and therefore I do not think it ought to go through by unanimous consent.

Mr. DUNN. My colleague [Mr. ENGLISH] has withdrawn his objection to the bill. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTLETT] will sustain me in this statement. Since the objection of my colleague was made, the bill has been amended so that there is no objection to it now whatever.

Mr. BARTLETT. On the occasion of my last conversation with Dr. ENGLISH, he was still opposed to the bill; so that I can not state that he has withdrawn his opposition.

Mr. DUNN. He withdrew his opposition in committee.

Mr. WISE. I would cheerfully give consent to the passage of the bill; but I know that in the last interview I had with Dr. ENGLISH he expressed himself as bitterly opposed to the bill, and as wanting an opportunity to be heard in opposition to it on the floor of the House. I see him entering the Hall now. He can speak for himself. Personally I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. DUNN. I will ask my colleague [Mr. ENGLISH], whom I now see in his place, whether he has any objection to this bill as amended by the committee.

Mr. ENGLISH of New Jersey. Not at all. It is the substitute that I favored.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague states that he has no objection to the measure.

Mr. WISE. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. This is not a railroad bridge?

Mr. DUNN. No, sir; it is a bridge for public travel between the cities of Elizabeth and Bayonne.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DUNN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the words "Secretary of War," in line 27, page 2, insert the following: "And the said bridge shall be held to be a public highway forever."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS SOUTH CANADIAN RIVER.

Mr. AVERY. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7811) authorizing the El Reno Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the South Canadian River, between Blaine County, Okla., and the Wichita Indian Reservation. The bill was read.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of section 2 the following:

"And equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph companies, and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge and approaches for postal telegraph purposes: *Provided*, That before the construction of any bridge herein authorized is commenced the said company shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawing of such bridge and a map of the location, giving sufficient information to enable the Secretary of War to fully and satisfactorily understand the subject, and unless the plan and location of such bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the structure shall not be built: *Provided also*, That any bridge constructed under authority of this act shall at all times be so kept and managed as to offer reasonable and proper means for the passage of vessels and other water craft through or under said structure, and for the safety of vessels passing at night there

shall be displayed on such bridge, from sunset to sunrise, such lights or other signals as may be prescribed by the Light-House Board."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. AVERY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE CURRENCY.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reading of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks consent for the consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the balance in available gold in the Treasury of the United States on the 1st day of August, 1894, had been reduced, despite the sale of \$50,000,000 in gold bonds, to the sum of \$54,975,607; and

Whereas the demand for gold in the Treasury made for shipments to foreign ports continues and increases; and

Whereas the reports from the Treasury show that during the month of July not a dollar in gold was added to the Treasury stock from the port of New York, the largest customs port in the United States; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that gold coin and gold certificates have virtually ceased to be used in discharging obligations to the Government, but that the obligations to the Government are discharged in silver certificates, United States notes and United States Treasury notes, which are so used as to deplete the Treasury of gold faster than it accumulates from all sources, including customs, internal revenue, and sales of bonds; and

Whereas there is in the Treasury unused and available an amount of silver equal to \$513,880,682 of American standard coin value; and

Whereas the income of the United States does not now equal its expenditures: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures is directed to at once report to the House for its consideration a bill providing for the proper use and avail of the said silver.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules is directed, upon the report of said bill from the said committee, to report a rule for the consideration of the House under which suitable, full, and reasonable debate may take place, and amendments be offered and votes taken within a reasonable time, to be fixed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I object.

Mr. TRACEY. Let it go to the committee.

POTOMAC STEAMBOAT COMPANY.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 425) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SAYERS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

JOEL A. KING.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Joel A. King.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Joel A. King, of Caldwell County, Ky., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,800, being for stores and supplies furnished the Army of the United States during the late war for the suppression of the rebellion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation of that bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman can make a brief explanation.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the report is very short. It sets forth the facts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the report can be read.

The report (by Mr. STONE of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Joel A. King, submit the following report:

This is a claim for quartermaster's stores furnished to the Army of the United States by Dr. Joel A. King, of Caldwell County, Ky., during the late war for the suppression of the rebellion, under orders from Lieut. Col. S. F. Johnson, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Infantry. Claim stated at \$1,800.

The committee find that Joel A. King was loyal to the Government of the United States throughout the late war; and that in 1863 and 1864 he furnished stores and supplies for the military use of the United States at or near Princeton, Ky., then reasonably worth \$1,800.

Your committee report back the bill and recommend its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

TITLE TO LAND IN YUMA, COLO.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7955) to perfect the title to a quarter section of land in the town of Yuma, Colo.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the preemption cash entry numbered 4090, of George F. Weed, made at the district land office at Denver, Colo., on the 15th of September, 1885, for the southeast quarter of section 22, township 2 north, of range 48 west, which tract embraces the town of Yuma, Colo., the county seat of Yuma County, Colo., be, and the same is hereby, confirmed; and that patent of the United States issue therefor to said Weed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of gentleman from Colorado [Mr. PENCE]?

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, let the report be read.

The SPEAKER. The report is quite long. By consent, the gentleman can make a brief explanation.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the bill is simply to perfect the title to the land on which the town of Yuma, in Eastern Colorado, now stands. This bill is reported favorably by the Committee on Public Lands, unanimously.

In 1885 Mr. Weed made his proof upon the land. Thereafter, within the next twelve months, when the railroad came through, a town sprang up and was organized under our State laws, and proceeded to build its public improvements. In October, 1888, some three years afterwards, an affidavit was filed of record that raised some question as to the title to these town lots. It has caused some considerable trouble to the owners of the lots, and the petitioners who have presented this bill have presented such facts to the Committee on Public Lands that they feel that these people ought to be relieved by this act. There is nobody who is interested in it now except the lot claimants, and they wish to perfect their title.

Mr. COOMBS. Are there many of them?

Mr. PENCE. There were a good many last spring. I have forgotten how many voted last spring. This is the county seat of the county. There are probably less people there now since the drought.

Mr. COOMBS. Do I understand this bill is reported unanimously and favorably?

Mr. PENCE. Yes.

Mr. COOMBS. Is it understood out there, so that the people who would have the right to object to it could have done so?

Mr. PENCE. I should not present it otherwise.

Mr. COOMBS. I make no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. PENCE]?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PENCE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RECONVEYANCE BY DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS OF CERTAIN LAND.

Mr. POST. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill S. 2269.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to consider a bill which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2269) providing for reconveyance by District Commissioners of certain lands to Andrew J. Curtis and Mary E. Curtis.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to reconvey by a suitable deed of conveyance or quitclaim to Andrew J. Curtis and Mary E. Curtis, their heirs and assigns, all the right, title, and interest of the District of Columbia in and to all that lot or parcel of land fully described and acquired in a deed from Andrew J. Curtis and Mary E. Curtis to the said District of Columbia on the 10th day of September, A. D. 1891, and recorded in Liber 1638, folio 294 of the land records of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. COOMBS. I would like to hear the report.

Mr. POST. The simple facts are these, if the gentleman will allow me. A street in Bennings was deeded to the District.

Mr. COOMBS. Where?

Mr. POST. In Bennings. The Commissioners say that the topography of the ground makes it unsuitable for a street; and the only effect of this conveyance is to relieve the owners from taxation; and they desire to have it reconveyed.

Mr. COOMBS. Have you a letter from the Commissioners?

Mr. POST. I have a letter from the Commissioners to that effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gen-

tleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. POST, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. POST. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House bill relating to the same subject lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection that order will be made. There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

JOEL A. KING.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the bill of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York withdraws the objection he entered to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky. The Chair will have the title of the bill read again, and ask if there is any other objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Joel A. King.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objected to the consideration of this bill. Is there further objection?

Mr. LOUD. I will ask if this bill was not considered some few weeks ago?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be again read.

The bill was read again.

Mr. LOUD. I would like to ask if that bill was not considered here one Friday afternoon?

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. No, sir.

Mr. LOUD. I do not think this bill ought to pass without some discussion.

Mr. STONE of Kentucky. It never has been before the House, but it has been reported from the committee a number of times.

Mr. LOUD. I think it ought to come up in committee on Friday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California objects.

FINANCES.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk be read, after which I will ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas, etc., the tariff bill has been passed by the House reducing the duty and cheapening the necessities of life; and

Whereas by separate acts coal, iron, barbed wire, sugar, and molasses have been put upon the free list; and

Whereas without further legislation the masses of the people will be very little better off than before: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the people's money should be restored to its original status by the remonetization of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, followed by some financial legislation increasing the circulating medium of the country, so that the people may be able to purchase the necessities of life lately reduced in the tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to consider this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. TRACEY. Let it go to a committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, which is equivalent to an objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. ALDERSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

By unanimous consent, on the request of Mr. PHILLIPS, a reprint was ordered of the bill (H. R. 7756) authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agriculture, and capital.

LIFE-SAVING STATION, BOSTON HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. CARUTH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported the bill (H. R. 7973) as a substitute for the bill (H. R. 7213) to establish a life-saving station at or near City Point, Boston Harbor; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill was ordered to lie on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS AND TESTS OF AMERICAN TIMBER.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported back favorably the bill (S. 313) appropriating funds for investigations and tests of American timber; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

INSPECTION OF LIVE CATTLE, HOGS, AND CARCASSES AND PRODUCTS THEREOF.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported with amendments the bill (H. R. 7910) to amend "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are subject to interstate commerce, and for other purposes;" which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EXPLORATION AND PURCHASE OF MINES.

Mr. WEADOCK, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported favorably the bill (H. R. 7148) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, JAMESTOWN, N. Y.

Mr. CADMUS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported favorably the bill (H. R. 2891) for the erection of a public building at the city of Jamestown, N. Y.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

VIEWS OF MINORITY.

Mr. CHILDS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the views of the minority on the bill (H. R. 6411) relating to issuance of writs of habeas corpus by Federal courts or judges thereof, and on the bill (H. R. 5217) to regulate and discharge the payment of contracts in any money made a legal tender by law for the payment of debts; which were ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BLACK of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order during the call.

The call of committees was resumed and concluded.

The SPEAKER. The morning hour begins at fifteen minutes past 1, and the call rests with the Committee on Patents.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees.

Mr. BUNN (when the Committee on Claims was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Committee on Claims be passed, with the privilege of being called later.

There was no objection.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a similar privilege be granted to the Committee on War Claims, owing to the temporary absence of the chairman.

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF CONTRACTS IN LEGAL-TENDER MONEY.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5217) to regulate and discharge the payment of contracts in any money made a legal tender by law for the payment of debts.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all contracts for the payment of any money, whether in gold, silver, or coin, may be discharged by any money which is by law a legal tender for the payment of debts when the contract matures.

An amendment recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, inserting in line 3, after the word "contracts," the words "hereafter executed," was read.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the importance of this bill can not be overstated. The purpose of the measure is to secure stability in our financial system. Under our present financial method we have various kinds of money, and the law, as it is now interpreted by the courts, allows parties to discredit various forms of our money by contract.

Mr. COOMBS. Does not the gentleman think that is proper?

Mr. LANE. It is not proper, and I will show that it is not. Our law requires that all the proceedings of our courts shall be expressed in dollars, dimes, cents, and mills. It was always the practice in this country up to 1878. The records of this country everywhere were always kept in that way, and the Supreme Court in 1878 for the first time changed that mode of procedure.

I have examined with great care the decisions of the courts of the various States on this question, and I find a uniform concurrence of opinion up to the time the question came before the Supreme Court of the United States. The courts of the various States had formerly held that when an obligation was given for the payment of money, it meant that that obligation could be discharged in whatever was declared to be the legal money of the country. I know that some gentlemen may claim that this bill is an attempt on my part to bring up the silver question, but I beg to state that such an idea never entered my mind in connection with this bill.

What brought this question to my attention was the fact that some of my constituents, desiring to borrow money, were offered some, but were required, in executing their notes, to give an obligation that the money should be repaid in gold. They sent the papers to me and asked my view about it. I advised them that that was not necessary, and with a view to meet that contingency I introduced this bill.

Mr. COOMBS. Has this bill been reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. LANE. There is no dissenting report, as I understand.

Mr. POWERS. One was filed this morning.

Mr. LANE. I did not know that. The Democratic members of the committee, as I understand, all agree in recommending this bill, and some of the members on the other side, but not all. I wish to call attention now to the law as it was before this question came before the Supreme Court.

Mr. DANIELS. When this question came before the courts of New York they decided that all contracts could be discharged by the tender and payment of greenbacks, and that inasmuch as all debts were payable only in gold and silver before the law was passed, it made no difference whether that provision was in the contract or not, the greenback law covered the whole question.

Mr. LANE. I have those decisions here. I wish to call attention now to the decision of the courts of Massachusetts. In 1863 this question came before the supreme judicial court of the State of Massachusetts, and I have here a brief summary of the decision of the court. The note in that case was for \$500 payable in specie, and of course the plaintiff insisted that he was entitled to gold or its equivalent on that contract. The court in that case said:

All the court can do is to treat as money that which the statutes of the United States legally enacted declare to be money. If it were in our power to render a specific judgment designating a species of currency in which it should be paid, we might avoid some of the existing difficulties, but we have no such power.

That is the opinion of the court of Massachusetts in 1863.

Mr. COOMBS. That was before the war.

Mr. LANE. It was during the war and after Congress had passed an act declaring greenbacks to be a legal tender for the payment of all debts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in this controversy I do not raise at all the question about the power of Congress to declare what shall be a legal tender. That question is not involved in this discussion.

Congress saw proper to declare that greenbacks should be a legal tender for the payment of debts; and my contention is that no private party has a right to annul an enactment of Congress.

Mr. COOMBS. Does not the form of the bill prevent contracts being made for the payment of a debt in specie even if the parties desire to so frame the contract?

Mr. LANE. The effect of the bill if it should become a law will be that a money contract may be discharged with any money that Congress has declared shall be legal tender.

Mr. COOMBS. No matter what the contract may be.

Mr. LANE. That is, a money contract. But it does not prevent a contract to be executed for a commodity, and gold may be a commodity.

Mr. COOMBS. I think it does.

Mr. LANE. It applies only to money contracts.

Mr. TRACEY. But it prevents the enforcement of a gold contract.

Mr. LANE. If it is a money transaction, you can discharge the debt in legal-tender money. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is what ought to be done.

Mr. LANE. If you desire to purchase gold as a commodity you may provide that the contract may be discharged in so many grains of gold. But that is a different transaction. If the intention of the contract is the payment of money, then the legal-tender money will discharge the obligation. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. And a very proper purpose.

Mr. COOMBS. I call the attention of the gentleman to this provision of the bill:

All contracts hereafter executed for the payment of any sum of money, whether in gold or silver or coin, may be discharged by any money which is by law a legal tender for the payment of debts when the contract matures.

Mr. LANE. Yes; that is the provision of the bill.

Mr. COOMBS. And that prevents a man from making a contract for payment in specie.

Mr. LANE. That is exactly what we intend shall be the law. But it applies only to money contracts. When a man makes a money contract that contract ought to be dischargeable in money of the United States declared by law to be a legal tender. No man has a right to discredit that which the Government has declared to be money. No contract can be made except in con-

formity with the law. The law is the essence of every contract. A contract which does not conform to the law is void. This bill prevents anybody from making a contract that a money debt shall be discharged specifically in gold and nothing else.

Mr. COOMBS. So I understand.

Mr. LANE. In other words, if you loan greenbacks you can not exact from your debtor an obligation that he shall repay the debt in gold.

Mr. RYAN. But suppose gold is the money loaned?

Mr. LANE. You can loan gold if you want to loan it, just as you can loan paper.

Mr. RYAN. The bill prevents a contract being made (though both parties may be willing) for the payment of a debt in gold dollars.

Mr. LANE. It prevents any man from discriminating against the currency of the country. If there has been a loan of gold, and if, when the contract matures, paper money is legal tender, you are allowed to discharge that obligation with paper money.

Mr. COOMBS. Then it restricts contracts?

Mr. LANE. It does not.

Mr. RYAN. But if both parties are willing to make the contract payable in gold this bill forbids it, though gold be loaned.

Mr. LANE. It does, because such a thing is against public policy. We propose not to allow any man to discredit the money of his country. At one time it was regarded as treason for any man to undertake to discredit the money of his country. Why should we allow a privileged class in this country to make gold contracts and cast upon the debtor the burden of preserving the currency of the country from depreciation? We have in this country now thousands, I may say millions, of dollars of money out on contracts of this very kind, contracts which are payable in gold; and the holders of such contracts can force gold to a premium in two hours, thus filching from the hands of the debtor class millions of dollars. I say the principle is wrong.

Mr. COOMBS. But suppose the parties have made contracts payable in gold?

Mr. LANE. This bill does not affect contracts already made; only those hereafter made.

Mr. COOMBS. But you said it was wrong that such contracts should be recognized by the law.

Mr. LANE. I do say it is wrong, morally wrong.

Mr. COOMBS. I see that it was an afterthought to amend the bill so as not to affect contracts already made.

Mr. LANE. That makes no difference. You have a right to make contracts in conformity to the existing law. Contracts must always be made in obedience to law. When there is no law there can be no binding contract. If there was no government, contracts would have no legal force; they would simply be moral obligations, dischargeable at the pleasure of the maker.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. A bill was presented here not long ago proposing to permit the Territory of Arizona to issue gold bonds, because it was stated that as gold bonds they could be floated at a lower rate of interest than if they were payable in currency. Now, this bill will prevent any State or municipality from issuing gold bonds, although the inability to do so may involve the payment of a higher rate of interest for years on the bonds issued.

Mr. LANE. I beg to differ with the gentleman from Florida. This has nothing whatever to do with contracts of the States or the nation.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. Why?

Mr. LANE. Simply because it has not. That question was settled in *Lane County vs. Oregon* (7 Wall., 71); or, rather, a kindred question.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I think it has.

Mr. LANE. It relates only to private contracts.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. There is nothing in it that confines it to private contracts.

Mr. LANE. Oh, yes. The States and the nation can take care of themselves. They can only be sued by their consent.

Mr. COOPER of Florida. I would risk my judgment as a lawyer that it covers all contracts—State, municipal, or any other—coming within the purview of the law.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let me ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. LANE. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. How does the gentleman from Illinois reconcile his position with that taken by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Brownson vs. Rodes*, where the Supreme Court say, in speaking of a contract to pay a certain number of dollars in gold and silver, that—

It is not distinguishable, as we think, in principle from a contract to deliver an equal weight of bullion of equal fineness.

Mr. LANE. Well, I will come to that in a little while, and I think I can satisfy the gentleman on that point.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman from Illinois proceeds I wish to ask him if, in his judgment, this prohibits a municipality from issuing bonds payable in gold?

Mr. LANE. It would.

Mr. DINGLEY. Even if they could borrow money at 3 per cent to pay a debt which carried 5 per cent or more?

Mr. LANE. It would. The bond could be made payable in gold, but it could be discharged in legal tender.

I want to read now from what Judge Cooley says on this subject. He has some followers on this floor, and there are many gentlemen here who regard him as eminent in his profession as a lawyer. In a citation in 13 Michigan Reports, 420, in the case of *Buchegger vs. Schultz*, where the question before the court was in reference to a contract to pay a certain number of dollars stipulated to be paid in gold, not being a contract for merchandise, but for money, and to be discharged in money, Judge Cooley, delivering the opinion of the court, among other things, said:

If legal-tender laws were designed chiefly to confer upon debtors a privilege, there would be force in an argument that the class to be benefited might waive the privilege by stipulation in their contracts. But these laws are also based in great measure upon reasons of state policy, which sometimes to a considerable degree override and disregard individual interests.

The act in question was based exclusively upon reasons of a public character, which, in the opinion of the lawmaking power, imperatively demands that Treasury notes shall be made equal in legal value to coin, and parties have no more right to stipulate that their contracts shall not be governed by it than those of a particular locality have to agree among themselves that a law shall not be in force in that locality.

That was in 1865, before the question came before the Supreme Court of the United States, which declared that a contract payable in gold could be discharged by legal tender, it being held that under the law of Congress legal-tender notes were equal in value with gold.

Now, in the State of Illinois, my own State, the question came up there on a similar presentation of fact, and that State held the same view of the law.

It was declared in 1866, in the case of *Appel vs. Woltman*, Thirty-eighth Missouri reports, that the same principle would apply, the court using this language:

But by law Congress has made Treasury notes of legal value with gold, and declared they should be legal tenders in satisfaction of private debts. As a legal medium, then, there can not be a distinction taken between them and gold.

The same principle, precisely, was laid down in the Illinois case. Of course when the Supreme Court decided the question they had to reverse that decision, as the Supreme Court of the United States had primarily full power in the premises.

The court in the Missouri case continue as follows:

It is a notorious fact which has passed into the history of the country that for the purpose of trade and in commercial transactions there is a difference made between Treasury notes and specie coin; but whatever fluctuations there may be arising from extraneous causes, the debtor's right to pay in whatever medium he chooses can not be affected. In administering the law gold and Treasury notes must be considered as equal, and no difference or discrimination can be allowed.

That was followed by the decision in the Indiana case, in 1886, in the case of *Brown vs. Welch*, where the court used this language:

When Treasury notes were made a legal tender in the payment of debts they were made the equivalent of coin as a means of payment in all but the cases excepted by law. If, then, the law makes them equivalent for the purpose of payment, a failure to pay a given sum in gold, as required by contract, can not possibly beget an obligation to pay a greater sum in legal-tender notes, whatever premium men may voluntarily choose to give for gold when forced to obtain it for a specific purpose or when impelled by a spirit of speculation or by a weak distrust of the Government.

Without giving a citation from all of the other cases I can say, in brief, that this same principle was followed uniformly by a perfect consensus of opinion in all of the States—in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Texas, California, Georgia, Louisiana, Vermont, Alabama, Nebraska, and Iowa.

Mr. POWERS of Vermont. To what case does the gentleman refer from Vermont?

Mr. LANE. I will refer to that case particularly.

It was the case of *Townsend vs. Jennison*, quoted in the Forty-fourth Vermont Reports, where the court held that when a debt is payable in specie it is an error for the court to allow the plaintiff premium on silver coin, there being more than one kind of money called "specie," and the kinds being capable of different values.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Then you wish to provide that A can not contract with B a debt which shall be paid in gold?

Mr. LANE. I do; simply that and nothing more.

Mr. COOMBS. And it was an afterthought that they put in the word "hereafter."

Mr. LANE. It is in the bill now.

Mr. COOMBS. But it shows the wisdom of the bill!

Mr. LANE. In the Alabama case, the court say:

The verdict is for \$5,000 in gold, and the judgment follows the verdict. The present law of the United States governing the currency and defining what shall be legal tender for the payment of debts forbids such a payment.

The verdict ought, therefore, to have been for dollars simply. A judgment for dollars in gold is erroneous.

That is the decision of the court in that case. If you will take the pains to read through all these cases you will find they all hold that when a private contract is made to be paid in gold, silver, or specie, that the debt is discharged by any money that is legal tender at the time the debt matures. I find that the court of Georgia delivered this utterance on the question:

As the debt was contracted long after the passage of the legal-tender acts of Congress regulating the payment of such contracts, the judgment should have been for so many dollars only, leaving it to be discharged in any legal-tender currency or money of the United States.

I say that uniformly the State courts of this country have held that this kind of a contract could be discharged in any money that was a legal tender. The courts of France, construing not a special act, but their general law, held that it was against public policy to allow a man to contract against the currency of his country, and it was treason in England to discredit the money of the realm, and subjected the offender to the penalty of death. Now, these gentlemen, every time they make a contract of this kind, discredit the money of this country, discredit the paper money or any other money, excepting the special money contracted to be paid.

As I said before, all contracts must be made according to law, not contrary to law, and if the law was as indicated by this bill, then we should have a uniform currency, uniform contracts, and uniform decisions everywhere. This question came before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1868 for the first time, in the case of *Bronson vs. Rodes*, reported in 7 Wallace, 229. I call your attention to the anomalous position in which the question was placed under that decision. The contract was for \$1,507, to be paid in gold and silver coin. The court went on and decided in that case, and adopted a new rule, for the first time, I think, in this or any other country. They held that on a note payable in gold and silver coin the judgment should be for coined dollars and part of dollars.

The judgment in that case was for coined dollars. We all know that an execution is the end of the law or was up to that time. When you go into court and get a judgment, and take out an execution, that is the end of the law; but under this decision it is not the end of the law. How will you collect a judgment for coined dollars? How are you going to enforce it? When you get an ordinary judgment for dollars and cents, the execution runs to the sheriff or marshal, to collect from the debtor so much money in dollars and cents. Under the decision of the case here in *Bronson vs. Rodes*, 7 Wallace, it is to collect coin dollars.

Under that kind of an execution, what must the sheriff do? He takes the execution, goes out and makes a demand for the coin dollars. He can not get them. They are not in the country at all. Coin does not circulate. What does he do? He levies his execution on a farm or some other property of the debtor, and sells it. What does he sell it for? Why, for greenbacks.

The marshal is compelled to accept the legal tender from the party purchasing the property. The law compels him to do so. What is he to do then?

Go to New York or some other market and purchase coined dollars. How is he going to know what premium to pay for gold? Who made him a judicial officer? What market is to control the price?

Mr. COOMBS. I would ask the gentleman if the original error does not lie in the party making that contract to pay in coin?

Mr. LANE. No. The error lies in the court legislating in the interest of the gold bugs.

Mr. BARTLETT. How is there any more difficulty in enforcing such a judgment than in enforcing any judgment for specific performance?

Mr. LANE. I will tell you. When you get a judgment of a court for specific performance, the court tells you what you are to do.

Mr. BARTLETT. They can do the same in this case.
Mr. LANE. Here you get a judgment for coin dollars. Now, the sheriff or the marshal goes with the execution, and how is he going to buy gold? In what market shall he buy? Shall he take the premium on gold in Illinois or New York or Louisiana, or in England? What right has anyone to make of him a judicial officer? He is a ministerial officer, to execute a process. How is he going to do it?

Mr. NORTHWAY. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Half dollars are legal tender, are they not?

Mr. LANE. For a certain amount.

Mr. NORTHWAY. They are legal-tender money?

Mr. LANE. For certain amounts.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Under this contract you could redeem a contract for a million dollars in half dollars.

Mr. LANE. You could under certain conditions.
Mr. NORTHWAY. But there is no condition. They are legal tender.

Mr. LANE. They are only legal tender for \$5.

Mr. MARSH. A limited legal tender.

Mr. NORTHWAY. But nevertheless what is known as legal tender.

Mr. LANE. But if you make a contract for \$10, you can not pay it off in half dollars.

Mr. NORTHWAY. Read the bill and see.

Mr. LANE. I know what it is; and I say you can discharge it in any money that is legal tender to that amount. Now, the State courts follow the case of *Bronson vs. Rodes*. There are only two cases in the Supreme Court, *Bronson vs. Rodes*, and the case of *Trebilcock vs. Wilson*, 12 Wall., 687. In that case there was a note given for \$900, a plain promissory note. In the court below the debtor tendered the amount due on the note in legal tender, and the trial court below held that that was a good tender.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Did this note call for gold?

Mr. LANE. I will give you the exact words [reading]: "Payable in specie."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Payable in specie.

Mr. LANE. Now, specie is gold and silver, and it is also copper. There are three kinds of specie. So you will see the absurdity of the position. The definition of specie in the law books and in ordinary dictionaries is given as coined money, in gold, in silver, or in copper; and according to the literal meaning of this note the debtor could have discharged it in copper coin. It is payable in specie. Now, the court below held that as he had tendered in greenbacks or Treasury notes the amount of the contract it was a sufficient tender.

The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and they held that he was entitled to a coin judgment for the amount due. You find the same condition as in the other case. The marshal is to take out an execution and go to the party and make his collection, or sell the property, and then go and buy gold.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me just a moment to make a suggestion to him?

Mr. LANE. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is it not true that the effect of these two decisions is entirely destroyed, so far at least as silver is concerned, by the declaration of the statute of the policy of this Government to preserve gold and silver at a parity? Is not that obligatory upon the courts, as well as on the other branches of the Government? Would the court be permitted to discredit a portion of the coin of the United States by holding that it would not discharge an obligation, in the face of the declaration of the Government that silver is equivalent to gold?

Mr. LANE. I am glad the gentleman made that point, and I will show him how it operates. When this contract was made, there was no question between gold and silver. That was before some people in this country had discriminated against silver; now they claim that a silver dollar is only worth 50 cents, and they insist that the contract shall be in gold, not in specie.

Mr. BARTLETT. Make it gold.

Mr. LANE. A silver dollar is just as much a dollar as a gold dollar, and it has the same purchasing power.

Mr. BARTLETT. But make the contract in gold.

Mr. LANE. This contract is not made for gold. The rate is payable in specie and it can be discharged in specie. But it is a contract for the payment of money and it should have been held by the court that it could be discharged in any money that was by law made a legal tender. This is and should be the legal effect of such a contract. The law must control. The law declares that a certain per cent per annum shall be the legal rate of interest for the use of money, and any amount over that would be usury.

Parties, by private contract, can not annul such a law. The law controls the contract and the lawmaking power has the right to say that all contracts for the payment of money, whether in gold or silver, shall be discharged and satisfied by the payment of any money made by law a legal tender. You have no more right to make a contract in gold than you have to make a usurious contract.

Mr. BARTLETT. What right have you to restrain the liberty of making a contract if the contract is not against good morals?

Mr. LANE. It is contrary to public policy, and it is therefore against good morals. No contract can be lawful unless it is in conformity to law, and the law has the right to control the contract. The law is greater than the contract or the parties to the contract.

Now, let me show you what the court did here in this case. In the case of *Vaughn vs. Telegraph Company*, 14 Wallace, the action was for the loss of a cargo of goods, valued at \$2,436 in

gold. Now, in this case there was no contract at all. It was simply an action of tort. The court below held that the value of the goods destroyed was \$2,436, and they turned round and entered up a judgment for \$6,515.51.

Putting it mildly, this might be called legal robbery. This property was worth in gold only a little over \$2,000, and the court rendered a judgment for over \$6,000. That is the Supreme Court of the United States that rendered this judgment. If you will take and read this case, you will see what the court did in the premises.

A MEMBER. That is the case reported in your report?

Mr. LANE. It is in my brief. I will read you from 12 Wallace, page 548.

But the obligation of a contract to pay money is to pay that which the law shall recognize as money when the payment is to be made. If there is anything settled by decision it is this, and we do not understand it to be controverted.

That is what the Supreme Court itself decided in this class of cases.

Mr. COOMBS. That was not a gold contract.

Mr. LANE. It was in regard to a contract for the payment of money.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Yes; but that gold contract was before the statute establishing the equality of gold and silver and imposing the duty of maintaining that parity.

Mr. LANE. What the gentleman states is true, but the question then before the court was not a question between gold and silver, but the difference between specie or coined money and a legal tender in paper money. At that time there was no question as to a difference between gold and silver. The attempt then was to discredit paper money, and having succeeded in doing that, since that time the war has been made on silver and the attempt made to recognize no money as lawful money but gold.

The act of July 14, 1890, in regard to the purchase of silver bullion, known as the Sherman act, expressly provides that it is "the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals (that is, gold and silver) on a parity with each other upon the present ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law." This was the solemn declaration of Congress, but clearly that was not the intention of Congress in passing this act, for the act destroys the parity of the two metals by prohibiting the free coinage of silver. Parity means equality, and a law that grants a certain right to one metal and denies it to another does not put the two metals on a parity.

The statute does not declare that the parity shall relate to their legal-tender quality or their purchasing power, but simply to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law. But I beg leave to remind gentlemen that the Supreme Court of the United States, so far as I know, has never discriminated against the silver dollar. When the decisions in the cases of *Bronson vs. Rodes* and *Trebilcock vs. Wilson* were rendered there was no complaint that a silver dollar was not as good as a gold dollar.

In the first case the promise was to pay in "gold and silver coin," and in the second case in "specie," and the judgments in both cases were for so many "coined dollars." As a matter of course a coined silver dollar would discharge the judgments as well as a coined gold dollar. If, however, a case should be carried to the United States Supreme Court now where the promise would be to pay so many dollars in gold, I do not know whether the court would or not render a judgment for coined dollars. The purpose of this bill is, however, simply to change the law as laid down in these cases where the court discriminated against Treasury notes or greenbacks and denied their validity as a legal tender.

The Congress of the United States declared that Treasury notes should be equal in value to coin, and private parties have no right nor power to annul that law. It is no violation of the right of contract to provide that a certain thing shall not be done, and every act is now regarded as unlawful which the law forbids to be done, and the courts generally hold that contracts made in violation of law are void.

Lobbying contracts are held void on the ground of public policy. Services in procuring contracts from heads of Departments of the Government and to secure appointments to offices or places of trust or an agreement to influence the action of an officer are void. Contracts made on Sunday, wager or gaming contracts are void. Option, future, and margin contracts and contracts in restraint of trade are void. Contracts given for Confederate money are void, as being against public policy. And so should contracts be void that discriminate against Treasury notes, which are a legal tender by law. Contracts for human flesh were permitted by the laws of Venice:

But, in the cutting it, if thou dost shed
One drop of Christian blood, thy land and goods
Are, by the laws of Venice, confiscated
Unto the state of Venice.

This condition was the restraint on Shylock, but our modern Shylocks oppose all restraint. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS] asked me some time ago if this bill prevents contracts being made for the payment of a debt in specie, even if the parties desire to so frame the contract.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman states a false assumption in his question. No person ever desires to sign such a contract. No sane man would voluntarily sign such a contract. Such a contract might be signed to-day for a hundred dollars in Treasury notes with the gold or specie clause in it, and within six months gold might go to a premium and the debtor would be compelled to pay \$200 in Treasury notes in discharge of his contract for \$100. Such things have happened and may happen again, and the law that permits it is manifestly unjust.

There is no equality between the creditor and debtor when the one is about to borrow of the other; the parties are not on equal terms. The debtor is pressed for means and he must yield to the tyrannical exactions of the creditor, whatever his terms are.

If all men were just we would need no laws, but human experience teaches that they are not, and therefore the law must protect the weak against the strong. The question finally resolves itself into one of justice. The reason a gold contract is exacted by the creditor is to protect himself against any fluctuation in our currency.

Why should the debtor alone be held responsible for the stability of the money of the country. Should not this burden be borne as well by the creditor as the debtor. Equality is justice and every man should have an equal chance in the race of life. When an ordinary money contract is given, if the volume of money in the country increases it is to the interest of the debtor, if it decreases it is to the interest of the creditor. These are chances that all business men must take in the affairs of life.

But under the gold contract the rule is changed and the responsibility is all cast on the debtor.

Justice demands that this measure should be enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, my time has about expired, and I therefore ask permission to extend my remarks and to print in connection with them the report which I made to the House on this bill.

There being no objection permission, is therefore granted.

APPENDIX.

[House Report No. 1270, Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

TO REGULATE AND DISCHARGE THE PAYMENT OF CONTRACTS IN ANY MONEY MADE A LEGAL TENDER BY LAW FOR THE PAYMENT OF DEBTS.

July 17, 1894.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 5217):

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred House bill 5217, introduced by Mr. LANE, which reads as follows:

"A bill to regulate and discharge the payment of contracts in any money made a legal tender by law for the payment of debts.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all contracts hereafter executed for the payment of any sum of money, whether in gold, silver, or coin, may be discharged by any money which is by law a legal tender for the payment of debts when the contract matures."

Beg leave to report that they have considered said bill, and find that the purpose of this bill is to regulate the practice in the Federal courts in regard to entering judgments, in requiring such judgments to be expressed in dollars and parts of dollars, and to preserve the stability and uniformity of our currency.

The act of Congress of 1792, establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States, provides that the money of accounts of the United States shall be expressed in dollars, dimes, cents, and mills, and that all proceedings in the courts of the United States shall be kept in conformity with this regulation.

The law now is that gold and silver coin and Treasury notes are a legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private. There are some exceptions in regard to the payment of customs, etc., in Treasury notes, but this has no application to judgments between private parties. The law makes coined money and Treasury notes a legal tender in the payment of private debts, that is, makes both kinds of money equal for this purpose, and neither the courts nor private individuals have the right to annul the law.

The law is greater than the court or the individual, and neither have the right to set it aside. The courts have no power to legislate or to annul the laws of Congress, or to permit private parties to set aside a public statute. This the Federal courts have done in holding that a judgment can be entered in "coined dollars," which is done for the very purpose of annulling the act of Congress making Treasury notes a legal tender for the payment of debts. In England it was a felony to discredit the money of the realm. The courts of France have held that parties can not, by special contracts, discriminate between the bank notes of the Bank of France, which are made a legal tender, and coin money, which is also a legal tender.

The decision will be found in Bulletin of Appeals of France, volume 75, No. 46, of date February 11, 1873. In the case of *Delatre vs. Scouteters* the court said: "In a monetary crisis laws directing the legal tender of bank notes have the character of police and surety laws, and are for the public benefit; consequently these laws can not be avoided by written contracts, made either after the promulgation of such laws or even before. Therefore creditors can not, in view of such contracts, refuse payment if it is tendered him in notes of the Bank of France, taking them at their legal value, which is by law equivalent to that of coin." Many other nations of the earth even went further and made it a crime punishable by death to discredit the money of the country.

The State courts of many of the States of the Union have passed on this question, and they hold the law substantially as it was held by the court in France.

These decisions were rendered in the State courts after the passage of the legal-tender act by Congress and before the decision of the United States Supreme Court was fully known. A few of the cases will be examined and the date of trial given.

Attention is first called to the following case:
In 1863, in the case of *Wood vs. Bullens*, 6 Allen (Mass.), 516, the note was for \$500, with this statement in the note: "The above payable in specie." The court held that the note could be discharged in currency, and in deciding the case used this language:

"All the court can do is to treat as money that which the statutes of the United States, legally enacted, declare to be money. If it were in our power to render a specific judgment designating the species of currency in which it should be paid we might avoid some of the existing difficulties, but we have no such authority."

In 1862, in *Shoenburger vs. Watts*, 10 Am. Law Reg., 553 (Pa.), a bond for \$28,000 was executed payable in specie, "current gold and silver of the United States," and the court held that the bond could be discharged in currency. The court says in that case:

"This being the object and design for which the coining and money-making power was given to the Government of the United States in common with all other governments, we may well doubt whether, while that Government has exercised its high prerogative by deciding that certain modes or forms of value shall all be money, and all money be equal, that the same named quantities of each shall be worth as much as any of the others, it can be competent for the citizen to distinguish to make a bargain excluding those with whom he contracts from a means of payment which the law has decided shall be open to and available for all and encumber them with a debt of a new and special nature not capable of being discharged in the way in which the ordinary debts are by law payable."

In 1864, in *Schallenberg vs. Brinton*, 13 Am. Law Reg., 561 (Pa.), the lease was for ground rent payable in "lawful silver money of the United States," the court held that the rent could be paid in legal-tender notes.

In 1865, in the case of *Buchegger vs. Schultz* (13 Mich., 429), it is held by the court that a contract for a certain number of "dollars," though stipulated to be paid "in gold," is not a contract for merchandise, but for money, and therefore can be discharged in any lawful money. Judge Cooley delivered the opinion in this case, and in doing so, among other things, he said:

"If legal-tender laws were designed chiefly to confer upon debtors a privilege, there would be force in an argument that the class to be benefited might waive the privilege by stipulation in their contracts. But these laws are also based in great measure upon reasons of State policy, which sometimes to a considerable degree override and disregard individual interests."

"The act in question was based exclusively upon reasons of a public character, which, in the opinion of the lawmaking power, imperatively demands that Treasury notes shall be made equal in legal value to coin, and parties have no more right to stipulate that their contracts shall not be governed by it than those of a particular locality have to agree among themselves that a law shall not be in force in that locality."

In 1865, in *Whetstone vs. Colley* (38 Ill., 325), suit was on a note for \$150, payable in "gold." The court held that the note could be discharged in United States Treasury notes, and in an action thereon evidence as to the value of gold compared with legal-tender Treasury notes is inadmissible.

In 1866, in *Appel vs. Woltman* (35 Mo., 194), the action was for recovery of \$2,000, which, by the terms of the contract, "should be paid in the current gold coin of the United States, in full tale, or without regard to any legal tender that may be established or declared by any law of Congress." It was held by the court that this contract could be discharged in legal-tender Treasury notes. The court says in this case:

"But by law Congress has made Treasury notes of legal value with gold, and declared they should be legal tenders in satisfaction of private debts. As a legal medium, then, there can not be a distinction taken between them and gold."

Again the court in the same case says:
"It is a notorious fact which has passed into the history of the country that for the purpose of trade and in commercial transactions there is a difference made between Treasury notes and specie coin; but whatever fluctuations there may be arising from extraneous causes the debtor's right to pay in whatever medium he chooses can not be affected. In administering the law gold and Treasury notes must be considered as equal and no difference or discrimination can be allowed."

In 1866, in *Brown vs. Welch* (23 Ind., 116), the contract was for the "payment of a specified sum in gold or if paid in paper the amount thereof necessary to purchase the gold at the place of payment." It was held by the court that the contract could be discharged in Treasury notes at the sum named in the contract. The court uses this language in the opinion:

"When Treasury notes were made a legal tender in the payment of debts they were made the equivalent of coin as a means of payment in all but the cases excepted by law. If, then, the law makes them equivalent for the purpose of payment, a failure to pay a given sum in gold, as required by contract, can not possibly beget an obligation to pay a greater sum in legal-tender notes, whatever premium men may voluntarily choose to give for gold when forced to obtain it for a specific purpose, or when impelled by a spirit of speculation, or by a weak distrust of the Government."

In 1866, in *Riley vs. Sharp* (1 Ky., 348), it is held that a note payable in "gold" can be discharged in legal tender in the amount named in the contract.

In 1871, in *Kellogg vs. Sweeney* (46 N. Y.), \$493.51 in gold coin was stolen from the plaintiff, and in a civil suit for its recovery it was held that the amount could be discharged by Treasury notes, although the value of gold coin in currency was \$1.59 at the time, and if the matter was in contract the law would be the same. (*Chrysler vs. Renois*, 4 Hand, 208.)

In 1870, in *Killough vs. Alford* (32 Texas, 457), the court holds that \$750, payable "in gold coin, or the equivalent thereof in the United States legal-tender notes," can be paid in legal-tender notes of the United States, and gold coin are the same dollar for dollar; that things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

In 1867, in *Beatty vs. Rhodes* (3 Nebr., 240), it is held that in the payment of a debt legal-tender notes are in contemplation of law equal to coin, and making the salary of a State officer payable in legal-tender notes after it had previously made it payable in coin is not unconstitutional.

In 1865, in *Reise vs. Stearns* (20 Cal., 273), a suit was on a contract to pay in gold coin of the United States, "or the equivalent of such gold coin, if paid in legal currency," and it was held that such contract can be paid in any kind of lawful money of the United States. The court says in this case:

"In contemplation of law a dollar in legal-tender notes is equal to and therefore the equivalent of a dollar in coin. In comparing the two kinds of money the law knows no difference in value between them. Where none is adopted the standard of equivalents must be that which the law establishes. Tried by this standard, any given number of dollars in legal-tender notes is equivalent to the same number of dollars in coin."

In 1873, in *Grover vs. Robbins* (49 Ga., 219), the note was of date October 10, 1864, and in five years after date promised to pay \$5,500 in specie with 4 per cent interest. The trial court in this case rendered the following judgment:

"It is there ore considered and ordered by the court that the plaintiff have and recover of the defendant the said sum of \$7,549.15 in gold or silver

coin or its equivalent in United States currency, for which execution may issue to be levied and collected in gold or silver coin or its equivalent in United States currency, and also that the said plaintiff have and recover of said defendant the costs of this suit, for which execution may issue to be levied in United States currency."

On appeal the supreme court of Georgia reversed this judgment, and in the opinion, among other things, said:

"Yet, as the debt was contracted long after the passage of the legal-tender acts of Congress regulating the payment of such contracts, the judgment should have been for so many dollars only, leaving it to be discharged in any legal-tender currency or money of the United States."

In 1866, in *Jump vs. Pettit* (18 La. Am. 193), it is held that a note payable in gold can be satisfied by the tender of United States Treasury notes.

In 1872, in *Townsend vs. Jennison* (44 Vt., 315), the court held that when a debt is payable in specie it is error for the court to allow plaintiff premium on silver coin, there being more than one kind of money called specie, and the kinds being capable of different values.

In 1870, in *Hunter vs. Rogers* (50 Ala., 283), the court used this language:

"The verdict is for \$5,000 in gold, and the judgment follows the verdict. The present law of the United States governs the currency, and defining what shall be legal tender for the payment of debts forbids such a payment. The verdict ought, therefore, to have been for dollars simply. A judgment for dollars in gold is erroneous."

The decisions of the supreme courts of fifteen of the States are now given, and they all hold with singular unanimity that private parties can not discriminate against the different kinds of legal tender in this country. We have here the opinion of fifty judges, many of them men of eminent learning, celebrated as jurists, and of national reputation, among them such men as Judge Cooley, of Michigan, and Judge Breese, of Illinois, all substantially agreeing that the debtor could not be held as an insurer against the fluctuation of our currency and that the debtor could discharge his debt in the payment of Treasury notes made a legal tender. Up to that time such a thing as a judgment in "coin dollars" was unknown to the law. Attention is now called to the decision of the United States Supreme Court on this point.

It is not intended to question the power of Congress to issue Treasury notes or make them a legal tender for the payment of debts. The simple inquiry is, did not the court misinterpret the act of Congress in regard to making Treasury notes a legal tender? If they did, here and now is the time to make the correction. It will further be noticed that these decisions in the United States Supreme Court were by a divided court, sometimes but one judge in the majority, and the dissenting opinion being joined in by sometimes three or even four of the nine judges composing that august tribunal, and the dissenting opinion being in harmony with the decisions of the State courts, as will be seen by a fair comparison. Attention is now called to some of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

In 1868, in *Bank vs. Supervisors* (7 Wall., 26), the United States Supreme Court held that Treasury notes were not subject to taxation in the same manner and to the same extent as coin issued under like authority, and reversed the decision of the New York court. The decision of the Supreme Court was predicated on the act of February, 1862, which declares that—

"All United States bonds and other securities of the United States held by individuals, associations, or corporations within the United States shall be exempt from taxation by or under State authority."

It was held that Congress had the power to make this difference between coin and Treasury notes; so it will be seen that this case has no application to the question presented by this bill.

In 1868, in *Lane County vs. Oregon* (7 Wall., 71), the Legislature of Oregon passed a statute enacting that the sheriff of that State shall pay over to the county treasurer the full amount of the State and school taxes in gold and silver coin. The county of Lane brought suit against the sheriff to recover \$3,400.96 in gold and silver coin. The sheriff answered that he had tendered the amount in United States notes, but the circuit court held this was not a good tender and rendered judgment against the sheriff for the sum claimed, in gold and silver coin with costs. This judgment was affirmed by the supreme court of the State and also by the United States Supreme Court. The reason for this decision was placed on the distinct ground that the law making United States notes a legal tender for debts has no reference to taxes imposed by State authority. So it can be safely claimed that this case has little or no bearing on the question at issue, as this bill only applies to private debts.

In 1868, in *Bronson vs. Rodes* (7 Wall., 233), a bond or note was given for \$1,400, payable in gold and silver coin, with 7 per cent interest, payable also in coin. A tender of \$1,507 in United States notes, the nominal amount of the note, was made and refused.

At this time \$1 in coin was worth \$2.25 in United States notes. So the question is here fairly presented, whether the United States notes have an equal debt-paying power as coin and whether the practice should be that judgments may be entered for "coined dollars and parts of dollars" on coin contracts, and in dollars generally in other cases. In this case the supreme court of New York held that the plea of tender was not a good plea, but on appeal to the supreme court in general term the plea was held good and this judgment was affirmed by the court of appeals of New York and the case was brought to the United States Supreme Court, when the judgment was reversed, Justice Miller dissenting.

The United States Supreme Court held in this case that a bond or note, payable in gold and silver coin, must be paid in coined dollars and can only be satisfied by the payment of coined dollars, and that such judgments may be entered for coined dollars and parts of dollars.

A judgment for coined dollars is a judicial curiosity. When Congress made Treasury notes a legal tender it was clearly the intention to give those notes the same purchasing and debt-paying power as coin, and public policy demanded that the statutes should be so construed. A "coin judgment" is also an undesirable innovation in our judicial practice.

In *Butler vs. Harwitz* (7 Wall., 259), the decision in *Brownson vs. Rodes* is followed.

In 1869, in *Willard vs. Taylor* (8 Wall., 557), the court in a suit in equity for the specific performance of contract, decreed that the complainant should pay in gold, although the contract which was made in 1854 did not in express terms contract for gold payment.

This case had no general application and does not demand further notice.

In 1860, in *Hepburn vs. Griswold* (8 Wall., 604), a suit was brought on a note of date June 20, 1850, for \$11,250, but there was no express promise to pay the note in gold. In March, 1854, the maker of the note tendered \$12,720 in Treasury notes in full payment. The trial court held the tender good, and the case was taken to the court of errors of Kentucky, which reversed the judgment, and the case was then taken to the United States Supreme Court, where the judgment of the court of errors of Kentucky was affirmed.

The United States Supreme Court placed the decision in this case on the ground that the act making Treasury notes a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, had no application to debts contracted before the passage of the act, Justices Miller, Swaine, and Davis dissenting. This case has since been overruled by the court, and therefore has no application now.

In *Knox vs. Lee and Parker vs. Davis* (12 Wall., 457), the decision in *Hepburn vs. Griswold* (8 Wall., 603), is overruled, and the court holds that the

acts of Congress known as the legal-tender acts are constitutional when applied to contracts made before their passage, the Chief Justice and Justices Clifford, Field, and Nelson dissenting. It will be noticed, however, that there was no express contract to pay in coin in this case.

In 1871, in *Trebilock vs. Wilson* (12 Wall., 687), a note was given for \$900, due in one year, with 10 per cent interest, "payable in specie." The amount due on the note was, after its maturity, tendered in United States notes, being a legal tender for all debts, public and private. The district court of Iowa held that the tender was good. The case was then appealed to the supreme court of Iowa and the decree was affirmed; the case was then brought to the United States Supreme Court and the decree reversed, Justice Bradley and Miller dissenting. The United States Supreme Court held that the note could not be discharged in its nominal value in Treasury notes, but that the plaintiff was entitled to a judgment to be entered for the payment of "coined dollars."

In 1871, in *Vaughan vs. Telegraf* (14 Wall., 258), the action was for the loss of a cargo of goods, valued at \$2,438 in gold, and the decree was for \$4,896.30 and interest, making in all \$6,515.51. At this time gold was 101 per cent above legal-tender notes. On appeal from the United States circuit court at New York to the United States Supreme Court this decree was affirmed, the Chief Justice and Justices Clifford and Field dissenting. The principle announced in this case seems to be indefensible.

In the first place, the court heard evidence and found that the value of the goods destroyed was \$2,438 in gold, and then heard further testimony and found that \$2,438 in gold was worth \$4,896.30, more than double the value of the goods, and rendered judgment for this sum and the interest, making \$6,515.51. If this was not simple robbery, it was very near of kin to it. Why should the debtor be held alone responsible for the fluctuation of the currency when Congress declared that currency and coin money should be a legal tender, dollar for dollar, one as good as the other? What right had the court to annul the law in order to favor the creditor? It can not be explained.

It is no part of the design of this bill to consider the authority of Congress to issue Treasury notes and declare them a legal tender. These were burning questions at one time in this country, but they may be regarded as settled now. Before the adoption of the Constitution the power of coining gold and silver and emitting bills of credit or making money and declaring it a legal tender existed in the several States, but now by the Constitution it is prohibited in all the States except the right to make gold and silver a legal tender.

The power to issue money does not exist in the States, and it must therefore exist, if at all, in Congress. The fact is not forgotten that a great many constitutional lawyers believe that when the Constitution was drafted the intention of its framers was not to grant to the General Government the right to emit bills of credit, and if the General Government did have a right to issue bills of credit in certain emergencies, still they had no right to make them a legal tender. The United States Supreme Court, however, has finally held that Congress has the power in times of peace or war to issue Treasury notes, and also to make them a legal tender.

These questions are now settled in the affirmative, it is true, by a divided court, but they are settled, and it is to be hoped that they will remain so. But the trouble now is that, after the court decided that Congress can make Treasury notes a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, the court annuls its own decision by holding that these coin contracts can be satisfied by entering a "coin judgment." The uniform judgment of common-law courts is for a specific sum of money in pounds and parts of pounds, or in dollars and parts of dollars, leaving such judgment to be discharged in whatever has been rightfully made a legal tender for the payment of debts.

Judgments are not rendered and can not be rendered without an act of the Legislature or Congress in anything but dollars. Congress can say what a dollar shall be, and in such dollars judgments of courts shall be paid. It is the stamp of the Government that bestows upon a piece of gold or silver the value of a dollar. So Congress can make Treasury notes money, transmitting, if you please, the paper into coin and cause it to pass in all private transactions at their declared value, and all judgments rendered by the courts between individuals being entered up for dollars can, and of a right should be, discharged in dollars, paper money as well as coin.

When Congress declared that Treasury notes should be lawful money and a legal tender for the payment of all debts, public and private, the design was to render paper dollars legally equivalent to specie and an adequate performance of a contract expressly stipulating for payment in coin.

If the law does not mean this it means nothing. When the parties intended by their contract that money should be paid, then it can be paid in any lawful money. This is made plain by the court itself. In *Knox vs. Lee* (12 Wall., 566) Justice Bradley, in concurring in the opinion of the majority of the court, among other things said:

"So long as the money of the country, in whatever terms described, is in contemplation of the parties it is the object of the legal-tender laws to make the credit of the Government a lawful substitute. Therefore, if the contract is for the delivery of a chattel or a specific commodity or substance the law does not apply. If it is bona fide for so many carats of diamonds, or so many ounces of gold as bullion, the specific contract must be performed. But if terms which naturally import such a contract are used by way of evasion, and money only is intended, the law reaches the case. Not but that Congress might limit the operation of the law in any way it pleased. It might make an exception of cases when the contract expressly promises gold and silver money. But if it has not done so, if the enactment is general in its terms, specific promises to pay the money in specie are just as much subject to the operation of the law as a mere promise to pay so many dollars, for in contemplation of law is a promise to pay in specie."

No language could be plainer than this. Can any person doubt that in the cases cited and decided by the court it was not the intention that money was to be paid and not a commodity delivered?

There are but two of the foregoing cases that have a direct bearing on this question, and those are the cases of *Brownson vs. Rodes* and *Trebilock vs. Wilson*. In the first case the court tells us that a contract was given for \$1,400, payable in gold and silver coin. Then there can be no doubt but it was a contract for the payment of money, coupled with an attempt to hold the maker as a guarantor against any fluctuation in the currency.

Now, a promissory note is an agreement in writing to pay a certain person a certain sum of money by a time certain. These three elements are indispensable to a promissory note. An agreement to deliver to a certain person a certain number of ounces of gold or silver by a day certain is not a promissory note, nor is it a negotiable instrument. If, therefore, the note for \$1,400 was not for a sum of money, but the amount had to be fixed by testimony as to the difference between coin and Treasury notes, then the sum would not be certain, and the court was in error in calling it a promissory note. It was payable in gold or silver coin, so it is uncertain in which coin.

Suppose a suit was brought on this note at the present time; it might become a question in which coin it should be paid. Some members of Congress state on the floor of the House that a silver dollar is only worth 50 or 70 cents, and it is supposed they would swear to it if called on in court, and in that event in which coin would the court hold that the note could be discharged?

No one can tell. If parties have a right to discriminate between Treasury notes and coin, then they have the right to discriminate between the coins themselves, and the whole matter is at sea. Nor did it help the matter for the court to legislate that the judgment should be for "coined dollars," for the same trouble still remained.

The means of satisfying a judgment is by execution. The execution must follow the judgment and be founded on it. What would a sheriff or a marshal do with an execution for "coined dollars?" The usual language of an execution is a command to the officer to cause to be made so many dollars out of the defendant by levying the same on his goods and chattels, lands and tenements, etc. When the execution would be for coined dollars then the sheriff would be compelled to sell the property of the defendant, and if he could not get coined dollars, and then he would be compelled to accept Treasury notes and with that buy gold or silver coin, how would he determine what price he would pay? What market would control the price of coin as compared with Treasury notes? Such a system leads to endless confusion.

Again, suppose the promise was to pay \$1,400 in wheat. The promiser would have the right to discharge his note by tendering \$1,400 worth of wheat, but if he defaulted and suit should be brought on the paper the court would not inquire into the value of wheat but simply render a judgment for \$1,400. The instrument itself fixed the measure of damages. Now suppose in the place of wheat the word "gold" should be used—gold is simply a commodity and the rule would not be changed, and in default of payment in gold the judgment would be for \$1,400. The parties themselves in their contract fixed the amount to be paid at \$1,400, no more nor no less. And the contract further provided that this sum should be paid in gold and silver coin; so according to the very terms of the contract the maker had a right to pay \$1,400 in gold and silver coin, and if gold and silver were at a premium then why should not the maker of the contract be allowed to satisfy the claim with less than \$1,400 in gold coin? But the truth is the promise was for \$1,400, and the judgment should be for that sum.

All that has been said with reference to the case of *Brownson vs. Rodes* applies with even greater force to the case of *Trebilock vs. Wilson* (12 Wall., 687). In this case a promissory note was given for a debt of \$900, payable in "specie." Now, what is specie? It is coin; gold, silver, and copper as currency. How could the court determine what kind of specie would discharge this note? Suppose a promise is made to pay \$900 in wheat, oats, or corn. The maker could discharge the obligation by a tender of \$900 worth of either of these commodities. These three articles were of different values, and if default was made in the payment of the note the court would not go into an investigation of the value of the wheat, oats, and corn, but would render a judgment for \$900. The court was correct in the Vermont case just cited when they said that it was "error for the court to allow plaintiff premium on silver coin, there being more than one kind of money called specie and the kinds being capable of different values."

Again, the maker of this promise to pay \$900 in coin could lawfully discharge it in silver half dollars and quarter dollars. When, then, did the court find authority to render judgment for "coined dollars"? It was clearly a money contract, and Judge Cooley was right when he said in *Buchegger vs. Schultz*:

"The act in question (meaning the legal-tender act) was based exclusively upon reasons of a public character, which, in the opinion of the lawmaking power, imperatively demanded that Treasury notes should be made equal in legal value to coin, and parties have no right to stipulate that their contracts shall not be governed by it."

Parties can not make contracts in violation of public policy. The statute of usury can not be annulled by contract; gambling contracts, and contracts for the sale of margins and for speculation in the rise and fall of commodities, and contracts for the sale of "puts" and "calls," and contracts in restraint of trade, are all void.

A contract to defeat a public statute is void. No lawyer will deny this proposition, for it can be sustained by unlimited authority from the courts of this and other countries.

Congress passed a public statute making Treasury notes equal in legal value to coin in the payment of debts; yet in the two cases mentioned the Supreme Court held that the parties could by private contract annul and defeat this statute. The rule is a menace to trade and commerce. A party desires to borrow money to go into business, and when he applies for it he is told that there must be the usual gold clause in the note. The risk is too much, and he refuses to borrow. It is to the interest of society that money should be used in business. The borrowers of money are the men who build our railroads, span our rivers, tunnel the mountains, build cities and towns, churches and schoolhouses, and engage in our vast industrial pursuits, all at great risk to them financially, and it is unjust in addition to the risk of their business to hold them responsible for the fluctuation of the currency. This rule also offers a premium for rascality. When the money of the country is loaned in the gold contracts, then the money power can greatly increase their wealth by forcing gold to a premium and compel the debtor to pay double the amount of money borrowed.

There can be no stable currency in this country if private parties are permitted to contract against a certain kind of currency and in favor of another kind, both of which the law declares shall be equal. Legal tender is a function of money, and no private contract should be permitted to annul it. Contracts must be made in pursuance of law and not contrary to it. There is no class of persons in this country who should be more interested in sustaining the commercial law of the land and the financial policy of the Government than the credit class.

When default is made in their contracts for the payment of money they apply to the courts to enforce the law for its collection, and, therefore, they should not themselves violate the law when they make their contracts and demoralize the money of the country. The creditor and debtor rarely ever occupy the same vantage ground. The necessities of the debtor often deprive him of the freedom of contract.

The object of law is to defend the weak against the strong, "to restrain men from injuring one another." "Equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none," is the basis of all free governments; and it is not just to the debtor that he should be held liable for any and all fluctuations that may take place in the currency between the date of contract and the time of performance. The creditor should be willing to submit to the law and accept on his money contract the money declared by Congress to be legal tender for the payment of all debts.

This is what the United States Supreme Court declared in its second legal-tender decision, when it used this language:

"The obligation of a contract to pay money is to pay that which the law recognizes as money when the payment is to be made."

The flag of the country is pledged to sustain our financial system, and to make every dollar of our money equal to every other dollar in purchasing and debt-paying power, and no person should have the right to repudiate the money or the flag of the Republic. Patriotism, justice, and State policy demand that this bill should become a law, amended, however, by adding after the word "contract" in line 3 of said bill, the following words, to-wit: "Hereafter executed;" and as amended the bill is reported back to the House with a recommendation that the same do pass.

Mr. LANE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Committee on Appropriations desire to submit a conference report, and as they could take us off the floor anyway, I am willing to yield now. I suppose, however, that when the conference report is disposed of I may be permitted to occupy the remainder of the hour.

The SPEAKER. Without objection that can be done.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will merely state that I intend to withdraw this bill and present another one, inasmuch as the time at command will not give sufficient opportunity for the discussion of this measure.

Mr. WARNER. I trust the gentleman will allow the time to be so divided as not to have the discussion of this bill, which goes into the RECORD, all on one side.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am going to withdraw the bill.

Mr. WARNER. Well, that is one way to defeat it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, after the conference report is disposed of, twenty minutes will be given to the consideration of this bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7477) making appropriations to supply the deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 7668) to authorize the St. Louis, Avoyelles and Southwestern Railway Company to bridge Bayou Des Glaisses and Atchafalaya River, in the State of Louisiana; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 859) for the relief of B. D. Greene.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bill of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. Res. 101) providing for clerical assistance in the Health Department of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1713) to permit Commodore Louis C. Sartori, now on the retired list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on said list in accordance with his original position on the Navy Register.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I present the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7477) making appropriations to supply deficiencies.

As the report is quite long, I ask that the reading of it be dispensed with, that only the statement of the House conferees be read, and that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

For conference report see Senate proceedings.

The statement of the House conferees was read as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill H. R. 7477, making appropriations to supply deficiencies, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

The bill as it passed the Senate appropriated \$7,939,551.41, being an increase of \$2,934,518.63 over the bill as it passed the House.

Of this sum, \$1,809,539.70 is to pay a judgment in favor of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and upon this amendment the committee of conference have been unable to agree; \$77,453.34 is for payment of certain so-called charter party cases and insurance claims, from which it is recommended that the Senate recede, together with other amendments involving appropriations amounting to \$107,163.06.

It is recommended that the House agree to the amendments appropriating \$940,362.73, to cover deficiencies, final judgments of the Court of Claims, and audited accounts certified to Congress since the passage of the bill by the House. An additional appropriation of \$250,000, for fees and expenses of marshals, United States courts, is recommended in the conference report, in accordance with a recommendation of the Attorney-General, certifying that at least that sum will be necessary to settle accounts on account of the fiscal year 1894.

Exclusive of the judgment of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, the bill as finally agreed upon appropriates \$6,202,903.91, being \$1,736,617.50 less than as it passed the Senate, and \$1,197,871.33 more than as it passed the House.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,

J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform the House that all the differences between the two Houses upon this bill have been settled with the exception of one item, amounting to about \$1,500,000 in round numbers, in relation to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and I suggest to my colleague on the conference committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], that the House be asked to agree to the partial report, leaving that item still open for discussion.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is, the gentleman desires the House to adopt the report?

Mr. SAYERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLER. What has been done about the judgments for Indian deprecation claims?

Mr. SAYERS. The item was increased \$50,000. It passed the House at \$100,000, and was increased \$50,000 in conference.

Mr. PICKLER. And was the provision retained which the House adopted with regard to a future investigation?

Mr. SAYERS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have a few minutes before this report is adopted. I understand that there is still one amendment upon which no agreement has been reached.

Before this vote is taken I would be glad to have two minutes to state generally my understanding as to the appropriations of this session—

Mr. SAYERS. I will state to my friend that when the deficiency bill comes back I will yield to him. We want to pass the sundry civil bill immediately; but when we come back with our final report on the general deficiency bill, the gentleman can have as much time as he wants.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. There will be no final report in a certain contingency. If the House should insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment, we would have to go into conference again; if the Senate should recede from its amendment, that would pass the bill.

Mr. SAYERS. Certainly. I am willing to accommodate the gentleman from Illinois as to the time he desires to occupy.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think I had better take a few minutes now, as my friend from Iowa [Col. HENDERSON], who is now temporarily absent, desires to be heard when the deficiency bill comes up.

Mr. SAYERS. Very well, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois as much time as he desires.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from Illinois begins, the House will receive a message from the Senate.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5575) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from consideration for a few minutes the report on the general deficiency bill in order that the House may agree to the report on the sundry civil bill. It is important that this bill should be enrolled and signed as quickly as possible.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the conference report on the deficiency bill will be temporarily withdrawn, and the House will take up the conference report on the sundry civil bill. The Clerk will read the statement of the House conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the sundry civil appropriation bill, submit the following written statement in explanation of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report on each of the amendments, namely:

On amendment numbered 11: Strikes out the appropriation of \$100,000 proposed by the Senate for the purchase of sites for and commencement of buildings at Cheyenne, Wyo.; Boise City, Idaho; Helena, Mont.; and Spokane, Wash.

On amendment numbered 110: Strikes out the appropriation of \$105,000 proposed by the Senate for the sufferers of the Ford Theater disaster, and inserts in lieu thereof provision for a joint commission of the two Houses to investigate and report upon the claims of said sufferers.

On amendment numbered 118: Appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for a quarantine station at Southport, N. C.

On amendment numbered 119: Strikes out the appropriation of \$40,000 proposed by the Senate for a quarantine station at or near the mouth of the Columbia River.

On amendments numbered 127, 128, 133, and 134: Strikes out the appropriations proposed by the Senate of \$10,000 for the purchase of the electric-light plant in the Senate wing of the Capitol and \$10,000 for the repairs and extension thereof, and restores to the bill the provision proposed to be stricken out by the Senate authorizing the payment of \$200 per month rent for the electric-light plants in the Senate and House wings during the sessions of Congress; and strikes out the provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the introduction of electric-light current into the Capitol building by any existing electric-light company in Washington.

On amendment numbered 145: Authorizes the use of \$16,000 of the appropriation made for surveys of public land, for making a resurvey of lands in Grant and Hooker Counties, Nebr., and makes a verbal correction in the text of the bill.

On amendment numbered 238: Appropriates \$45,000, instead of \$36,000, as proposed by the Senate, for dry dock at Puget Sound, Washington.

On amendment numbered 231: Appropriates \$5,000, instead of \$16,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Bureau of American Republics, and places said Bureau under the control and direction of the Secretary of State, and requires him to report to Congress at its next session the propriety of continuing said Bureau, or if any obligation exists on the part of the Government for its continuance.

On amendment numbered 270: Strikes out the provision, proposed by the Senate, fixing the salary of the assistant librarian in charge of the Law Library at \$1,600, and allowing him \$480 for laborer's service.

On amendment numbered 277: Strikes out the amendment, proposed by the House, providing for the purchase of additional land for the Government Printing Office, and for the construction of additional buildings thereon.

On amendments numbered 278 and 279: Appropriates \$200,000 for the Cotton States and International Exposition at Atlanta, Ga., in terms substantially in accordance with the instructions of the House.

On amendment numbered 280: Provides for the reclamation of desert lands as provided by the House, with an amendment that not less than 20 acres of each 160-acre tract shall be irrigated, reclaimed, occupied, and cultivated by actual settlers.

The bill as finally agreed upon appropriates \$34,209,776.05, being \$1,991,350.05 less than as it passed the Senate, and \$1,686,393.25 more than as it passed the House.

JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
JOS. H. O'NEIL,
W. COGSWELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report.
Mr. WILSON of Washington. Before the question is taken, I would like to occupy three or four minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire only to call attention to the receding on the part of the Senate from amendment numbered 11, providing an appropriation for the purchase of sites for public buildings in the four new States—in Boise City, Idaho; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Helena, Mont., and Spokane, Wash.

Taking into consideration the environment of this question, the conditions operating in that section of the Union, and the further fact that this amendment was placed on the sundry civil bill in the other end of the Capitol, it seems to me the House conferees might, in their extreme liberality, have granted to each of these new States a public building for United States courts, for marshals' offices, for postal purposes, and for other official uses needed by the Government. I believe that every State in the Union is provided with at least one public building except the States of Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana.

The difficulty in this case, Mr. Speaker, is that the responsibility for the failure of this appropriation will be regarded as coming with peculiar and particular hardship upon the Representatives of these States in the House. I do not know of anything in the nature of appropriations with which I have had any connection since I have been in the House that will cause me personally, perhaps, so much damage as the defeat of this amendment. By reason of the fact that when the amendment was placed on the appropriation bill it was telegraphed to the various newspapers of our locality, causing the people to become intensely interested; all the responsibility for the defeat of the amendment will now be regarded as falling upon the members from the various new States, to which the amendment appertains.

The postal receipts at the town of Spokane are \$60,000 a year. It is the headquarters of a postal division. Besides, we have there the United States court, United States marshal's offices, United States land office, the offices of the deputy collector of internal revenue and deputy collector of customs, etc. It seems to me that now, when the opportunity offers, the Government should acquire a site there, because in the course of a year or two it may not be able to do so; for since the great fire of 1889 which swept over that city and destroyed \$6,000,000 worth of property, the available sites for the location of a public building are being rapidly appropriated.

I am not here (in the language of a gentleman who addressed the House the other evening) asking for pity; but I do think that in view of the large appropriations embraced in this bill for the improvement of rivers and harbors; in view of the large appropriations made in every direction by this Congress, it would have been nothing more than fair and just to have granted to these four States these sites for the erection of public buildings. You must of necessity come to it sooner or later.

I had on this floor a controversy relative to an appropriation for a public building that was already constructed in the State that my friend from Texas represents so ably and honorably on this floor. There they had no United States court; there their postal receipts were not equal to ours. But they came here and got a provision for a third story to be placed on their building on this sundry civil bill. Now, if they could not pass that bill through the House; if I could not pass mine through the House for a similar purpose, it seems to me that if the new States are to be cut out from any consideration, then all of them should be placed upon the same footing, and all of this appropriation should have been stricken out.

I know, sir, and I make my public acknowledgment of the fact now, that the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has upon many occasions rendered not only to myself but to the people of my State great services, and I here and now wish to thank him for myself and for them

for the many and extensive acts of courtesy shown through his committee. I am not here to criticize the gentleman on this subject; but I do think I may be permitted to say that all the responsibility for the defeat of this amendment should not have been placed on the members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield now what time my colleague on the committee desires.

Mr. COGSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to occupy but a very few moments.

As the statement of the conferees set forth, the amendment agreed to in the report in regard to the Atlanta Exposition is substantially in accord with the instructions of the House itself. The only material variance is in retaining the Government building exclusively for the Government exhibit.

The House instructions involved the setting apart of the vacant space in that building for the exhibit of the colored people. It was thought best, however, that the Government exhibit should occupy the Government building exclusively; and this was yielded because of the assurance that the corporation itself would erect a proper structure for the colored exhibit; and in this connection, and at the request of the friends of that exposition, I desire to have read from the desk as a part of my remarks the following letter:

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 14, 1894.

HON. JOSEPH D. SAYERS,

Chairman House committee in conference on the sundry civil bill:

SIR: The Cotton States and International Exposition Company hereby guarantees that said company will provide upon their grounds a suitable building, to contain not less than 25,000 square feet of space, and as much more as may be needed for an exhibit by the colored people of the United States, free of all expense for rent and entrance fees for exhibits.

Said space so provided to be used exclusively by said race for the purpose of making exhibit of the progress of the said race in education, art, mining, agriculture, and all other pursuits and industries; said exhibit to be made at the time and under the rules and regulations governing all other exhibits.

In witness whereof, the said Exposition Company hereunto attaches its signature by its president.

THE COTTON STATES AND INTERNATIONAL
EXPOSITION COMPANY,

By C. A. COLLIER, *President*,
EVAN P. HOWELL, *Director*,
CLEMENT A. EVANS, *Director*.

In presence of:

J. B. GORDON, *United States Senator*.

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield a few minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER].

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire, as a Representative of one of the Northwestern States, to join in the commendatory words of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WILSON] in regard to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], for his uniform courtesy and consideration of the interests of our section of the country.

I desire now, with the gentleman's permission, to ask one or two questions in regard to the agreement just submitted. I understand the conference committee agree to the proposition to donate the million acres of land to the States, with an amendment?

Mr. SAYERS. With an amendment.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman please state the purport of the amendment?

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman will recollect that the amendment of the House provided that the 160 acres of land should not only be occupied, but also cultivated. Instead of that, we now provide that at least 20 acres of the land shall be occupied, cultivated, and irrigated. We thought that if you let the House amendment stand, requiring the entire 160 acres to be cultivated and irrigated, it would be of little or no benefit to the States; but by only requiring that at least 20 acres of it shall be cultivated or irrigated, the real purpose of the House would be accomplished.

Mr. PICKLER. I did not understand the House bill required that; but I am glad that it is made certain and definite.

Mr. SAYERS. We consider it as more liberal to the States than the House amendment as it originally stood.

I will state to the gentleman that we have further increased the sum appropriated for surveys to \$250,000. It was \$175,000 as the House passed it, and we increased it \$75,000 more, making \$250,000 in all.

Mr. PICKLER. Then one more question, with the gentleman's consent. I have felt a great deal of interest, as I have constituents who are directly involved, in the Ford's Theater disaster. That question goes over, I understand.

Mr. SAYERS. The agreement reached by the conferees amounts to this: That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House appoint five Senators and five Members who shall investigate the matter and report to the two Houses.

Mr. PICKLER. When?

Mr. SAYERS. At the next session.

Mr. PICKLER. Well, will this matter be then disposed of?
Mr. SAYERS. That is for the House to determine.
Mr. PICKLER. But will they come to a conclusion and make their report?

Mr. SAYERS. That is for the commission to say. They have the power to act if they choose to do so.

Mr. PICKLER. If it were going to put the matter off indefinitely I should have very grave objections.

Mr. SAYERS. That was certainly not the intention of the conferees.

Mr. COOMBS. This is a very specific arrangement.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. It was the distinct understanding, I will state with the gentleman's consent, in the conference committee that this was not an attempt on the part of the conferees to evade any responsibility of the United States at all, but was an honest effort on the part of the committee, through a commission to be appointed in the manner suggested, to secure a report of all the facts by the time Congress meets in December for whatever action was proper to be taken at that time.

Mr. PICKLER. I think I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEIL] this morning in private conversation to say that it not only relates to death claims, but to all claims.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. To claims growing out of the Ford's Theater disaster.

Mr. SAYERS. I wish to amend the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEIL] by saying that so far as my understanding goes, and speaking for myself, it was not intended to admit any responsibility on the part of the Government for that disaster.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I meant simply the responsibility, if any existed.

Mr. HERMANN. What changes have been made by the conferees as to the arid lands provision?

Mr. SAYERS. The only change was, that instead of requiring the whole 160 acres to be occupied, cultivated, and irrigated, it only requires that at least 20 acres of the 160 shall be so occupied, cultivated, and irrigated, making it more favorable to the States than the House amendments.

Mr. HERMANN. Then, in that case, upon proof being made to the Secretary of the Interior, that 20 acres have been regularly cultivated and resided upon, that will carry the remainder of the 160 acres into title?

Mr. SAYERS. That is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. HERMANN. Then, I ask the gentleman further whether the precaution has been taken by the conferees as to requiring that these prerequisites shall be complied with before title vests in the State?

Mr. SAYERS. I will state to the gentleman from Oregon that the amendment adopted by the House was passed with the single amendment thereto, requiring that at least 20 acres of the land be occupied, cultivated, and irrigated before title should pass.

Mr. HERMANN. Otherwise the McRae amendment stands.

Mr. SAYERS. Yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. COFFEEN].

[Mr. COFFEEN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SAYERS. I ask for a vote on the conference report.

Mr. BRYAN. Was there any concession made in regard to the arid lands on which we passed the resolution the other day?

Mr. SAYERS. The conferees amended the House amendment, by making it more favorable, putting 20 acres in as the minimum, instead of 160, to be cultivated and irrigated, and not requiring them to cultivate 160 acres.

Mr. BRYAN. Did you include Nebraska and Kansas, or did you consider them included in the present terms of the bill?

Mr. SAYERS. We adopted the resolution passed by the House.

The question was taken on the motion to agree to the conference report; and the Speaker *pro tempore* [Mr. TARSNEY] announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. COFFEEN. Division.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that demand. I am as much interested in this matter as the gentleman from Wyoming, and it is impossible to secure anything. I appeal to him to withdraw that motion. We can not help ourselves. If we could I would be with the gentleman until the last moment in attempting to accomplish something.

Mr. COFFEEN. I am not disposed to be captious, but you have given us no time to consider the injustice which has been done to our States.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I hope you will withdraw your demand. We are interested the same as you are.

Mr. COFFEEN. I withdraw on that plea.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The ayes have it; and the report of the committee on conference is agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report of the committee of conference was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I have returned good for evil to my friend from Texas. [Laughter.]

INSPECTION OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to consider at this time a bill of great public interest to the entire meat industries of the United States, in relation to the enforcement of a section of the law now upon the statute books. If the Clerk will read the bill, it will explain itself or I will explain it to the House.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know how much time it will take.

Mr. HATCH. It will not take two minutes to explain it.

The report is only a few lines, and I will explain it to the House. I do not think that any gentleman will object, and if they do I will withdraw it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7910) to amend "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof, which are the subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

As it enacted, etc. That the "Act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof, which are the subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, be, and the same is hereby, amended by the addition of the following section, which shall be designated as "section 8" of said act, and which shall read as follows, to wit:

"SEC. 8. That the Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules, regulations, and orders as he may decide to be necessary to prevent the transportation from one State or Territory or the District of Columbia into any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, of the condemned carcasses or parts of carcasses of cattle, sheep, and swine, or the edible products of the same, which have been inspected in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof, which are the subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891. Any person, company, or corporation owning or operating any such slaughter-house, abattoir, or meat curing, packing, or canning establishment, or any employé of the same, that shall willfully violate any rule, regulation, or order made pursuant to this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished for each offense by a fine not exceeding \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court, one-half of the time to go to the informer."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I would state to the House, in explanation of this matter, that it is simply to carry out the provisions of a law now upon the statute books in regard to the inspection of meats for interstate commerce, in which an omission was made as to any penalty for the violation of the law in taking the carcasses or any part of the carcasses condemned and putting it on the market for sale. The Secretary of Agriculture, in a personal conversation, and in a letter written, part of which is embodied in this report, states that he has ascertained, after having complied with the law and made the inspection of animals, such as lump-jawed cattle and cholera hogs, and they had been condemned and sent to the tanks for rendering into grease, he found portions of them had been stolen out of the tanks, after being put into them, and shipped outside of the State and sold for human food.

The Secretary says that it is impossible for him to execute the law properly without this additional legislation, and he asks that it be passed at once, and I have asked unanimous consent to pass it, so that it may be sent to the Senate and passed before we adjourn. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to consider this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOMBS. What is the usual course taken with condemned cattle after being slaughtered?

Mr. HATCH. I can not hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOMBS. I want to ask a question for information as to the disposition of these condemned cattle?

Mr. HATCH. The law is that after the meat has been inspected either at a slaughterhouse, a packing house, or a canning establishment, and has been found defective, and for any reason unfit for human food, it shall be condemned by the inspector, and under the regulation of the Department the owner of the carcass can only take it to a rendering establishment to be rendered into what is known as common grease, and it is for the violation of that rule (which had no penalty attached to it) that we ask this additional legislation.

The bill 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. HATCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the con-

ference report on the general deficiency bill, and I ask consent that the members of the Committee on Appropriations have leave to print remarks on the subject of the appropriations made by the present and previous Congresses. That is a privilege which has always been granted to members of the Committee on Appropriations ever since I have been a member of this House.

There was no objection to the request of Mr. SAYERS, and it was so ordered.

[Mr. COFFEEN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SAYERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague on the committee [Mr. CANNON of Illinois] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under our Constitution and laws the Congress appropriates the moneys for the public service and the President expends the same. In practice the Congress appropriates from year to year for the service of the succeeding year. The law requires the Executive to send to each session of Congress his estimates in detail for the public service and the amounts he desires therefor. There are, however, certain appropriations for the public service made by permanent law, and known as "permanent," as distinguished from annual appropriations. Among the permanent appropriations are those for the interest on the public debt, the collection of the customs revenues, the sinking fund, etc.

When the Executive forwards yearly to Congress his estimates for annual appropriations he also forwards his estimate of the amount that will be expended for the coming year under permanent law. Mr. Cleveland, by his estimates, asked Congress to appropriate for the public service, for the coming fiscal year, including permanent appropriations, \$520,662,840.71, and Congress has appropriated for such service \$490,668,369.51. This, in round numbers, is \$30,000,000 less than the President asked for the public service. A large part of this \$30,000,000, however, will be appropriated next winter by way of deficiencies.

I hold in my hand a table which I will submit, to be printed as a part of and at the conclusion of my remarks. It is a comparative statement of appropriations made at this Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, next, with appropriations made at the first and second sessions of the last Congress (the Fifty-second Congress), and at the first and second session of the Fifty-first, commonly known as the "Reed Congress."

This statement shows, Mr. Speaker—and such is the fact—that the appropriations this year are greater by \$27,269,858.72 than were those made by the first session of the Fifty-first, or "Reed Congress." The statement also shows that the appropriations made this year are \$28,835,989.70 less than those made at the second session of the last or Fifty-second Congress. The Democrats controlled the House in both the last Congress and this. But, Mr. Speaker, I ask the House and the country to notice that this reduction is covered by the item for pensions alone. There was appropriated this year for pensions \$29,099,504.85 less than was appropriated last year. It will be noticed, therefore, that the appropriations this year, excepting pensions, are greater than the appropriations made last year by \$263,515.15.

Mr. Speaker, the total appropriations for the Fifty-first, or "Reed Congress," two years, were \$988,417,183.34; those for the Fifty-second, or last Congress, two years, were \$1,027,104,547.92; and it is absolutely certain that, starting off at \$490,000,000, as we do, for this year, when the deficiencies are added next winter to the regular appropriations then to be made for the coming year, the total appropriations will aggregate at least \$1,050,000,000 for the Fifty-third Congress, unless by unfriendly administration further heavy reductions are made in payment of pensions.

In the main, Mr. Speaker, these appropriations are necessary. Ours is the greatest country on earth, and the demands of the public service will grow as the country grows. I would not call attention to this matter now were it not that in 1890, 1891, and 1892 the Democrats in the House, in the press, on the stump, and everywhere in the country, denounced the Republicans for having made the Fifty-first Congress a "billion-dollar Congress." You Democrats had two-thirds of the House in the last Congress, and in that Congress you increased the appropriations over those of the "Reed Congress" by \$40,000,000, in round numbers, and now in this Congress you are to increase the appropriations over and above the "Reed Congress" by \$60,000,000.

You were either guilty of misrepresentation and deceit then or you are guilty of fearful extravagance now. You can choose which defense you will make.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF 1894 COMPARED WITH 1893.

Mr. Speaker, under the law the Executive is required at the close of each fiscal year to make a statement of the receipts and

expenditures of the United States Government for the past year. I hold in my hand and read the official comparative statement for the fiscal years 1894 and 1893, respectively:

Comparative statement of the receipts and expenditures of the United States.

Source.	Fiscal year ending June 30, 1894.	Fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.
	Since July 1, 1893.	Since July 1, 1892.
RECEIPTS.		
Customs	\$132,294,242.43	\$203,355,016.73
Internal revenue	146,945,778.31	161,027,623.93
Miscellaneous	17,720,315.26	21,436,988.12
Total	296,960,336.00	385,819,628.78
EXPENDITURES.		
Civil and miscellaneous	101,403,455.85	103,732,790.27
War	54,357,600.84	49,641,773.47
Navy	31,527,195.15	30,136,084.43
Indians	10,286,416.64	13,345,347.27
Pensions	141,177,234.96	159,357,557.87
Interest	27,841,405.64	27,264,392.18
Premium		
Total	366,593,359.08	383,477,954.49

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Warrant Division, July 2, 1894.

This statement does not include the postal receipts or expenditures therefrom, and as they balance each other it is not material to state them here. It shows the receipts of the United States for the twelve months ending June 30, 1894, to have been \$38,859,292.78 less than the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

This alarming deficit was paid in part from moneys in the Treasury on the 4th of March, 1893, when President Cleveland was inaugurated, and in part from a sale of 5 per cent interest-bearing bonds made by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle, in February last, yielding \$58,633,295.71, and increasing the annual interest charge against the Government \$2,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, this statement shows also that the expenditures for the twelve months ending June 30, 1894, were \$16,884,595.31 less than for the twelve months ending June 30, 1893; but, Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that this same statement shows that the payment for pensions made for the year ending June 30, 1894, was \$18,180,272.91 less than they were for the year ending June 30, 1893.

In other words, exclusive of pensions, President Cleveland, for his first full fiscal year, expended \$1,295,677.50 more to carry on the Government than was expended in the final fiscal year under President Harrison. Whatever was saved by President Cleveland was saved at the expense of the soldiers of the late war and of their widows and orphans by an unfriendly and unjust administration of the pension laws.

Mr. Speaker, during the whole of the Harrison Administration we were on the highway of prosperity. The Government was liberally and effectively performing its functions. Public improvements were being made where needed, and the Government, by wise and economical expenditures, kept step with a prosperous and happy people; whereas for the last year, under Cleveland, there has been great distress throughout the land. The revenues of the Government have fallen off and the expenditures of the Government have increased, except for pensions.

In other words, it is more expensive to enforce the law with great blocks of our citizens out of employment, the Government making its strong arm felt by force, than it is to expend the public moneys for the common good, for public objects, with our people profitably employed, and therefore contented—the people obeying the law from love, rather than from force.

The condition of the country under the respective policies of Harrison and Cleveland is known by all, and its future condition will depend upon the economic and fiscal policies which will be chosen by the people at the ballot box.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the great distress throughout the country, there have been many increases in the salaries of Democratic officials, especially in the diplomatic and consular service. I specify a few of them. The salary of the First Assistant Secretary of State is increased from \$3,500 to \$4,500. The minister to Belgium, Mr. Ewing, of Illinois, the former law partner of the Vice-President, is increased from \$7,500 to \$10,000. The ministers to Switzerland and Portugal, Messrs. Caruth and Broadhead, are increased from \$5,000 to \$6,500 respectively.

The minister to Mexico, ex-Governor Gray, of Indiana, who receives an annual salary of \$17,500, has the salary of his secretary of legation increased from \$1,800 to \$2,650. The ministers to Nicaragua and Costa Rica, for the first time, are allowed secre-

taries of legation at \$1,800 each, while the Bureau of American Republics, established under the auspices of Secretary Blaine to promote commerce and reciprocity—a real service—is cut down from \$30,000 to \$10,000. The six Auditors of the Treasury Department are increased from \$3,600 to \$4,000 each. The salaries of a great many consuls and other officials are largely increased, but I have not the time to enumerate them or you the patience to hear.

Mr. Speaker, all these Democratic officials have received their appointments under Mr. Cleveland. For years they declaimed, in common with all other Democrats, about the extravagant sal-

aries of officials, and pledged that if they came into power there should be economy and reform. There is no excuse for the increase of most of these salaries. I call attention to the matter to show the difference between promise and performance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask how many more poor widows of soldiers of the late war and how many worthy veterans must have the small pensions which they receive taken away or reduced by an unfriendly Administration, to meet these and many other increases of salary to already well-paid officials? From every standpoint the Democratic party fails. The best interests of all the people demand that the Democratic party step down and out.

Comparative statement of appropriations made by the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses, and by extra and first regular sessions of the Fifty-third Congress, fiscal years 1891 to 1895 inclusive.

Title.	Fifty-first Congress.		Fifty-second Congress.		Fifty-third Congress.
	First session, 1891.	Second session, 1892.	First session, 1893.	Second session, 1894.	Extra and first regular sessions, 1895.
Agricultural.....	\$1,799,100.00	\$3,028,153.50	\$3,232,995.50	\$3,323,500.00	\$3,222,023.06
Army.....	24,206,471.79	24,613,529.19	24,308,499.82	24,225,639.78	23,592,834.68
Diplomatic and consular.....	1,710,815.00	1,656,925.00	1,604,045.00	1,557,445.00	1,563,918.76
District of Columbia.....	5,769,544.15	5,597,125.17	5,317,973.27	5,413,223.91	5,544,593.57
Fortifications.....	4,232,935.00	3,774,803.00	2,734,276.00	2,210,055.00	2,427,004.00
Indian.....	7,262,016.02	16,386,284.86	7,654,047.84	7,854,240.38	9,329,648.49
Legislative, etc.....	21,030,752.75	22,027,674.75	21,900,132.97	21,865,802.81	21,308,295.79
Military Academy.....	435,296.11	402,064.64	428,917.33	432,556.12	406,523.08
Navy.....	24,136,035.53	31,541,654.78	23,543,385.00	22,104,061.38	25,327,126.72
Pensions, including deficiencies*.....	123,779,368.35	164,550,383.34	154,411,682.00	180,681,074.85	151,581,570.00
Post-office.....	72,226,698.99	77,907,222.61	80,331,276.73	84,004,314.22	87,236,599.55
River and harbor.....	25,136,295.00		21,154,218.00		11,473,180.00
Sundry civil.....	29,738,282.22	37,410,363.99	27,665,076.93	41,716,311.15	34,203,776.05
Deficiencies.....	13,295,541.61	9,364,148.62	8,230,859.50	8,127,361.51	11,820,545.76
Total.....	354,759,152.52	398,260,333.45	382,527,385.89	403,515,586.11	389,043,689.51
Miscellaneous.....	7,010,905.27	4,271,531.10	3,208,922.82	520,499.18	550,000.00
Total regular annual appropriations.....	361,770,057.79	402,531,864.55	385,736,308.71	404,036,085.29	389,593,689.51
Permanent annual appropriations†.....	101,628,453.00	122,486,808.00	121,863,880.00	115,468,273.92	101,074,680.00
Total.....	463,398,510.79	525,018,672.55	507,600,188.71	519,504,359.21	490,668,369.51
Total Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses.....	\$988,417,183.34		\$1,027,104,547.92		

* Deficiencies included as follows: 1891, on account of 1890, \$25,321,907.25; 1892, on account of 1891, \$20,335,598.34; 1893, on account of 1892, \$7,674,322; 1894, on account of 1893, \$14,149,724.85.

† This is the amount originally submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury as estimated to be necessary under permanent specific and permanent indefinite appropriations.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the figures to which the gentleman from Illinois has called the attention of the House seem to make it desirable that three facts should be emphasized to the people of this country.

It will be remembered that two and four years ago there rang all through this country denunciations of the Republican party, the Republican Congress, and the Republican Administration for alleged extravagance of appropriations and expenditures. We replied at that time, showing that there had been only the ordinary growth of the expenditures of the country, except so far as permanent work had been done which had been delayed too long, and that the charges were without foundation. Yet these unfounded charges were iterated and reiterated, and had more or less influence in bringing the Democratic party into power.

It is certainly a gratification, after the Democratic party has been in power in every department of the Government for one year, now to have it so clearly demonstrated that these gentlemen who, when out of power, made such denunciations of Republican extravagance two and four years ago, now find the boot is on the other leg. The extravagance now is on the part of the Democratic party in power, who denounced alleged Republican extravagance two and four years ago, and who find themselves now subject to the criticism of those whom they then criticised.

In short, it appears from the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, first, that the appropriations at the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, which had been denounced throughout the country as the "billion-dollar Congress," were \$27,000,000 less than the appropriations at the corresponding session of this Congress, the round figures being \$463,000,000 for the first session of the Fifty-first Congress and \$490,000,000 for the first session of the present Congress.

Second, that the expenditures under the Democratic Administration, with both Houses of Congress Democratic, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, have been only seventeen millions less than the last fiscal year of President Harrison, and this reduction has been entirely in pensions, leaving an increase of one million in other expenditures.

And third, that while the revenue after the enactment of the McKinley tariff was more than enough all through President Harrison's Administration to meet all expenditures, including

the increasing pensions, for the first year of the present Democratic Administration there is a deficiency of \$70,000,000.

Having stated these three facts by way of reply to the billion-dollar charges of the Democratic party in 1892 against the Republican party, I desire to add—what is the simple truth—that there was no extravagance in 1890 beyond the requirements of the country; there is none now. The Government of this country two and four years ago was conducted as reasonably, economically, and efficiently as any government upon the face of the earth, and I do not stand here to declare that those who are now in power and who, two and four years ago, criticised us for extravagance have themselves become participants in extravagance, notwithstanding they have appropriated and expended more than we did.

This simply illustrates the fact that gentlemen who are out of power have little difficulty in criticising those who are in power, and that when the critics themselves come into power, if they do as well as the party they criticise, they will be doing better than our friends on the other side have done thus far.

I took up a few moments ago an editorial article in the Kansas City Times, in which the editor proceeded to say that the Democratic party had inherited a deficiency which had been created by their predecessors, and upon that ground to excuse the deficiency which now exists.

The editorial stated that a hundred million dollars of the bank-redemption fund was turned into the Treasury by the act of July 14, 1890, and was used for the purpose of meeting current expenditures. Gentlemen here very well understand that there is not a particle of truth in that statement. Fifty-four million dollars—not a hundred millions—of the bank-redemption fund was turned into the Treasury by the act of July 14, 1890, and that \$54,000,000 was used not for current expenditures, but for the reduction of the public debt.

Every year since the passage of the tariff act of 1890 up to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, the revenue was sufficient to meet the current expenditures. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, the revenue exceeded the expenditures by \$37,000,000. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, the revenue exceeded the expenditures by nearly \$10,000,000, and even for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, in the last portion of which the revenue was affected by the disturbance of business,

resulting from the threatened tariff revolution, the revenue exceeded the expenditures by \$2,500,000. Thus, for every year after the enactment of the tariff act of 1890 up to and including the fiscal year 1893, the revenue under that act was ample to meet all the current expenses of the Government, including the current expenditures for pensions.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, the revenue exceeded the expenditures by \$105,000,000. Gentlemen will remember the demand that was made at that time by our Democratic friends that such a surplus should not be allowed to continue which necessitated the purchase of our bonds at a premium. We were told that a "condition" of a surplus and "not a theory" confronted us which called for a reduction of revenue by a revision of the tariff. In response to that demand the annual revenue was reduced \$60,000,000 by the abolition of the duty on sugar, by the remission of the duty on sugar.

At the same time expenditures were increased from year to year by enlarged appropriations for pensions; yet, notwithstanding the fact that by the repeal of the duty on sugar \$60,000,000 was thus remitted to the people in the fiscal years 1891, 1892, and 1893, as I have already said, we were able to meet all expenditures and leave a surplus each and every year. Every dollar, let me repeat, of the bank redemption fund which was turned into the Treasury by the act of June 14, 1890, was used for the reduction of the public debt.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What about the postponement of the payment of bonds and the running of contracts on them?

Mr. DINGLEY. What does the gentleman mean by the "running of contracts"? Surely the gentleman does not include the payment of bonded indebtedness a current expenditure in carrying on the Government. It is sufficient for me to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that every year up to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, the revenue was ample to meet all current expenditures of the Government, and if it had not been decreed in 1892 that a Democratic tariff revolution should come upon the country, there is no doubt whatever that this condition of things would have been continued.

In the last fiscal year, the year ending June 30, 1894, for the first time in time of peace since 1860, we had a deficiency of \$70,000,000. That deficiency has not been caused by an increase of expenditures. The expenditures, as has been stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], are \$17,000,000 less than those of the previous year, but the whole of that \$17,000,000 reduction, and one million more, has been brought about by reducing and discontinuing pensions for the boys in blue. The expenditures for the ordinary purposes of the Government are \$1,000,000 more for this fiscal year under Democratic rule than they were for the preceding year, under Republican rule.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. DINGLEY'S time was extended.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the deficiency for the past fiscal year has been brought about entirely by a falling off of revenue. There has been a decline of the revenue in the last fiscal year of \$39,000,000, of which \$71,000,000 is in customs revenue, \$14,000,000 in internal revenue taxes, and \$4,000,000 miscellaneous. In order to meet this deficiency of over \$70,000,000, occurring for the first time in peace since 1860, bonds have been issued and money borrowed to the extent of \$58,000,000, and \$12,000,000 more have been taken from the gold redemption fund to meet current expenses.

Now, in this condition of things, with the gold redemption fund run down to-day to \$52,000,000, while \$100,000,000 is the amount contemplated by law and by the regulations of the Department, this amount being necessary to preserve the public confidence in the currency of the nation, the situation is such certainly as should command the serious attention of Congress and the people. Fifty-two million dollars only as the gold redemption fund to maintain at par \$346,000,000 of greenbacks and \$163,000,000 of Treasury notes!

This is a situation, Mr. Speaker, which if we will but carefully consider must inspire a feeling of alarm in the minds of those who understand that with so small a redemption fund the public confidence may be impaired at a single stroke.

And, Mr. Speaker, the other day when the "popgun" bill for the abolition of the duty on sugar imposed by the Gorman-Brice bill, was passed by this House, I could not but think that gentlemen of the majority who voted for it and also for the Gorman-Brice tariff, could not have considered the fact that the duty on sugar is absolutely required to meet the expenditures of this Government for the present fiscal year, if the bill which has been known as the Gorman-Brice act should become a law, as I presume it will, because the latter measure reduces the revenue from a large number of sources—particularly upon luxuries—to such an extent that it is impossible the expenditures of this nation can be met without the duty on sugar. And it must have been obvious to gentlemen here that this sugar bill was presented and put through, not with the slightest purpose of

its becoming a law, but for buncombe, with the distinct knowledge that it could not be enacted into law in the present condition of the finances of the nation if the Gorman-Brice bill is to stand in the terms in which it has been enacted.

Why, sir, in that Gorman-Brice bill—just as there was in the Wilson bill—there has been a reduction of revenue to the extent of over \$15,000,000 upon pure luxuries, such as liquors, cigars, leaf tobacco, opium, ostrich feathers, silks, kid gloves, etc., where there was no earthly call for a single dollar's reduction. In order to meet the deficiency created by such reductions, it is inevitable that the duty on sugar, as provided by the Gorman-Brice act, must remain, if that act in its other provisions is to become law as the Democratic majority have willed.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter upon any discussion of these questions. I simply desired to call attention to the fact that the situation in which this country finds itself at the close of the fiscal year just passed—the first year of full Democratic control since 1860—is one which may indeed attract the attention and arouse the alarm of every true friend of our institutions. I trust that before this Congress shall reassemble the clouds will to some extent have broken away; that gentlemen who have the responsibility of the government of this nation will feel the sense of that responsibility, and that from this time henceforth we shall have legislation designed to promote the interests of the people—legislation calculated to restore confidence—not the revolutionary threats which we have had throughout the past year, which have so destroyed confidence and excited alarm throughout the country that business has been shattered, industries overwhelmed, and millions of men have found themselves out of employment, with wages reduced, consumption diminished, and all the springs of industry dried up to an extent which may well arouse the commiseration of every friend of the American Republic. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

EXTENSION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the joint resolution (H. Res. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for expenditures of the Government.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the conference report be suspended for the purpose of considering the resolution just received from the Senate.

There was no objection.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows.

In line 7, strike out the word "twenty-fourth" and insert "twentieth;" so that the resolution will read as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the provisions of joint resolutions approved June 29 and July 31, 1894, providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government, be, and the same are hereby, extended and continued in full force and effect to and including the 20th day of August, 1894."

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, it will be impossible for the sundry civil bill to be enrolled and sent to the President to-day. The resolution of which this is amendatory expired last night at 12 o'clock; hence it is important that this resolution go to the President as soon as possible. I move that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the vote just taken was laid on the table.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. I now call up, Mr. Speaker, for further consideration the report of the conferees on the general deficiency bill, and yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] such time as he desires.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want the House of Representatives and the country to understand the leading facts touching the appropriations for 1895 and their relations to the appropriations in the near past.

THE REDUCTIONS BY THIS CONGRESS—THE FIFTY-THIRD.

The total appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, just made by the Fifty-third Congress, amount to \$490,668,369.51. This includes the permanent annual appropriations as well as those for the postal service. It includes all appropriations. The total amount appropriated for the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1894, made by the second session of the Fifty-second Congress, amounted to \$519,504,359.21. The details of these several appropriations will be found in a table appended to my remarks and marked "Exhibit A."

These figures give a reduction for 1895 of \$28,835,989.70, and doubtless much credit will be claimed during the campaign now coming on for this reduction, and the cry of "demonstrated economy by the Democracy" will be heard on every stump.

First, let it be borne in mind that this is a reduction by one Democratic Congress below the appropriations of a former Democratic Congress, the former doing work under the watchful

eye of Judge HOLMAN, the "watchdog of the Treasury." Let the question come up, if these are proper, were the former improper?

Let us now examine the appropriations for the two years 1894 and 1895, and find where these reductions come from. It will be found that in the single item of appropriations for pensions alone the difference can be accounted for, and not in a cutting down of the other current expenses of the Government.

The pension appropriations for last year amounted to \$180,681,074.85, while for next year it is \$151,581,570. Here is a cut of \$29,099,504.85, more than accounting for the reductions in the bills just passed for the next year, and leaves a margin of \$263,515.15.

But let us look a step further. The second session of the last Congress had to appropriate for the Eleventh Census \$1,020,000. This session only had to give \$356,580 for that work. Again, the second session of the last Congress had to give \$958,000 for the World's Fair. This Congress had nothing to appropriate for that purpose. Now, let us take the three items of pensions, Eleventh Census, and World's Fair and see what the three cuts aggregate:

Cut in pensions	\$29,099,504.85
Cut in Eleventh Census	663,500.00
Cut in World's Fair	958,000.00

Total	30,721,004.85
Subtract reductions for '95	28,835,989.70

And the difference of 1,885,015.15 is found over and above all reductions by this Congress.

The passing by of the great fair and the almost finished work of the Eleventh Census dropped, unasked, \$1,621,500 from the appropriations for next year. Leaving out these three items, for doing which no credit can be claimed by this Congress, and it will be seen that there is an increase of the current expenses of the Government of \$1,885,015.15.

THE OLD SOLDIER SACRIFICED TO ECONOMY.

These facts will demonstrate that the reductions made, the "economy" practiced, falls alone upon the old soldiers—the defenders of the country from 1861 to 1865.

Of the appropriations made even by the last Congress for pensions, the sum of \$23,822,715.04 was withheld from them and covered back into the Treasury last year.

One is filled with horror when the brutal attacks on the pension roll by this Administration is examined. I call attention to Senate Executive Document No. 121 of the second session of this Congress, being a report of the suspensions ordered by the present Administration—a report called for by a Senate resolution introduced by the watchful, true-hearted Senator CULLOM of Illinois.

This report confesses that between March 4, 1893, when Harrison went out and Cleveland came in, and May 10, 1894, the pensions of 15,520 old soldiers and widows had been suspended. Of this number the Pension Office found that it had to reinstate at their former rates, 9,509, thus confessing the hasty and inconsiderate and unfeeling attack upon these deserving men. But 3,014 were reduced from former rates, cutting them mostly down to \$5 and \$8 per month, where they had been drawing mostly \$12 and \$10 per month; 2,671 were dropped altogether from the rolls, and 326 are still under suspension, pursued, undoubtedly, by the detectives of the Pension Bureau.

These men sent out to examine into pension claims are called "special examiners." The real aim of the law creating them was to look into doubtful cases and to help out ignorant but worthy claimants who did not know how to properly prepare their proofs. I fear that now instead of "special examiners" they are used as detectives to cut off pensioners from the great roll of honor.

As bearing upon this point it may be well to note that for the year 1893 there was appropriated for special examiners the sum of \$225,000, while for 1894, at the request of the Pension Office it was increased to \$400,000. Evidently an assault of deadly character was being made on the pension roll. It is however significant and gratifying that even an unfriendly Administration was forced to restore the 9,509 at the rates formerly allowed.

THE FIFTY-FIRST, FIFTY-SECOND, AND FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESSES COMPARED.

The Fifty-first Congress was Republican, and was denounced by the Democratic party as "the billion-dollar Congress," and I believe that the able, genial, and creative mind of the present chairman of the Committee of Appropriations in the House first gave birth to the name.

Time ought to make the blind see and the deaf hear. It ought also to cause some to blush. Let us see what these three Congresses have been at. The figures are now made up showing the work done, and I refer to table "A."

The Fifty-first Congress appropriated \$988,417,183.34 for the two years of its service. But that amount includes deficiencies made by its Democratic predecessor, the Fiftieth Congress, amounting to \$38,617,448.96, and included in that was a deficiency for pensions, amounting to \$25,321,907.35. Deducting the above deficiency, which belonged to the Fiftieth Congress, and it leaves the appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress at \$949,799,734.38.

The appropriations of the Fifty-second Congress were for its two years \$1,027,104,547.92. The present Congress has only appropriated for one year, and it has done its best at cutting before the elections just coming on. At the next session, after the elections, look out for a large increase by reason of forced deficiencies and deferred appropriations. But let us assume that the appropriations for next year will be the same as those just made, and the total for this Congress will be \$981,336,739.02.

Let us now look at the work of the three Congresses placed together:

Fifty-first Congress (Republican)	\$949,799,734.38
Fifty-second Congress (Democratic)	1,027,104,547.92
Fifty-third Congress (Democratic)	981,339,739.02

Where, I ask my Democratic friends, is your cry of economy? You may slash at the defenders of your country in order to swell other bills, and yet you can not keep the appropriations down to the Republican standard.

ADDITIONS BY THE SENATE.

It has been one of the great pleasures of our Democratic friends to call attention to the fact that the appropriations, as made by the House of Representatives, were increased by the Republican Senate. But now the Senate is Democratic as well as the House, and yet the Senate increased the House bills to the amount of \$15,372,977.34.

I am not questioning the constitutional right of the Senate to increase or to decrease the House bills, but I invite attention to it and hope that the Democratic press and stumblers will tell the country of the outrages perpetrated by the Democratic Senate.

The table marked "Exhibit B" will throw full light on this question, and give in detail the work of the two Houses.

INCREASE OF SALARIES, ETC.

While Republicans filled the public offices every effort was made by the Democracy in Congress to reduce the salaries of public officials; even to cutting the amount appropriated lower than the compensation fixed by law. But now that Democrats fill the offices their economic zeal has calmed down materially, and increases have commenced all along the line. They can find the heart to cut down pensions, while they are increasing the salaries of Democratic officials, and that, too, in the face of a hungry Treasury, with bonds being sold to meet the running expenses of the Government.

I will give a few illustrations:

Minister to Belgium is increased from \$7,500 per annum to \$10,000. The First Assistant Secretary of State increased \$1,000. Secretary of legation to Mexico increased \$850. Minister to Switzerland is increased from \$6,000 to \$7,500. Contingent expenses of foreign missions is increased \$15,000. Two new secretaries of legation are created at \$1,800 each. Salaries of two consular clerks increased \$200 each. In the Departments at Washington there are several other increases in the salaries of bureau chiefs. No increases were made by the Fifty-first Congress, excepting a large clerical force given to bring up the work in the Pension Office.

CERTAIN OTHER REDUCTIONS AND INCREASES.

The bills showing reductions as compared with appropriations made at the last session of the last Congress are as follows:

The Agricultural bill	\$101,476.94
The Army bill	632,755.10
The legislative bill	557,507.02
The Military Academy bill	26,033.04
The pension bill	14,949,780.00
The sundry civil bill	7,506,535.10
Deficiencies	10,456,540.60
Permanent appropriations after deducting for both sessions the amounts charged for "Refund of national-bank notes"	12,393,593.92

Total reduction 46,624,221.72

Of the reduction on the legislative bill, \$345,000 is on account of 300 clerks dropped in the Record and Pension Office. This reduction was promised both by Secretaries Proctor and Elkins, Republicans, in their last annual reports, the work on which the clerks were employed in carding war records having just been completed. I presume that the claim will be made that because of these reductions great credit is deserved by this Congress.

The reduction in the pension bill is in accordance with recommendations of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Of the reduction of \$7,506,535.10 on the sundry civil bill,

\$5,766,153 is on account of contracts for river and harbor works.

The deficiencies of the last session of the last Congress included \$14,149,724.85 for payment of pensions. Deducing that sum from the whole amount of deficiencies of the last session, only \$8,127,361.51 remain, or \$3,693,184.25 less than the deficiencies appropriated by this Congress.

The permanent appropriations show an apparent reduction of \$14,393,593.92, which includes \$11,000,000 for sugar bounty and \$450,000 for expenses under election laws.

The bills which have been increased are as follows:

The diplomatic and consular bill.....	\$6,473.76
The District of Columbia bill.....	131,396.66
The fortification bill.....	216,949.00
The Indian bill.....	1,475,408.11
The naval bill.....	3,223,065.34
The Post-Office bill.....	3,232,285.33
The river and harbor bill.....	11,473,180.00
Miscellaneous.....	29,500.82

Total increase..... 19,788,232.02

Net apparent reduction..... 28,835,989.70

During the last session of the last Congress there was appropriated for pensions, including a deficiency of \$14,149,724.85, the total sum of \$180,681,074.85. At this session there is appropriated for pensions only \$151,581,570, or \$29,099,504.85 less, which reduction in pensions exceeds the whole apparent net reduction in all appropriations by this session, under the last session of the last Congress, by \$263,515.15. I have already alluded to this and to other items of reduction forced upon this Congress and not of its seeking.

WHAT HAS THIS CONGRESS DONE?

It has repealed the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, but wholly failed to keep the promise made at the time that during this Congress other legislation would follow for the proper utilization of both our metals.

It has let the Mormons into the Union of States.

It has wiped out the last vestige of Federal protection to the ballot box, and thus opened the door for frauds and a high carnival of crime.

It has utterly failed to keep its pledges touching a revision of the tariff, and after a surrender to the sugar trust, after stopping commerce, closing factories, throwing millions of laboring men out of employment, keeping order with fixed bayonets and the slaughter of the people, it winds up by giving the country an unwise revision of the McKinley law.

I see but one thing to commend it for, and over that the whole country will heartily rejoice, and that is that both Houses are without a quorum, and give promise of an early adjournment.

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

I invite the attention of the House and the country to the terrible effects of Democratic control upon the foreign commerce of the country.

During the last year of President Harrison, and before the elections warned the people here and abroad that Democracy had the power, by carrying the legislative and executive branches of the Government, to carry out the dangerous doctrines of the national Democratic platform, the foreign commerce of this country reached the highest point ever attained by the nation, the aggregate reaching the enormous sum of \$1,857,680,610 in 1892.

In 1893, after the Democracy were in power, it fell to \$1,714,066,113, and in 1894 to \$1,547,133,698.

Here is a falling off in 1893, as compared with 1892, of \$143,614,494, and in 1894, as compared with 1892, of \$310,541,912.

In 1892 the exports from this country exceeded our imports \$202,875,686. We were doing a safe business, selling more than we bought; but after the advent of Democracy, in 1893, the imports exceeded the exports \$18,735,728, and we were buying more than we were selling.

How did agriculture fare under Democracy? Let us see. We exported in 1892, under Harrison, \$799,323,232 of our agricultural products. In 1893, under Cleveland, \$615,382,986, and in 1894 only \$628,318,773. Here is a falling off in 1893 of \$183,945,246, and in 1894 of \$171,009,459.

In support of my statement I refer to table from the Bureau of Statistics appended to my remarks and marked "Exhibit C."

REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES.

I come now to consider the management of the finances by this Administration.

In 1865 the expenditures of the Government exceeded revenues \$936,840,619.33, and during the civil war our expenditures each year exceeded our revenues. But from 1865, the last year of the war, we have had no such experience until the fiscal year just closed, when we find that the expenditures exceeded the revenues in the startling sum of \$69,803,260.58.

With this exception the revenues and the cash in the Treasury have met all of our necessities since 1865. (See Exhibit D.)

I find that the receipts, exclusive of postal, from March 1, 1885, to March 1, 1889, under President Cleveland, was \$1,451,660,246.74, while from March 1, 1889, to March 1, 1893, under President Harrison, they amounted to \$1,540,225,448.35. This gives an excess of receipts for the four years of Harrison of \$88,565,201.61. This is the key to the efficiency of a Republican Administration executing Republican laws.

But here comes a sharper test of the two Executives, leaving out postal receipts:

Receipts:

For first sixteen months of Harrison's Administration (from March 1, 1889, to July 1, 1890).....	\$532,743,263.03
For first sixteen months of Cleveland's Administration (from March 1, 1893, to July 1, 1894).....	422,147,849.48
For last sixteen months of Harrison's Administration (from November 1, 1891, to March 1, 1893).....	493,691,074.39

A study of these figures will show that the first sixteen months of Harrison's Administration collected \$110,595,413.55 more than the first sixteen months of the present Administration, and the receipts for the last sixteen months of Harrison's Administration exceeded the first sixteen months of the present Administration \$71,543,224.91. Is it any wonder that a deficit in the Treasury is upon us, and that this Administration is selling bonds to pay the running expenses of the Government?

Let me give a further test of the administration of the laws by the different Executives. I call attention to "Exhibit E," appended to my remarks—a statement prepared in the Treasury Department at my request. Observe the receipts from "customs, internal revenue, and miscellaneous," which gives the true test of an honest and efficient enforcement of the laws:

Collected by President Arthur, \$1,487,749,110.37.

Collected by President Cleveland, \$1,451,661,246.74.

Collected by President Harrison, \$1,540,225,448.35.

When President Cleveland came in the revenues in four years fell off \$36,087,863.63, and when President Harrison came in they increased in four years over President Cleveland's work \$88,564,201.61.

The moonshiners and violators of law evidently had an easy time of it under Mr. Cleveland's appointees.

"THE SURPLUS."

The favorite argument of the ignorant, or those who understanding wish to deceive the people is that Mr. Cleveland left a full Treasury on March 4, 1889, and found an empty one on March 4, 1893. Let us examine this question.

On the first line in "Exhibit E" will be found the amount available at the beginning of the several Administrations of Arthur, Cleveland, Harrison, and again Cleveland, and on the last line, opposite the word "surplus," the amounts over and above expenditures during each period indicated.

Mr. Arthur had, when he was inaugurated, in round numbers \$170,000,000, Mr. Cleveland \$159,000,000, Mr. Harrison \$183,000,000, and Mr. Cleveland, second term, \$124,000,000. President Harrison did start with \$59,000,000 more than President Cleveland started with in 1893. Why? Because Harrison, during his term paid off \$233,588,950 of the public debt of the country. During Mr. Cleveland's first term he paid off only \$143,834,350, and had to be forced to pay off any by the passage of a resolution in the House of Representatives, assailing him for his delinquency in this particular.

Even after so lashed to his duty he paid off \$59,704,600 less than Mr. Harrison paid during the four years following. Mr. Harrison applied the cash locked up in the Treasury to pay off the debt of the people, and in doing so he saved in interest \$55,352,493.51, as against \$42,832,538.38 saved by Mr. Cleveland.

The Democracy used to abuse the Republicans for keeping too much cash in the Treasury, but now when it is applied to lift the debt burden, they are displeased and regret that the money so spent was not left in the Treasury for them to spend.

There is nothing clearer to my mind than this: That if the Democracy had not come into power on their revolutionary platform the Republicans would have had plenty of money with which to run the Government, and that the \$50,000,000 of bonds lately issued by this Administration would not have been needed.

I call attention to Exhibit F, following my remarks, being a statement of the bond purchases, prepared in the Treasury Department.

If Harrison left \$59,000,000 less for Cleveland than he received, he paid off \$89,704,600 more of the public debt.

I have demonstrated that the revenues were vastly greater under the Republicans, and if they had been continued in power there would have been plenty of cash to pay the Government bills.

It is a sad sight for this country to see the bonded debt increased, while the revenues that come from the foreigners are

being transferred so as to come directly from the pockets of our own people. The burden is increased at home, while the laborer abroad is allowed to do the work of our people, thus lessening our ability to lift the burden.

IN CONCLUSION.

I do not see one claim that can be advanced by the President or this Democratic Congress for the continued support of the people. Leaving out the pension roll, and the current expenses are increased in the appropriation bills just passed.

In our dealings with foreign questions we have become the

laughingstock of the people and the Administration the rich subject for the cartoonist.

The people are sick at heart, and hope for the first time has left the breasts of a large army of workers only willing and eager to earn their daily bread.

For the first time in the history of our country the capital city has become the camping ground and rallying place for an unemployed army.

But even Democracy can not destroy this great Republic. There is a sure remedy—the ballot in the hand of the sovereign citizen.

EXHIBIT A.

Appropriations made by the Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses, and by extra and first regular sessions of the Fifty-third Congress, fiscal years 1891 and 1895, inclusive.

Title.	Fifty-first Congress.		Fifty-second Congress.		Fifty-third Congress.
	First session, 1891.	Second session, 1892.	First session, 1893.	Second session, 1894.	Extra and first regular sessions, 1895.
Agricultural	\$1,799,100.00	\$3,028,153.50	\$3,232,995.50	\$3,323,500.00	\$3,222,023.06
Army	24,206,471.79	24,613,529.19	24,308,499.82	24,225,639.78	23,592,884.68
Diplomatic and consular	1,710,815.00	1,656,925.00	1,604,045.00	1,557,445.00	1,563,918.76
District of Columbia	5,769,544.15	5,597,125.17	5,817,973.27	5,413,323.91	5,514,593.57
Fortifications	4,232,935.00	3,774,803.00	2,734,276.00	2,210,055.00	2,427,004.00
Indian	7,262,016.02	16,356,284.86	7,664,047.84	7,854,240.38	9,329,648.49
Legislative, etc.	21,030,752.75	22,027,674.75	21,900,132.97	21,805,802.81	21,308,295.79
Military Academy	435,296.11	402,064.64	428,917.33	432,556.12	406,523.08
Navy	24,136,035.53	31,541,654.78	23,543,385.00	22,104,061.38	25,327,126.72
Pension, including deficiencies*	123,779,368.35	164,550,383.34	154,411,682.00	180,681,074.85	151,581,570.00
Post-Office	72,226,698.99	77,907,222.61	80,331,276.00	84,004,314.22	87,236,599.55
River and harbor	25,136,295.00		21,154,218.00		11,473,180.00
Sundry civil	29,738,282.22	37,410,363.99	27,065,076.93	41,716,311.15	34,209,776.05
Deficiencies	13,295,541.61	9,364,148.62	8,230,850.50	8,127,361.51	11,820,545.72
Total	354,759,152.52	398,260,033.45	382,527,385.89	403,515,586.11	389,043,689.51
Miscellaneous	7,010,905.27	4,271,531.10	3,208,922.82	520,499.18	550,000.00
Total regular annual appropriations	361,770,057.79	402,531,861.55	385,736,308.71	404,036,085.29	389,593,689.51
Permanent annual appropriations	101,628,453.00	122,486,808.00	121,863,880.00	115,468,273.92	101,074,680.00
Total	463,398,510.79	525,018,672.55	507,600,188.71	519,504,359.21	490,668,369.51
Total Fifty-first and Fifty-second Congresses	\$988,417,183.34		\$1,027,104,547.92		

* Deficiencies included as follows: 1891, on account of 1890, \$25,321,907.25; 1892, on account of 1891, \$29,335,598.34; 1893, on account of 1892, \$7,674,332; 1894, on account of 1893, \$14,149,724.85. † This is the amount originally submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury as estimated to be necessary under permanent specific and permanent indefinite appropriations.

EXHIBIT B.

Tabular history of appropriation bills, first and second sessions of the Fifty-third Congress; estimates and appropriations for the fiscal year 1894-'95, and appropriations for the fiscal year 1893-'94.

Title.	Estimates, 1895.	Reported to the House, amount.	Passed the House, amount.	Reported to the Senate, amount.	Passed the Senate, amount.	Law, 1894-'95, amount.	Law, 1893-'94, amount.
Agriculture	\$2,233,843.06	\$3,180,643.06	\$3,215,643.06	\$3,208,183.06	\$4,225,183.06	\$3,222,023.06	\$3,323,500.00
Army	25,332,918.52	23,568,284.68	23,586,924.68	23,603,384.68	23,611,384.68	23,592,884.68	24,225,639.78
Diplomatic and consular	1,642,638.76	1,511,738.76	1,509,738.76	1,589,438.76	1,591,218.27	1,563,918.76	1,557,445.00
District of Columbia	5,381,473.91	5,157,573.57	5,206,473.57	5,854,533.57	5,887,038.57	5,514,593.57	5,413,223.91
Fortification	7,438,413.00	2,219,654.00	2,221,654.00	2,779,104.00	2,836,604.00	2,427,004.00	2,210,055.00
Indian	6,931,156.61	6,611,260.78	6,735,518.90	9,327,386.69	9,404,248.49	9,329,648.49	7,854,240.38
Legislative, etc.	22,310,110.33	21,086,923.29	21,105,787.29	21,348,739.79	21,378,315.70	21,308,295.79	21,865,802.81
Military Academy	463,183.58	401,283.08	401,283.08	410,303.08	410,203.08	406,523.08	432,556.12
Navy	27,875,914.02	25,280,930.27	25,339,580.27	25,215,080.27	25,437,105.30	25,327,126.72	22,104,061.38
Pension	162,631,570.00	151,581,570.00	151,581,570.00	151,581,570.00	151,581,570.00	151,581,570.00	166,531,350.00
Post-Office	90,399,485.33	87,470,599.55	87,240,599.55	87,236,599.55	87,236,599.55	87,236,599.55	84,004,314.22
River and harbor	27,625,000.00	9,458,689.56	9,538,689.56	12,771,180.00	12,946,680.00	11,443,180.00	(d)
Sundry civil	34,966,002.81	32,308,642.80	32,523,383.80	35,061,686.70	36,202,165.70	34,209,776.05	e41,716,311.15
Total	395,232,109.93	369,837,793.40	370,209,846.52	379,981,094.15	382,748,367.49	377,223,143.75	381,238,499.75
Urgent deficiency, recoinage silver coins, etc.		300,000.00	300,000.00	306,000.00	306,000.00	306,000.00	
Further urgent deficiency, assistant custodians, etc.		338,000.00	338,000.00	370,588.33	370,588.33	370,588.33	
Further urgent deficiency, customs, census, etc.		1,651,896.31	1,889,455.86	1,889,455.86	1,889,455.86	1,968,470.86	
Further urgent deficiency, United States courts, etc.	f17,012,627.31	338,958.00	338,958.00	453,278.00	453,278.00	768,278.00	g22,277,086.36
Further urgent deficiency, engraving and printing, courts, etc.		1,237,255.66	1,242,255.66	1,785,889.66	1,842,304.66	1,854,304.66	
Further urgent deficiency, printing and customs		350,000.00	350,000.00	350,000.00	350,000.00	350,000.00	
Deficiency 1894 and prior years		4,890,593.78	5,005,032.58	7,910,219.96	7,939,551.41	6,202,903.91	
Total	412,244,737.24	378,944,497.15	379,673,548.62	393,046,525.96	395,890,545.75	389,043,689.51	403,515,586.11
Miscellaneous	7,343,423.47					550,000.00	520,499.18
Total regular annual appropriations	419,588,160.71					389,593,689.51	404,036,085.29
Permanent annual appropriations	h101,074,680.00					h101,074,680.00	h108,468,273.92
Grand total, regular and permanent annual appropriations	520,662,840.71					490,668,369.51	512,504,359.21

a One-half of the amounts for the District of Columbia payable by the United States, except amounts for the water department (estimated for 1895 at \$265,083.93), which are payable from the revenues of the water department. b Includes all expenses of the postal service payable from postal revenues and out of the Treasury. c This is the amount estimated for rivers and harbors for 1895, exclusive of \$4,885,000 required to meet contracts authorized by law included in the sundry civil estimates. "The amount that can be profitably expended" in that fiscal year, as reported by the Chief of Engineers, is \$43,760,611. [Book of Estimates for 1895, pages 192-197.] d No river and harbor bill was passed for 1894, but the sum of \$14,166,153 was included in the sundry civil act to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements. e This amount includes \$14,166,153 to carry out contracts authorized by law for river and harbor improvements, and for improvements under the Mississippi River and the Missouri River Commissions. f This amount includes \$14,149,724.85, deficiency for pensions for the fiscal year 1893. g No amount is included in the estimates of permanent annual appropriations for 1895 for bounty on sugar, for the reason stated in the following note on page 267, Book of Estimates for 1895: "NOTE.—The Secretary of the Treasury having recommended the repeal of the sugar bounty law, no estimate is submitted for the fiscal year 1895. In case the law is not repealed, \$11,000,000 will be required for the purpose, which should be added to the sum total to the estimates for 1895." h This is the amount submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual estimates for the fiscal year 1894, the exact amount appropriated not being ascertainable until two years after the close of the fiscal year.

EXHIBIT C.

Imports and exports of merchandise of the United States, 1884 to 1894.

Table with columns: Years, Imports (Free, Dutiable, Total, Per capita for consumption), Exports (Domestic, Foreign, Total, Per capita of domestic, Domestic exports of agricultural products, Per cent of domestic). Rows for years 1884-1894.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Bureau of Statistics, July 27, 1894.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD, Chief of Bureau.

EXHIBIT D.

Receipts and expenditures of the Government. RECAPITULATION OF REVENUE BY FISCAL YEARS.

Table with columns: Year, Customs, Internal revenue, Direct tax, Sales of public lands, Miscellaneous sources (Primitums on loans and sales of gold coin, Other miscellaneous items), Total revenue, Excess of revenue over expenditures, Surplus revenue. Rows for years 1856-1894.

RECAPITULATION OF EXPENDITURES BY FISCAL YEARS.

Table with columns: Year, Civil and miscellaneous (Premium on loans and purchase of bonds, etc., Other civil and miscellaneous items), War Department, Navy Department, Indians, Pensions, Interest on public debt, Total expenditures, including premium, Bonds and other securities applied to sinking fund. Rows for years 1856-1894.

EXHIBIT D—Continued.

Receipts and expenditures of the Government—Continued.

RECAPITULATION OF EXPENDITURES BY FISCAL YEARS—continued.

Year.	Civil and miscellaneous.		War Department.	Navy Department.	Indians.	Pensions.	Interest on public debt.	Total expenditures, including premium.	Bonds and other securities applied to sinking fund.
	Premium on loans and purchase of bonds, etc.	Other civil and miscellaneous items.							
1877		\$56,252,066.60	\$37,082,735.90	\$14,959,935.36	\$5,277,007.22	\$27,963,752.27	\$97,124,511.58	\$233,660,008.93	\$24,498,910.03
1878		53,177,703.57	32,154,147.85	17,395,201.37	4,629,280.23	27,137,019.08	102,500,874.05	230,964,823.80	17,012,634.57
1879		65,741,555.49	40,455,650.73	15,125,123.84	5,206,103.03	35,121,432.39	105,327,949.00	230,947,822.53	723,062.99
1880	\$2,795,320.42	54,713,529.76	38,116,916.22	15,536,984.74	5,945,457.09	36,777,174.44	95,787,575.11	237,042,987.78	73,904,017.41
1881	1,051,248.78	64,416,324.71	40,469,460.55	15,686,671.06	6,514,161.09	59,059,279.62	82,508,741.19	230,712,887.59	74,480,351.05
1882		57,219,750.98	43,570,494.19	15,032,046.28	9,733,747.40	61,345,193.95	71,077,309.79	257,981,459.57	60,137,255.55
1883		68,678,022.21	48,911,382.93	15,283,437.17	7,362,500.34	65,012,573.64	59,100,131.25	235,408,137.54	44,837,255.96
1884		70,920,433.70	39,499,603.36	17,292,601.44	6,475,999.29	55,439,228.06	54,578,273.48	244,126,244.33	46,790,229.50
1885		87,494,253.33	42,670,578.47	15,021,070.67	6,552,494.63	56,102,267.49	51,389,256.47	269,226,035.11	45,601,035.43
1886		74,166,929.85	34,324,152.74	13,907,897.74	6,099,158.17	63,401,884.03	50,580,145.97	242,483,138.50	44,551,013.36
1887		85,264,825.59	38,561,025.85	15,141,126.80	6,194,522.69	75,039,101.79	47,741,577.25	267,932,173.97	47,903,248.15
1888	8,270,842.46	72,952,260.80	38,522,438.11	16,926,437.05	6,249,307.87	80,238,508.77	44,715,007.47	237,924,801.13	43,732,550.00
1889	17,292,362.65	80,664,064.26	44,438,270.85	21,378,809.31	6,892,207.78	87,694,779.11	41,001,484.29	299,288,978.25	39,063,173.35
1890	20,304,224.06	81,403,253.49	44,532,838.08	22,006,206.24	6,708,046.67	106,936,855.07	39,099,284.05	318,040,710.66	39,847,839.50
1891	10,401,220.61	110,048,167.49	48,720,065.01	23,113,896.46	8,527,469.01	124,415,951.40	37,547,135.37	365,773,905.35	44,008,111.37
1892		99,841,989.61	46,896,458.39	23,174,188.98	11,150,577.67	131,583,052.79	23,378,116.23	345,023,330.58	37,574,179.98
1893		103,732,789.27	49,641,773.47	30,136,084.43	13,345,347.27	159,337,557.87	27,264,392.18	383,477,954.49	6,703,744.50
1894		101,943,884.07	54,567,929.85	31,701,298.79	10,293,481.52	141,177,284.96	27,841,405.64	357,525,279.83	221,587.20

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Warrant Division.

* Expenditures in excess of revenue.

† Excess supplied from cash in the Treasury.

EXHIBIT E.

Condition of the Treasury for the four-year periods ending March 1, 1885, March 1, 1889, March 1, 1893, and for sixteen months ending July 1, 1894.

	March 1, 1881, to March 1, 1885.	March 1, 1885, to March 1, 1889.	March 1, 1889, to March 1, 1893.	March 1, 1893, to March 1, 1894.
Available cash balance at beginning of each period	\$170,817,436.69	\$159,356,506.41	\$183,827,190.29	\$124,128,087.88
Receipts from customs, internal revenue, and miscellaneous	1,487,749,110.37	1,451,661,246.74	1,540,225,443.25	422,147,849.45
National-bank redemption fund			68,671,039.25	17,453,853.00
Five per cent loan, principal and premium				58,633,295.71
Total available	1,658,566,547.06	1,611,017,753.15	1,792,723,672.89	622,363,086.07
Expenditures during each period:				
Civil and miscellaneous	275,816,227.84	317,070,407.91	386,152,128.75	134,165,656.61
War	173,397,251.55	154,442,268.23	188,968,268.91	70,115,973.89
Navy	63,416,599.89	65,474,108.82	103,230,176.54	42,559,374.71
Indians	29,678,240.95	24,861,517.36	36,029,064.36	16,112,912.65
Pensions	234,522,486.18	316,546,814.59	438,132,532.85	193,507,478.65
Interest	241,178,532.52	187,823,251.08	123,745,242.72	34,261,607.47
Redemption of debt, principal and premiums	450,246,511.10	363,565,032.31	292,691,254.02	483,560.20
Redemption of debts, national-bank notes redeemed			46,398,978.00	13,354,228.75
Total expenditures	1,498,255,859.98	1,480,076,460.36	1,070,378,247.13	505,220,792.94
Surplus	160,310,687.08	180,941,292.79	122,345,425.76	117,142,293.13

EXHIBIT F.

Statement of United States bonds purchased from March 1, 1885, to March 1, 1893.

	Principal.	Premium paid.	Interest saved.
From March 1, 1885, to March 1, 1889:			
Four percents	\$56,726,550.00	\$15,604,309.79	\$27,450,259.22
Four and a half percents	87,157,800.00	6,772,813.32	8,882,279.16
Total	143,884,350.00	22,377,123.11	32,832,538.38
From March 1, 1889, to March 1, 1893:			
Four percents	121,615,950.00	30,666,133.59	53,596,469.67
Four and a half percents	111,973,000.00	3,225,388.08	1,756,023.84
Total	233,588,950.00	33,891,521.67	55,352,493.51

Mr. SAYERS. I ask the adoption of the report.

Mr. DUNPHY. Before that, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question with his consent. I find on page 54 of the bill as reported by the Senate this provision:

And the clerks of the United States court may act as United States commissioners without receiving additional compensation for their services from the United States.

I see from the report that the Senate has receded from that amendment.

Mr. SAYERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNPHY. I would like to know the reason why?

Mr. SAYERS. Well, they receded, in the first place, because it is legislation on a general deficiency bill; and I am one of those who do not believe that there should be legislation on an appropriation bill. In the second place, it is believed that under the law passed at this Congress there was embodied a provision that no one man shall hold two offices unless hereafter or heretofore specially authorized to do so; and I was informed that there was a law which authorized this clerk to act as commissioner. I think these are the facts in connection with the matter, although I do not pretend to speak with absolute accuracy.

Mr. DUNPHY. I desired to have the explanation appear in the RECORD, because some question has come up between the members of the House on this point.

Mr. SAYERS. The gentleman understands me to say, however, that I do not pretend to speak with absolute accuracy on the subject.

Mr. DUNPHY. I understand that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. TARSNEY). The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was adopted.

On motion of Mr. SAYERS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. SAYERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will call the attention of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], to the remaining question at issue, and ask how much time he would like to have in discussing that matter?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I can not tell exactly; but we will not occupy very long.

Mr. SAYERS. Well, say a half hour on each side.

A MEMBER. What is the amendment?

Mr. SAYERS. It is the amendment of the Senate appropri-

ating \$1,800,000, in round numbers, to pay the Southern Pacific Company.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman from Texas it seems to me as this is the last appropriation bill to be passed—I suppose about the last piece of legislation Congress will enact—

Mr. COGSWELL. Oh, no; there are four tariff bills in the Senate to be passed.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois (continuing). I think that a half hour on this side would be enough, although I would prefer not to be limited in that way.

Mr. SAYERS. We want to get through with the discussion of this matter with a view to adjourning.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think we can get through in a half hour, but I hope the gentleman will not regard it as absolutely necessary to close up the time definitely. I think my friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] desires some time, and perhaps other gentlemen. The length of debate will depend a little on the course it takes. I think we can get through by 5 o'clock.

Mr. SAYERS. I suggest that we take a vote at twenty minutes to 5.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I will not occupy very much time.

Mr. SAYERS. I will divide the time with you. I ask consent that debate be closed at twenty minutes to 5.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think you had better let it alone. We will get through sooner.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. There will be no trouble about that.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I think if the gentleman will just let the debate run along, we can close it up more quickly than if we make an agreement.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I first desire to have the amendment read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Southern Pacific Company, \$1,809,539.70.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE].

[Mr. MAGUIRE addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. DALZELL. Do I understand the proposition to be one for the payment of any judgment in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad Company?

Mr. SAYERS. This bill proposes to pay a judgment in favor of the Southern Pacific.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand; but there are judgments existing in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad which, as I understand, this bill does not propose to pay. That is true, is it not?

Mr. SAYERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DALZELL. This bill proposes to pay a judgment of the Southern Pacific, which is the lessee of a number of roads, among others the Central Pacific, but not for services on the Union Pacific or any of the nonaided lines.

Mr. SAYERS. That is so.

Mr. DALZELL. Then the proposition of the gentleman from California is that we shall punish this innocent company, between whom and the Government no relation exists.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Leave out the word "innocent."

Mr. MAGUIRE. The same men own it.

Mr. DALZELL. They are separate organizations, and this Government has connection with them.

Mr. MAGUIRE. This same set of men promoted and incorporated the Southern Pacific Company in Kentucky for the purpose of using it as a cover for the diversion of these funds and earnings of the Central Pacific road.

Mr. DALZELL. All of which would have been good matter to present in a trial of the cause.

Mr. MAGUIRE. No, sir; because the Central Pacific Company would have had a legal right to recover if it had sued.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to know why not?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Because the Supreme Court, in the case of the United States against the Union Pacific, held that these fraudulent diversions could not give rise to a cause of action or suit in equity in favor of the Government until the obligations of the Central Pacific Railroad Company to the Government shall have matured.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand the decision.

Mr. SAYERS. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois want?

Mr. DALZELL. Why, I am told there are 30,000 stockholders in the Southern Pacific Railroad Company.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Where is the evidence of that?

Mr. DALZELL. The evidence is quite as good as the evidence the gentleman has furnished.

Mr. MAGUIRE. The attorney of the company does not say so.

Mr. SAYERS. How much time shall I yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I do not know; several gentlemen desire to have some time.

Mr. SAYERS. How much time does the gentleman from Iowa desire?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I cannot tell exactly, but I think not over ten or fifteen minutes.

Mr. SAYERS. Will fifteen minutes satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I think that will cover my necessities. If I need more, I shall get it.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield the gentleman fifteen minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my duty to explain this matter as I understand it. We have had repeated hearings before the Committee on Appropriations in respect to this subject. Now, let us not have any confusion in this discussion. Let us know exactly what we are talking about. This amendment provides \$1,809,539.70 to be paid to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company. Fix that in your minds. For what is that payment to be made? For carrying troops, mails, and freight for the Government of the United States. Is there any controversy between the Government and the Southern Pacific Railroad Company as to the rates? None whatever. They have always been able to agree as to the compensation to be paid for the work done by the Southern Pacific Railroad. There is not to-day pending a single issue between the Government and that railroad company, not one.

Fix another point in your minds. The amount covered by this amendment, inserted in the bill by the Senate without a dissenting voice, is all in judgment. Suit has been brought for these amounts and they are covered by judgments in the Federal courts, and every question has been adjudged by the highest tribunal in this country. So much for that.

Now, an attempt has been made, I think, to confuse the House by a discussion of the Central Pacific Railroad and its relations to the Government. The Central Pacific and the Union Pacific Railroads are roads that were aided by the issue of Government bonds, the amount aggregating, I believe, without interest, some \$27,000,000. The amount covered by this amendment for the Southern Pacific Railroad Company is for work done and for money earned wholly by nonaided railroads. Not a single Government bond was issued to one of the railroads that performed this work.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Is it not a fact, well known in the history of these railroads, that the Southern Pacific Road is owned by the Central Pacific Company, and that it was created out of the profits of the Central Pacific, which were diverted to the Southern Pacific? And is there not now pending litigation between the Government and the Central Pacific and its owners to recover money that they owe the Government by reason of the aid extended to them?

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. I do not so understand it at all. Let me read at this point from the hearings on this subject before the Committee on Appropriations a question which I put to Judge Payson and his answer. There are many gentlemen here who remember the attitude of Judge Payson in this House on these railroad questions, and I voted with him in every instance when a vote was taken for the forfeiture of the railroad land grants. Here is a question that I put to him when he was recently before the Committee on Appropriations:

Mr. HENDERSON. One other matter, because I am quite interested and we have gone into this thing more comprehensively than before, in order to bring up a question which has appeared in the discussion, as I am not clear as to what was done, and that is in relation to the idea that Governor Sayers brought out when he made clear from your answers that the same men owning the Central Pacific own the Southern Pacific.

It has been stated that the funds derived from the sale of Government bonds for the construction of the Central Pacific were diverted by the management of the Central Pacific for the purchase of lines and for the construction of lines of the Southern Pacific system, and that therefore an equity arises affecting the whole Southern Pacific as an offset, or equitable offset, to the claims against the Government for transportation, etc. Now, I want you to state whether that question has ever been investigated and decided in court, or in anyway adjudicated.

Judge PAYSON. I will answer first in a general way, and in the letter which I will prepare and send you I will give you a citation of the book and page where you will find a brief of it. First, I will state that every dollar which the Government aided the Central Pacific system was used upon that road. The entire amount of both the bonds furnished by the Government, \$27,000,000, and the bonds issued by the railroad company, which were also \$27,000,000, was sold on the market for gold. At that time, if you remember, the currency of California and west of the Rocky Mountains was in gold.

The official reports show that out of that amount of \$54,000,000 there was realized only forty-odd millions—between \$40,000,000 and \$41,000,000 in gold. That had to stand the shaving; you understand as to that. So there was expended in cash on the Central Pacific system between \$42,000,000 and \$43,000,000 of cool cash in its construction before it commenced its practical operation. More money was expended upon this road than was realized from both sets of bonds. I will refer you to the book and page.

Now, if \$54,000,000 was expended upon this road and the Government aid was \$27,000,000, it would require a smart mathematician to demonstrate that there was a diversion of \$52,000,000 or \$52,000,000 or any other sum to build the Southern Pacific.

Here is Judge Payson's statement in the brief which he subsequently filed:

The report of the Pacific Railroad Commission of 1887 shows fully that there has been no improper diversion of funds by the Central Pacific Company, and that every legal requirement has been met and satisfied; that no dividends have been paid in violation of law, page 111; no diversion of earnings through constructive mileage accounts.

So much for the information that was furnished the committee on that point, and Judge Payson stated further that there was nothing now in controversy between the Southern Pacific and the Government. If there is anything I have no knowledge of it. I have only the information that we derived from the investigation we have made as a committee.

Now, let me say another thing. It is true, as Judge Payson stated before our committee, that the chief owners of the Southern Pacific are the same men who are the chief owners in the Central Pacific.

But I am assured that in the Central Pacific Railroad Company, as was shown before the committee of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. REILLY] is chairman, there are some 10,000 stockholders, and that there are many thousands more in the Southern Pacific. Bear in mind that the whole attempt here is to keep back payment from the Southern Pacific on principles which might apply to the Central Pacific.

The Central Pacific being a bond-aided road, the statement is made (and it is a matter that has occupied my mind and troubled me not a little) that as the bonded indebtedness of that road will fall due or commence falling due in 1895, and they admit that they can not pay it, it might be well for us to hold back what is due to the Central Pacific road until that indebtedness matures, so that we may put it in as an offset.

But no such consideration can apply in the case of the Southern Pacific Road. If we were to-day in such a position that the bonds of the Central Pacific Road were due, there is no offset that can apply to the Southern Pacific or any of the branches that are entitled to this \$1,900,000. Then why put this off? We should not have the benefit of any offset even if the time were come for a settlement between the Government and the Central Pacific Road.

But there is another consideration. Granting the stockholders, and the largest stockholders are common to both these lines, the one line aided, the other nonaided, what follows? If I owe a thousand dollars to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE] and the gentleman from Texas, Governor SAYERS, owes me a thousand dollars, does it follow that I can not settle with the gentleman from Texas because the gentleman from California has some arrangement with me? For my part, I can not understand such logic. I see no reason in it.

Here is another point that I want to impress upon this body. We have already been paying this very class of claims to the Southern Pacific Railroad Company. Indeed, I believe we are paying them now. And I call attention to a circular which was issued by Secretary Fairchild June 4, 1886. Prior to that time there had been a general holding up of payments in regard to these railroads; then after matters were settled by the Supreme Court, he issued this circular:

The attention of the accounting officers of the Treasury Department is invited to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *The United States, appellants, vs. The Central Pacific Railroad Company, respondents*, No. 1291, calendar October term, 1885, rendered May 10, 1886, as to the right of the Government to withhold and apply under the Thurman act the compensation due the Central Pacific Railroad Company—

This applies even to the Central Pacific road—

for transportation and other services for the Government over the non-aided portions of the lines owned, leased, or operated by such company, and hereafter the accounts and claims of the company for such services will be settled, adjusted, and paid in conformity to such decision.

All Department circulars heretofore issued upon the subject are modified accordingly.

C. S. FAIRCHILD, *Acting Secretary.*

Under that order a large amount of these earnings was paid even to the Central Pacific Railroad Company. When Mr. Harrison came in as President a temporary suspension of that order was had, on the advice of an officer of the Department of Justice. But there was no revocation of the order, as I understand; there was merely a suspension until another question, not previously raised, in regard to these claims could be settled. That question was raised in the Court of Claims and unanimously decided against the Government; and so clear was the case that no one thought it necessary to appeal; no appeal has ever been taken, and the time for appeal has long since gone by.

Thus it will be seen that the Central Pacific Company cuts no figure in this case. That company is not here. No aided line is covered by this proposition. The only question now is whether Congress shall exercise a power, which I grant it may exercise, the power of refusing to pay an honest debt. The question is whether the Government will set to the people of

the country the example of not paying debts that are justly due for services faithfully rendered, there being no controversy as to the legality of the claim.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Just a word more.

Mr. SAYERS. I yield the gentleman a few moments more.

Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I believe for one that the Government ought not to be adding to the distress, already mountain high, upon the railroad systems of the country. I believe in holding the railroads to a strict accountability to the people. I have voted for the most radical propositions that have come before Congress to so hold them. I believe in that doctrine. But with our railroads passing one after another into bankruptcy, and when they do so are throwing armies of laboring men out of employment, is it wise policy to hold back this sum of nearly \$2,000,000 honestly earned, the work having been well done by a line of road which never had a dollar of aid from the United States Government? I state the facts; and this House can do as it pleases.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois rose.

Mr. SAYERS. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois want?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. There are a number of gentlemen here who want to speak.

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield to the gentleman if he will state what time he wants.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman yields to me, I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. SAYERS. I do not yield the floor to the gentleman. I have asked him how much time he wants?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, I do not know. The gentleman from Pennsylvania wants ten minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] ten, and I may want ten or fifteen minutes myself.

Mr. SAYERS. Well, I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, and he can parcel out that time as he chooses.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. All right. I would be glad to hear from the gentlemen, however, on the other side. But I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] for ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the only interest I have in the pending controversy at this time is largely a personal one. It so happened that early in my service in Congress I was brought into a study of the relations existing between the United States Government and the Pacific railroads; and in a discussion in the Fifty-first Congress—in the second session of that Congress—I strenuously resisted, so far as I could resist, an appropriation then proposed for the payment of certain judgments which had been rendered by the Court of Claims and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad Company and against the Government.

It has been said in the course of this discussion that the position I have assumed to-day, judging that position from the interrogatories I propounded to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE], is inconsistent with the position I then assumed. I do not think that it is so in any sense of the word; in fact, I think it quite the contrary; and I desire to occupy the floor for a few moments in order to establish that fact.

Now, what was the question before the Fifty-first Congress? The question then presented was whether or not that Congress should appropriate a sum of money for the payment of certain judgments rendered in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad Company against the Government. These judgments were rendered for services performed by that company on the nonaided lines, and were rendered in favor of the Central Pacific Company, because the Supreme Court had held that, under the contract relations existing between the company and the Government, it had a right to be paid in full for all services rendered upon the nonaided lines.

The situation then was this: There was a judgment in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad Company against the Government for services rendered on what is known as the nonaided lines, for which services the Supreme Court of the United States said the company had a right to be paid in full. It was urged here on the floor of the House that the judgment having been so rendered, and there being no money due to the Government from these companies at the time, we could not set off the amount of money to be due by them in the future against the judgment that they had already recovered.

I conceded that principle; but I stood on this principle: That the Central Pacific Company having the judgment, was an insolvent company; that it had presented itself at the doors of every Congress within my recollection declaring that when the

time came to pay the \$70,000,000 which it owed to the Government of the United States it would be unable to meet its obligations, and I stood on the proposition that a court of equity would always grant an injunction to restrain an execution on the part of an insolvent judgment creditor issued against a party to whom the insolvent would be bound to pay a greater sum of money in the future.

That was the position I then assumed, and I stand on that proposition and the principles it enunciates now. No man on the floor of this House will go further than I will in resistance of the payment, on the part of the United States, of a single dollar to these subsidized railroads, whether for services rendered on the subsidized portions of the lines or upon the nonaided portions of the lines. But that is not the case here.

Mr. RILEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I think it is exactly the case presented here, the only difference being, as I understand, that the judgments before were in the name of the Central Pacific Railroad Company, whereas to-day they are in the name of the Southern Pacific, its lessor, but for the same services and over the same nonaided lines.

Mr. DALZELL. That is precisely the fallacy of the position that is assumed by these gentlemen. The gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE] says it is true the judgment is not in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad, but in favor of the Southern Pacific. He says, however, that the stockholders of the Central Pacific and the stockholders of the Southern Pacific Railroad are one and the same.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is there any lawyer here who will have the temerity to claim that identity of stockholders makes identity of corporations? If it were a good defense that this is a scheme on the part of the stockholders of the Central Pacific road, under cover of another corporate name, to recover a judgment against the Government of the United States, it was a good defense to set up in court where the case was tried, but it is no defense here; and because we refuse and still refuse, and will continue to refuse to pay judgments, how many or how great it does not matter, rendered in favor of the subsidized lines, is no reason why we should refuse to pay a judgment in favor of another company for services rendered on roads not aided by the Government and having no connection with the subsidized lines.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Now, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me, had the Central Pacific Company under the terms of its agreement with the Government in the first instance the right to make leases with the Southern Pacific Company, or any other company to deprive the Government of its opportunity to obtain services to be rendered, or which should have been rendered to it under the terms of its creation?

Mr. DALZELL. I understand the services were rendered on lines belonging to the Southern Pacific Company, a company which was not aided by the Government, and has no contract with the Government at all.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. I think the gentleman is mistaken in that. The services in this case were rendered on branches of the Central Pacific which were leased by the Southern Pacific.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, not at all.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. I understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. REILLY] chairman of the Committee on Pacific Railroads, that that is the situation of the case.

Mr. REILLY. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. Now, I want to ask as to the validity of this lease made without the consent of the General Government.

Mr. DALZELL. I can not pass upon that question.

Mr. COOPER of Indiana. If they had no power to make that lease without the consent of the General Government, then we are under no obligations to deal with them.

Mr. DALZELL. That is too big a question for me to pass on now. If your position is correct, why do you simply include in this appropriation bill the judgment rendered in favor of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company? Why do you not put in the judgments rendered in favor of the Central Pacific Railroad Company that are yet unpaid?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You understand that this amendment was put into the bill at the other end of this building.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand, but they must be consistent.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, but they are not consistent.

Mr. DALZELL. The mere fact that they have provided for the payment of this judgment and have not provided for the others is a declaration upon their part that there is a fundamental distinction between the Central Pacific judgment and this judgment. As I stated when I started, I have no interest in this matter except that I want to be consistent; and if any gentleman can convince me that the ground I now occupy is not

the ground I occupied in the Fifty-first Congress, I will go back to that ground.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Chair, at the end of ten minutes, would call me down.

This is a Senate amendment that provides for the payment of a judgment rendered in favor of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company for carrying the mails and transportation of Government troops over the Southern Pacific Railroad—not the Central Pacific Railroad—prior to 1889.

Since the passage of the Thurman act the Central Pacific Railroad, which was built by Government aid and a loan of Government bonds, performed services over its line which have never been paid for, but under the law are held to reimburse the Government for the debt of that road hereafter to accrue.

But there came up a question between the Government and the Central Pacific Railroad, that was then operating itself and also operating certain leased lines built without Government aid, as to whether payment could be recovered for the service to the Government upon those lines, or whether under the law such earnings could be held by the Government to reimburse it for debts hereafter to accrue from the Central Pacific Railroad. Well, some said one thing and some said another. The question went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and was fully argued by way of appeal from the Court of Claims, and the Supreme Court of the United States, construing the Pacific railroad laws and the Thurman act, said that for services performed on the nonaided lines they were entitled to pay. The judgment was rendered and is still unpaid. That judgment is not only unpaid, but is not on this bill.

In 1885 or 1886, I am not sure which, a new corporation was organized, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and they proceeded to build railroads and bridges, and to build, own, and acquire 2,000 miles of railroad in that system. The Central Pacific Railroad is less than 1,000 miles long. Now, from that time up to 1889, on these 2,000 miles of railroad, owned and operated by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, they carried our mails and troops until we owed them \$1,800,000. The Southern Pacific Railroad went into the courts and got judgment, which was finally adjudicated. This is on the Southern Pacific, upon its own lines, not upon the Central Pacific at all.

Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAGUIRE] can talk. The gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Ohio can talk, and I can talk about this question and that question and the other question, but the coordinate branch of the Government, the Supreme Court of the United States, was created to settle questions, and when it has solemnly settled them and rendered a judgment, that is the last guess, and is the guess that binds everybody.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Would it not be perfectly true if you owed me of your colleagues \$2,000 immediately maturing, and he owed you \$10,000 to mature within a few days after judgment was rendered; would not the court be bound to render judgment in his favor upon the note against you, notwithstanding the greater obligation in your favor about to fall due? That is the situation here.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is not the situation; and the gentleman does not state it fairly when he states it to be the situation. Not at all. The Southern Pacific Railroad system is an entirely different system from the Central Pacific. It was built independent of the Government. The Government never aided in its construction. It has different stockholders from the Central Pacific in part.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Did not the Government aid it to the extent of a grant of several millions of acres in aid of its construction?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Yes. I stated that it had not aided it in the issue of bonds. It aided the Northern Pacific and 10,000 miles of other roads; but that is not the question. The Southern Pacific Railroad owns 2,000 miles of road, has built and paid for its construction, and it has its own set of stockholders independent of the Central Pacific. I am told there are 20,000 of them. And now, after they have earned this money, and the highest court of the land has rendered a judgment in their favor, the gentleman seeks to come in here and muddy the water by not correctly stating the situation. Now, one further matter.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Where does this \$1,800,000 come from? Is it an allowance for carrying the mails, etc., on non-aided roads; and is it proposed to hold this as security for the debts and obligations of aided roads?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, no; it is for money due by the United States for carrying the mails on 2,000 miles of the South-

ern Pacific Railroad, and not over a single foot of the Central Pacific.

Mr. HEPBURN. Over a nonaided road.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It has 2,000 miles of nonaided road, having no connection with the Central Pacific, but having different stockholders; and after exhaustive litigation the judgment has been rendered.

Now, let me tell you another fact, and I hope I will have the attention of the gentlemen from California, Ohio, and Texas. Under Mr. Cleveland's former Administration, a part of it, after the decision of the Supreme Court, and under Mr. Harrison's Administration, and under this Administration, and by our appropriations last Congress, and by Congresses before, and this Congress, we are paying money this day to this Southern Pacific Railroad Company for carrying our mails quarter by quarter. You have appropriated for it in the army bill, in the naval bill, and you have appropriated for it in the Post-Office appropriation bill; and in all these years we pay them every dollar that they earn, if there is enough appropriated; and there is substantially enough.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will take two minutes more.

Now, I can not say anything more about it. That is enough. If the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from California object to the payment of this claim after the money has been earned, and after the Supreme Court has rendered a judgment, pray, if you want to be consistent, why do you not withhold that money, or why do you permit its payment for current services? Why do you not amend this very amendment if you want to do that, and say that there shall be no money paid for services rendered by the Southern Pacific Railroad?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question right there?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the chairman of the committee, under the present Administration, is reporting provisions for paying the Southern Pacific Company for carrying the mails, the class of services for which it refused to pay on a judgment—for carrying the mails prior to 1879?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. We refuse to pay if we vote down this amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is the same class of case.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. It is the same thing.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. That is what I wanted to find out.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The United States mails were carried in 1888 or 1889, or parts of those years, and troops transported to the amount of \$1,800,000, which the Southern Pacific Railroad went into the court and recovered by a final judgment; and in the last quarter and the quarter before, and for years before, we have been paying the same company for similar services, and are doing it to-day.

Mr. HULICK. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MARSH. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, I will; both.

Mr. HULICK. In the suit in which that judgment was rendered was there any defense, legal or equitable, set up against the payment of the judgment bearing upon this defense now set up?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. On which defense?

Mr. HULICK. The claim that the Central Pacific Railroad Company would be insolvent, and that it could not pay.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. All the defenses were set up that could be set up, I apprehend. I have not read the pleadings; but I am satisfied that every defense was set up.

Mr. MARSH. This is just what I want to ask my colleague. The gentleman from California made the point, and it made some impression upon my mind, that four individuals, and he named them, are the owners of the Central Pacific, which railroad is about to default to the United States.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. And it is sustained by the testimony taken.

Mr. MARSH. I do not want to know anything from you. I want my colleague to answer my question. The point the gentleman from California made was that four certain men, whom he named, are the owners, and the sole owners, of the Central Pacific Railroad, and that the same four men are the owners of the Southern Pacific Railroad. And hence he says, properly, as I believe, if his statement is correct, that what the Central Pacific road owes the Government might, in equity, be set off against what the Government owes the Southern Pacific. Now, what is the fact? Are the same men the owners of the two corporations?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], answered that question in part.

Mr. MARSH. Well, will you not answer it in whole?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Certainly. And I answer that, if Judge Payson's word can be taken, the stockholders of the two companies are different. I have no doubt that there are some stockholders common to each company; but all the stockholders in one company are not all the stockholders in the other.

Mr. MARSH. Then the statement of the gentleman from California is not correct.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I understand that it is not correct if that gentleman intended to make that statement.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Judge Payson is contradicting the testimony taken by the Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Let us have the testimony, but in your own time. Now, Mr. Speaker, even if it were so, it would cut no figure. The corporations are different. Their debtors and creditors are different. Each one of these roads is bonded. The Southern Pacific Railroad, with its 2,000 miles of road, is bonded. Its bonds were sold to build the road step by step through Texas long after the Central Pacific was completed. They have different interests. Their creditors are different. Their stockholders are different in part, as I am informed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that they sold bonds to build the railroad through Texas?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, well, the road runs through Texas, and I made that as a general remark. I do not know specifically that they sold bonds to build the part of the road that runs through Texas; but I understand that the Southern Pacific Railroad, in whole or in many of its branches, did sell bonds for construction purposes.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman has any special knowledge on this subject I will yield to him.

Mr. CULBERSON. I would like to have three or four minutes on this question.

Mr. SAYERS. I will yield the gentleman time.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. If the gentleman has any information on the subject that I have not, I will yield to him.

Mr. CULBERSON. I was simply asking the question for information.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I did not mean United States bonds.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] have used about twenty-five minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] about fifteen minutes, making forty minutes altogether used on that side. Now, I intend to move an adjournment at 5 o'clock—

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. You can not complete this matter this evening.

Mr. SAYERS. I am not going to try. I am going to submit a proposition to the House. I ask unanimous consent that, after the reading of the Journal to-morrow the debate on this amendment be continued for an hour and a half, when the vote shall be taken; the time for debate to be divided in proportion to the consumption of time to-day; that is, those in favor of the amendment having consumed forty-five minutes and those opposed to it twenty minutes, each side shall have its proper proportion of the remaining time.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. There is no disposition to prolong the debate, but I think it would be better to let it run temporarily.

Mr. SAYERS. I would like to reach an agreement because members will desire to know when they are required to vote. I ask consent that the debate continue now until 5 o'clock and for an hour and a half to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal—

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Why not say that you will not ask a vote before half past 1 or half past 2? We on this side have used a good deal of the time, and I do not know what may be said on the other side that may require a reply.

Mr. SAYERS. I am willing to give the gentleman time.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Well, the gentleman has it in his power to move the previous question at any time. I will cooperate with him to close the debate as soon as it can be done reasonably.

Mr. SAYERS. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to yield it so that other motions may be made. What I desire is to reach some fair and equitable agreement between those who are in favor of the Senate amendment and those who are opposed to it. I do not wish to press a vote unless with the consent of the gentlemen who are in favor of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I can say nothing further than I have said. There is no disposition on my part to occupy one

minute of time for the mere purpose of consuming time, and I will, to the best of my ability, cooperate with the gentleman to bring this matter to a speedy vote, but I am not prepared at this moment to say just how much time we require.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman agree that the vote be taken at 2 o'clock to-morrow?

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will agree that I will not ask the gentleman to call for a vote before 2 o'clock. [Laughter.]

Mr. CULBERSON. There are a few of us over here that want a little time.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. The gentleman from New Hampshire also wants ten minutes, and quite a number of gentlemen over here want to be heard.

Mr. CULBERSON. I think we can get through by 2 o'clock.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I hope so; but there is a morning hour.

Mr. SAYERS. No; I am going to call up the report the first thing after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. I will agree to two hours and a half, this side to have an hour and the other side an hour and a half.

Mr. SAYERS. All right, sir. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this question may be limited to two hours and a half—one hour and a half to be used by those gentlemen who are opposed to the Senate amendments, and the remaining hour by those who are in favor of those amendments, the hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and the hour and a half by myself.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. That is, two hours and a half to-morrow.

Mr. SAYERS. Perhaps the gentleman might be willing to go on now.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois. Oh, I will not go on now. It is quarter before 5.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. TARSNEY). The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that, after two hours and a half of further debate, the previous question may be considered as ordered and a vote be taken on the pending proposition. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SAYERS. With the understanding that this conference report will be called up as soon as the Journal is read to-morrow, I will move that the House adjourn.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 2107) granting to the Northern Mississippi Railway Company right of way through certain Indian reservations in Minnesota;

Joint resolution (H. R. 217) to continue the provisions of existing laws providing temporarily for the expenditures of the Government;

A bill (S. 2303) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Contentnea Creek at Grifton, Lenoir County, N. C., and establish it as a post-road; and

Joint resolution (S. R. No. 96) to extend the charter of the Maryland and Washington Railroad Company.

WINNEBAGO INDIANS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. PICKLER, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably from the Committee on Indian Affairs the bill (H. R. 7731) for the relief of certain Winnebago Indians in Minnesota; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The motion of Mr. SAYERS was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

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

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (H. R. 6985) granting a pension to William Armstrong. (Report No. 1438.)

Also, a bill (S. 577) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Chill. (Report No. 1416.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 6461) to grant a pension to Mrs. Mary Button, of Arkansas, widow of Asa Button, deceased. (Report No. 1447.)

By Mr. HOUK, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 1512) for the relief of Slater and William Cowart, of Hamilton County, Tenn. (Report No. 1439.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 7802) for the relief of William Pickett, administrator of Jesse Pickett, late of Sequatchie County, Tenn., as found due by the Court of Claims under the act of March 3, 1883. (Report No. 1440.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions: A bill (S. 2056) granting a pension to Ada J. Schwatka, widow of the late Lieut. Frederick Schwatka. (Report No. 1448.)

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Annie E. Colwell. (Report No. 1449.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 7974) providing for the punishment of persons falsely making, forging, altering, or counterfeiting military and naval commissions or discharges or other public records for the purpose of defrauding the United States or deceiving the public, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TATE: A bill (H. R. 7975) to provide to whom contracts for carrying the mails shall be awarded—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 7976) to repeal section 4901 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 7977) to amend the internal revenue laws of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENDLETON of Texas: A resolution asking for a special order providing for the consideration of a bill repealing all specific and differential duties on sugar—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUDSON: A resolution calling for a committee to ascertain the status of lands granted to railroads and other corporations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLACK of Illinois: A resolution directing the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to report to the House a bill providing for the proper use and avail of the silver in the Treasury, and asking the Committee on Rules to report a rule providing for the consideration of said bill—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COGSWELL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 219) instructing the Secretary of War to return to the State of Massachusetts the flag of the Twenty-third Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7948) granting a pension to Aloysius Oberle, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 7978) for the benefit of Martin W. Greene—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7979) for the benefit of Edward Lautenschlager—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7980) granting an increase of pension to Alvin F. Kimball—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOMBS: A bill (H. R. 7981) for the relief of Capt. John T. Bruen, of the State of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DURBOROW: A bill (H. R. 7982) for the relief of W. L. Clifford, a letter-carrier in the Post-Office Department of the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 7983) for the relief of Daniel Cupples, Claiborne Wilson, J. B. King, and R. A. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIEFER: A bill (H. R. 7984) for the relief of Mrs. Celeste H. McCoy, widow of W. D. McCoy, deceased—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 7985) for the relief of R. R. Barrow, of Geneva County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7986) to correct the military record of Christopher Bolin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7987) for the relief of the estate of James Campbell, deceased, late of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7988) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Phoenix, Yazoo County, Miss.—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. BRODERICK: Petition of W. H. Griffith and 600 other

citizens of Kansas City, Kans., against appropriating public money for sectarian purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEEN (by request): Petition of 100 American Railway Union members of Uinta County, Wyo., asking for impeachment proceedings—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENLOE: Papers to accompany the bill for the relief of Daniels Cupples, Claiborne Wilson, J. B. King, and R. A. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota: Petition of Samuel Moore and 54 other citizens of Grand Forks County, N. Dak., residing near Turtle River, asking that John R. G. Karlen be relieved of the contest now pending against his free claim, viz, the north-west quarter of section 8, township 154, range 51, and that he be allowed to prove up on said land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of William Hadaway, for a claim against the Government—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MEREDITH: Papers to accompany House bill 7966—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PENCE: Resolutions of the taxpayers of Rio Blanco County, Colo., urging that White River forest reservation be abolished or very materially reduced—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the citizens of Colorado, for the impeachment of the Attorney-General of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 16, 1894.

Prayer by Rev. J. H. MCARTY, D. D., of the city of Washington.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4605) granting chief justices of United States courts in Territories power to appoint commissioners to take proof in land cases, etc.; agreed to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MCRAE, Mr. SOMERS, and Mr. ELLIS of Oregon managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7668) to authorize the St. Louis, Avoyelles and Southwestern Railway Company to bridge Bayou Des Glaisses and Atchafalaya River, in the State of Louisiana.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 101) providing for clerical assistance in the health office of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 7811) authorizing the El Reno Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the South Canadian River, between Blaine County, Okla., and the Wichita Indian Reservation;

A bill (H. R. 7839) to bridge the Newark Bay;

A bill (H. R. 7910) to amend "An act to provide for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof, which are the subjects of interstate commerce, and for other purposes;" and

A bill (H. R. 7955) to perfect the title to a quarter section of land in the town of Yuma, Colo.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 387) to authorize the construction of a life-saving station at or near Rocky Point or East Marion, Long Island, New York;

A bill (H. R. 859) for the relief of B. D. Greene;

A bill (H. R. 6038) to repeal House resolution numbered 104, first session Fifty-first Congress, granting to Secretary of War a permit to license to use a pier at mouth of Chicago River; and

A bill (H. R. 6060) to amend section 4833, Revised Statutes, and for other purposes.

MEMORIALS.

Mr. ALLISON presented the memorial of Robert Lipton and sundry other citizens of Ida County, Iowa, and the memorial of H. G. Harshburger and sundry other citizens of Woodbine, Iowa,

remonstrating against the support of the Government in maintaining the present system of sectarian Indian education, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXCLUSION AND DEPORTATION OF ALIEN ANARCHISTS.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 2314) to provide for the exclusion and deportation of alien anarchists.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. CALL. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from New York, but this seems to be a very long bill, and it will probably occupy some time.

Mr. HILL. I will explain it to the Senator, if he will permit me just a moment.

This bill is virtually a report from a conference committee. The other House passed a bill to provide for consular inspection abroad. The Senate did not like that bill, and we substituted another measure. A conference committee was appointed, and we finally agreed upon this bill; but the conferees on the part of the House did not wish to have their bill killed, but wanted the principle of consular inspection to remain open and go over until the next session. We consented to allow that bill to remain in conference, they in the mean time agreeing that we should pass this bill here and send it to the House, when that body would concur in it.

Mr. CALL. If there is to be no debate, I will withdraw my objection.

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

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. When this bill or a similar bill was before the Senate the other day, on the motion of the Senator from New York there was a provision inserted that when any person had come into our country and had been naturalized, if it could be proven before the proper tribunal that he was not a man of good moral character, that he was not attached to the Constitution and principles of our Government, and was not disposed to the good order and happiness of the same, he should be deported. That language is omitted from this bill, and I do not see why it should not be contained in it.

Mr. HILL. By the provisions of this bill, in the first place, if an alien immigrant should be convicted of a crime and the judge should determine upon a further hearing that the person had been guilty of a crime involving moral turpitude, and that his presence in the country would be a menace to the Government and the peace and good order of society, he may be ordered deported. It was thought wise by the conference committee not to use the words "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States," as it left too much open. As the man is an alien, of course it is not expected that he will be attached to the principles of our Constitution. An alien who behaves himself in this country would not and could not be touched under this bill, and we do not propose to do it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not propose to offer an amendment—

Mr. HILL. The bill was very carefully considered by the committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. But it does seem to me that every person who has been admitted under our immigration laws ought to be required to stand by the declaration we require for admission; and if it be proven afterward that he is not a man of good moral character, that he is not attached to the principles of our Government, and is not disposed to the good order and peace of the same, he ought to be excluded.

Mr. HILL. We do not touch the citizen who is naturalized. We do not think it wise to go so far as that.

Mr. SHERMAN. I see no reason why persons who are brought into our country under our naturalization laws should not only prove at the time they are admitted that they come within its provisions, but that they should maintain that condition, or else be liable to be deported.

Mr. HILL. I will simply say, as has been said heretofore in regard to other bills, that it is a step in the right direction. Sooner or later we may adopt the idea, which is an entirely good one, of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, but it is a little too early to do it now.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to say that it was not deemed advisable by the committee to provide that every alien should be deported whom we would not be willing to naturalize and make a citizen of.

This bill was drawn in the Treasury Department, and has been